Investigating the role of teachers' teaching styles in instructing general English to EFL learners

Maryam Bagheri
Department of TEFL, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran.

ABSTRACT

A teaching style is defined as a pattern of needs, beliefs, and behaviors that teachers expose in their classrooms. It is stated that it results in substantial influence on students' achievements. This study investigated the role of teachers' teaching styles in instructing general English to EFL learners. 33 Iranian EFL teachers and 50 intermediate EFL learners in five classes participated in the study. The teachers were selected from Safir Language Academy based on their teaching experience of more than seven years, availability, and willingness to participate. The learners were in intermediate levels, and they were also selected from Safir Language Academy in Ahvaz, Iran. Data related to teachers were collected using classroom observations, a semi-structured oral interview including five open-ended questions, and the Teaching Styles Inventory (version 3.0) designed by Grasha-Reichman (1996). The results of classroom observations, interviews, and questionnaires demonstrated that 16 teachers preferred the facilitator style. However, the one-way ANOVA results depicted that the expert style was the most effective, and the formal authority style was the least effective among all styles. Since EFL learners' ability, readiness to learn, and degree of success do not only depend on students themselves but also lie in the suitability of teachers' teaching styles as well as other factors, teachers should try to be aware of their teaching style and change it for better if possible, to help EFL learners achieve the goal of learning general English.
Keywords: Teaching Styles, Expert, Delegator, Personal Model, Formal Authority, Facilitator.

Introduction

Over the past few decades, teachers have been the subject of attention for many researchers in various pedagogical studies. As Wright, Horn, and Sanders (1997) have asserted, "More can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor" (p. 63). Hence, various studies have attempted to scrutinize teachers' beliefs, perceptions, and thoughts tied to their behaviors and performances.

We argue that it is essential to study teachers' beliefs to determine how they perform and behave in educational contexts and the effect on students' achievements. The teachers' teaching styles, which is defined as "A pattern of needs, beliefs, and behaviors that teachers display in their classrooms" (Grasha, 1996, p. 152), and results in considerable influence on students' achievements (Akbari, Kiany, Imani

Naeeni, & Karimi Allvar, 2008). The teaching style is one of the factors affecting the creative classroom atmosphere (Aktan, 2012). The teaching style is defined as consistent and continuous teachers' behavior patterns (Grasha, 2002). Grasha (1996) emphasized that teaching style has many components, such as teacher-student relations, teaching methods, teachers giving feedback and reinforcement, asking questions, or answering questions.

In the traditional view of language teaching, effective learning is defined as transferring objective knowledge from teachers to students. Accordingly, in conventional classes, the teacher controls the class and the students' learning. Thus, *how to teach* is the center of educational research (Akbarzadeh & Fatemipour, 2014).

Student academic excellence is the main agenda for any educational institution and college. Ensuring that academic excellence can be achieved requires action and cooperation from all parties. This is because the students' ability and readiness to learn depend not only on the students themselves but also on the teacher's teaching style (Felder & Henrique, 1995).

Grasha and Hicks (2000) argue that to guarantee the effectiveness of a teaching and learning process, it is simply not enough to focus only on students' learning styles. Teaching styles also need to be considered as an important element in a lesson. According to Grasha (1996), the teaching styles are the pattern of belief, knowledge, performance, and behavior of teachers when they are teaching. In this study, according to Grasha (1996), there are five dimensions of teaching styles: expert, formal authority, personal model, delegator, and facilitator.

To the best of the researchers' knowledge, almost no research has been conducted to identify teaching styles' role in teaching general English to EFL learners. The present study aims to identify the role of teaching styles in teaching general English to EFL learners to understand and determine whether teaching styles affect teaching general English as a foreign language to EFL learners within the specific context of two Iranian language academies.

Methodology

Participants

The participants were 33 EFL teachers (females and males) teaching English for General purposes. The instructors were selected from a language institute called Safir Language Academy in Ahvaz based on their teaching experience of more than seven years, availability, and willingness to participate. They held BA, MA, or Ph.D. degrees. In this study, there were 50 Iranian EFL learners. All of the learners were in intermediate levels, and they were selected from Safir Language Academy. The age of learners varied from teenagers to adults (18-32), and learning the English language for general purposes was the subject of the course. In this study, the first ten learners' names in the class list of each teacher with a particular teaching style were selected to compare their pre-test and post-test scores.

Instrumentation

Teaching styles inventory (version 3.0)

The instrument that was used in this study was the Teaching Styles Inventory (version 3.0)—designed by Grasha (1996), which includes 40 items and examines the five types of teaching styles: expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. In this scale, each item is assessed using a five-point Likert scale in which one represents strongly disagree, and five represents strongly agree. The reliability and validity of this scale have been confirmed through Grasha's studies and other studies that were 80 and 86, respectively.

The researcher observed teachers' classes take notes on the teacher's teaching style. At the end of the class, teachers had a semi-structured oral interview with the researcher, consisting of 5 open-ended

questions with specific topics related to each teaching style, such as: Do you use personal examples while teaching your students? Which represents the personal model style. Answering the interview questions took around 5 minutes after completing the teaching styles inventory by the teacher.

Learners whose level was intermediate were divided into five classes with a single teacher with a particular teaching style. All 50 intermediate learners took a pre-test before starting the term, which lasted for 16 sessions to check their general English. They also took a post-test at the end of the term, which was developed to obtain the scores to be compared. There were main parts relating to general English in both pre-test and post-test, including listening, grammar, vocabulary, use of language, reading, word skills, and writing.

Procedure

The present study was conducted through a descriptive research design. Almost in all studies, teaching styles have, so far, been examined quantitatively using a questionnaire. However, quantitative tools alone are insufficient to ascertain the effectiveness and usefulness of a teaching style instrument, particularly in the case of non-native teachers. A triangular approach utilizing a questionnaire, semi-structured oral interviews, and participant observations present a full picture of instrument validation (DeCapua & Wintergerst, 2005).

A mixture of quantitative (questionnaires) and qualitative (interviews) research methods were used to answer the research questions. Because they are found to be the most suitable for the objectives of this investigation and because this combination of methodology offsets the weaknesses of either approach on its own (Blake, 1989; Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989; Rossman & Wilson, 1991). Questionnaires provide evidence of patterns in populations, and qualitative interview data offer more in-depth insights into participant attitudes, thoughts, and actions (Kendall, 2008).

Thus, following a triangular approach, this study used three methods of data collection: questionnaire, interview, and classroom observation, each of which was discussed in detail. The data of the study were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively.

This study was carried out in Iran, Ahvaz. The researcher observed 33 EFL teachers in Safir Language Academy in the classrooms, each for two sessions, to write notes and record the events and the activities to evaluate the teachers' performances in the class to identify each teacher's teaching style. These values were given to each item based on the frequency of its occurrence in the class. Teachers were asked to complete a paper copy of the Grasha-Riechmann Teaching Style Survey (1996), which took 40 minutes after the observation session. Instructions of the questionnaire were provided in English at the questionnaire beginning, and these instructions made clear that they responded to items in terms of their styles in teaching English. They also participated in a semi-structured oral interview consisting of 5 open-ended questions with specific topics related to their teaching style, which took around 5 minutes. Participation in all groups was voluntary, and anonymity was guaranteed. The process of data collection started at the beginning of spring and lasted till the end of spring. The questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations were transcribed, analyzed, and codified to examine qualitatively. The classroom observations were compared with the obtained results from the teachers' questionnaires and interviews. Moreover, the learners' scores in pre-test and post-test were analyzed and compared. Finally, the role of teaching styles in teaching general English to EFL learners was investigated.

Data Analysis

To analyze the gathered data, the SPSS software, version 22 software, was used. To identify the role of different teachers' teaching styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, delegator, and facilitator style) in teaching general English to EFL learners and comparing and analyzing students' scores, One-Way ANOVA and Paired Sample t-test were performed. Data were analyzed through triangulation procedures.

Results

Based on the descriptive statistics, the mean scores of the personal model group on the pre and post-tests were 85.10 and 89.45, respectively. It seems that the performance of this group is equal on the pre and post-tests. A paired samples t-test is run to ascertain the difference between the pre and post-tests of this group. The difference between the pre-test and post-test of this group is not significant since Sig (.139) is greater than 0.05.

The formal authority group's descriptive statistics show that the formal authority group's mean scores on the pre and post-tests are 82.00 and 75.90, respectively. A paired samples t-test is run to ascertain the difference between the pre and post-tests of this group. Results indicate that the difference between the pre and post-tests of formal authority groups is significant at ($p<0.05$) since Sig (.012) is less than 0.05. The treatment had a negative effect on improving their post-test scores.

The descriptive statistics of the facilitator group studied in this research. The mean score of this group on the pre-test is 83.00, and their mean score on the post-test is 87.15. A paired samples t-test is used to see if the difference between the pre and post-tests of this group is significant or not. Results reveal that the difference between the pre and post-tests of the facilitator group is not significant at ($p<0.05$) since Sig (.110) is greater than 0.05. The treatment had not any significant effects on the post-test of the facilitator group. The descriptive statistics of the expert group on the pre and post-tests show that the mean score of this group on the pre-test is 83.20, and their mean score on the post-test is 91.50. A paired samples t-test is run to find out if the difference between the pre and post-tests of this group is significant or not. Results indicate that the difference between the pre and post-tests of the expert group is significant at ($p<0.05$) since Sig (.004) is less than 0.05. The treatment helped this group to have better performance on their post-test. The descriptive statistics of the delegator group on the pre and post-tests show that the mean score of this group on the pre-test is 80.80, and their mean score on the post-test is 78.85. A paired samples t-test is utilized to ensure if the difference between the pre and post-tests of this group is significant or not. Results indicate that the difference between the pre and post-tests of the delegator group is not significant at ($p<0.05$) since Sig (.348) is greater than 0.05. It can be concluded that the treatment could not help the delegator group improve their post-test performance.

The descriptive statistics of all groups on the pre-test show that the mean score of the expert group is 83.200; the mean score of the delegator group is 80.80; the mean score of the personal model group is 85.10; the mean score of formal authority is 82.00; and the mean score of facilitator group is 83.00. To see the difference between the pre-test of all groups, One-Way ANOVA is used. Since Sig (530) is greater than 0.050, there is no significant difference between the pre-tests of the groups. They performed the same on the pre-test.

Table 1 compares the mean scores of all groups on the pre-test. Based on Table 1, there is no significant difference between all groups' pre-test mean scores ($p<0.05$). This table shows that there is no significant difference between the pre-test mean scores of the personal model group and the four other groups. In addition, there is not a significant difference between the pre-test mean scores of the formal authority group and the other four groups. Moreover, there is no significant difference between the pre-test mean scores of the facilitator group and the other four groups. This table indicates no significant difference between the pre-test mean scores of the export group and the other four groups. This table shows no significant difference between the pre-test mean scores of the delegator group and the other four groups.

Table 1. Tukey HSD Test, Multiple Comparisons (Pre-test).

VAR00001 Tukey HSD						
(I) VAR00002	(J) VAR00002	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	2.40000	2.51272	.873	-4.7398	9.5398
	3	-1.90000	2.51272	.942	-9.0398	5.2398
	4	1.20000	2.51272	.989	-5.9398	8.3398
	5	.20000	2.51272	1.000	-6.9398	7.3398
2	1	-2.40000	2.51272	.873	-9.5398	4.7398
	3	-4.30000	2.51272	.438	-11.4398	2.8398
	4	-1.20000	2.51272	.989	-8.3398	5.9398
	5	-2.20000	2.51272	.904	-9.3398	4.9398
3	1	1.90000	2.51272	.942	-5.2398	9.0398
	2	4.30000	2.51272	.438	-2.8398	11.4398
	4	3.10000	2.51272	.732	-4.0398	10.2398
	5	2.10000	2.51272	.918	-5.0398	9.2398
4	1	-1.20000	2.51272	.989	-8.3398	5.9398
	2	1.20000	2.51272	.989	-5.9398	8.3398
	3	-3.10000	2.51272	.732	-10.2398	4.0398
	5	-1.00000	2.51272	.995	-8.1398	6.1398
5	1	-.20000	2.51272	1.000	-7.3398	6.9398
	2	2.20000	2.51272	.904	-4.9398	9.3398
	3	-2.10000	2.51272	.918	-9.2398	5.0398
	4	1.00000	2.51272	.995	-6.1398	8.1398

The test of homogeneity of variances shows that Sig (.224) is greater than 0.050, so there is not a significant difference between the level of the participants. In other words, the difference between their level of English proficiency is not significant. In addition, the results of homogeneous subsets display that Sig (.438) is greater than 0.050, so subsets are homogeneous; the means of all groups seem almost equal.

Table 2 depicts the descriptive statistics of all groups on the post-test. The mean score of the expert group is 91.50; the mean score of the delegator group is 78.85; the mean score of the personal model group is 89.45; the mean score of formal authority is 75.90; and the mean score of the formal authority facilitator group is 87.15. One-Way ANOVA is run to discover the difference between the post-test of all groups (Table 3).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Five Groups on Post-test.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Expert	10	91.5000	4.74342	1.50000	88.1068	94.8932	83.00	100.00
Delegator	10	78.8500	3.73460	1.18098	76.1784	81.5216	75.00	84.50
Personal	10	89.4500	6.03439	1.90824	85.1333	93.7667	78.50	97.00
Formal	10	75.9000	2.90402	.91833	73.8226	77.9774	72.00	80.00
Facilitator	10	87.1500	6.52793	2.06431	82.4802	91.8198	75.00	96.00
Total	50	84.5700	7.79718	1.10269	82.3541	86.7859	72.00	100.00

Table 3 shows the scores of all groups on the post-test. Since Sig (.000) is less than 0.050, there is a significant difference between the post-tests of the groups. They did differently on the post-test.

Table 3. One-Way ANOVA (Post-test).

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1863.830	4	465.958	18.803	.000
Within Groups	1115.175	45	24.782		
Total	2979.005	49			

Table 4 compares the mean scores of all groups on the post-test. Based on Table 4, there is a significant difference between the post-test mean scores of expert, delegator, and formal authority groups (p<0.05). This table shows that there is no significant difference between the post-test mean scores of expert, personal model, and facilitator groups. In addition, there is a significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the delegator, expert, and personal model groups. There is no significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the delegator, formal authority, and facilitator groups.

Moreover, there is no significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the personal model, expert, and facilitator groups. There is a significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the personal model, delegator, and formal authority groups. This table indicates a significant difference between the post-test mean scores of formal authority, personal model, expert, and facilitator groups. This table indicates no significant difference between the post-test mean scores of formal authority and delegator groups. This table shows that there is no significant difference between the post-test mean scores of facilitator, expert, and personal model groups. There is a significant difference between the post-test mean scores of facilitator, delegator, and formal authority groups.

Table 4. Tukey HSD Test, Multiple Comparisons (Post-test).

VAR00001 Tukey HSD						
(I) VAR00002	(J) VAR00002	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Expert	Delegator	12.65000*	2.22628	.000	6.3241	18.9759
	Personal	2.05000	2.22628	.887	-4.2759	8.3759
	Formal	15.60000*	2.22628	.000	9.2741	21.9259
	Facilitator	4.35000	2.22628	.305	-1.9759	10.6759
Delegator	Expert	-12.65000*	2.22628	.000	-18.9759	-6.3241
	Personal	-10.60000*	2.22628	.000	-16.9259	-4.2741
	Formal	2.95000	2.22628	.677	-3.3759	9.2759
	Facilitator	-8.30000*	2.22628	.005	-14.6259	-1.9741
Personal	Expert	-2.05000	2.22628	.887	-8.3759	4.2759
	Delegator	10.60000*	2.22628	.000	4.2741	16.9259
	Formal	13.55000*	2.22628	.000	7.2241	19.8759
	Facilitator	2.30000	2.22628	.839	-4.0259	8.6259
Formal	Expert	-15.60000*	2.22628	.000	-21.9259	-9.2741
	Delegator	-2.95000	2.22628	.677	-9.2759	3.3759
	Personal	-13.55000*	2.22628	.000	-19.8759	-7.2241
	Facilitator	-11.25000*	2.22628	.000	-17.5759	-4.9241
Facilitator	Expert	-4.35000	2.22628	.305	-10.6759	1.9759
	Delegator	8.30000*	2.22628	.005	1.9741	14.6259
	Personal	-2.30000	2.22628	.839	-8.6259	4.0259
	Formal	11.25000*	2.22628	.000	4.9241	17.5759
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

The results of the variances homogeneity test show that Sig (.078) is greater than 0.050, so there is not a significant difference between the level of the participants; in other words, the difference between their level of English proficiency is not significant.

Table 5 shows that Sig (.305) is greater than 0.050, so subsets are homogeneous; the means of all groups seem almost equal on the post-test.

Table 5. Homogeneous Subsets.

Tukey HSD			
VAR00002	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
4	10		75.9000
2	10		78.8500
5	10	87.1500	
3	10	89.4500	
1	10	91.5000	
Sig.		.677	.305
Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.			

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that the difference between the pre and post-tests of the expert group is significant. The findings revealed that the treatment helped this group to have better performance on their post-test. Expert teachers concentrate on teacher-directed whole-class instruction, teacher-centered lecturing, and traditional teaching practices in their performances (Baleghizadeh & Shakouri, 2015). Results from this study are consistent with previous findings that have shown that the teachers whose styles include expert styles have more students with higher scores in general English. Due to the fact that it was found that English teachers who had an expert style had students with higher scores than the other teachers, the researcher considers that it is essential that teachers make an effort to tweak or modify their teaching styles to help students improve their general English.

The results obtained from this study indicate that the difference between the pre and post-tests of formal authority groups is significant. In fact, the treatment negatively affected their post-test scores, so the teacher's formal authority style significantly affects EFL learners' general English but negatively. As previously declared, teachers with the formal authority style have rigid expectations and less flexibility in setting class standards, give strict negative feedback when students' performances are unsatisfactory and ignore different learning styles by fixedly defining how students must learn (Grasha, 1996). Hence, teachers with the dominant style of formal authority report lower levels of self-efficacy in their class. Moreover, all the stated elements bring about an unsatisfactory learning condition and ultimately undesirable learner achievement (Baleghizadeh & Shakouri, 2015). Thus, the results of the current study confirm the above research findings.

As the current study results reveal, the difference between the pre-test and post-test of this group is not significant. In fact, the treatment had not any significant effects on the post-test of the personal model group. On the other hand, the result was inconsistent with some previous studies by Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998), who stated that "behaviorist learning involves conditioning and imitation. This study supports the view that personal model teaching style has great influence to students' attitudes to participate in the process of teaching and learning in the classroom" (p. 189). The results of this study are not consistent with what Sharri et al. (2014) have found, "Personal modeling style of teaching is very important when delivering lessons to students to learn. Teachers, who have the vision and deliver good content, will inspire students to strive for more and help students get better scores" (p. 18).

The results reveal that the difference between the pre and post-tests of the facilitator group is not significant. In fact, the treatment had not any significant effects on the post-test of the facilitator group. The

obtained results of the study are not in line with some previous findings. Through the facilitator teaching style, teachers can use problem-solving strategies. This strategy does help the students to work with others and improve listening and speaking skills. The study is supported by Faris (2008) when he found that using a problem-solving teaching strategy has improved students' attitudes toward learning science. The findings of this study are not in line with what Adesoji (2008) also has stated that students will lead to a positive direction in learning if the lecturers use the problem-solving method in their teaching. Style of teaching using problem-solving involves facilitator teaching style.

Based on the results, the difference between the pre and post-tests of the delegator group is not significant. It can be concluded that the treatment could not help the delegator group improve their post-test performance. Grasha (2002) indicates that the reports of a delegator teacher confirmed that fifteen students mentioned a lack of self-discipline and study habits as weaknesses that led to anxiety in the classroom on oral tests, which is following the results from the current study. Teachers may assume that their students possess competencies such as being able to work independently. Still, the interviews reveal that the specific strategies that teachers are employing to promote autonomy are not effective and do not help the students to improve their skills in that regard.

The results of this study depict the descriptive statistics of all groups on the post-test. The mean score of the expert group is 91.50; the mean score of the personal model group is 89.45; the mean score of the facilitator group is 87.15; the mean score of the delegator group is 78.85; and the mean score of formal authority is 75.90. The results of the study also show the scores of all groups on the post-test. There is a significant difference between the post-tests of the groups. In fact, they did differently on the post-test. Based on the results, the expert style has the highest mean score, which makes this style to be the most effective teaching style in this study, while the formal authority teaching style gets the lowest mean.

Conclusion

The study results indicate that facilitator style is the most preferred teaching style while delegator style is the least preferred. In other words, of all 33 teachers, the number of teachers with facilitator style was 16, the expert style was 8, the personal model style was 4, the formal authority style was 3, and the delegator style was 2. The results showed that even teachers did not have a clear picture of their teaching styles, and their responses to the questionnaire did not confirm what had been observed in their classes in some cases. This finding indicated a mismatch between what teachers think and claim and what they apply in the classrooms. This emphasized the importance of increasing teachers' awareness of their learning styles. When teachers know about their teaching styles, they can manage their classes better and adapt themselves to improve the quality of their teaching, resulting in effective learning (Zhang, 2008). Thus, teachers can make informed decisions and changes in their teaching styles to maximize general English learning in their future students.

References

Adesoji, F. A. (2008). Managing students' attitudes towards science through problem-solving strategy. *Anthropologist, 10* (1), 21-24.

Akbari, R., Kiany, G., Imani Naeeni, M., &KarimiAllvar, N. (2008). Teachers' teaching styles, sense of efficacy and reflectivity as correlates of students' achievement outcomes. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*, 1–28.

Akbarzadeh, M. and Fatemipour, H. (2014). Examining the Match or Mismatch between Teaching Style preferences and Upper-Intermediate EFL Learners' Learning Style Preferences. *Social and Behavioral Sciences. 98*(4), 137-142.

Aktan, S. (2012). *Öğrencilerin akademik başarısı, öz düzenleme becerisi, motivasyonu veöğretmenlerin öğretim stilleri arasındaki ilişki*. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation. Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Balıkesir.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Shakouri, M. (2015). Investigating the relationship between teaching styles and teacher self-efficacy among some Iranian ESP university instructors. *Routledge Taylor & Francis Group Innovations in Education and Teaching International,* http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2015.1087329

Blake, R. (1989). Integrating quantitative and qualitative methods in family research. Families Systems and Health, 7, 411e427.

DeCapua, A. and Wintergerst, A. (2005). Assessing and validating a learning styles instrument. *System*. 33: 1-16.

Faris, A. (2008). *The impact of PBL on the student's attitudes towards science among nine graders in Hamza Independent School.* Unpublished project paper.

Felder, R. M., &Henriques, E. R. (1995) Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28* (1), 21-31.

Grasha, A. F. (1996). Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhance learning by understanding learning and teaching style. *College Teaching, 48,* 1-12.

Grasha, A. (2002). Teaching with style (2nd ed.). San Bernadino, CA: Alliance Publishers.

Grasha, AF & Hicks, N. Y. (2000). Integrating teaching styles and learning style with instructional technology.*College Teaching, 48* (1), 2- 15.

Greene, J., Caracelli, V., & Graham, W. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed methods evaluation designs. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11, 255e274.

Kendall, L. (2008). The conduct of qualitative interview: research questions, methodological issues, and researching online. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear, & D. Leu (Eds.), Handbook of research on new literacies (pp. 133e149). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rossman, G., & Wilson, B. (1991). Numbers and words revisited: being "Shamelessly Eclectic." Evaluation Review, 9(5), 627e643.

Sharri, A., Yusoff, N., Ghazali, I., Osman, R., Dzahir, N. (2014). The relationship between lecturers' teaching style and students' academic engagement. *Elsevier Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *118*(2), 10-20.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning   and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202–248.

Wright, S. P., Horn, S. P., & Sanders, W. L. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education, 11*, 57–67.

Zhang, D. (2008). Effective Combination of Learning Styles and College English Teaching. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 5(4), 25-28.