Teaching Styles and Optimal Guidance
in English Language Major

Zohreh Kassaian Ph.D.[1] and Mohammad Ali Ayatollahi[2*]

Abstract
The purpose of this research paper was to investigate what level of guidance Iranian EFL instructors and students deem as optimal. For this purpose a theoretical framework which positions teaching styles on a continuum from the one which provides maximal guidance to the one which provides minimal guidance was employed. The participants in this study were 306 college students and 36 faculty members. The results showed that whereas the students consistently preferred teaching styles that provided moderate guidance, the instructors preferred different teaching styles with varying degrees of guidance depending on the nature of the course they taught.

Keywords: Teaching Styles, Teaching Style Clusters, Teaching Methods, Reciprocity**.**

Introduction
It has been argued that optimal learning occurs when students' and teachers' expectations of each other are mutually respected in the sense that there is agreement about what should be done and why by each party (Williams and Burden, 1997). Feuerstein, Keline and Tennenbaum (1991) call this principle reciprocity, which is often lacking in classrooms. One aspect of this mutual understanding has to do with level of guidance that students expect to receive from their instructors through their teaching styles. Nonetheless, much of the current academic level teaching orthodoxy in universities can be characterized as being insensitive to the students' expectations and views.

This orthodoxy has been criticized on the ground that it is inherently exclusionary and inhibits efficient and effective learning (Wyand and Bozman, 1996). The result is often the ignorance of the mismatch between teachers' behavior and students' expectations and preferences. One area in which such conflictions are likely to be observed is the conflict between the teachers' and students' perceived level of optimal guidance. It is not an

uncommon scene to see students complaining about instructors' not giving them enough guidance. Instructors, too, are often seen to complain about students' lack of proclivity toward autonomy and independence. This can lead to mismatches between the instructors' and students expectations with respect to their teaching styles.

As Conti (1990 cited in Lucas, 2005) observes Teachers do not come to the classes they teach leaving all their life experience, beliefs, and expectations behind. Rather, they are influenced and shaped by them

> As a teacher, you do not randomly select your teaching style, and you do not constantly change your style. Instead, your style is linked to your educational philosophy, which in turn is a subset of your overall life philosophy (p.80).

Therefore, practically there are as many teaching styles as there are teachers. Nonetheless, there are ways to identify more common patterns. Grasha (1996) introduces a framework to identify five broad teaching styles, each entailing different levels of guidance: Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator. She asserts that these styles are not isolated qualities that affect only a few teachers. Rather, they are prevalent aspects of faculty presence in their classrooms, and they interact with students' learning styles in predictable ways. They also provide us with ways to understand the nature of teacher-students encounters.

The first category in this framework is expert. An expert teacher is one who expresses knowledge and expertise that students need and strives to maintain status as an expert by displaying detailed knowledge and by challenging students to enhance their competence. Such a teacher is concerned with transmitting information. Anecdotally speaking, this style reflects a Confucian view of education prevalent in some East Asian countries.

The second category is formal authority. College teachers with this style are different from those with expert style in that because of their reputation as knowledgeable people they are concerned with providing positive and negative feedback, establishing learning goals, expectations, and rules of conduct for students. They emphasize the correct, acceptable, and standard ways of doing things. They provide students with the structures they need to learn.

The third category in this model is personal model. College teachers with this style believe in teaching by personal example and establish a prototype for how to think and how to behave. They oversee, guide, and direct by showing how to do things, and encourage the students to observe and emulate the college teachers' approach.

The forth category in this model is facilitator. College teachers with this style emphasize the personal nature of teacher-student interactions. They guide and direct students by asking questions, exploring options, suggesting alternatives, and encourage them to develop criteria to make informed choices. Their overall aim is to develop in students the capacity for independent action, initiative, and responsibility. Such college teachers work with students on projects in a consultative fashion and try to provide as much support and encouragement as possible.

The fifth category in this model is delegator. College teachers with this style are concerned with developing the students' capacity to function autonomously. Students work independently on projects or as part of autonomous teams. The teacher is available at request of students as a recourse person.

Such classifications, however, do not mean that teachers can be classified neatly to one of above-mentioned categories. Grasha (1996) emphasizes almost every teacher possesses each of the five teaching styles to varying degrees. In effect, each individual style is like a different color on an artist's palette. Like those colors, they can be blended together. This implies that rather than talking about individual teaching styles we may talk about clusters of teaching styles. Grasha (1996) reported that the following clusters were dominant in the 761 classrooms she examined.

> Cluster 1: Expert/Formal Authority (38%)
> Cluster 2: Personal Model/Expert/Formal Authority (22%)
> Cluster 3: Facilitator/Personal Model/Expert (17%)
> Cluster 4: Delegator/Facilitator/Expert (15%)

Each cluster of teaching style helps to create the mood of a class (Grasha,1996). When used in a very traditional manner, the styles of cluster 1 send a message to students that I'm in charge here and tend to create a cool emotional climate. In contrast, an emphasis on the Delegator/ Facilitator/ Expert blend of cluster 4 creates a different picture. It sends message to students that I'm here to consult with you and to act as a recourse person. A warmer emotional climate is created and students and teachers work together, share information, and the boundaries between teacher and student are not as formal.

Statement of the Problem

It is a commonsense understanding that students' expectations with respect to optimal guidance are not often met by their instructors in Iranian universities. Influenced by the popular constructivist learning theories, many instructors feel that too much direct instruction may impede the students'

progress toward autonomy. On the contrary, accustomed to many years of direct instruction in schools, many students just do not appreciate the logic of such problem solving Socratic teaching styles.

What happens when teachers' teaching styles and students' preferred teaching styles and their learning styles do not match? A major hypothesis known as the matching hypothesis is that such a mismatch causes learning failure, frustration, and demotivation (Lovelace, 2005; Bedford, 2004; Ogden, 2003; 2001; Reid, 1995). Nonetheless, there are researchers who do not agree with this view (Robatham, 1999). Hutchinson and Waters (1987) suggest that needs analysis surveys should include students methodological preferences. This study had the following objective: to compare the self-reported teaching styles of college teachers with the preferred teaching styles of EFL students at Islamic Azad University-Shiraz,Iran.

Significance of the Study
Continuing insensitivity to student expectations and preferences could result in ineffective learning styles in students (Williams, 2007). The reason is that the students who are accustomed to such insensitivity from their teachers will develop limited and ineffective perceptions regarding acceptable teaching and learning styles (Brindley 1984, Horwitz, 1985, 1988). Riley and Harsch (1999) maintain that it is absolutely essential for language learners and teachers alike to be aware of and sensitive to their own and their students' style preferences.

With respect to teaching styles Beck and Campbell (2006) argue that in spite of having been trained in education most teachers tend to teach out of their preferred way of learning with a lack of understanding and appreciation for other ways of teaching. Grasha (1996) hypothesizes that "they (teaching styles) interact in predictable ways with the learning styles of students"(p.153). Thus, it is crucial for college teachers to be aware of their teaching styles and the learning styles of their students and set teaching goals and methods that address a variety of student learning styles because learning styles provide a conceptual basis for teaching. She also maintains that any attempts to enhance teaching-learning processes would have to focus on the needs students have as learners.

Review of Literature
Interest in teaching/learning styles has been gaining momentum in recent years mainly due to more individualized mode of teaching and learning such as computer assisted language learning CALL and blog assisted language learning BALL (Lucas, 2002; O'Connor, 1997). Conventional language teaching practice, however, lags behind in this area. Research in general

confirms that the majority of teachers teach in a style predictably consistent with others of their type. This means that if one had access to a teacher's lists of habits and knowledge of his/her cognitive preferences, one could predict what he/she as a teacher would do. This makes the teaching choices of most teachers very predictable (Churchill**,** 2008**;** Wehrwein, Lujan, and DiCarlo, 2007).

Andrews (1981) reported that students with a strong collaborative style benefited more from participating in a peer-centered chemistry discussion section. In contrast students with a competitive style reported benefited from instructor-centered class. He noted that students with strong personal styles (collaborative, participant, dependent) found review sessions, study questions, and learning from other students most beneficial. Students with more impersonal style (independents, avoidant, competitive) found the texts, handouts, and lectures to be most beneficial.

Milton, Pollio an Eison (1986) studied the metaphors and images that college teachers used for their role as a teacher. He found that three metaphors were popular among college teachers: 1. Containers, where knowledge was viewed as a substance and the instructor was the container filled with content and facts. The student was the vessel wanting to be filled up. 2. Journey-guides, where knowledge was perceived as a perspective on horizon. The teacher guided students on their journey. Students needed to follow a course, had to overcome obstacles and hurdles, and if a good course of study was designed, they would come to the end of their journey. 3. Master-disciples, where knowledge was viewed as a skill or habit to be learned. The instructor trained the students and the students ideally did what they were told without questioning the master. Common images included the teacher as a midwife, gardener, lion tamer, entertainer, and choreographer.

Grasha (1993), however, found that students did not share such concepts with their teachers. She conducted a study in which a random sample of 351 student metaphors was taken from a database of over 2000 metaphors, and reported that the viewpoints of students about the classroom as expressed in their metaphors did not match those of the faculty. Student metaphors suggested more adversity than challenges in courses. For example, although students did use the metaphor 'journey', it tended to be an individual journey. With respect to the metaphor 'container', rather seeing themselves as containers into which nutritious substances were poured, they perceived themselves as being crammed or stuffed. With respect to 'master-disciple' metaphor only a very small minority of students [2٪] depicted themselves as disciples to a master.

Cooper and Miller (1991) reported that when teachers did nothing other than what they were prone to do, similar-typed students did better in their classes, enjoyed the experience more, and were viewed more favorably by the teacher. Conversely, students who were less similar to the teacher by type were less successful, reported liking the teacher and the class less, and even received lower grades on average. However, when teachers took steps to understand and mitigate issues related to incongruence, these effects were minimized. Huxland and Land (2000), however, found no relationship between students' learning styles and teachers teaching styles.

Polhemus, Danchak and Swan (2004) reported that there was not a connection between the perceived learning styles of the students and the presentation guidelines developed to match those indicated styles. They explain this somewhat counter intuitive finding by the fluid nature of learning styles themselves: learners are not categorized into one of the learning styles, and then stay there. The situation, topic, prior knowledge, motivation, goals and other variables affect a student's placement on the bipolar continuums.

Parsa and Saketi (2006, In Persian) found a relationship between instructors' teaching style and their students approach to learning. When the instructors used a transmission teaching styles as opposed to a constructive style, the students were more likely to employ surface approaches to learning as opposed to deep approaches.

Rinaldi and Gurung (2008) reported that although students preferred assignments that matched their particular learning styles, they did not benefit from matching their learning styles with their instructors teaching styles. However, Teachers who employed diverse teaching styles enhanced learning.

Akbari, Kiani, Imani, and Krimi Alvar (2008) investigated three important teacher-related variables, i.e. teaching styles, teachers' sense of efficacy, and teacher reflectivity to see how they relate to student achievement gains in ELT. They reported that teaching styles were the most significant factor in predicting student achievement outcome.

Sadeghi and Hosseini (2009, In Persian) found that students across different majors in the same university (University of Guilan) had different views about the teaching style they deemed as appropriate. This finding highlights situatedness of the nature of this construct. However, the most important dimension in their view was whether the teaching style was teaching centered or learning centered.

Research Questions

Three objectives were thought of in the design of this research: first to see whether the self-reported teaching styles of the college instructors in an Iranian university matched the preferred teaching styles of their EFL students in two types of courses i.e. proficiency-oriented and content courses, second, to see whether the teachers used identical teaching styles in their proficiency-oriented and content coursers, third to see whether the EFL students had identical teaching styles preferences in proficiency-oriented and content courses. Therefore, the following research questions were formulated for this research study:

1. What are the lecturers' self reported teaching styles in content courses?
2. What are the students' teaching styles preferences in content courses?
3. What are the lecturers' self reported teaching styles in proficiency-oriented courses?
4. What are the students' teaching styles preferences in proficiency-oriented courses?
5. Are there any significant differences between the lecturers' self reported teaching styles and their students' teaching styles preferences in content courses?
6. Are there any significant differences between the lecturers' self reported teaching styles and their students' teaching styles preferences in proficiency-oriented courses?
7. Are there any significant differences between the lecturers' self reported styles in content courses and proficiency- oriented courses?
8. Are there any significant differences between the students' teaching styles preferences in content courses and proficiency- oriented courses?

Methodology

Participants

Participants in this study were 306 college students at Islamic Azad University in Shiraz, about half of whom (132 students) were majoring in English Translation and the rest (174 students) in ELT. 36 faculty members of the same university participated in the study, too. 83 participants were freshmen, 73 participants were sophomore, 63 participants were juniors and 87 participants were seniors. As year of college education was one of the variables of interest, we decided to choose intact group design sampling procedure to make sure there are enough participants from every year of education.

Materials

Two versions of Teaching Styles Inventory version 3.0 developed by Grasha (2007) was used in the study. Grasha's Teaching styles Inventory is a 40 item Likert scale questionnaire with statements to which the respondents respond with numbers 1(least like me) through 7 (most like me). The respondents would choose number one if they strongly disagreed with relevant statement. They would choose number 7 if they strongly agreed with the relevant statement. Number 4 represented a midpoint value showing neither agreement nor disagreement. Two versions of this questionnaire were prepared: the student and teacher version. In the student version of the questionnaire, the statements started with the phrase "I would like my teachers to…."

In order to ensure the validity of the instruments a pilot study was carried out, in which the teaching style questionnaire was sent to 19 university instructors and 23 college students across the country. Likewise, the learning style questionnaire was pretested on a sample of 42 students. Confirmatory factor analysis revealed five factors in the teaching style questionnaire (accounting for %51.7 of the total variance) and six factors in the learning style instrument (accounting for %47.8 of the total variance). All together eleven items were deleted from the instrument due to lower inter-item correlation. In order to ensure the reliability of the instruments Cranach's alpha was measured for each sample independently in the main study, of which the results are reported in the part five of this paper.

Procedure

There were three variables in this study: 1-The self-reported teaching styles of the college teachers 2- The teaching styles that students think their teachers should use in class (teaching styles preferred by students), 3- Students' learning styles. As Grasha (1996) pointed out teachers might use different teaching styles in different courses. In case of the majors we were concerned with in this study i.e., English Translation and ELT, students had to pass two qualitatively different types of courses known as proficiency-oriented and content courses. Proficiency-oriented courses generally dealt with the knowledge of the language. These included such courses as English Grammar, Conversation, Reading Comprehension, and Writing. Students had to pass these courses within the first two years of college education. Content courses dealt with the major specific subjects such as Principles of Teaching and Learning, Linguistics, Phonology, Introduction to Literature, Translation of Literary Texts, Translation of Journalistic Texts, Oral Translation, etc. Students had to pass these courses in their third and fourth years of study. Such courses were usually more theoretic in nature.

In order to address the concern that the teachers would use different teaching styles for different courses, we administered the Teaching Styles Inventory version 3.0 twice- once for proficiency-oriented courses and the second time for content courses. Therefore, college teachers in the said university were approached and asked to fill-out two teaching styles questionnaires for the two types of courses explained above. The questionnaire return rate for content and proficiency-oriented courses was 27 and 32 respectively.

Likewise, the students had to indicate their preferences for both types of courses. As freshmen and sophomores studied only proficiency-oriented courses and seniors and juniors studied only content courses, the researchers did not have to administer the teaching style preference questionnaire (the student version) twice. The questionnaire return rate among freshmen and sophomore, who studied proficiency-oriented courses, was 156. The same rate for juniors and seniors, who studied content courses, was 150.

Results

Both descriptive statistics i.e. mean and standard deviation and inferential statistics i.e. t-test[3] and ANOVA[4] were made use of in this study.

What are lecturers' self reported teaching styles in content courses?

Table 1- Teachers' teaching styles for content courses

Teaching Styles	N	Mean	SD	Rank
Expert	27	5.47	0.97	2
Formal Authority	27	6.01	0.93	1
Personal Model	27	3.41	1.30	5
Facilitator	27	4.30	1.40	4
Delagator	27	4.80	0.71	3

The results in table 1 showed that Formal Authority (mean = 6.01), Expert (mean=5.47), and Delagator (mean = 4.80) were the most dominant teaching styles. Personal model (mean = 3.41) was the least dominant teaching style, and Facilitator (mean = 4.30) was a moderately dominant teaching style. The result of AVOVA and post-hoc t-test showed that difference between means were significant at p ‹.01 except for the mean differences between Expert and Delagator style (P = .20), Facilitator and Delagator (P = .07), and Expert

---

3. It is noteworthy that the t-tests carried in this study meet the assumption of independence of comparisons. This is because when we make comparisons such A with B, A with C, and A with D. the likelihood of type one error increases. However, when we make comparisons such as A with B, C with, D, E with F, There is no such threat. The comparisons carried out in this research are of the latter type.
4. Although the nature of research questions in this study is descriptive in the sense that there are not any null hypotheses, we used ANOVA in addition to descriptive statistics to make sure that the differences in ranking do matter.

and Formal Authority (P =.05). The lack of mean difference between Expert and Formal Authority was an expected outcome as they form a natural cohort of teaching styles i.e. cluster 1 Expert, Formal Authority (See part 2.1). The lack of mean differences between Facilitator and Expert and Expert and Delegator, too, were partly expected because according to Grasha (1996) the cluster Facilitator, Expert, and Delegator is a natural cohort, although contrary to our theory-based expectation there was a significant difference between Delegator and Facilitator. The Cronbach's alpha for this sample was 0.95.

The results showed that college teachers at the department of English in Islamic Azad University in Shiraz strongly favored Formal authority and Expert styles of teaching for teaching content courses. This reflected a type of traditional view of teaching. According to Grasha (1996) these styles are the ones most teachers start their career with. However, the same teachers showed a strong preference for Delegator style, which according to Grasha (1996) is the most professionally developed teaching style.

What are students' preferences with respect to their lecturers' teaching styles in content courses?

Table 2- Students' teaching style preferences for content courses

Teaching Styles	N	Mean	SD	Rank
Expert	150	4.27	1.12	4
Formal Authority	150	5.11	0.97	3
Personal Model	150	5.92	0.86	1
Facilitator	150	5.71	1.17	2
Delagator	150	2.50	0.44	5

The results in table 2 showed that students had high preferences for Personal Model (mean 5.92) and Facilitator (mean = 5.71) teaching styles in teaching content subjects. The least popular style among students was Delagator (mean = 2.50). Formal Authority (mean = 5.11) and Expert (mean = 4.27) occupied mid positions in a continuum of popularity of styles. ANOVA and post-hoc t-test showed that all differences between means were significant at p ‹01 except for the mean difference between Personal Model and Facilitator (P = .05). This was an expected outcome in light of the fact that these styles formed a natural cohort according to Grasha (1996) i.e. cluster 3 Facilitator/Personal Model/Expert (See part 2.1), although the existence of mean differences between Expert and personal model on the one hand and Expert and Facilitator on the other was contrary to our theory-based expectations. The Cronbach's alpha for this sample was 0.87.

What are lecturers' self reported teaching styles in proficiency-oriented courses?

Table 3- Teachers' teaching styles for proficiency-oriented courses

Teaching Styles	N	Mean	SD	Rank
Expert	32	2.81	0.27	5
Formal Authority	32	3.70	1.17	4
Personal Model	32	6.20	1.14	1
Facilitator	32	5.83	1.02	2
Delagator	32	5.11	1.70	3

The results in table 3 showed that Personal Model (mean = 6.20), Facilitator (mean = 5.83), and Delagator (mean =5.11) were the most dominant teaching styles for proficiency-oriented courses. Expert (mean =2.81) was the least dominant teaching style, and Formal Authority (mean =3.70) was a moderately dominant teaching style. ANOVA and post-hoc t-test showed that all differences between means were significant at p ‹01 except for the mean difference between Personal Model and Facilitator (P = .20). This was an expected outcome because it was to a great extent a natural teaching cluster identified by Grasha i.e. cluster 3 Facilitator/Personal Model/Expert (See part 2.1). As before (table5.2), the existence of mean differences between Expert and personal model on the one hand and Expert and Facilitator on the other ran contrary to our theory-based expectations. The Cronbach's alpha for this sample was 0.89.

The results showed that college teachers at the department of English in Islamic Azad University in Shiraz strongly favored Personal Model and Facilitator teaching styles for teaching proficiency-oriented courses. This reflected a view typical of more modern approaches in language teaching such as the communicative approach. According to Grasha (1996) these styles are more mature than the ones preceding them i.e. Expert and Formal Authority styles.

What are students' preferences with respect to their lecturers' teaching styles in proficiency-oriented courses?

Table 4- Students' teaching style preferences for proficiency-oriented courses

Teaching Styles	N	Mean	SD	Rank
Expert	156	4.31	0.81	4
Formal Authority	156	4.73	0.99	2
Personal Model	156	5.33	1.70	1
Facilitator	156	4.70	1.09	3
Delagator	156	2.32	0.34	5

The results in table 4 showed that with respect to their proficiency-oriented courses the students had a somewhat balanced inclination toward all styles except for Delagator style (mean = 2.32). ANOVA and post-hoc t-test showed that all the differences between the means were significant at p ‹01

except for the differences between Personal Model and Facilitator styles (p = .20). This could mean that Personal Model and Facilitator formed a natural teaching cluster for this sample, which partly resembles the third cluster identified by Grasha i.e. Facilitator/Personal Model/Expert. The Cronbach's alpha for this sample was 0.90.

Are there any significant differences between the lecturers' self reported teaching styles and their students' preferences of teaching styles in content courses?

Table 5- t-test results for teachers' self-reported and students' preferred teaching styles in content courses

Teaching styles Rank	Variables	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Deg. Of Free.(two-tailed)	Sig.
Expert	Lecturers' 2 Self-Report	27	5.45	0.97	5.136 *.0000		175
	Students' 4 Preference	150	4.27	1.12			
Formal Authority	Lecturers' 1 self-report	27	6.01	0.93	4.912 *.0000		175
	Students' 3 Preference	150	5.11	0.97			
Personal Model	Lecturers' 5 Self-report	27	3.41	1.03	14.899 .0000	175	*
	Students' 1 Preference	150	5.92	0.76			
Facilitator	Lecturers' 4 Self-report	27	4.30	1.04	5.857 .0000	175	*
	Students' 2 Preference	150	5.71	1.17			
Delagator	Lecturers' 3 Self-report	27	4.80	0.71	22.959 .0000	175	*
	Students' 5 Preference	150	2.50	0.44			

* Significant at confidence level p ‹ 0.01

The results in table 5 showed that there were significant differences between the teachers' self-reported teaching styles in content courses and the students' preferred teaching styles. The students' preference for Personal

Model and Facilitator styles was significantly higher that their teachers' self-reported use of these styles in content courses. On the contrary, the students' disinclination toward Expert, Formal Authority, and Delegator styles were significantly lower than their teachers'. The most noticeable difference is the rather extreme unpopularity of the Delagator style (mean = 2.50) among students for content courses in spite of the fact that this style enjoys moderate popularity among teachers (mean = 4.80). This might reflect students' belief that the Delagator style runs contrary to the traditional expectations of teachers as transmitters of knowledge.

Are there any significant differences between the lecturers' self reported teaching styles and their students' preferences of teaching styles in proficiency-oriented courses?

Table 6- t-test results for teaches' self-reported and students' preferred teaching styles in proficiency-oriented courses

Teaching styles SD Rank	Variables	N	Mean	t-value	Deg. Of Free. (two-tailed)	Sig.
Expert	Lecturers' 5 Self-Report	32	2.81 0.27	10.339 .0000	186	*
	Students' 4 Preference	156	4.31 0.81			
Formal Authority	Lecturers' 4 self-report	32	3.70 1.17	5.449 .0000	186	*
	Students' 2 Preference	156	4.73 0.93			
Personal Model	Lecturers' 1 Self-report	32	6.20 1.14	3.860 *.0002		186
	Students' 1 Preference	156	5.33 1.70			
Facilitator	Lecturers' 2 Self-report	32	5.83 1.02	5.756 *.0000		186
	Students' 3 Preference	156	4.70 1.09			
Delagator	Lecturers' 3 Self-report	32	5.11 1.70	18.910 *.0000		186
	Students' 5 Preference	156	2.32 0.34			

* Significant at confidence level p‹ 0.01

The results in table 6 showed that there were significant differences (p‹0.01) between the teachers' self-reported teaching styles in proficiency-oriented courses and the students' preferred teaching styles. The students' preference for Expert and Formal Authority styles was significantly higher than their teachers' self-reported use of these styles. On the contrary, the teachers' self-reported use of Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delagator style was significantly higher than their students' preference for these styles in proficiency-oriented courses.

The results suggested that the teachers did not meet the students' expectation of them in a few areas. Firstly, the students felt that their teachers were delegating their responsibilities to their students more than is justified. This is evident by the great mean differences with respect to the Delegator style (t value = 18.910). The second greatest mean difference was observed with respect to the Expert style (t value = 10.339). This could mean that the teachers did not meet their students' expectations to play the role of transmitters of knowledge by displaying detailed knowledge. A similar albeit less powerful conclusion could be made with respect to Formal Authority style (t value = 5.44 9). With respect to the two remaining styles i.e. Personal Model and Facilitator the result showed that the students were less inclined to these styles than their teachers. In conclusion, it was observed that the students felt that their classes were too much student-centered than they thought justified.

Given the data in tables 4.5 and 4.6, a question to ask at this juncture is whether there emerges a recognizable pattern with respect the teachers and students' disposition toward certain teaching styles. Tables 4.7 and 4.8 show that there are indeed recognizable and interpretable patterns in the data.

Table 7- Teachers and students' ranking of their dominant teaching styles dispositions for content courses

	Expert	Formal Authority	Personal Model	facilitator	Delegator
Teachers' Ranking	2	1			3
Students' Ranking		3	1	2	

Table 8- Teachers and students' ranking of their dominant teaching styles dispositions for Proficiency-oriented courses

	Expert	Formal Authority	Personal Model	facilitator	Delegator
Teachers' Ranking			1	2	3
Students' Ranking		2	1	3	

   The results in the tables 8 could be interpreted as showing that the students consistently preferred the teaching styles which were neither too teacher-centered nor too student centered. It is interesting to note that in both cases the students ranked the most central teaching style in terms of teacher-student centeredness as their number one priority. It is also noteworthy that in the case of proficiency-oriented courses, where the teachers' inclination was toward learner-centered teaching styles, the students chose Formal Authority as their second favorable style. The reverse happened with respect to their content courses, where their teachers' disposition was to a large extent toward more teacher-centered styles. Here the students chose Facilitator as their second favorable teaching style. This might indicate that firstly, the students were quite sensitive to their instructors' teaching styles and secondly, they had a complementary rather than contrastive incongruence with their instructors' dispositions.

   The pattern emerging from the teachers' ranking of the teaching styles might be interpreted as showing that they were quite sensitive to the nature of the courses they taught in the sense that for their proficiency-oriented courses they were inclined toward more student-centered courses, but for their content course they had a somewhat opposite yet mixed inclination. That is to say, although their first and second favorable styles were clearly teacher-centered by nature, their third favorable style was clearly student-centered.

   Are there any significant differences between the lecturers' self reported styles in content courses and proficiency- oriented courses?

Table 9- T-test results for teaches' teaching styles in content and proficiency courses

Teaching styles Rank	Variables	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Deg. Of Free. (two-tailed)	Sig.
Expert	Content 2 courses	27	5.45	0.97	14.755 .0000	57	*
	Proficiency 5 courses	32	2.81	0.27			
Formal Authority	Content 1 courses	27	6.01	0.93	8.567 .0000	57	*
	Proficiency 4 courses	32	3.70	1.17			
Personal Model	Content 4 courses	27	3.41	1.03	9.784 *.0000		57
	Proficiency 1 courses	32	6.20	1.14			
Facilitator	Content 5 courses	27	4.30	1.04	5.689 .0000	57	*
	Proficiency 2 courses	32	5.83	1.02			
Delagator	Content 3 courses	27	4.80	0.71	0.884 .3805		57
	Proficiency 3 courses	32	5.11	1.70			

Significant at confidence level p‹ 0.01

The results in table 9 showed that there were significant differences (p‹0.01) between the teachers' self-reported teaching styles in content courses and proficiency-oriented courses except for the Delagator style. The dominant styles for teaching content courses were Formal Authority (mean = 6.01). Expert (mean = 5.45), and Delegator (mean =4.80), and the most dominant teaching styles for proficiency-oriented courses were Personal Model (mean = 6.20), Facilitator (mean = 5.83), and Delagator (mean =5.11) The results suggested that the instructors tended to use more learner-centered styles i.e. Personal model and Facilitator in their proficiency-oriented courses and more teacher-centered styles i.e. Formal authority and Expert in their content courses. Nonetheless, the most student-centered style i.e. Delegator was used for teaching both types of courses.

Are there any significant differences between the students' preferences with respect to their lecturers' teaching styles in content courses and proficiency-oriented courses?

Table 10- t-test results for students' teaching styles preferences in content and proficiency courses

Teaching styles Rank	Variables	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Deg. Of Free.	Sig. (two- tailed)
Expert	Content 4 courses	150	4.27	1.12	0.359	304	.7193
	Proficiency 4 courses	156	4.31	0.81			
Formal Authority	Content 3 courses	150	5.11	0.97	3.499 .0005	304	*
	Proficiency 2 courses	156	4.73	0.93			
Personal Model	Content 1 courses	150	5.92	0.76	3.893 .0000	304	*
	Proficiency 1 courses	156	5.33	1.70			
Facilitator	Content 2 courses	150	5.71	1.17	7.817 .0000	304	*
	Proficiency 3 courses	156	4.70	1.09			
Delagator	Content 5 courses	150	2.50	0.44	3.344 .0009	304	*
	Proficiency 5 courses	156	2.32	0.34			

* Significant at confidence level p‹ 0.01

The results in table 10 showed that there were significant differences (p‹0.01) between the students' teaching style preferences in content and proficiency-oriented courses except for the Expert style (p = .71). The mean differences implied that the students were sensitive to different teaching styles and what they entailed. Statistically speaking, while the students' most preferred styles for content courses were Personal Model (mean = 5.92), Facilitator (mean = 5.71), and Formal Authority (mean = 5.11), their most preferred teaching styles for proficiency-oriented courses were Personal

Model (mean = 5.33), Formal Authority (mean = 4.73), and Facilitator (mean = 4.70). As before, the students showed relative disinclination toward teaching styles that were either extremely teacher-centered or extremely student-centered. On the contrary, the students felt at ease with teaching styles that were neither too teacher-centered and traditional nor too student-centered and communicative. These teaching styles included Formal authority, Personal model, and Facilitator.

Discussion

The findings of this study broaden our understanding of the nature of faculty-students interaction. Firstly, they point to the importance of meeting students' expectations with respect to the level of guidance they desire. The findings show that the students' opinion with respect to their favourite teaching styles converge when the construct of teaching styles is deemed as a continuum encompassing different degrees of guidance. They also show that teachers' opinions with respect to their favourite teaching styles are situated and context dependent. This means that the teachers are more sensitive to the requirements of the courses they teach than their pupils. Secondly, the findings of this study contradicts Grasha's claim that moving from style one (expert style) to style five (delegator style) represents a kind maturation for college instructors. We showed that at least as far as the students' expectations are concerned, students constantly prefer styles in the middle of the spectrum such as formal authority and personal model. The following paragraphs summarize the findings.

While Formal Authority, Expert, and Delagator were the most dominant teaching styles among college teachers when teaching content courses, Facilitator and Personal Model were the most popular teaching styles for content courses among students. According to Grasha (1996) teachers with this type of teaching styles cluster make use of teaching methods such as case-based discussions, concept mapping, critical thinking, fishbowl discussions, guided reading, problem-based learning, role plays.

On the contrary, teachers' favorite styles for teaching proficiency oriented courses were Personal Model, Facilitator and Delagator. Their students, however, were inclined toward all the teaching styles except for the Delegator style. According to Grasha (1996) teachers with the Delegator style encourage learner responsibility and initiative when appropriate; their goal is to have learner function autonomously; answer questions and periodically review learner progress..

As the results in tables 5 and 6 showed all the mean differences between teachers self-reported teaching styles and students preferred teaching styles were significant at p‹0.01. However, the greatest gap was observed in case of

the students' disinclination toward the Delegator style in both content and proficiency-oriented courses.

Why should this be the case? One possible reason is that perhaps the students saw this style as the relegation of responsibility to students, which entailed more effort on the part of the students in form of assignments, presentations, etc. Another possible reason is that this teaching style did not match students' traditional expectation of the role of the teacher as the transmitter of knowledge.

In conclusion, the results of this study offered an opportunity to use Grasha's framework to compare the teaching/learning style compatibility in a university setting. The results showed incompatibility between teachers' self-reported teaching styles and their students' preferred teaching styles in both content courses and proficiency-oriented courses. The researchers believe that if college teachers became aware of this incompatibility through self-assessment tools, it would provide them with an invaluable tool to adapt and improve their professional skills.

Implications

The findings of this study provide us with useful information for suggesting changes in various aspects of college EFL college education in Iran. The first implication is that it is vital for college instructors to recognize, accept the students' expectations with regard to level of guidance they desire.

A second implication is the need for college instructors to reflect on their teaching style and ask for their pupils' reactions. By so doing, they will understand their own teaching strengths and weaknesses. Such understanding will contribute to faculty-students interactions. It is also likely to decrease feelings of frustration among their pupils.

A third implication of this study is the need for college instructors to find the common ground between proficiency and content area courses. It seems that college EFL instructors overemphasize the differences between these types of courses. It is true that the courses are different qualitatively, but they also share the feature of being related to aspects of formal educations.

A fourth implication is the need for colleges to change their evaluation strategies. At the present the evaluation strategy employed by most universities focus on individual instructors. It may be a good idea to extent such evaluation strategies to general areas such as teaching style preferences and to inform college instructors of the results of such evaluations routinely.

References

1. Akbari, R., G. Kiani, M. Imani Naeemi and N. Krimi Alvar (2008); "Teachers' Teaching Style, Sense of Efficacy, Reflectivity as Correlates of Students' Achievement Outcome"; *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 1-28.

2. Andrews, J. A. (1981); "Teaching Format and Student Style: Their Interactive Effects on Learning; *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 14, pp.161-178.

3. Beck, C. A. and M. Campbell (2006); "Interactive Learning in a Multicultural Setting"; *Christian Education Journal,* Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 101-118.

4. Bedford, T. A. (2004); *Learning Styles: A Review of Literature;* Toowoomba, *OPACS*, The University of Southern Queensland.

5. Brindley, G. (1984); *Needs Analysis and Objective Setting in Adult Migration Programs*; Sydney: NSW Adult Migrant Education Service.

6. Churchill, J. A. (2008); "Teaching Nutrition to the Left and Right Brain: An Overview of Learning Styles"; *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education,* Vol. 35, pp. 275-280.

7. Conti, G. J. (1990); Identifying your Teaching Style; In M. Gailbraith (Ed.); *Adult Learning Methods*; Malabar, FL: Krieger.

8. Cooper, S. E. and J. A. Miller (1991); "MBTI Learning Style-teaching Styles Discongruencies"; *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 51, No. 4, pp. 699-706.

9. Feuerstein, P., S. Keline and A. Tennenbaum (1991); *Mediated Learning Experience: Theoretical, Psychological and Learning Implications;* London: Freund.

10. Grasha, A. F. (1990); "Using Traditional Versus Naturalistic Approaches to Assessing Learning Styles in College Teaching"; *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*, Vol. 1, pp. 23-38.

11. Grasha, A. F. (1993); "Metaphors We Teach and Learn by"; Workshop Presentation at 13th Annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching, Maami University, Oxford.

12. Grasha, A. F. (1996); *Teaching with Style;* Pittsburgh, PA: Alliance Publishers.

13. Grasha, A. F. (2007); Teaching Styles Inventory; Maintained by the University of Maryland, Retrieved February 3rd 2009 from http://polaris.umuc.edu/~rouellet/learning/tsi.htm

14. Horwitz, E. K. (1985); "Using Student Beliefs about Language Learning and Teaching in the Foreign Language Methods Course"; *Foreign Language Annals,* Vol. 18, pp. 33-40

15. Horwitz, E. K. (1988); "The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Language Students"; *The Modern Language Journal,*Vol*. 72*, pp. 283-93.

16. Hutchinson, T. and A. Waters (1987); *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-centered Approach*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

17. Huxland, M. and R. Land (2000); "Assigning Students in Group Projects: Can we do better than Random?"; *Innovations in Education and Training International*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 17-22.

18. Lovelace, M. K. (2005); "Meta-analysis of Experimental Research based on the Dunn and Dunn Model"; *The Journal of Education Research*, Vol. *98*, pp.176-183.

19. Lucas, S. B. (2002); "The Individualization of Education: WebCT and Learning Styles in Language Instruction"; *IALLT Journal of Language Learning Technologies,* Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 77-81.

20. Lucas, S. B. (2005); Who am I? The Influence of Teacher Beliefs on the Incorporation of Instructional Technology by Higher Education Faculty; Unpublished PhD Dissertation, The University of Alabama.

21. Milton, O., H. R. Pollio and J. Eison (1986); *Making Sense of College Grades*; San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

22. O'Connor, T. (1997); *Using Learning Styles to Adapt Technology for Higher Education;* Retrieved October 20th 2008 from http://www.indstate. edu/clt⁄ 20styles/learning/html

23. Ogden, W. R. (2003); Reaching all the Students: The Feedback Lecture; *Journal of Instructional Psychology,* Vol. 30, pp. 22-27.

24. Parsa, A. and P. Saketi (2006); "Investigating the Relationships between Simple and Multiple Constructivist Evaluation and Teaching Approaches and the Undergraduate Students' Learning Styles in Shiraz University"; *Journal of Education and Psychology of Shahid Chamran University,* Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 147-184 (in Persian).

25. Polhemus, L., M. Danchak and K. Swan (2004); "Adaptive Presentations for Learning Styles: Reflective online Teaching"; Paper Presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

26. Reid, J. M. (1995); "*Learning Styles in the ESUEFL Classroom*; Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

27. Riley, L. D. and K. Harsch (1999); Enhancing the Learning Experience with Strategy Journals: Supporting the Diverse Learning Styles of ESL/EFL Students; *Proceedings of the HERDSA Annual International Conference,* Retrieved January8th 2009 from http://www.herdsa.org.au/ branches/vic/cornerstones/tocauthors.html

28. Rinaldi, C. And R. Gurung (2008); "Should Teaching and Learning Styles Match?"; *Teaching Forum, 1.* Retrieved on February 1st 2009from internet www.umlax/teaching forum/index/html.

29. Robatham, D. (1999); "The Application of Learning Style Theory in Higher Education Teaching"; GDN Discussion Papers, Retrieved January 18th 2009 from http//:www.chelt.ac.uk/gdn/discuss/index.htm

30. Sadeghi, A. And F. Hosseini (2009); "A Survey of College Students' Views about Optimal Teaching Approach in Guilan University"; *Journal of Iranian Higher Education*, Vol. 1, pp. 123-147 (in Persian).

31. Wehrwein, E. A., H. L. Lujan and S. E. DiCarlo (2007); Gender Differences in Learning Style Preferences among Undergraduate Physiology Students; *Advances in Physiology Education,* Vol. 31, pp. 153-15.

32. Williams, J. (2007); Does Style Matter? Considering the Impact of Learning Styles in E-learning. In ICT: Providing Choices for Learners and Learning Proceedings of ASCILITE, Singapore. http://www. ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/willems-poster.pdf

33. Williams, M. and R. L. Burden(1997); *Psychology For Language Teachers;* New York: Cambridge University Press.

34. Wyand, W. R. and C. S. Bozman (1996); "Student Learning Style: A Segmentation Strategy for Higher Education; *Journal of Education for Business,* Vol. 71, No. 4, pp. 232-235.