Effects of Teaching Styles on Academic Performance of Business Studies Students in Upper Basic Secondary Schools in Delta State

CHIAZOR Patience Omavuotu[1] & AGWAZIE Bridget[2]
[1&2]Faculty of Education
University of Delta, Agbor.
Patience.chiazor@unidel.edu.ng
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13825710

Abstract

The study investigated the effects teaching styles on academic performance of Business Studies students in junior secondary schools in Delta State. To guide the study, four research questions and four hypotheses were raised. The study adopted a quasi-experimental design. The population of the study consist of 62,527 public upper basic secondary class (2) students in Delta State. The study sample consist of 376 Business studies students from nine mixed secondary schools in the three senatorial districts in Delta State. The purposive and stratified sampling techniques were used for the study. The instrument used for the study was the Business studies Achievement Test (BSAT) consisting of 50 multiple choice items drawn from the scheme of work from upper basic secondary school (class 2). Kuder Richardson formular 21 was applied to determine the reliability of the instrument and a co-efficient r of 0.77 was obtained. The mean and standard deviation was used in answering the research questions while the hypothesis were tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and t-test statistics at 0.05 level of significance. The findings of the study showed that there was a difference in the mean scores of Business Studies Students taught using the expert, personal model, and delegator teaching styles. Based on these findings, it was recommended that Business studies teachers should use more of the personal and delegator teaching styles. Government through the ministry of Education should organize seminars and workshops to sensitize and train teachers on how to effectively use the personal model and delegator teaching styles in the classroom.

Keywords: Teaching Styles, Academic Performance and Business Studies

Introduction

Teaching generally involves bringing about a positive change in the life of the individual learner. To achieve reasonable success in this regard, the teacher's ability to identify and use the right teaching style must come to play because every human activity has its own technique for executing it and teaching styles is one of such technique used in delivering instruction effectively. Teaching is a process that requires proper teaching styles to inculcate knowledge and skills in the minds of

the learners and to transfer such knowledge and skills to the next generation. Teaching according to Ayeni (2017), is a process which involves bringing about needed changes in learners. Teaching constitutes the organization of activities that leads to the realization of the objectives of the curriculum It is the act of imparting knowledge and skills to learners.

Teaching styles are ways or procedure of presenting information, knowledge, and values to learners to enable them to achieve the desired objectives. A teaching style is a process, a course of action or a method of operation which varies according to circumstances (Umar,2018). Pierro, Pragati and Higgins (2019) designated two teaching styles as supportive and controlling. They found that teachers who use the supportive style provides an open classroom environment while teachers who use the controlling style provides strict classroom guidelines. Teaching styles are the means for helping students to study effectively. It involves the skills teachers use to meet teaching goals including instructional organization techniques, subject matter, and the use of teaching aids. Ameh and Dantani (2012) observed that teaching style is vital in any teaching and learning process and the styles used by the teachers may promote learning and sharpens mental activities which are the bases of social integrity or discourages initiatives and curiosity, thus making self-reliance and survival difficult. Erdem (2012) emphasized four roles of teaching styles. Firstly, it improves students' predisposition to learning by increasing the desire for studying and understanding new situation. Secondly teaching styles helps learners to rapidly capture information distributed through instruction and develop learners' abilities in assimilating and using knowledge processed, thirdly, it enables students to comprehend new knowledge by applying prior experiences. Teaching styles have been categorized in different ways by different researchers. This study will be based on the teaching styles of Grasha (1994) specifically, it will focus on three of the teaching styles, Expert, Personal model, and Delegator teaching styles.

Expert teaching style is practiced by teachers who have knowledge and expertise in the subject area. It is a teaching style that emphasized the dissemination of information to the maximum. According to Grasha (1996), teachers displaying the expert style possess the knowledge and expertise students need, challenges, students to reach their potentials and is concerned with preparing students for assigned goal. Grasha (1996) added that teachers exhibiting the expert teaching style believed that they held the power and knowledge for student learning. The advantage of the expert teaching style is that individual students may quickly acquire vast amount of knowledge but unfortunately, students who acquire knowledge in classrooms led by teachers with an expert teaching style may be disadvantaged because their knowledge is superficial, and they often lack deeper understanding and their thought processes produces minimal answers. Teachers using this style are also not concerned with building relationship with the students and students' participation is not required. The expert teaching style is less practical and more theoretical and understanding. Teo & Worg 2016 observe that the expert teaching style is the traditional teaching style where teachers are at the Centre of the class activities, teach, talk and explain. They noted that in the traditional classroom, pupils have a definite perception and ideas of their roles. Their

experience shows that teachers behave in certain ways and have roles in the process. This view seems to regard teachers as "custodian of knowledge.

The personal model teaching style actively engages the pupils in the teaching-learning process for effective mastery of the subject and promotion of positive attitude towards the subject. It promotes free participation in learning, meeting student communication needs and improving student competences and skills (Cummins, 2017). Kumar (2016) and Greitzer (2012) stated that the approach assist students to develop a "can-do" behavior which motivate the students to do their task and enjoy their time. The personal model teaching style promotes interest, analytic research and critical thinking. Students are seen as being able to assume a more active and participatory role. Teachers facilitate students' activities and interfere only when necessary (Froyd, 2019).

In the delegator classroom, the teacher actively involves the students in their learning process by way of regular teacher-student interactions. The method involves the use of both the expert teaching style. and the delegator teaching style. The goal of the teacher in a delegator classroom is to develop the student capacity to function autonomously. The teacher often creates choices in the design and implementation of the learning activity needed to complete the required activity. Student may work independently or in group. The teacher under the delegator teaching style acts as consultant or resource persons that provide directions only at the request of students.

Business studies is a skill-oriented subject that equip the individual learner with necessary skills and knowledge that will enable them to contribute to the development of their country Ogumayi (2013) describe Business studies as the type of education that assist individuals in acquiring skills which they can apply to solve problems in business and office occupation.

The general objectives of Business studies are as follows.

- Develop basic skills in office occupations.
- Provide the orientation and basic skills with which to start an occupation for those who may not have the opportunity for further studies.
- Provide basic business skills for personal use now and in the future.
- Relate the knowledge and skills to the national economy.

Full realization of these objectives has however not been achieved due to several problems including teachers teaching style. Students' performances in Business studies have been relatively poor compared to other discipline especially in the Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE). Below is a summary of performance of students in Business studies for the last couple of years; 2019, 23.4% credit 40.2% failure, 2020 28.2% credit 46.4% failure and 2021 29.4% credit and 42.4 % failure. From the above, it is obvious that much still must be done to ensure the realization of the objectives of Business studies curriculum and to improve the academic performance of the students. The pertinent question is which of the teaching styles will yield a better academic performance? Is it the expert, personal model, or delegator teaching style? Thus, the study will proffer solutions to these questions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate the effects of teaching styles on academic performance of Business Studies students in Upper Basic Secondary Schools in Delta State. Specifically, this study examined the following:

1. If there is any effect of personal model, delegator, and expert teaching styles on students' performance in Business Studies.
2. If there is any difference in the mean performance scores in Business Studies among students taught using the personal model, delegator, and expert teaching style.
3. Examine if there is any difference between male and female students mean performance scores in Business Studies taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching style.
4. Compare urban and rural students' performance scores in Business Studies taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching style.

Research Questions

The following research questions were raised to guide the study:

1. Is there any effect of personal model, delegator, and expert teaching styles on students' achievement in business studies?
2. Is there any difference in the mean performance scores in Business Studies between students taught using the personal model, delegator and expert teaching style?
3. Is there any difference in the mean performane scores in Business Studies between male and female students taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching style?
4. Is there any difference in the mean performance scores in Business Studies between urban and rural students taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching style?

Hypotheses

The following null hypothesis were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance.

H_{01}: There is no significant effect of personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles on students' achievement in Business Studies.

H_{02}: There is no significant difference in the mean performance scores in Business Studies among students taught using the personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles.

H_{03}: There is no significant difference in the mean performance scores in Business Studies between male and female students taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching style.

H_{04}: There is no significant difference in the mean performance scores in Business Studies between urban and rural students taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching style.

Method

The design of the study was a quasi-experimental design. The population of the study consists of all public upper basic secondary school students in Delta State. The sample of the study consist of (376) public basic secondary school (JSS2) students from (9) mixed secondary school from the three senatorial districts in Delta State. Nine experienced Business studies teachers from each of the nine sampled schools were trained on the teaching styles assigned to them using the training manual developed by the researcher. Five urban and four rural schools were purposively selected from the three senatorial district comprising of 185 males and 191 females. The instrument used for the study was the Business Studies Achievement Test (BSAT) consisting of (50) multiple test items. The test questions covered the scheme of work for upper basic secondary School (class 2). Kuder Richardson formula (21) was used to estimate the reliability of the instrument. A coefficient r of 0.77 was obtained. Data collected for the study were analyzed using mean and standard deviation to answer the research question while Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Research question 1

Is there any effect of personal model, delegator, and expert teaching styles on students' performance in Business Studies?

Table 1: Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Mean Performance Scores in Business Studies among students taught using the Personal model, Delegator and Expert Teaching Styles.

Teaching Styles	Group	N	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Mean ($\bar{X}$) Difference	Std. Deviation
Personal Model	Pretest	136	60.68	4.75	14.73
	Posttest	136	65.43		11.08
Delegator	Pretest	130	68.21	4.79	17.32
	Posttest	130	73.00		13.64
Expert teaching	Pretest	110	59.91	5.82	14.38
	Posttest	110	65.73		13.09

Table 1 showed that the students taught with personal model teaching style had a pretest mean of 60.68 and standard deviation of 14.73 while posttest had a mean of 65.43 and standard deviation of 11.08. A mean difference of 4.75, 4.79, and 5.82 was recorded respectively across the three teaching styles which indicate that there is a difference between pretest and posttest means performance scores in Business Studies among students taught using, personal model delegator and expert teaching style.

Hypothesis 1

Ho_1: There is no significant effect of personal model, delegator, and expert teaching styles on students' performance in business studies.

Table 2 t-test Comparison of Performance Scores in Business Studies between Pretest and Posttest of Students taught with Personal Model, Delegator and Expert Teaching Styles.

Teaching Styles	N	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Std. Deviation	Df	t-value	p-value	Decision
Personal Model							
Pretest	136	60.68	14.73	270	3.006	.003	
Posttest	136	65.43	11.08				$Ho_1$is rejected
Delegator							
Pretest	130	68.21	17.32	258	2.48	.014	
Posttest	130	73.00	13.64				
Expert							
Pretest	110	59.91	14.38	218	3.138	.002	
Posttest	110	65.73	13.09				

Result in table 2 above showed that personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles had a t-value of 3.006, 2.48 and 3.138 and a p-value of .003, .014 and .002 respectively. Testing at an alpha level of .05, the p-value is less than the alpha level, the null hypothesis therefore was rejected. Hence, there is a significant effect of personal model, delegator, and expert teaching styles on students' performance in business studies.

Research Question 2

Is there any difference in the mean achievement scores in Business Studies among students taught using the personal model, delegator, and expert teaching style?

Table 3: Comparison of Mean Performance Scores in Business Studies among students taught using the personal model, Delegator and Expert Teaching Style.

Teaching Styles	N	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Std. Deviation
Personal model	136	69.13	13.49
Delegator	130	72.08	10.56
Expert	110	68.26	13.07

Table 3 showed that the students taught using personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles had a mean of 69.13, 72.08, 68.26 and standard deviation of 13.49, 10,56 and 13.07 respectively this means there is a difference in the mean performance scores in Business Studies among students taught using personal, delegator and expert teaching styles.

Hypothesis 2

Ho_2: There is no significant difference in the mean Performance scores in Business Studies among students taught using the personal model, delegator, and expert teaching styles.

Table 4: Summary of Pretest Score Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of Mean Performance Scores in Business Studies among Students taught using the Personal Model, Delegator and Expert Teaching Styles.

Teaching Styles	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P-value	Decision
Between Groups	8.532	2	4.266			
Within Groups	10728.463	182	58.948	.072	.930	Retained
Total	10736.995	184				

Table 4 showed summary of pretest score Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of mean performance scores in Business Studies among students taught using the personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles. The result showed an F-value of .072 and a p-value of .930. Testing at an alpha level of .05, the p-value is less than the alpha level. This implies that there is no significant difference in the pretest scores in Business Studies among students taught using the personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles. For this reason, ANOVA was appropriate for testing hypothesis 2.

Table 5: Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of Mean performance Scores in Business Studies among Students taught using the Personal Model, Delegator and Expert Teaching Styles.

Teaching Styles	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P-value	Decision
Between Groups	995.118	2	497.559			
Within Groups	57607.041	373	154.442	3.222	.041	Ho_2 is retained
Total	58602.160	375				

The result in table 5 above showed an F-value of 3.222 and a p-value of .041. Testing at an alpha level of .05, the p-value is less than the alpha level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference in the mean achievement scores in Business Studies among students taught using the personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles. Therefore, there is need for post hoc analysis to determine where the differences lie.

Table 6: Post Hoc of Scheffe Multiple Comparisons of Personal Model, Delegator and Expert Teaching Styles

	(J) Teaching Styles	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Personal model	Delegator	12.952*	1.564	.015	-6.70	.79
	Expert	7.869*	.594	.026	-3.05	4.79
Delegator	Personal model	12.952*	1.564	.015	-.79	6.70
	Expert	3.821	1.610	.031	-.14	7.78
Expert	Personal model	7.869*	.594	.026	-4.79	3.05
	Delegator	3.821	1.610	.031	-7.78	.14

Table 6 showed the Post hoc tests of mean difference between the personal model and delegator teaching styles as 12.952 and a p-value of .015 while between personal model and expert teaching styles as 7.869 and a p-value of .026. The mean difference between delegator expert as 3.821 and a p-value of .031. These comparisons are significantly difference since the p-values.

Research Question 3

Is there any difference in the mean achievement scores in Business Studies between male and female students taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles?

Table 7; Comparison of Mean Performance Scores of Business Studies between Male and Female Students taught with Personal Model, Delegator and Expert Delegator and Expert Teaching Style.

Personal Model					
	Male	63	66.59	1.77	12.68
	female	73	68.36		15.66
Delegator	Male	62	65.85	0.8	13.78
	Female	68	69.16		10.26
Expert teaching	Male	60	69.87	3.55	11.91
	Female	50	66.32		12.98

Table 7 showed that males taught with personal model had a mean of 66.59 and standard deviation of 12.68 while female had a mean of 68.36and standard deviation of 15.66. Comparatively, a mean difference of 1.77 indicated that there is no difference between male and female means performance scores in Business Studies among students taught using personal model teaching style. The male taught with delegator teaching style had a mean of 65.85 and standard deviation

of 13.78 while female had a mean of 69.16 and standard deviation of 10.26. Comparatively, a mean difference of 0.8 indicated that there is no difference between male and female means performance scores in Business Studies among students taught using delegator teaching style. The males taught with expert teaching style had a mean of 69.87 and standard deviation of 11.91 while female had a mean of 66.32 and standard deviation of 12.98. Comparatively, a mean difference of 3.55 indicated that there is no difference between male and female mean performance scores in Business Studies among students taught using expert teaching style.

H03: There is no significant in the mean performance scores in Business Studies between male and female students taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles on student.

Table 8 t-test Comparison of Performance Scores in Business Studies between Male and Female Students taught using the personal, delegator and expert teaching style.

Teaching Styles	N	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Std. Deviation	Df	t-value	p-value	Decision
Personal							
Male	63	66.59	12.68	134	.716	.475	
Female	73	68.36	15.66				
Delegator							Ho3 rejected
Male	62	65.85	13.78	128	1.561	.121	
Female	68	69.16	10.26				
Expert							
Male	60	69.87	11.91	108	1.493	.138	
Female	50	66.32	12.98				

Table 8 above showed that personal model, delegator, and expert teaching styles had a t-value of .716, 1,561, and 1.493 and a p-value of .475, .121 and .138 respectively. Testing at an alpha level of .05, the p-value is greater than the alpha level, the null hypothesis therefore, was accepted. Hence there is no significant difference in the mean performance scores in Business Studies between male and female students taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles.

Research Question 4

Is there any difference in the mean performance scores in Business Studies between Urban and Rural students taught with personal model, delegator, and expert teaching styles on students' performance in business studies?

Table 9: Comparison of mean performance scores in Business Studies between urban and rural students taught using the personal model, Delegator and Expert Teaching Style.

Teaching Styles	School Location	N	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Mean ($\bar{X}$) Difference	Std. Deviation
Personal Model	Urban	104	64.15	1.49	11.78
	Rural	32	62.66		7.31
Delegator	Urban	100	64.85	3.88	11.92
	Rural	30	68.73		7.51
Expert teaching	Urban	50	69.92	3.05	12.80
	Rural	60	66.87		12.13

The result as in table 9 above shows a mean score of 64.15, 64.85 and 69.92 respectively for urban students taught using the three teaching styles. While standard deviation of 11.78, 11.92, and 12.80 was recorded respectively for urban students taught using the three teaching styles, Rural schools recorded a mean of 62.66, 68.73 and 66.87 respectively across the three teaching styles. Standard deviation for Rural schools was 7.31, 7,51and 12.13 respectively. the mean difference of 1.49, 3.88, and 3.05 was indicated respectively for the three styles, This indicate that there is a difference in the mean performance scores between urban and rural Business studies students taught using the personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles

H04: There is no significant in the mean performance scores in Business Studies between urban and rural students taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles on student.

Table 10; t-test Comparison of performance Scores in Business Studies between urban and rural Students taught with Personal Model, Delegator and Expert Teaching Styles.

Teaching styles	School Location	N	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Std. Deviation	df	t-value	p-value	Decision
Personal Model	Urban	104	56.24	16.23	270	2.585	.010	Ho5 is rejected
	Rural	136	61.97	20.15				
Delegator	Urban	130	67.77	17.11	258	2.716	.007	
	Rural	130	72.98	13.61				
Expert	Urban	110	67.08	17.43	218	2.377	.018	
	Rural	110	72.05	13.29				

Major findings

The following are the major findings of the study:

1. There was a significant effect of personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles on students' achievement in business studies.
2. There is a significant difference in the mean achievement scores in Business Studies among students taught using personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles in favor of personal model.
3. Male and female students taught with personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles performed equally without any difference.
4. There is a significant difference between urban and rural means achievement scores in Business Studies taught using personal model teaching style.

Conclusion

The major conclusions drawn from the findings of the study are as follows.

- Personal model, delegator and expert teaching styles influenced Business Studies academic achievement in junior secondary schools in Delta State.
- Business Studies students' academic achievement in Business Studies is not affected by their sexes.
- Business Studies students in urban schools performed significantly better than their counterparts in rural sc achievement in junior secondary schools in Delta State.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, the following recommendations were made.

1. Business Studies teachers should use more of the personal model and delegator teaching styles in teaching their students. These teaching styles will enable the students develop the required skills and competences needed in Business Studies. It will also enable the students to be creative and take control of their own learning.
2. The government through the Ministry of Education at the state and local government levels should organize seminars and workshops to sensitize and train teachers on how to effectively use the personal model and delegator teaching styles in the classroom.

References

Ameh, P.O. & Datani, Y.S. (2012). Effects of lecture and demonstration method on the academic achievement of students in chemistry in Nasarawa Local Govt Area of Kano State. *International Journal of Modern Social Sciences, 1(1),* 29-37.

Ayeni, A.J. (2017), Teachers professional development and quality assurance in Nigeria secondary schools. *World Journal of Education*, *2,* 143-149.

Cummins, J. (2017). Pedagogies for the poor? Realigning reading instruction for low- income students with scientifically based reading research. *Journal of Educational Research*, *36(9),* 564-573.

Erdem, E. (2012). Examination of the effects of project-based learning approach on student attitudes towards chemistry and test anxiety. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 17(6),* 745-764.

Froyd J.E. (2019). Evidence for the efficacy of student active learning pedagogies. *Retrieved from http:/ctetamuedu/programs*.

Greitzer F.A. (2012). Cognitive Approach to Student-Centered E-learning, Human factors, and Society" 46th Annual Meeting Sept. 30th – Oct. 4th

Kumar, M. (2016). Constructivists epistemology in action. *Journal of Educational Thought, 40(3)*, 246-262.

Ogunmayi B. (2013) Business education at the secondary school level: Problems and prospects. *ABEN Book of Reading, 1(1),* 18-25.

Pierro, A., Presaghi, F. Higgins, T.E. & Kruglanski, A.W. (2019). Regulatory mode preferences for autonomy supporting versus controlling instructional styles. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *79(4),* 599-615.

Teo, R & Wong (2016), Does problem based learning creates a better student? Paper presented at the 2nd Asia pacific conference on problem based learning across discipline. December 4-7. Singapore.