

ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – II Issue-III (May – June) 2024

Frequency: Bimonthly



Communication and Teaching Styles and Job Performance of Faculty Members

Jerome A. Billariña

Cagayan State University-Aparri Campus, Aparri 3515, Cagayan, Philippines

| **Received:** 30.04.2024 | **Accepted:** 04.05.2024 | **Published:** 07.05.2024

***Corresponding author:** Jerome A. Billariña

Cagayan State University-Aparri Campus, Aparri 3515, Cagayan, Philippines.

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the communication and teaching styles and job performance of faculty members. The study was limited only to the communication and teaching styles, and job performance of the faculty members. Further, it was limited only to the profile of the faculty members in terms of age, sex, civil status, monthly income, highest educational attainment, employment status, current academic rank and length of service with the organization. The study was conducted from January 2022- May 2022 among the Faculty Members of Cagayan State University for the academic year 2021-2022.

It further explained if there was a significant difference between the communication and teaching styles of the faculty members and their profile and if there was a significant relationship between the job performance of the faculty members and their profile, communication and teaching styles. Correlations for the study revealed that job performance of faculty members is significantly related to their age and length of service in other institution. Moreover, the driver type of communication style is significantly related to their job performance.

Keywords: *Communication and Teaching Styles, Faculty Members, Job Performance*

INTRODUCTION

Educational institutions all over the world are constantly changing because of rapid globalization, technological advancement, and increased environmental complexity. When it comes to educational issues and the need for ongoing reform, the Philippines is no exception. Social pressure to improve learning quality and national regulatory agencies' demands that schools comply to quality standards and benchmarks intensify the variables affecting education quality in the country. Curriculum, teaching methodologies, student and teacher duties, research requirements, teacher development and training, as well as the quality and style of their leadership, are all evolving.

As the cornerstone of all activities and processes, communication is both the most vital and the most elusive aspect of any organization. Effective workplace communication is essential for good job performance. Strong communication skills in school management and faculty members allow them to clearly explain their thoughts, ensuring that they understand what is expected of them and that they can contribute positively to the organization. Because organizations are made up of people who interact in a variety of ways, there is a significant risk of conflict as a result of communication issues, misunderstandings, and differing expectations, making workplace relationships tough. Thus, lack of

communication can lead to employee dissatisfaction, poorer productivity, absenteeism, and a higher staff turnover rate.

Communication Style is defined as how an individual prefers to communicate with others and how they interpret or perceive communications from others Wolfe (2012), and it is important in social relationships. As a result, communication research is a broad topic encompassing a variety of disciplines. The communication style of a person can be perceived in a number of ways. In an attempt to define what communication entails, several researchers have proposed a precise but fairly restrictive definition. Hartley (2003), for example, defines interpersonal communication as a face-to-face meeting between two persons.

Also, teaching styles are the way in which teachers manage their classroom and deliver content. The way teachers manage their classrooms and deliver content is defined by their teaching styles. Individual classroom settings, the subject they are teaching, and the different variety of students in their class can all influence their teaching approach.

Gafoor (2012) defined teaching styles as teacher's preferred way of solving problems, carrying out tasks, and making decisions in the process of teaching, and, besides differing from individual to individual, may sometimes differ between different groups, for example schools. These are particular patterns of needs, beliefs, and behaviors that teachers display in the classroom. It is said that a good teacher must possess the style that appropriately responds to his students' needs. Equally important, a good teacher must know a variety of styles, employ them, and determine what is appropriate at a given instance (Hill, Tomkinson, Hiley, & Dobson, 2016). If teachers were to accomplish these, students would experience greater satisfaction and derive a more positive attitude towards the subject (Gafoor, 2012; Suwanwong, 2017).

Thus, this study attempted to determine the communication and teaching styles and job performance of the faculty members. Furthermore, this study assisted members of the organization in better understanding their own and others' communication styles in order to cope effectively in today's workplace, which can help the campus achieve its ultimate vision of providing quality tertiary education to all.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized descriptive-correlational method where it described the faculty members' profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, employment status, current faculty rank, length of service and the faculty members' job performance. The descriptive method was used as a process of gathering, analyzing, classifying and tabulating data about the communication and teaching styles of the faculty members.

Further, it aimed to determine the significant relationships between the aforementioned variables; hence, correlational.

Locale of the Study

This study was conducted to determine the communication and teaching styles and job performance of faculty members. The said study was conducted in three satellite campuses of Cagayan State University namely Aparri, Gonzaga and Lal-lo comprising all regular and part-time faculty members for the second semester, academic year 2021-2022.

These three campuses of Cagayan State University are situated in the north-eastern part of Cagayan. These institutions started as Secondary Schools, but are now composed of different colleges namely: College of Business, Entrepreneurship and Accountancy; College of Criminal Justice Education; College of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences; College of Hospitality Management; College of Industrial Technology; College of Information and Computing Sciences; College of Agriculture; College of Teacher Education and the Graduate School.

Furthermore, there were few studies conducted yet in those campuses concerning communication and teaching styles and job performance of the faculty members that could be a basis in improving faculty performance.

Respondents and Sampling Procedure

Respondents of the study were the faculty members of Cagayan State University- Aparri, Gonzaga and Lal-lo Campus for the second semester, academic year 2021-2022. Total enumeration was used to ensure having valid, reliable and information-rich data. The following matrix shows the distribution of respondents:

Campus	No. of Respondents
Aparri	86
Gonzaga	53
Lal-lo	51
Total	190

The study utilized survey questionnaire as a main tool in gathering data. The questionnaire was subdivided into four parts.

The Part I questionnaire dealt on the background demographic profile of the respondents which includes their age, sex, civil status, income, major or specialization, highest educational attainment, webinars attended along specialization, employment status, current academic rank, length of service in the organization and designations which are considered vital in the study.

The Part II questionnaire determined the communication styles in the workplace of the faculty members. This questionnaire contains 18 items with four options that represent the different communication styles namely; Driver, Expressive, Amiable and Analytical. Descriptive interpretation was utilized on the analysis of data. This was adapted from Schlegel (2016).

The Part III questionnaire deciphered the teaching styles of the faculty members. This questionnaire contains 40 items that describe how the faculty members teach. This tool contains the five different teaching styles including items regarding expert style (1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, 36), formal authority style (2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37), personal model style (3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 33, 38), facilitator style (4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39), and delegator style (5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40). In other words, each subset contains eight items on a 5-point Likert Scale. Descriptive interpretation was utilized on the analysis of data. This was adapted from Grasha (1996) and Gafoor (2012).

Part IV questionnaire gathered the job performance. This only comprised a single question that was used to determine the latest faculty evaluation result of the faculty members. The questionnaire was rated using 5-point Likert scale.

Data Gathering Procedure

After the approval of the research proposal, the researcher sought the approval of the University President and the Campus Executive Officers of the three Campuses to conduct the study through channels. When granted permission, the researcher floated and retrieved the data via Google Forms. Data were gathered from the faculty members of Cagayan State University Aparri, Gonzaga and Lal-lo Campuses. Finally, the responses that were obtained were categorized, organized, analyzed and then interpreted.

Statistical Tools

Frequencies, percentages, ranks, sums, means and standard deviations were used in describing the collected data of the study. In determining the faculty members' communication styles and organizational commitment, a 5-point Likert Scale was used. The interpretations are the following descriptive values:

Scale	Statistical Limit	Descriptive Value
5	4.20-5.00	Strongly Agree
4	3.40-4.19	Agree
3	2.60-3.39	Neutral/Not Applicable
2	1.80-2.59	Disagree
1	1.00-1.79	Strongly Disagree

Bivariate correlation analysis using Pearson r, point-biserial and Chi-square whichever was appropriate for each pair of correlated variables were used to test significant relationship among the variables. All hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Communication Styles of the Faculty Members

Table 1 displays the distribution of the faculty members in terms of dominant communication styles. Most of the faculty members possess an analytical communication style with a frequency of 117 or 61.6 percent while the amiable communication style recorded a frequency of 50 or 26.3 percent, and expressive and driver styles got 19.5 and 11.6 percent respectively.

Revealed also in the table is the number of dominant communication style. 159 or 83.7 percent of the faculty members goes to single while 26 or 13.7 percent point to eclectic dual and 5 or 2.6 percent for eclectic triple.

This finding means that majority of the faculty members are analyticals. According to Merrill and Reid as cited by Farrington (2013), Analyticals are concerned with being organized, having all the facts and being careful before taking action. They need to be accurate, precise, orderly and methodical. They conform to standard operating procedures, organizational rules and historical ways of doing things. He also added that they are perceived as serious, industrious, persistent and exacting.

Table 1. Distribution of the faculty members in terms of dominant communication styles

Communication Style	Frequency (n=190)	Percentage
Analytical	117	61.6
Amiable	50	26.3
Expressive	37	19.5

Driver	22	11.6
Number of dominant communication style		
Single	159	83.7
Eclectic Dual	26	13.7
Eclectic Triple	5	2.6

Teaching Styles of the Faculty Members

Table 2 discloses the distribution of the faculty members in terms of dominant teaching style. As shown, 100 or 52.6 of the faculty members described their teaching style as expert, while 77 or 40.5 percent identified their teaching style as personal model. The rest described their teaching style as facilitator, delegator and formal authority with 34.7, 22.6 and 21.6 percent respectively. Also evident in the table is the number of dominant teaching style. Single teaching style gained 101 or 53.2 percent while eclectic dual or triple got 78 or 41.1 percent.

This finding tells that most of the faculty members prefer the expert style in teaching their students. According to Gafoor (2012), as Expert, the teacher is the transmitter of information. He or she is the focal point of all activity on account of his detailed knowledge of the subject. This finding can be connected to earlier findings that most of the faculty members hold a doctorate degree which conveys that the teachers have the mastery and competence to transmit detailed information to their students.

Table 2. Distribution of the faculty members in terms dominant teaching style

Teaching Style	Frequency (n=190)	Percentage
Expert	100	52.6
Personal model	77	40.5
Facilitator	66	34.7
Delegator	43	22.6
Formal authority	41	21.6
Number of dominant teaching style		
Single	101	53.2
Eclectic dual or triple	78	41.1
Eclectic quadruple	6	3.2
Universal (all)	5	2.6

Job Performance of the Faculty Members

Table 8 displays the frequency and percentage of the job performance of the faculty members. Majority of the faculty members have a very satisfactory performance rating with a frequency of 99 or 52.1 percent while 78 or 41.1 percent have an outstanding performance rating, and 13 or 6.9 percent have satisfactory performance rating.

This finding means that the faculty members executed their duties and responsibilities very satisfactorily. At present, the performances of the teachers are measured through the Online Faculty Evaluation System (OFES).

Table 3. Job performance of the faculty members

Job Performance	Frequency (n=190)	Percentage
Outstanding (4.20 to 5.00)	78	41.1
Very satisfactory (3.40 to 4.19)	99	52.1
Satisfactory (2.60 to 3.39)	13	6.8
Mean = 4.16 (Very satisfactory)	S.D. = 0.50	

Relationship between the Job Performance of the Faculty Members and the Other Variables Profile

Table 11 presents the correlation test results between the job performance of the faculty members and their profile. As shown, age and length of service (other institution) of the faculty members are significantly associated with their job performance as reckoned by the computed values lesser than 0.05 level of significance, thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

As shown, age is significantly related to job performance of the faculty members as reckoned by the value of r of -0.145 and its probability value of 0.023. This finding indicates that younger faculty members tend to perform better than their older counterparts. This finding corroborates with the fact that a person’s work ability and performance declines with age and more physically demanding tasks are to be performed by younger team members (Rembiasz, 2017).

In addition, it was also evident in the table that length of service is significantly related to faculty members’ job performance as reflected by the compute value of r of 0.144 with the computed probability value of 0.047. This finding indicates that faculty members who have longer years of experience in other institution tend to display higher level of job performance than those who have fewer years of experience in other institutions. This finding constitutes with the fact that work experience is important for the successful performance of the job (Abun et al, 2021), and that prior experience and career history affect job performance (Dokko et al, 2009).

Table 4. Correlation test results between the job performance of the faculty members and their profile.

Variables	Correl.	Probability*	Statistical Inference
Job performance			
Profile			
Age	-0.145	0.023	Significant
Sex	-0.067	0.356	Not significant
Civil status	-0.044	0.546	Not significant
Monthly family income	-0.078	0.285	Not significant
Highest educational attainment	-0.054	0.461	Not significant

Specialization	-0.059	0.420	Not significant
Number of webinars attended	0.071	0.327	Not significant
Employment status	-0.001	0.989	Not significant
Academic rank	-0.066	0.363	Not significant
Length of service (CSU)	-0.099	0.176	Not significant
Length of service (other institution)	0.144	0.047	Significant
Designation	0.000	1.000	Not significant

*tested at 0.05 level of significance

Communication style

Meanwhile, Table 12 presents the correlation test results between the job performance of the faculty members and their communication style. As shown, faculty members who display “driver” communication style tend to outperform their counterparts who possess other communications styles as reckoned by the r-value of 0.144 and the probability value of 0.048. This finding corroborates with the fact that drivers are natural leaders, making decisions quickly and delegating naturally and they deliver the job on time, under budget, and will all measures have exceeded, albeit with a few casualties along the way. They have set clear vision, and are generally good motivators of others. This finding supports the fact that when teachers create a vision for teaching, it allows them to craft an “ideal image” of what it is they wish to accomplish and use this to sustain them throughout their teaching career (Hammerness, 2006), and higher level of motivation will progress the performance of those teachers and those whom they motivate (Dar, 2020).

Table 5. Correlation test results between the job performance of the faculty members and their communication style

Variables	Correl.	Probability*	Statistical Inference
Job performance			
Communication style			
Amiable	0.003	0.972	Not significant
Analytical	-0.006	0.930	Not significant
Driver	0.144	0.048	Significant
Expressive	-0.097	0.184	Not significant

*tested at 0.05 level of significance

Teaching style

Correlation test results between the job performance of the faculty members and their teaching style is presented in Table 13. As shown, teaching styles of the faculty members are not significantly associated with their job performance as reckoned by the computed

probabilities higher than 0.05 level of significance. Hence, this finding indicates that teaching style does not affect the level of job performance of the faculty members. This finding further implies that no specific teaching style will increase job performance because developing a teaching style is influenced more by knowing how to engage students in the learning process rather than on their performances, and to ensure students receive the learning that works for them, it's important for teachers to experiment with different styles (Innova, 2015).

Table 6. Correlation test results between the job performance of the faculty members and their teaching style

Variables	Correl.	Probability*	Statistical Inference
<i>Job performance</i>			
<i>Teaching style</i>			
Delegator	0.110	0.129	Not significant
Expert	0.015	0.836	Not significant
Facilitator	0.013	0.856	Not significant
Formal authority	0.095	0.195	Not significant
Personal model	0.040	0.584	Not significant

*tested at 0.05 level of significance

Conclusions

Based on the aforementioned findings of the study, this study concludes that:

1. As the faculty members grow older, their job performance tends to be lower.
2. Faculty members who have longer years of experience in other institution tend to display higher level of job performance than those who have fewer years of experience in other institutions.
3. Faculty members who display "driver" communication style tend to outperform their counterparts who possess other communications styles.

Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing findings and conclusions of this study, the following initiatives are highly recommended:

1. Since driver type of communication style is significantly correlated to job performance, faculty members should often demonstrate this style in order to raise their performance.
2. Administrators should look for faculty members who are young yet with experience.
3. Institutions are encouraged to adopt the proposed Training Design for Faculty Members in Increasing Job Performance.

4. Future and parallel researches must be conducted along communication and teaching styles and job performance of faculty members.

REFERENCES

1. **Aquino, J.** (2013). Adversity Quotient, Leadership Style and Performance of Secondary School Heads and Commitment to Organizational Values of Teachers in the Province of Tarlac.
2. **Burleson, B.** (2010). The Nature of Interpersonal Communication: A Message-Centered Approach. In C. Berger, M. Roloff & D. Roskos-Ewoldsen, The Handbook of Communication Science (2nd ed., pp. 145-164). USA: SAGE Publications.
3. **Cabaguing, A.** (2016). Teaching and Learning Styles in Social Science: The Samar State University Experience
4. **Carli, L.** (2006). Gender Issues in Workplace Groups: Effects of Gender and Communication Style on Social Influence (1st ed.). Cornwall: Ashgate Publishing.
5. **de Vries, R., Bakker-Pieper, A., Konings, F., & Schouten, B.** (2011). The Communication Styles Inventory (CSI): A Six-Dimensional Behavioral Model of Communication Styles and Its Relation with Personality. *Communication Research*, 40(4), 506-532.
6. **Gacelo, E. P.** (2012). Principles of Teaching I. Quezon City. C and E Publishing, p126
7. **Gafoor, Kunnathodi & Babu, U.** (2012). Teaching styles: A conceptual overview.
8. **Gilakjani, A.** (2012). A Match or Mismatch Between Learning Styles of the Learners and Teaching Styles of the Teacher
9. **Giri, V.** (2006). Culture and Communication Style. *Review Of Communication*, 6(1-2), 124-130.
10. **Hanushek, E., Rivkin, S.** (2010). Generalizations about Using Value-Added Measures of Teacher Quality. *American Economic Review* pp267 -271
11. **Ivanov, M., & Werner, P.** (2010). Behavioral communication: Individual differences in communication style. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 49(1), 19-23.
12. **McCroskey, J., Richmond, V., Heisel, A., & Hayhurst, J.** (2004). Eysenck's BIG THREE and communication traits: Communication traits as manifestations of temperament. *Communication Research Reports*, 21(4), 404-410.
13. **McMahon, M., Forde, C., & Martin, M.** (2010). Contemporary Issues in Learning and Teaching. SAGE Publication p 119.
14. **Myers, K., Seibold, D., & Park, H.** (2011). Interpersonal Communication in the Workplace. In
15. **Rembiasz, M.** (2017). Impact of employee age on the safe performance of productions tasks.
16. **Rotenberg, R.** (2010) The Art and Craft of College Teaching, Second Edition Left Coast Press, 15 May 2010 p399
17. **SHRM** (2008). Effective Organizational Communication: A Competitive Advantage. *Research Quarterly*.
18. **Teel, S. R.** (2003). Relationships among Perceived Organizational Support, Teacher Efficacy and Teacher Performance. Doctoral Dissertation, Alliant International University, San Diego.

19. **Tongson, M.** (2018). Teaching Styles and Language Performance: Towards a Development of an English Language Program.
20. **Towers, W.** (2010). Capitalizing on Effective Communication. Communication ROI Study Report. Retrieved 21 February 2016, from