Abstract

Today, teaching is no longer an approach as a simple act. The complexity of the society has led to a more careful study of the teaching process, so that, over the last 10 years, specialists are increasingly discussing about teaching styles as differentiating elements of the quality of educational services offered to students. The present study tries to reveal the impact that teacher’s teaching style has upon the student’s well-being level. We investigated 180 Romanian teachers who teach different disciplines (48.3% at secondary school’s pupils and 51.7% at high school’s pupils), and 385 Romanian pupils: 48.16% coming from secondary schools and 51.84% coming from high schools, aged 10–18 years old. Using specific and adapted investigative tools (The ‘Teaching style questionnaire’ and ‘The Ryff’s Well Being Scale’), we found specific influences of teacher’s teaching style upon the elements that define the well-being level.
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1. Warning of intention

The pressure of the new developments in science, technology, as well as the psychological features and potential of pupils, affects more and more the system of education at global, European, national level. The attempts of sketching the coordinates of teaching involve serious researches, debates. This study approaches a penetration into the basic or derived processes connected with the wish to analyse the influences of teacher’s teaching style upon the pupils’ well-being in an educational environment. There is a real spiral of criticisms regarding the quality of the educational services with a real community awareness of the long-term implications resulting from the social policy that operates in the educational field under a certain model. The analyses are focused on revealing the differences that are significant beyond the current information in the process of reducing school dropout among pupils.

2. Conceptual analyses and background

Currently, the educational system is analysed in many ways and on multiple dimensions. However, teaching (which is referring to the teacher’s activity) as well as learning (which is referring to the student’s activity) have remained the central elements of analysis of the educational process, especially when it is approached from an operational point of view.

Both teaching and learning are carried out within a specific environment, known as the classroom and involve two active participants: the teachers (the teacher) and the students (the school group). Throughout the teaching process, teachers make it easier for students to understand the world (Blair, 1988; Hamilton & Ghatala, 1994) and ‘convey not only information on different topics but also shape the pupils’ personality, assisting them in discovering the fields of activity they are suitable for in the future’ (Urea, 2013).

The teaching activity is carried out through specific teaching styles and teaching behaviours. When a teacher has a specific way of teaching, which has a certain stability and durability, the teaching mode can be called as teaching style. The teaching style is associated with the behaviour, manifests itself in the form of the structure of influences and actions: has a certain internal consistency, relative stability: appears as a product of ‘personalisation’ of the principles and norms that define the educational activity (Potolea, 1989). It also signifies the specific manner of organising and leading the educational process and it represents, most of the time ‘the way of working with students’, ‘the original style of training the students’. It defines and guides the teacher during the instructional process, generating effects on students and on their ability to learn and it has become a necessity to sustain the quality and the efficiency of the teaching process.

In the context of the personalised education, the teaching style appeared as a dynamic dimension of the training, decisively influencing the state of instructional existence of the strategy through the contribution made to the establishment and ‘balancing’ of a harmonious educational relationship (Iucu, 2005).

The specialised literature records a series of elements that define the teaching style. In a synthetic way, we can say that the teaching style: a) is always personal, even though many of its aspects are common or very close with other teachers; b) is relatively constant, in the sense that it is objectified in constant personal behaviours and qualities (for a given period), during the relational-value interactions with the school group; c) it is dynamic, perfectible, enriching itself by the accumulated experience. The evolution of the teaching style depends, to a large extent, on the permanent manifestation of the teacher’s desire for self-improvement, on his attitude towards his own activity and on his self-evaluative capacity.

Related to teaching style, the experts have tried to classify the teaching style. There are different classified criteria used by experts in the educational field, such as 1) relation with specific of the teacher's learning style; 2) relation with cognitive characteristics of teaching (abstract/concrete); 3) in
relation with the communication mode (directly/indirectly); 4) in relation with the strategies used (expository, interrogative, applicative); in relation with professional involvement and deontology (responsible, negligent, indifferent); 5) in relation with teacher ‘personality (proactive, reactive, ultra-active) (Ilie, 2003).

However, the most used classification of teaching styles that we find in the specialised literature is the one that has appeals to the roles and functions that a teacher fulfils: guidance, control, leadership, planning and evaluation. According to this classification, they can be distinguished: a) individual styles, which give the identity of each teacher; b) grouped styles, which subordinate the same category of teachers with similar stylistic features and c) generalised styles, which represent general modes of educational leadership, with a value of strategy (Salavastru, 2006).

The studies in the area of teaching styles have revealed that the presence of effective classroom practices can be explained by a learner-centred teaching style and by good class management skills (Opdenakker & VanDamme, 2006) and the most effective teaching styles as opposed to students’ school results presume logical learning, applied representation of concepts, methods based on exploration and didactic activities for groups (Bota & Tulbure, 2015).

Gill (2013) revealed the five teaching styles that highlight the five main strategies teachers use in the classroom. These teaching styles are: 1) the authority, or lecture style is the style where the teacher makes a one-way presentation and the students had to take notes; 2) the demonstrator, or coach style is the style where the teacher is maintained the formal authority role, and teachers show the students what they need to learn, but use in their lesson’s multimedia presentations and demonstrations; 3) facilitator, or activity style is a style where the teachers promote self-learning and help students develop critical thinking skills and retain knowledge that leads to self-actualisation, in this style, activities are used to promote self-discovery and develop problem-solving skills, which can often lead to the student developing a much deeper understanding of the topic; 4) the delegator, or group style is used for school subjects that require group work, lab-based learning or peer feedback; when a teacher uses this style, he (she) acts as a delegator, becoming an observer to promote peer collaboration and encourage student-to-student learning; 5) the hybrid, or blended style is an integrated teaching style that incorporates the teacher’s personality and interests with students’ needs and curriculum-appropriate methods.

3. Methods

3.1. Methods

The ‘Teaching style questionnaire’ is an instrument aimed to revealed the teaching style of teachers that work with pre-adolescents and teenagers. It was created in 2017 on Gill’ theoretical background of teaching styles (2013) and has 35 statements. Each investigated teacher was asked to assess each statement on a scale from 1 (not agree/never ever use) to 5 (total agree/daily use). The questionnaire’s features are internal consistency index = 0.795, fidelity test-retest index = 0.801.

‘The Ryff’s Well Being Scale’ is a specific instrument aimed to investigate the following variables: personal autonomy, self-control, personal development, positive relationships, meaning of life and self-acceptance. It also computes the current level of well-being. It was adapted in 2017 for Romanian pre-adolescents and adolescents (internal consistency index = 0.735, fidelity test–retest index = 0.807). All the variables were assessed on a Likert scale of five levels of assessment: from 1 – the lowest level to 5 – the highest level.

In our investigation, in order to analyse the collected data, we used IBM-SPSS 25.
3.2. Participants

We performed our research on: a) 180 Romanian teachers who teach different disciplines 48.3% at secondary school’ pupils and 51.7% at high school’ pupils, aged 28–56 years old (with mean of 44.06 years and median = 40.05 years). The teacher’ participation to this investigation was voluntary and based on personal accord; b) 385 Romanian pupils: 48.16% coming from secondary schools and 51.84% coming from high schools, aged 10–18 years old. The pupils’ participation in this investigation was with parents’ agreements. The parents’ agreements were obtained according to the General Data Protection Regulation of U.E– GDPR.

3.3. Procedure

Our investigation had an initial pre-testing procedure on 35 teachers and on 41 pupils and the obtained Cronbach Alpha index (α = 0.784) allowed us to proceed to an extended research that had two stages: a) investigation of the teachers’ teaching style and b) investigation of the pupils’ well-being level in the classroom, which reveal the influences of teachers’ teaching style upon the pupils’ well-being.

4. Results

4.1. Investigation of teachers teaching style

The first objective of the research was aimed at identifying the teaching styles of teachers included in this investigation.

The data analyses process pointed that the distribution was uniform; the skewness index values were from 1.908 to 4.228, and with a standard error of skewness from 0.742 to 1.091, kurtosis index values from 0.715 to 1.242, and with a standard error of kurtosis from 0.709 to 1.821.

We are further presenting the data related to the five teaching styles that we took into consideration, in relation to the type of school where they teach (Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of teaching styles</th>
<th>Teachers – secondary school (%)</th>
<th>Teachers – high school (%)</th>
<th>Teachers – regardless of the school type where they teach (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority style</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrator style</td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator style</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegator style</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid style</td>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data presented in Table 1, we noticed that the dominant type of teaching style among all investigated teachers is the hybrid one. But, in relation to the type of the school where they teach, the dominant type of teaching style is the demonstrator style at teachers that teach secondary school’ pupils and the hybrid style at teachers that teach high school’ pupils.

The statistical data analysed pointed a direct correlation between the disciplines that investigated teachers teach and their teaching style, as follows: a) the investigated teachers who teach math, biology use the demonstrator teaching style (direct significant correlation, $r = 0.689, p = 0.05$); b) the investigated teachers who teach history, geography use the facilitator teaching style (direct significant correlation, $r = 0.704, p = 0.05$); c) the investigated teachers who teach Romanian language use the authority teaching style (significant correlation, $r = 644, p = 0.05$); d) the investigated teachers who teach physics, chemistry use the delegator teaching style (direct significant correlation, $r = 0.705$,
4.2. Investigation of pupils’ well-being features

The statistical data analyses allowed us to compute the Pearson correlation analysis between the teachers’ teaching style and pupils’ well-being features.

A series of influences has resulted depending on the type of school where the investigated subjects teach (teachers) and the pupils learn (Tables 3 and 4).
Table 3. Influences between teachers’ teaching style upon the pupils’ well-being – secondary school (correlations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of teacher's teaching style</th>
<th>Pupils' personal autonomy</th>
<th>Pupils' self-control</th>
<th>Pupils' personal development</th>
<th>Pupils' positive relationships</th>
<th>Pupils' self-acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s authority</td>
<td>Direct, very significant correlation: ( r = 0.704, p = 0.05 )</td>
<td>Direct low correlation: ( r = 0.174, p = 0.05 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.204, p = 0.359 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.295, p = 0.450 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.217, p = 0.745 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s demonstrator</td>
<td>Direct, very low correlation: ( r = -0.274, p = 0.080 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.206, p = 0.05 )</td>
<td>Direct, very significant correlation: ( r = 0.685, p = 0.01 )</td>
<td>Direct very low correlation: ( r = 0.246, p = 0.05 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.072, p = 0.336 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s facilitator</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.217, p = 0.088 )</td>
<td>Direct, very significant correlation: ( r = 0.690, p = 0.01 )</td>
<td>Direct low correlation: ( r = 0.206, p = 0.05 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.033, p = 0.080 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.108, p = 0.410 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s delegator</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.194, p = 0.177 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.296, p = 0.068 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.246, p = 0.129 )</td>
<td>Direct, very significant correlation: ( r = 0.711, p = 0.05 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.146, p = 0.058 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s hybrid</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.295, p = 0.139 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.276, p = 0.258 )</td>
<td>Direct very low correlation: ( r = 0.121, p = 0.05 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.276, p = 0.158 )</td>
<td>Direct, very significant correlation: ( r = 0.667, p = 0.05 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Influences of teacher’s teaching style upon the pupils’ well-being – high school (correlations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of teacher's teaching style</th>
<th>Pupils' personal autonomy</th>
<th>Pupils' self-control</th>
<th>Pupils' personal development</th>
<th>Pupils' positive relationships</th>
<th>Pupils' self-acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s authority</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.314, p = 0.320 )</td>
<td>Direct, very significant correlation: ( r = 0.709, p = 0.05 )</td>
<td>Direct very low correlation: ( r = 0.214, p = 0.05 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.191, p = 0.405 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.247, p = 0.315 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s demonstrator</td>
<td>Direct, very low correlation: ( r = -0.254, p = 0.094 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.139, p = 0.101 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.139, p = 0.101 )</td>
<td>Direct, very significant correlation: ( r = 0.688, p = 0.01 )</td>
<td>Correlation: ( r = 0.252, p = 0.231 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher teaching style</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Direct very low correlation</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Direct, very significant correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’ facilitator</td>
<td>$(r = 0.277, p = 0.188)$</td>
<td>$(r = 0.222, p = 0.05)$</td>
<td>$(r = 0.163, p = 0.180)$</td>
<td>$(r = 0.701, p = 0.05)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’ delegator</td>
<td>Direct, very significant correlation</td>
<td>$(r = 0.287, p = 0.069)$</td>
<td>Direct very low correlation</td>
<td>$(r = 0.126, p = 0.05)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’ hybrid</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>$(r = 0.226, p = 0.043)$</td>
<td>Direct, very significant correlation</td>
<td>$(r = 0.214, p = 0.136)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusions and recommendations

This research had the goal to reveal the influences of teachers’ teaching style upon the pupils’ well-being in order to increase the quality of educational services.

In our investigation, we used specific and adapted questionnaires.

With the help of statistical analysis, we found that Cronbach’s Alpha index is 0.825.

We found that:

a) teacher’ teaching style is shaped by the teacher’ personality and by the specific of the discipline that he/she teaches (concepts, strategies, methods used);

b) the pupil’ well-being in the classroom is shaped by the copying strategies developed at educational demands;

c) there are direct influences of teacher’ teaching style upon the pupils’ well-being features. The assumption of our research was confirmed.

We can use the previous conclusions for:

- developing counselling sessions for pre-adolescents and for teenagers in order to increase their well-being in the classroom;
- encouraging the ‘good practices changes’ between teachers that work with pre-adolescents and teenagers for developing teaching strategies in relation to their teaching style;
- developing stress copying techniques for teachers that work with pre-adolescents and teenagers.

References


