The Effect of Teaching Styles on Student-Teacher Interaction in a University: A Gender Based Analysis

Asma Seemi Malik,[1] Shehla A Yasin,[2] Amjad Mahmood,[3] & Madeeha Tariq[4]

Abstract:

Globally, teaching is one of the most renowned professions as teachers play an important role in the character building of not only the students but the people of any area. The present study aimed to explore the gender difference in teaching styles and how it affects the interaction between students and teachers; how it enhances the motivation and discipline of students. It also attempted to explore whether students feel that differences in teaching styles are effective to enhance their learning and academic performance. The students both male and female were selected through purposive sampling techniques. In-depth interviews were conducted with the help of a structured interview protocol by Ya-Ching Chang (2010). The participants (*n*=12) included 6 boys and 6 girls within the age group of 18-24 years. The sample was chosen from the public university of Lahore. The thematic analysis was used to bring out the emerging themes. The study identified three major themes. The participants perceived the issues of partiality and punctuality among teachers. Both male and female participants mostly perceived male faculty members to be more empathetic and maintained better discipline among students and motivated the students to learn.

Keywords: Teaching styles, discipline, motivation, partiality, punctuality, gender difference

INTRODUCTION

Teaching is one of the most renowned profession globally as teachers play an important role to build the character of not only the students but the whole nation. Students normally consider their teachers as role models. The teaching profession has its exclusive dominant environment and effects that need to be investigated.

The current research focused on the following objectives and research questions. Are there found gender differences in teaching styles and student-teacher interaction? To explore the interaction

---

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Lahore College for Women University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: asmaseemi3@gmail.com

[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Gender & Development Studies, Lahore College for Women University Lahore. Email: shehlaahmad@gmail.com

[3] Assistant Professor, Punjab College of Information Technology, Lahore /PhD Scholar, National College of Business Administration and Economics, Lahore. Email: amjadmahmood502@gmail.com

[4] MS Scholar, Department of Gender & Development Studies, Lahore College for Women University Lahore. Email: madeehatariq19@gmail.com

between teaching styles and to maintain discipline (in case of misbehavior) in class among students. To gain insight into teachers with different teaching styles in enhancing the learning and academic performance of students. To examine whether male or female faculty allocate more time in the university to lecturing and for answering queries of students. To find out if there is any difference between the effectiveness of male and female teachers in delivering lectures and knowledge. The research question for this research was what will be the outcome of gender differences in teaching styles on student-teacher interaction?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2009) in the Teaching and Learning International Survey talked about teachers' professional competence, beliefs, and attitudes; classroom strategies and professional activities; and the classroom environment. Scheerens (2007) identified three main areas for this profession as the process of teaching, classroom environment, and teacher characteristics; McBer (2000) also stressed the teaching abilities, classroom climate, and features of faculty as important elements of teaching.

So, it becomes clear that teaching relies on the teacher's talent, persistence, vision, brainpower, and struggle in maintaining challenges of discipline, attentiveness, and learning among students in the academic environment (Kardia & Wright, 2004). It is argued that the learning ability and readiness of students does not only depend on the students but also depend on the suitable teaching styles (İlçin et al., 2018). Both teachers' teaching styles and students' learning styles play an important role in enriching the achievements, successes, and learning motivation of students (Charkinset al., 2015). An effective teaching style always determines the characteristic of a good teacher.

In a classroom environment, the teaching styles of faculty matter. The teaching styles are the ways and strategies that teachers use while teaching (Suparman, 2010); pattern of belief, knowledge, performance, and behavior of faculty (Grasha, 1994). He identified five aspects of teaching styles, such as expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. The teaching style is carefully linked to a certain behavior, so the faculty's teaching style can be observed by pupils.

For teaching and learning, the environment of the classroom must be welcoming, conducive, and exciting (Sokal et al., 2003). Teaching styles help to explain the lessons well, nurturing motivation, guidance, and directions to students in learning. To address the argument that teaching styles have an impact on students' motivation, first, an understanding has to be developed about motivation to learn; many experts have defined motivation. The overall inspiring force in students that helped them to learn can be considered as motivation (Sardiman, 2012), a drive or incitement of a person to have the will to learn, to determine the activity to teach (Simmons & Page, 2010). It is argued that a motivated individual will be more successful than a non-motivated individual. In another version, stress was on the inner and outer impulses of a person that causes him or her to perform or act with an expected change in behavior (Nashar, 2004). There is another argument that motivation to learn can be visible from the learning behavior of pupils, the highly motivated students meticulously do their tasking, show resilience toward hard-work, interest to find the solution to issues, excitement to do tasks, and always prefer to work alone (Anni, 2006).

The other argument of current research is that an effective teaching style helps to discipline students in the class. Maintaining discipline in classrooms and among students is one of the

effective strategies of teachers that are socially appreciated. According to Lewis, Qui, and Katz (2005), discipline maintaining the strategy of teachers was considered to be a powerful force to create a sense of responsibility among students, it made them responsible citizens in the long run (Lewis, 2001). This helps to enhance the learning ability of students because it didn't allow any disturbance in the classroom. It was argued by Rahimi and Karkami (2012) that high classroom discipline is necessary to create a healthy environment for learning because if any student misbehaves in class, it will distract the other students and disrupts the learning and teaching process; which in turn disturbs the flow of the carefully prepared lecture by a faculty member.

It is perceived by students that differences in teaching styles of teachers also help to increase their learning and academic results. Many kinds of research have proven that teacher teaching styles or strategies help to increase the learning and success-seeking abilities of students. Altinel (2006) has proved that students' academic achievements and task completion enhanced with the teaching styles of teachers; students were more involved in learning (Everston & Weinstein, 2006), enthusiasm, and academic scores increased (Bassey, 2012). The teaching styles may have something to do to enhance all these illustrated qualities mentioned as per previous literature.

With the help of teaching styles, student-teacher interaction is possible, with a good relationship between both, which will bring good fruitful results and vice versa. The teacher's behavior plays a serious role in edifying the pupil-teacher affiliation. Students' association and strong relationship with instructors bring a positive impact on gratification, which so, permits the educational grades (Gillet et al., 2012). A sturdy relationship between student and teacher helps to build in learning habits and achievements of students noticeably.

 According to Grasha (1996), there are five teaching styles for bringing various academic and behavioral results in students. These are namely expert, personal, facilitator, delegator, and authority. The expert holds the facts, awareness, and abilities that pupils necessitate. Excess use of it will lead to the fact that students become more apprehensive of teachers' knowledge (Grasha, 1996). The faculty in authority (formal) style used to conduct class in a perfect and orderly way with secure potential. But if the teacher continuously applies it, it will result in a more severe, consistent, and inflexible classroom environment. In personal style, faculty quoted examples that allow students to perceive and compete with the teacher's method, this model used the observation method. A personal kind of linkage existed among teacher-students in the facilitator style. Faculty with this style stressed a student-centered approach with more flexibility and inclination to use more innovative ideas (Grasha, 1996). If this was held optimistically in a classroom, students remained uncomfortable due to vulnerable and communicative situations. In the end, in the delegator model, stress is more laid on the independence of students, but it consumed more time and results in misinterpretation of the eagerness of students to opt for independent assignments (Grasha, 1996). So it was obvious from this model of teaching styles that these styles can neither help nor delay the learning practice among students.

Which teaching style is better or more effective depends on many things like the size of the class, the subject being taught, being a co-education or single-sex institute, etc. One of these styles is student-centered learning vs. teacher-centered learning which also involves two secondary categories named high technology and low technology (Burden & Byrde, 1994). In a teacher-centered style more power and authority goes to the teacher as he/she plays the supreme role in

learning and students are the passive recipient (McCarthy, et al., 2000). It is concluded that these methods are effective in their way if both student and teacher seek to keep its advantage and avoid its disadvantages (Asiri, 2019). Yet most research indicates the dominance of teacher-centered learning/ teaching across the world (Muganga & Peter Ssenkusu, 2019; Wright, 2011).

Most of the research addresses the argument that a gender difference existed in the teaching styles of both male and female teachers. As both male and female teachers try their abilities to display all the teaching traits to do the best for students, according to Laird et al. (2007) gender differences do occur in assigning time to students for different activities, teaching styles, and dynamic classroom performance and practices. They also exhibited gender gaps in styles to deliver a lecture. The common tool to get feedback about faculty teaching is possible through students' assessment of them. In one of the studies, students observed that female teachers are extra caring, loving, kind, and sensitive towards students while male faculty members were more knowledgeable, and showed more grip over their subject (Reyes et al., 2012). Statham et al. (1991) stated that gender differences existed even in a skillful environment like adaptable course level, monitoring professional grading of teachers, size of the class, and the ratio of the staff in a department. As far as the interaction between teachers and students is concerned, this research found that female faculty had standard feelings toward their students as compared to male faculty, who spend lesser time with students and exhibited less attention and linkage regarding teaching to students.

One of the research conducted by Malik, Nadeem, and Tariq (2022) found a gender difference in the attitude of male and female faculty while dealing with students in class. But both faculties have no difference in the competency of knowledge and in seeking students' attention. It was found that female teachers better deliver theory-based lectures while male teachers have a better practical approach towards knowledge (El-Emadi, Said, & Friesen, 2019).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To understand the phenomena better, this research has focused on two theoretical frameworks to understand the teaching styles and student-teacher interaction. As this is a two-way process because without the teacher's teaching styles and pupils' clear understanding and efforts, the process didn't work alone. So, both invitational theory and social constructivist learning theory were adopted.

The invitational education theory by Purkey (1992) was established around the capability, values, and responsibilities of a human being. A set of assumptions is the basis of this model such as clarifying, offering, and describing the ways for individuals to recognize their potential to justify their efforts to achieve goals in life. According to Purkey (1992), this model is founded on four pillars; respect, trust, optimism, and intentionality. By respect, individuals are valued; trust creates a cooperative and collaborative environment; optimism tries to bring out the hidden potentials of the individuals, and intentionality helps to create and maintain a welcoming place, plans, and courses, to realize learner's potentials to intentionally invite them and others through personal and professional efforts (Purkey, Schmidt, & Novak, 2010). In this theory, it's the teacher's teaching ways that can motivate or demotivate their pupils to learn (Purkey, Schmidt, & Novak, 2010). The classrooms play an important role in the whole process of learning by involving both teachers and learners, it's the invitational classroom concept presented by Palmer (1983) that teacher creates an

air of hospitality in the classroom environment that motivates learners to learn (p.71). If the classroom is inviting then both teacher and pupil experience encouraging results (Palmer, 2007).

As to support the argument that student-teacher interaction is a two-way process, the social constructivist learning theory by Jean Piaget (1972) and Lev Vygotsky (1978) believed that learning could be made in person and that students themselves build their knowledge capacity. According to constructivists, learners through meaningful learning processes add important knowledge to their existing experiences. Here the role of the teacher is important, who helps to construct that knowledge through their expressive activities, supportive teaching approaches and respect, and assignments. These contacts appeared to be lectures, classroom interactions, assignments, question & answer sessions, freedom to ask questions, and discipline. Yager (1991) opined that the instructional approach of constructivist teachers is to invite ideas, explore, propose clarifications and answers, and take action. Teachers should respectfully address pupils. According to Schuh (2003), in a constructivist class setting, scholars are made to believe that their contributions are imperative and worthy of being expressed. Their views are valued and sought by teachers to make this interactive process quite strong. As knowledge is not in the brain of pupils but is developed through interaction with people. McDermott (1999) believed that students learn to formulate through numerous discussions of which they are a part rather than simply their approach. McKinley (2015) argued that social constructivism exists as a social theory of knowledge of humans, which is socially developed and built through contact with people in their surroundings.

According to Melrose, Park, and Perry (2013), the conceptual approach comprehensively assessed the knowledge developed through consensus, standards of specialized practices, and proficiencies of the teacher. Through this, the fallacies of pupils are easily recognized and readdressed. The student-teacher social interaction is developed to nurture abilities by adding new knowledge rather than excluding existing information (Novak &Purkey, 2001). This interaction is social and between the seekers and their environment. It is a significant tool to develop knowledge. The teachers, family, and peer groups can be a part of this environment. According to Pritchard (2009), students' learning developed through their independence and actions (Bradley & Postlethwaite, 2003).

Huetle, Baviskar, and Smith (2012) believed that constructionist teachers guide students to take independent decisions about knowledge seeking. This line of action extends a positive and healthy invitation to learners to explore their abilities of learning. Knowledge is a cognitive approach constructed through the acts and practices of students, which they experienced in the social environment of learning. Students study with their intentions (Wentzel, 2016).

METHODOLOGY

To investigate the query further in the current scenario of Pakistan, especially in a gender context, this qualitative investigation is a pragmatic approach in this direction. It aims to explore the gender difference in teaching styles and how it affects the interaction between student and teacher (both male and female). This study focused on this particular issue in Public Sector Universities because firstly there are a maximum number of students enrolled in these universities as being economically affordable for them. Secondly, it was easier for the researcher to approach students in these universities as compared to private universities where there were a lot of formalities and hurdles to encounter. Teachers in the public sector have secured job benefits so they served for a

longer period in one particular institution and tried to deal with students with more authority and persuasion.

Participants

12 in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with male and female students (N=10, 6 females and 6 males) about teaching styles. Students were studying at BS and MS levels. The age range of students varied from 18 to 24 years. The student sample was drawn from the one public sector University of Lahore. A purposive sampling technique was used to recruit the sample. The interested candidates were briefed about the purpose of the research and then students were recruited depending on their convenience and availability.

The Technique for Data Collection

The researcher took help from a structured interview protocol designed by Ya-Ching Chang (2010) about teaching styles and teacher-student interaction and modified statements by getting permission from the author as this scale was created for quantitative study only. There were 10 questions in it, which were self-constructed.

Procedure

After getting permission from concerned authorities to conduct interviews, informed consent was taken from participants. The participant's confidentiality and anonymity were ensured. They were asked before the interview about the use of a recorder. The interview lasted for 15-35 minutes. The audiotape data were then transcribed.

ANALYSIS

The whole analysis process involved the following steps, according to Creswell (2009), first to organize and prepare the data and then read it. After that, coding was conducted and themes were searched for by Rossman and Rallis, (1998), then themes were reviewed for naming. The data interpretation had taken place to bring out verbatim (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Findings

3 major themes with 5 sub-themes were generated.

PERSPECTIVE ABOUT STANDARD TEACHING

Gender Wise Perspective

Firstly, it appeared that what is the gender-wise perspective of students towards their male and female teachers? Overall, students of both genders have a negative perspective towards their teachers of the same gender and a favorable perspective toward the teacher of the opposite genders. Male students felt that their male teachers give undue favors to female students in terms of grades, overlooking their misbehavior and giving extra time to help them after class. One of the male respondents, R alleged,

 "I've perceived that male teachers accept excuses of female students so easily if they failed to submit their assignments within time and even male teachers show generosity and award more marks to female students. He further added, *"Male teachers give redundant favors to female students".*

Male respondent B opined that:

 "*My male teacher takes it very seriously if he saw male students cheating and deals with them very seriously and he also gives extra time and more attention to female students after class to help them with their studies.*"

On the other hand, female students also reflected similar views but their views were less intense than males (as some of them claimed that teachers treat students similarly irrespective of their gender).

One female participant T said, "Female teachers are always welcoming towards boys, and always inclined to give unusual favors to male students to benefit them in their studies."

Another Female S endorsed and said, "I've found female teachers to be more lenient with male students as compared to female students in matters linked to studies. They even give them good grades."

Perceptive on Maintaining Discipline in Classrooms Secondly

Most of the students were not satisfied with the punctuality of teachers (both genders) but so far as deadlines for projects and assignments are concerned, teachers of both genders were claimed to be strict. Students raised concerns about punctuality issues as they think it affects their performance.

A male student A said, "Is there any way of making teachers realize how badly this habit of getting late is going to affect the students' careers?

One male respondent M said, "Teachers arriving late are better than not arriving at all; being only punctual in giving assignments and projects during the semester studies isn't enough to portray responsibility."

 Male student N said,

"*Whenever my assignment's date is due, I feel like my words got wings and seem flying from my mind because my teachers practice punctuality and time limits quite religiously.* Then he said, "*My teachers here believe that being prompt and punctual in these semester assignments and projects will make us more proactive and stronger in other day-to-day tasks and future goals.*"

Lecture Deliverance

The next perspective was about the quality of the lecture. Students of both genders claimed that male teachers readily allow small breaks during lectures, unlike female teachers who do not give such favors. Male teachers respond to questions but female teachers got irritated to frequent questions. A female student D reported, *"Male teachers always take better care of their students and their understanding level is so good".*

Another female student I commented:

"*Male teachers in the majority have good interpersonal skills that help us raise queries during lectures, while female teachers are irritated with repetitive questioning.*"

Perspective Regarding Teaching Styles

So far as the teaching styles of teachers are concerned, students were quite elaborative about teachers of both genders and interestingly there was homogeneity in their opinions about teachers' teaching styles. From their discussion the points that emerged can be categorized as follows:

Teacher-Centered Low Tech Teaching Style

Students of both genders believed that their female teachers use more lecturing as compared to male teachers. They focus more on bookish assignments and students of both genders agreed on that.

A male student R said that Female teachers deliver only book-based knowledge and do not enlighten us with thought-stimulating concepts.

As a female student T commented, "I am much more reluctant in asking the same question twice from a female teacher due to her unfriendly and frustrating nature".

Female teachers use directing style more as compared to male teachers. So, giving long lectures, assigning readings and students listening and taking notes are reflective of their directive style.

The students also labeled them as autocratic because they keep the decision-making authority in their hands. As a male student B said, *"Female teachers show more interest in autocratic teaching, while male teachers have a more interactive approach"*

Another female B commented, *"Our female teachers discuss assignments, etc. with us but the final authority is in their hand".*

The participants reported that female teachers cannot maintain discipline in class and students of both genders agreed on that. So, the female student I, D said:

"Less control is there over students by female teachers, Female teachers immediately get distressed by disobedient students".

Student-Centered High-Tech Teaching Style

In students' perception, male teachers mostly adopt a student-centered approach; where power is still with the teacher but the activity level of the student and teacher are the same. Male teachers adopt coaching to impart learning and engage students through class participation and group activities as one male student B uttered,

"I always find male teachers using problem-based teaching methods to teach that boost up our learning skills during lectures. They used to relate lectures with everyday examples to make them more meaningful and clearer."

Male teachers are better able to handle queries. A female student T said:

"When a male teacher provides us a chance to reciprocate our queries with a live questioning opportunity after the lecture, it clarifies most of my concept-based problems. However, we rarely get this opportunity with female teachers."

Male student R expressed, "I always find male teachers using problem-based teaching approaches that enhance our learning skills during lectures."

Another attribute dedicated to male teachers was their humorous and easy-going style and that they can grasp the attention of even larger groups easily.

5 out of 12 students expressed that *"When a male teacher pops a funny analogy of a concept, it refreshes our minds. Female teachers need to work on making such interesting associations"*

A female respondent D said, *"Male teachers are better at grasping attention than female instructors because of their friendlier nature and pleasant manners.*

Male teachers were declared to keep discipline in class and can handle the situation in a better way according to our participants.

SEXISM OR GENDER STEREOTYPES

It was surprising to note that our students have a sexist approach towards their teachers and they defined the underlying reasons for some teacher behaviors from a stereotypical perspective. For example, it is expected that teachers should act humbly and if they react harshly, they are considered overburdened or victims of work-family conflict. A male participant R said, "Female teachers become easily distressed on class disturbances rather than humbly handling the situation"

Another male respondent A replied that *"Female teachers are more reactive because of being overburdened and because of their dual duties at home and work."*

The students also declared female teachers as kind-hearted, caring, and motherly which is a prevalent thought about females. A male student N said that "Some female teachers treat their students as their children."

A Female participant, D said, "Our female teachers are kind-hearted and caring."

In the case of male teachers for maintaining discipline in class, almost all 12 students of both genders attributed them to handling situations effectively, maintaining better discipline, and effectively controlling overwhelming responses or conditions.

"Female teachers walk out in case of disobedience but male teachers do not, "Female teachers are more likely to get distressed, confused, and chaotic in response to the misbehavior of students."

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study showed a positive trend in students to consider teachers teaching ways as an important tool to motivate the learning process, success, and enrichment of knowledge for them (Charkinset al., 2015). The opinions expressed by 7 participants out of 12 acknowledged the importance of the teaching styles of faculty in creating a healthy environment to enhance their motivation to learn, and improve grades and discipline (Lewis, Qui, & Katz, 2005; Rahimi & Karkami, 2012)).

So far as the standard teaching is concerned, the foremost concern showed by the students of both genders was that both gender faculty favored students of the opposite sex like male teachers showed favoritism to female students and female faculty to male students. The major concern was shown by male students towards male faculty who gave undue favor to female students during their studies. Male teachers overlooked the misbehavior of females during class while scolding severely the boys for a similar mistake. On the other hand, female students complained that male

students got extra favor and academic support during lectures by female faculty. This finding was in line with the results of the study by Stevens (2015) which showed that male students received more female teacher attention and vice versa. Gender favoritism does exist in universities.

The second sub-theme perceptive on maintaining discipline in the classroom highlighted in generic teaching was the concern regarding the punctuality of faculty members while attending the classes and students raised serious concerns about it. The teaching faculty did not come on time to class for a lecture, as both seem to lack punctuality as perceived by both male and female students. This outcome is contrary to the findings of Harber (2014) who proved that male teachers are more punctual than female teachers. The reason for this contradiction could be the standard lack of punctuality in Pakistani people because they belonged to the event time culture rather than the clock time culture (Van Eerde & Azar, 2019). It is in line with the findings of Sultana and Rashid (2013) who claimed that the punctuality of teachers is good for the academic environment and student's behavior. The students claimed that faculty of both genders are pretty prompt for assignments and projects and do not tolerate delays in this matter.

The third sub-theme was the quality of lecture delivery. Overall students of both genders rated males positively regarding the quality of lecture in terms of discipline, empathy, and readiness to answer the questions than a female teacher. Students openly asked questions and raised their queries during the lecture with male teachers; further students were given a certain breathing space to express their opinion on assignments, examinations, and tests by male teachers. According to Stojiljkovic, Djigic, and Zlatkovic (2012) empathy is the professional requirement of a teacher. It is obvious from the subthemes that male teachers are more capable of considering students well than female teachers. On the other hand, female faculty becomes impatient upon asking too many questions and overlooks the students' wish for a small break during a lecture to speedily complete the lecture. These findings are contrary to most studies that claim women faculty to be higher on empathy, query handling, etc. (e.g. Jerabek, 2014; Toussaint & Webb, 2005). A possible reason could be the concept of self in those teachers. Lipka and Brinthaupt (1999) said that teachers' self-concept and more importantly reflexive self is quite important in determining their behaviors in class. The behavior of female teachers might be reflective of their self-concept rather than gender.

The next major theme was teaching styles. Students attributed female teachers as using a low tech teaching style where they take lesser help from technology. It is in line with Zhou and Xu study (2007) which claimed that female teachers are less experienced in using technology and has low confidence in this regard so they do not readily use technology whereas males adopt a more high-tech style.

Female teachers were perceived to use lectures more readily as compared to practical activities and group projects. This finding is also in line with Yu (2021) who claimed that females involve more in interactions which is reflective of lecture delivery whereas males are more appropriate when it comes to hand-on activities

El-Emadi, Said & Friesen (2019) also concluded that female teachers better deliver theory classes which are reflective of their lecturing whereas male teachers demonstrate better performance in practical type things like labs, etc. which is reflective of their activity-based teaching approach.

Students also showed their concerns regarding class discipline, control, and handling of class disturbances and positively rated male teachers on these skills. This finding is in line with the outcomes of a study by Carrington and McPhee (2008) as female teachers easily get upset by chaos in class and, in their protection, they become stricter and hardnosed in class. Men can maintain discipline in a better way; they are humorous and give students liberty in classrooms.

Kumari (2020) believed that men are better teachers; the reason narrated by participants was that female teachers got emotional easily; they bring their politics into classrooms and get subjective in class room.

As far as sexist or gender-stereotypical things (the last major theme) are concerned; the students seemed to give sexist comments about teachers and these comments were related to gender roles. For example, claiming female teachers to be kind-hearted and give motherly treatment and at the same time condemning her for being strict was the reflection of students that they want the female teacher to play the nurturing role (expected by the female gender generally). On the other hand, they attributed female teachers' short tempers or walking out of class as the result of their dual duties and work-family conflict which is again gendered specific belief (Kite, 2001) which makes our belief system to inculcate gender stereotypes. So being part of society, students too are no exception they also share the same gender schema which organizes gender-related knowledge in terms of characteristics, personality traits, and specific prototypes (Bem, 1981). Male students appeared to have more sexist attitudes as compared to females (García-Sánchez, et al., 2019).

It was inferred that those students were more motivated to learn from male teachers, as they displayed empathy and punctuality, welcome the class questioning and used problem-based tactics during classes. Maybe, a reason for these changes in the patriarchal mindset of Pakistani students is that men excel better at professional work i.e., in university-level teaching than women as women are meant to be homemakers.

CONCLUSION

This study acknowledged the significance of teacher teaching styles for better student-teacher interaction for maintaining discipline in class and motivating the students to learn in a better way by maintaining a healthier class environment. In this regard, 5 out of 12 participants were cautious in sharing their opinion about the teachers because of fear and respect and due to the developed culture of academic institutions. Thus, it is concluded that faculty teaching styles are helpful for the students to better learn, shine, and attain good academic results and in the long run to build their social and professional development more healthily.

Gender favouritism does exist in universities; male teachers are more attentive toward female students and vice versa. Lack of punctuality is a feature of both gender teachers; both do not come to class on time. A difference was found among teachers of both genders regarding the answer to queries raised by students, as male teachers answered more queries than female teachers. Female teachers got irritated with too many questions from students. Female teachers adopted traditional ways of teaching while male teachers preferred to use advanced technology for their lectures. Students believed that female teachers are theory-oriented and male teachers are practical-oriented. Male teachers maintained discipline in class; almost all 12 students of both genders

attributed them to handling situations effectively, maintaining better discipline, and effectively controlling overwhelming responses or conditions as compared to female teachers.

This study has theoretical significance because it builds on double-fold perspectives of the invitational education theory (Purkey, 1992; Purkey, Schmidt &Novak, 2010) and social constructivist learning theory (Jean Piaget, 1972; Lev Vygotsky, 1978; Yager, 1991; Schuh, 2003) endorses that learners through meaningful learning processes add important knowledge to their existing experiences. Here the role of the teacher is important, who helps to construct that knowledge through their expressive activities, supportive teaching approaches and respect, and assignments. Practically outcomes of current research are beneficial to draw consideration of teaching faculty and students for using conventional ways along with a concise manner. Faculty should assess the effectiveness of their teaching style to increase their ability to connect correctly with students. In this way, it will be proven fruitful to upgrade and improve the learning ability and knowledge of students.

Limitations and Future Directions

Even so, this study has a contribution to the theory of knowledge sharing and practice of academicians and educational institutions yet it has few limitations. The sample was taken from students of one university in the Punjab region of Pakistan and the findings could vary in other educational and countrywide situations. Moreover, it could be different in private and public setting universities. The traditional issues of bias and limited generalization of the population are always the limitation of qualitative investigation that can be eliminated in future research through the application of mixed-method and triangulation approaches. Furthermore, this assessment was only based on students' perceptions rather than on faculty.

Besides, the mere focus was on teacher's teaching styles as a tool of knowledge sharing that can be extended to other dimensions. It often involved the actual behavior of the students, their learning capability, their complaining attitude, and their interests. Although 12 interviews were not enough for the researcher to reach the point of saturation, but due to time constraints, researcher restricted the number of interviews.   The future researchers should try to measure student-teacher interaction through a mixed method approach by designing different questionnaires to contain separate questions related to the teaching style and teacher-students' interactions.

Authors' Note

This work has been conducted in University of Punjab, Lahore. Three of the authors belong to LCWU while fourth one was from NCBA & E.

References:

Altinel, Z. (2006). *Student misbehavior in EFL classes: Teacher's and students' perspectives* (Unpublished master thesis, Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey).

Anni, C.T. (2006). *Psychology of learning*. Semarang, Indonesia: UPT UNNES Press.

Asiri, A. M. (2019). Teaching methods with high tech learning in teacher centered such as flipped classrooms and student centered such as Debate Theory. *Multi-knowledge electronic comprehensive journal for education and science publications (MECSJ), 17*.

Bassey, B. A. (2012). *A Wider View of Classroom Management*. Uyo, Nigeria: Ekong Publishing House.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88,* 354–64. https://doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354

Bradley, P., & Postlethwaite, K. (2003). Simulation in clinical learning. *Medical Education*, *37*(1), 1-5.

Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006). *Conducting in-depth interview: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input.* Pathfinder International Tool Series, Monitoring and Evaluation-2.

Burden, P. R., & Byrd, D. M. (1994). *Methods for effective teaching* (Vol. 160). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Chang, Y. C. (2010). *Students' perceptions of teaching styles and use of learning strategies.* (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville).

Charkins, R. J., O'Toole, D. M., & Wetzel, J. N. (2015). Linking teacher and student learning styles with student achievement and attitudes. *The Journal of Economic Education*, *16*(2), 111-20.

Carrington, B., & McPhee, A. (2008). Boys' 'underachievement' and the feminization of teaching. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy, 34*(2), 109-20.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (3rd ed). Sage Publications, Inc.

El-Emadi, A.A., Said, Z., & Friesen, H. (2019). Teaching style differences between male and female science teachers in Qatari schools: Possible impact on student achievement. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, *15* (12), 1-16.

Jonassen, D., Davidson, M., Collins, M., & Campbell, J. P. (1995). Constructivism and computer-mediated communication in distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *9*(2), 7-26. https://doi:10.1080/08923649509526885

Kumari, J. (2020, 11 March). Talking Point: Are women better teachers than their male counterpart. *Times of India*. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/education/news/talking-point-are-women-better-teachers-than-their-male-counterparts/articleshow/74573956.cms

Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of classroom management research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

García-Sánchez, R., Almendros, C., Aramayona, B., Martin, M.J., Soria-Oliver, M., Lopez, J. S., & Martinez, M. (2019). Are sexist attitudes and gender stereotypes linked? A critical feminist approach with a Spanish sample. *Frontiers in Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02410.

Gillet N., Vallerand R. J., Lafrenière M.-A.K. (2012). Intrinsic and extrinsic school motivation as a function of age: The mediating role of autonomy support. *Soc. Psychol. Educ*. *15*, 77-95.

Grasha, A. F. (1994). A matter of style: The teacher as the expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. *College Teaching*, *42*(4), 142-49.

Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with Style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles.* Pittsburgh, PA: Alliance Publishers.

Harber, C. (2014). *Education and international development: Theory, practice, and issues.* Oxford: Symposium Books.

İlçin, N., Tomruk, M., Yeşilyaprak, S.S., Karadibak, D., & Savci, S. (2018). The relationship between learning styles and academic performance in TURKISH physiotherapy students. *BMC Med Educ, 18*, 291. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1400-2

Jeřábek, T., Rambousek, V., & Wildová, R. (2014). Specifics of visual perception of the augmented reality in the context of education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *159*, 598 – 604.

Kardia, D. B., & Wright, M. (2004). Instructor identity: *The impact of gender and race on faculty experiences with teaching* (Occasional Paper, 19). University of Michigan, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. http://www.crlt.umich.edu/sites/default/files/resource_files/CRLT_no19.pdf

Kite, M. E. (2001). Changing times, changing gender roles: who do we want women and men to be? In R. Unger (Ed.), *The handbook of the psychology of women and gender*. (215–27). Wiley.

Laird, T. F. N., Garver, A. K., & Niskodé, A. S. (2007). *Gender gaps: Understanding teaching style differences between men and women*. Kansas City, MO: Annual meeting of the Association for Institutional Research.

Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: The students' view. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *17*(3), 307-19

Lewis, R., Romi, S., Katz, Y. T., & Qiu, X. (2008). Students' reactions to classroom discipline in Australia, Israel, and China. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(3), 715-24.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lipka, R. P. & Brinthaupt, T. M. (1999). *The role of self in teacher development (Eds).* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Malik, A.S., Nadeem, M., & Tariq, M. (2022). The gender difference in students-teachers' interaction at university level: A quantitative analysis. *Pakistan Journal of Gender Studies, 22*(1), 29-50.

McBer, H. (2000). *Research into teacher effectiveness: A model of teacher effectiveness* (Research Report 216). Nottingham: Department for Education and Employment.

McCarthy, A., Lee, K., Itakura, S., & Muir, D. W. (2006). Cultural display rules drive the eye gaze during thinking. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *37*(6), 717-22.

McKinley, J. (2015). Critical argument and writer identity: Social constructivism as a theoretical framework for EFL academic writing. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *12*(3), 184-207, doi:10.1080/15427587.2015.1060558

McDermott, P. (1999). Strategic and emergent issues in construction procurement. In S. Rowlinson & P. McDermott (Eds.), *Procurement Systems: A Guide to Best Practice in Construction*. (3–22.) E & FN Spon.

Schuh, K. L. (2003). Knowledge construction in the learner-centred classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *95*(2), 426-42. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.95.2.426

Melrose, S., Park, C. & Perry, B. (2013). Teaching health professionals online: Frameworks and strategies. doi:10.15215/aupress/9781927356654.01

Muganga, L., & Ssenkusu, P. (2019). Teacher-centered vs. student-centered: An examination of student teachers' perceptions about pedagogical practices at Uganda's Makerere University. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry, 11*(2), 16-40. DOI:10.18733/cpi29481

Nashar, H. (2004). *Peranan motivasi dan kemampuan awal dalam kegiatan pembelajaran [The role of motivation and ability in the learning process*]. Jakarta: Delia Press.

Novak, J. M., & Purkey, W. W. (2001). *Invitational Education*. Fastback #488. Bloomington: PhiDelta Kappa Educational Foundation

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2009). *Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS*. Paris: TALIS, OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/9789264068780-en.

Palmer, P. J. (1983). *To Know as we are known. Education as a spiritual journey*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.

Palmer, P. J. (2007). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons

Piaget, J. (1972). Development and learning. In C. S. Lavatelli & F. Stendler (Eds.), *Readings in child behavior and development.* (7-20). New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Pritchard, A. (2009). *Ways of learning: Learning theories and learning styles in the classroom* (2nded.). London: David Fulton Publishers.

Purkey, W. W., Schmidt, J. J., & Novak, J. M. (2010). *From conflict to conciliation: How to defuse difficult situations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Purkey, W.W. (1992). An introduction to invitational theory. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, *1*(1), 5-16.

Hartle, R. T., Baviskar, S., & Smith, R. (2012). A field guide to constructivism in the college science classroom: Four essential criteria and a guide to their usage. *Bioscene*, *38*, 31–35.

Rahimi, M., & Karkami, F.H. (2012). The role of teachers' classroom discipline in their teaching effectiveness and students' language learning motivation and achievement: A path method. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *3*(1), 57-82.

Reyes, M. R., Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., White, M., & Salovey, P. (2012). Classroom emotional climate, student engagement, and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *104*(3), 700-12.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis S. F. (1998). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sardiman. (2012). *Teaching and learning interaction & motivation*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Scheerens, J. (2007). *The conceptual framework for the development of the PISA 2009 context questionnaires and thematic reports*. OECD: paper for the PISA Governing Board.

Schuh, K. L. (2003). Knowledge construction in the learner-centered classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(2), 426-42.

Simmons, A. M., & Page M. (2010). Motivating students through power and choice*. English Journal*, *100*, 65-69.

Sokal, L., Smith, D. G., & Mowat, H. (2003). Alternative certification teachers' attitudes toward classroom management. *High School Journal*, *86*(3), 8-16.

Statham, A., Richardson, L., & Cook, J. A. (1991). *Gender and university teaching: A negotiated difference.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stevens, K. (2015). *Gender bias in teacher interactions with students.* (Master of Education Program Theses. Paper 90. Graduates Studies, Lowa, USA: Dordt University).

Stojiljković, S., Djigic, G., & Zlatković,B. (2012). Empathy and teachers' roles*. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. *69*, 960-66·

Sultana, A. M., & Rashid, S. N. B. (2013). A study on time management and punctuality issues among students at secondary school, Kedah. *American Journal of Economics, 3*(5), 52-56.

Suparman S. (2010). *Gaya Mengajar Yang MenyenangkanSiswa*. Yogyakarta: Pinus Book Publisher

Toussaint, L., & Webb, J. R. (2005). Gender differences in the relationship between empathy and forgiveness. *J. Soc. Psychol.* 145, 673-685. 10.3200/socp.145.6.673-86

Van Eerde, W., & Azar, S. (2019). Too late? What do you mean? Cultural norms regarding lateness for meetings and appointments. *Cross-Cultural Research, 54*(3), 111-29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397119866132

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wentzel, K. R. (2016). Teacher-student relationships. In K. R. Wentzel, and D. Miele (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (2nd ed.). (211–30). New York: Routledge.

Wright, G. B. (2011). Student-centered learning in higher education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Postsecondary Education, 23*(1), 92-97.

Yager, R. (1991). The constructivist learning model: Towards real reform in science education. *The Science Teacher*, *58*(6), 52-57.

Yu, Z. (2021). The effects of gender, educational level, and personality on online learning outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Educ Technol High Educ.*, *18*, 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00252-3.

Zhou, G., & Xu, J. (2007). Adoption of educational technology: How does gender matter? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 19*(2), 140-53.

Date of Publication	January 15, 2023