Impact of Teaching Styles on Study Skills of University Students

1. Rehmana Khalid   (Corresponding Author)
                              Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Sargodha.
                              Email: rehmanakhalid22@gmail.com
2. Sahibzada Shamim-ur-Rasul Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Sargodha.
                              Email: shamim.rasool@uos.edu.pk
3. Anila Ali   Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Sargodha.
                              Email: anila.ali@uos.edu.pk

Abstract

During professional training and qualification, teachers get acquainted with a variety of teaching approaches and styles. The strategies chosen by the teachers best represent their temperament and delivery style by implementing these techniques in real-life classroom circumstances. Instructors must use a wide range of teaching styles while educating various subjects. Teaching styles play a significant role in the overall development of learners. They play important role in the development of study skills which ultimately lead to academic performance. In this study we focused on six different styles of teaching (authoritative teaching style, democratic teaching style, Facilitator teaching style, Delegator teaching style, hybrid teaching style, laissez-faire teaching style). Objective of the study was to find out the impact of teaching styles on study skills of university students. Furthermore hypothesis was "there is no significant difference between male and female university teachers in applying the teaching styles in class". The convenience sampling technique was adopted owing to the pandemic, the university was closed. Teachers were not easily available for data collection. Researcher also created the online questionnaire for teachers and contacted the teachers of the selected departments, and requested them very respectfully to fill the online questionnaires. Data was examined using of statistical package for social science (SPSS). This study was done using descriptive statistics. It was determined that teaching styles had strong negative relationship with the study skills of the university students.

Keywords: Teaching style, Study Skills, University Students

Introduction

Teachers can alter their students' beliefs, opinions, and perceptions because they create their students' worlds. The thoughts, processes, and practices of the instructor are represented by their teaching methods, while their classroom behaviour is described by their teaching styles (Dash et al., 2020). Different educational experts have been described and prioritized teaching styles in various ways, but for this study, we focused on six specific teaching styles, that were authoritative teaching style, democratic teaching style, Facilitator teaching style, Delegator teaching style, hybrid teaching style, laissez-faire teaching style (Bohren, 2019).The authoritarian style is a teacher-centred approach in which teachers are active in the classroom while students take a passive role, (Bohren, 2019).Due to the democratic instructor's acceptance of the student's motivations and behaviours, the student's behaviour is less likely to be observed (Kumar, 2020).Ahmed (2015) The Facilitator Style is a student-centred, critical thinking-focused teaching approach. The major responsibility of the facilitator is to coach, assist. In educational institutions, hybrid teaching and learning methods are utilized, and they are successful. In a hybrid teaching method, students spend some days in class on campus and the other half of the week in class at home. Laissez-faire implies a lot of trust and an uninvolved attitude. This method of instruction involves teachers asking students to "DO YOUR WORK"(Bohren, 2019).Delegator teachers aim to give their students a lot of autonomy and responsibility for their learning (Dash et al., 2020). Arora (2016) Teaching styles make shape students' study skills. Teaching styles are affected in student's study skills .Teachers that have adopted strict styles in class, have adversely affected on study skills. Kamel et al. (2020) every student has a unique way of reading books and creating a study schedule, and every student's study skills differ from

person to person and location to location. Strategy is the most important thing in study skills. Until students have strategy to do studies, they cannot perform well in academics. Studying is a competent activity that calls for instruction and repetition of certain strategies that aid in the acquisition, organisation, retention, and application of knowledge.

Objectives of the study

Objective of the study was to find out the impact of teaching styles on the study skills of university students.

Hypothesis

H01: There is no significant difference between male and female university teachers in applying the teaching styles in class.

Significance of the Study

When teaching different subjects, teachers must use a variety of diverse teaching styles. Teaching styles are play an important role in the overall development of students and lifelong learning. They play the dominant role in the development of study skills which ultimately lead to academic performance. Study skills provide direction to students for significant achievement in every field of life.

Literature Review

Dash et al. (2020) inside the classroom, teachers have a big role to play in the lives of their students. In addition to teaching, their role includes establishing a positive learning environment in the classrooms. Success for students is not merely determined by grades received, but also by how those grades were obtained—whether the students showed interest in the material or simply learned it for its own sake. A teacher's ability to sustain the enthusiasm that first drew students to the course is essential for effective learning in the classroom.

Dash et al. (2020) Different values, needs, goals, and wants drive different students in different ways. Some students are driven to succeed by receiving praise from others or by conquering obstacles. Students who comprehend the lesson often display distinct traits, such as being drawn to work, persevering in the task in the face of difficulties, and taking evident pleasure in completing it. They also tend to be more involved in class. The best teaching methods for each student may be used by the teacher to help pupils enhance their comprehension of key ideas. There are two sorts of teaching approaches. Some educators embrace a teacher-centred strategy, while others shift to a strategy that is student-centred (Munir, 2016).

In this study, we considered six distinct teaching styles. According to Cakir (2015), the authoritative approach is highly rigorous, puts too much pressure on students, and interferes too much with their studies, which results in poorer academic achievement, less capacities, and worse study skills. Students gave the teacher their complete attention. The instructor is at the centre of this strategy, and all students pay close attention to them. There is no peer cooperation, and each student completes their task in solitude without talking to other students (Ahmed et al., 2021). In this facilitator style, teachers adapt the curriculum to the needs and interests of the students, and the latter successfully collaborate. The instructor effectively serves as a facilitator and guide for them (Ahmed et al., 2021). Democratic teaching approach is defined as doing your own work while receiving some assistance from the teacher. The democratic teacher is less likely to monitor their conduct since they accept the students' ideas and actions. In the classroom, both the professors and the students are animated. Every student in the class is treated equally, including the teachers. Students get subjects based on their areas of interest. Teachers treat their students with kindness and good humour. With student, teachers may share personal anecdotes and daily experiences (Kumar, 2020). The Facilitator Style is a student-centred teaching strategy that promotes critical thinking, according to Ahmed (2015), the primary duty of the facilitator is to support, encourage, and guide active learning by fostering a balanced emotional and cognitive climate in the classroom. With hybrid teaching, classes quickly transition from in-person instruction to online learning. In order to guarantee that all kids return to school, communities, parents, and children are included in the hybrid teaching approach, which is reliant on remote learning (Ali, 2020). Teachers do not become involved in their students' problems, although they do offer some assistance when necessary. Teachers let students make decisions and select the best course of action (Kumar, 2020). The teacher respects student autonomy, expects independent work from students, and only provides help when requested. The delegator

approach incorporates individual teaching and learning styles to help determine how teaching skills of instructors and students may improve the learning experience. (Kumar, 2020)

Kamel et al. (2020) studying is much individualized and consists of a number of flexible and intentional strategies, even though some pupils acquire study abilities on their own. Gersten asserts that many students who struggle academically are unaware of study techniques utilized by students who are academically proficient. In addition, pupils who perform poorly in school frequently have poor study skills. They frequently take a passive approach to education and rely on others (such as parents and instructors) to control their academic performance. These pupils might not be aware of the reason they are learning, and they do not appear to be using any "fix-up" techniques to address comprehension issues or looking back. Study skills are important for academic achievement, but the way students study in the 21st century, in a society with more interactive gadgets and educational techniques, is rarely discussed. There are several techniques to study, but not all of them may be beneficial for learning.

Gurung (2005) categorized study techniques into four primary categories: procedural (such as time management, organisation, and arranging study routines), cognitive (such as studying with a buddy, group work), repetition-based (such as flashcards and mnemonics), and metacognitive (e.g., taking quizzes to test self-knowledge)

Kamel et al. (2020) Each student reads books in a different way, has different study schedules, and has different study techniques depending on where they are in the world. In terms of study skills, strategy is crucial. Students cannot succeed academically unless they have a strategy for studying. Students' motivation serves as a catalyst or justification for their behaviour. Numerous students struggle greatly with motivation. Many students struggle to study well due to a lack of drive (Mason, 2017). Orr (2010) the ability to focus is important for academic success. We cannot adequately do any task if we are not focused. Numerous issues make studying difficult for the learner. Fred also offered the concentration enhancer formula of 15 x 4 approaches. Students can study for about 15 minutes at a time using this method. Students that employ this strategy can keep their focus and perseverance. In a student's life, time management is crucial. Many students struggle with time management, which has made their academic lives stressful. To handle our task correctly, we need a few skills (Mason, 2017). Orr (2010) in class, students ought to listen actively. In contrast to being confused, a prepared mind listens considerably better. Some students only pay attention to the professor during class or after a while, and as a result, they forget what they learned because they are not interested in listening to the lecturer, are not paying attention to the speaker, or are not prepared for listening to the lecturer. We should thus warm up before the professor so that our minds are ready to concentrate on them.

Research Question of the Study

1.   Is there any impact of teaching styles on the study skills of university students?

Research Methodology

The study was descriptive in nature. A descriptive survey method was adopted. All teachers of Sargodha University were the main populations of the current study. After the extensive study, the researcher herself developed the tool based on 30 items. Five items related to each style were developed and the total number of items in the questionnaire was 30.Three faculties were selected as a sample of the study which includes Faculty of Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, and Faculty of Arts and Humanities. Following steps were taken to select the representative sample.

1.   The Faculty of Sciences has a large number of departments. Therefore, three departments; 10 teachers from Department of Physics, 10 teachers from Department of Botany, and 10 teachers from Department of Computer Science were selected from this faculty.
2.   10 teachers from Department of Psychology were selected from Faculty of Social Sciences.
3.   10 teachers from Department of Islamic Studies and 10 teachers from Department of English were selected from Faculty of Arts and Humanities.
4.   Total 6 departments from 3 faculties were conveniently selected.

Faculty-wise division of departments is given in the table

Sr#no	Faculties	Departments	Teachers
1	Faculty of Science	Department of Physics	10
		Department of Computer Science	10
		Department of Botany	10

2	Faculty of Social Sciences	Department of Psychology	10	
3	Faculty of Arts and Humanities	Department of Islamic Studies	10	
		Department of English	10	
		Total	60	

Data analysis and Findings

Identifying the teaching styles

Sr#no	Teaching styles	Frequency	Percentage
1	Authoritative style	3	5%
2	Democratic style	2	3.3%
3	Facilitator style	5	8.3%
4	Hybrid style	8	13.3%
5	Laissez faire style	3	5%
6	Delegator	10	16.7%
7	Double style	19	31.7%
8	Triple style	10	16.7%

Table shows that majority of teachers (31.7%) use two styles in class i.e. hybrid and facilitator style (10%), 5% (hybrid and laissez-faire), 5% (democratic and facilitator), 5% (democratic and delegator), and 5% (Laissez-faire and delegator) whereas Minority of teachers used democratic style (3.3%), Authoritative style (5%), Laissez-faire style (5%), facilitator style (8.3%), hybrid style (13.3%), delegator style (16.7%) are used in class but (16.7%) teachers have used three styles in class i.e. majority of teachers are used (7% facilitator, hybrid, laissez-faire), (5%) democratic, facilitator, hybrid style in class and only (1.7%) teachers have used these styles (hybrid, laissez-faire, delegator) (delegator, democratic, authoritative) (authoritative, democratic, laissez-faire) in the classroom.

Authoritative teaching style

Sr#no	Statements	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
1	I don't allow the students to ask questions during my lecture.	Never	14	23.3		
		Rarely	24	40.0		
		Sometimes	17	28.3	2.23	0.94
		Frequently	4	6.7		
		Always	1	1.7		
2	I make my students prepare notes during class.	Never	16	26.7		
		Rarely	27	45		
		Sometimes	8	13.3	2.28	1.23
		Frequently	2	3.3		
		Always	7	11.7		
3	I always assign topics of my own choice to my students.	Never	17	28.3		
		Rarely	20	33.3		
		Sometimes	11	18.3	2.40	1.27
		Frequently	6	10		
		Always	6	10		
4	I always ensure students provide their assignments well in time without considering their problems.	Never	15	25		
		Rarely	21	35		
		Sometimes	10	16.7	2.48	1.28
		Frequently	8	13.3		
		Always	6	10		
5	The students with short attendance are not allowed to sit in my class.	Never	10	16.7		
		Rarely	17	28.3		
		Sometimes	17	28.3	2.75	1.21
		Frequently	10	16.7		
		Always	6	10		

Table shows the following stats;

1. With a mean value 2.23 and SD 0.94, the majority of the teachers (63.3%) were not in favour of allowing the students to ask questions during the lecture. 28.3% of teachers were sometimes allowing their students to ask questions and the minority of the teachers (8.4%) was in favour of allowing the students to ask questions during the lecture.

2.   With mean value 2.28 and SD 1.23, the majority of teachers (71.7%) teachers were not in favour of preparing notes in class, a minority of teachers (8%) were sometimes asked for preparing notes whereas (15%) teachers were in favour for preparing notes.

3.   With a mean value 2.40 and SD 1.27, the majority of teachers (61.6%) were not in favour of assigning topics to students of his or her choice in class and a minority of teachers (18%) were sometimes assigning topics to students according to his or her choice in the class whereas (20%) teachers were in favour of assigning topics to students of his or her choice in class.

4.   With a mean value 2.48 and SD 1.28, the majority of teachers (60%) teachers were not in favour of ensuring the students provide their assignments in time without considering their problems and a minority of teachers (16.7%) were sometimes ensuring about students provide their assignments well in time without considering their problems whereas (23.3%) teachers were in favour of ensuring the students provide their assignment well in time without considering their problems.

5.   With a mean value 2.75 and SD 1.21, the majority of teachers (45%) were allowing students to sit in class with short attendance, 28.3 % of teachers were sometimes allowing students to sit in class with short attendance and minorities of teachers (26.7%) were not allowing students to sit with short attendance in class.

Democratic teaching style

Sr#no.	Statements	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
1	I always assign tasks to my students keeping in view their ability and physical requirements.	Never	8	13.3		
		Rarely	10	16.7		
		Sometimes	24	40	2.98	1.17
		Frequently	11	18.3		
		Always	7	11.7		
2	I organize such activities in my class in which students show their interest.	Never	10	16.7		
		Rarely	9	15		
		Sometimes	22	36.7	2.97	1.24
		Frequently	11	18.3		
		Always	8	13.3		
3	I facilitate my students personally in their class activities and work.	Never	11	18.3		
		Rarely	10	16.7		
		Sometimes	18	30	2.97	1.31
		Frequently	12	20		
		Always	9	15		
4	I assign topics to my students after discussing with them and after asking about their choice.	Never	6	10		
		Rarely	12	20		
		Sometimes	18	30	3.18	1.24
		Frequently	13	21.7		
		Always	11	18.3		
5	I provide them chances to find the solutions to problems.	Never	6	10		
		Rarely	14	23.3		
		Sometimes	19	31.7	3.05	1.18
		Frequently	13	21.7		
		Always	8	13.3		

Table shows the following stats;

1.   With mean value 2.98 and SD 1.17, the same percentage of teachers (30%) were in responded and against assigning tasks to students keeping in view their ability and physical requirements whereas the majority of teachers (40%) were sometimes assigning tasks to students keeping in view their ability and physical requirements.

2.   With a mean value 2.97 and SD 1.24, (31.7%) teachers were not in favour of organizing activities in class in which students show their interest and the majority of teachers (36.7%) were sometimes organizing activities in class in which students show their interest whereas a minority of teachers (31.6%) were in favour of organizing activities in class which students show their interest.

3.   With a mean value 2.97 and SD 1.31, (35%) teachers were not in favour of facilitating the students personally in-class activities and work, and a minority of teachers (30%) were

sometimes facilitated the students personally in-class activities and work whereas (35%) teachers were in favour of facilitating the students personally in-class activities and work.

4. With mean value 3.18 and SD 1.24, an equal percentage of teachers (30%) were in responded and against assigning topics to students after discussing with them and after asking about their choice whereas the majority of teachers (40%) were in favour of assigning topics to students after discussing with them and after asking about their choice.

5. With a mean value 3.05 and SD 1.18, (33.3%) teachers were not in favour of providing them chances to find a solution to problem and a minority of teachers (31.7%) were sometimes providing them chances to find the solution to problem whereas the majority of teachers (35%) were in favour of providing them chances to find the solution to problem.

Facilitator teaching style

Sr#no.	Statements	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
1	If my students come across some problem, I guide them.	Never	6	10		
		Rarely	13	21.7		
		Sometimes	15	25	3.18	1.24
		Frequently	16	26.7		
		Always	10	16.7		
2	I teach and guide my students in a friendly manner.	Never	9	15		
		Rarely	12	20		
		Sometimes	14	23.3	3.08	1.31
		Frequently	15	25		
		Always	10	16.7		
3	I listen to the problems of my students and also help them to solve the problems.	Never	7	11.7		
		Rarely	14	23.3		
		Sometimes	12	20	3.13	1.26
		Frequently	18	30		
		Always	9	15		
4	I provide new information to my students by keeping into consideration their already obtained information.	Never	6	10		
		Rarely	12	20		
		Sometimes	15	25	3.18	1.20
		Frequently	19	31.7		
		Always	8	13.3		
5	I provide counselling to my students.	Never	10	16.7		
		Rarely	12	20		
		Sometimes	9	15	3.15	1.40
		Frequently	17	28.3		
		Always	12	20		

Table shows the following stats;

1. With a mean value 3.18 and SD 1.24, (31.7%) teachers were not in favour of guiding the students when they come across the problem and minority of teachers (25%) were sometimes guiding the students when they come across the problem whereas the majority of teachers (43.4%) were in favour of guiding the students when they come across the problem.

2. With a mean value 3.08 and SD 1.31, (35%) teachers were not in favour of teaching and guiding students in a friendly manner and minorities of teachers (23.3%) were sometimes teaching and guiding students in a friendly manner whereas the majority of teachers (41.7%) were favour of teaching and guiding students in a friendly manner.

3. With mean value 3.31 and SD 1.26, (34%) teachers were not in favour of listening to the problems of students and help them to solve the problems and minority of teachers (20%) were sometimes listening to the problems of students and help them to solve the problems whereas the majority of teachers (45%) were in favour of listening to the problems of students and help them to solve the problems.

4. With mean value 3.18 and SD 1.20, (30%) teachers were not in favour of providing new information to my students by keeping into consideration their already obtained information and a minority of teachers (25%) were sometimes providing new information to my students by keeping into consideration their already obtained information whereas the majority of teachers (45%) were in favour of providing new information to my students by keeping into consideration their already obtained information.

5.   With a mean value 3.15 and SD 1.40, (36.7%) teachers were not in favour of providing counselling to students and a minority of teachers (15%) was sometimes providing counselling to students whereas the majority of teachers (48.3%) were in favour of providing counselling to students.

Hybrid Teaching Style

Sr.no	Statements	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
1	I develop a strong bond with my students so that they feel pleasant in the class.	Never	10	16.7		
		Rarely	9	15		
		Sometimes	10	16.7	3.25	1.39
		Frequently	18	30		
		Always	13	21.7		
2	I try to ensure that my students prepare notes in the class.	Never	8	13.3		
		Rarely	11	18.3		
		Sometimes	10	16.7	3.28	1.35
		Frequently	18	30		
		Always	13	21.7		
3	By the demand of the situation, I prefer both physical and online learning methods.	Never	8	13.3		
		Rarely	13	21.7		
		Sometimes	7	11.7	3.28	1.39
		Frequently	18	30		
		Always	14	23.3		
4	Through online lectures, I am not able to share sufficient information with my students.	Never	8	13.3		
		Rarely	13	21.7		
		Sometimes	9	15	3.23	1.37
		Frequently	17	28.3		
		Always	13	21.7		
5	I like physical lectures.	Never	8	13.3		
		Rarely	10	16.7		
		Sometimes	11	18.3	3.28	1.32
		Frequently	19	31.7		
		Always	12	20		

Table shows the following stats;
1.   With a mean value 3.25 and SD 1.39, (31.7%) teachers were not in favor of developing a strong bond with my students so that they feel pleasant in the class and the minority of teachers (16.7%) were sometimes developing a strong bond with my students so that they feel pleasant in the class whereas the majority of teachers (51.7%) were in favour of developing a strong bond with my students so that they feel pleasant in the class.
2.   With a mean value 3.28 and SD 1.35, (31.6%) teachers were not in favour of preparing notes in the class and minorities of teachers (16.7%) were sometimes in favour of preparing notes in the class whereas the majority of teachers (51.7 %) were in favour of preparing notes in class.
3.   With a mean value 3.28 and SD 1.39, (35%) teachers were not in favour of preferring both physical and online learning methods according to the demand of situation and minority of teachers (11.7%) were sometimes teachers are sometimes preferring both physical and online learning methods according to with the demand of situation whereas the majority of teachers (53.3%) were on favour of preferring both physical and online learning methods according to with the demand of the situation.
4.   With mean value 3.23 and SD 1.37, (35%) teachers were in favour of sharing sufficient information with students through online learning and minorities of teachers (15%) were sometimes able to share sufficient information with students through online learning whereas the majority of teachers (50%) were not in favour of sharing sufficient information with students through online learning.
5.   With a mean value 3.28 and SD 1.32, (30%) teachers were not in favour of physical lectures and minorities of teachers (18.3%) were sometimes like physical lectures whereas the majority of teachers were in favour of physical lectures.

Laissez faire teaching style

Sr#no	Statements	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
1	I give free hands to my students in classroom.	Never	3	5		
		Rarely	14	23.3		

Sr#no	Statements	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
		Sometimes	19	31.7	3.23	1.14
		Frequently	14	23.3		
		Always	10	16.7		
2	Whether my students perform well or worse, I don't pressurize them.	Never	3	5		
		Rarely	15	25		
		Sometimes	17	28.3	3.25	1.17
		Frequently	14	23.3		
		Always	11	18.3		
3	Students work at their own pace in my class.	Never	2	3.3		
		Rarely	15	25		
		Sometimes	19	31.7	3.22	1.07
		Frequently	16	26.7		
		Always	8	13.3		
4	I don't interfere in the conflict of students.	Never	9	15		
		Rarely	5	8.3		
		Sometimes	19	31.7	3.18	1.21
		Frequently	20	33.3		
		Always	7	11.7		
5	I don't interfere in the studies of my students.	Never	7	11.7		
		Rarely	9	15		
		Sometimes	18	30	3.17	1.18
		Frequently	19	31.7		
		Always	7	11.7		

Table shows the following stats;

1. With mean value 3.23 and SD 1.14, a minority of teachers (28.3%) was not in favour of giving free hands to students in class, and (31.7%) teachers were sometimes giving free hands to students in the class whereas the majority of teachers (40%) were in favour of giving free hand to students in class.
2. With mean value 3.25 and SD 1.17, (30%) teachers were in favour of pressurizing the students when they perform worse in class and a minority of teachers (28.3%) were sometimes not pressurize the students when they perform worse in-class teachers whereas the majority of teachers (41.6%) were not in favour of pressurizing the students when they perform worse in class always.
3. With mean value 3.22 and SD 1.07, a minority of teachers (28.3%) were not in favour of students work at their own pace in class, and (31.7%) teachers were sometimes favouring students work at their own pace in class whereas the majority of teachers (40%) were in favour of students work at their own pace in class.
4. With mean value 3.18 and SD 1.21, a minority of teachers (23.3%) was in favour of interfering in the conflict of students, and (31.7%) teachers were sometimes interfering in the conflict of students whereas the majority of teachers (45%) were not in favour of interfering in the conflicts of students.
5. With mean value 3.17 and SD 1.18, a minority of teachers (26.7%) was in favour of interfering in the studies of students, and (30%) teachers were sometimes interfering in the studies of students whereas the majority of teachers (43.4%) were not in favour of interfering in the studies of students.

Delegator teaching style

Sr#no	Statements	Level	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
1	I plan group activities for the class.	Never	3	5		
		Rarely	16	26.7		
		Sometimes	16	26.7	3.20	1.14
		Frequently	16	26.7		
		Always	9	15		
2	I make groups in the classroom and implement already planned group activities and provide feedback to students.	Never	7	11.7		
		Rarely	11	18.3		
		Sometimes	18	30	3.12	1.20
		Frequently	16	26.7		
		Always	8	13.3		
3	I promote peer tutoring among the students.	Never	7	11.7		
		Rarely	16	26.7		

		Sometimes	17	28.3	2.97	1.22
		Frequently	12	20		
		Always	8	13.3		
4	I evaluate the assignments daily.	Never	6	10		
		Rarely	18	30		
		Sometimes	18	30	2.90	1.14
		Frequently	12	20		
		Always	6	10		
5	I evaluate my students according to their participation in the group.	Never	6	10		
		Rarely	19	31.7		
		Sometimes	16	26.7	2.97	1.24
		Frequently	9	15		
		Always	10	16.7		

Table shows the following stats;
1. With a mean value 3.20 and SD 1.14, (31.7%) teachers were not in favour of planning group activities for the class and minority of teachers (26.7 %) were sometimes planning group activities for the class whereas the majority of teachers (41.7%) were in favour of planning group activities for the class.
2. With mean value 3.12 and SD 1.20, the same percentage of teachers (30%) were in responded and against making groups in the classroom and implement already planned group activities and provide feedback to students whereas the majority of teachers (40 %)were in favour of making groups in the classroom and implement already planned group activities and provide feedback to students.
3. With a mean value 2.97 and SD of 1.22, the majority of teachers (38.4%) were not in favour of promoting peer tutoring among the students and the minority of teachers (28.3%) were sometimes promoting peer tutoring among the students whereas (33.3%) teachers were in favour of promoting peer tutoring among the students.
4. With a mean value 2.90 and SD 1.14, the majority of teachers (40%) were not in favour of evaluating the assignments daily and (30%) teachers were sometimes evaluating the assignments daily whereas (30 %) teachers were in favour of evaluating the assignments daily.
5. With a mean value 2.97 and SD 1.24, the majority of teachers (41.7%) were not in favour of evaluating the students according to their participation in the group and minority of teachers (26.7%) were sometimes evaluating the students according to their participation in the group whereas (31.7 %) teachers were in favour of evaluating the students according to their participation in the group.

T-test applied between male and female teachers

Gender	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	Sig (p-value)
Male	34	89.59	11.69			
				-0.77	58	0.441
Female	26	91.85	10.46			

This table indicates that there is no significant difference exists between male and female teachers apply the teaching styles as indicated by t= -0.77 and p= 0.441>0.05.Hence the null hypothesis stating, "There is no significant difference between male and female university teachers in applying the teaching styles in class" is not rejected. A slightly higher mean score of female teachers (91.85) shows that female teachers apply teaching styles slightly more than the male teachers with mean value (89.59).

Pearson correlation between teaching styles and study skills

	Study Skills	Teaching Styles
Teaching Styles	1	
Pearson correlation		-0.532
Sig(p value)		0.000
N	60	60
Study skills		
Pearson correlation	-0.532	
Sig(p value)	0.000	
N	60	600

Table shows that strong but negative correlation between teaching and study skills as indicated by r= -0.532 and the impact of teaching styles on study skills is highly significant as indicated by p=0.000. Hence teachers delivered their lectures in authoritarian domain, ultimately negative impact on students study skills.

Conclusion and discussion
1. There was no significant difference existed between male and female teachers in use of teaching styles and students in use of study skills.
2. There was negative correlation between teaching styles and study skills.
3. The main purpose of this study was to see the impact of teaching styles on the study skills of Sargodha University. The present study found that teaching styles had negative impact on study skills.
4. In this study, found that there was negative correlation between teaching styles and study skills. Prior studies on teaching styles Sheikh and Mahmood (2014) showed significant results towards the motivational level of students, which was checked by using, know your teaching styles with 40 private schools sample. Another research contradicts my study conducted by showed that the teacher's teaching style was a positive and significant effect on student's achievement (Muharam, Ihjon, Hijrah, & T, 2019).
5. Agus's research (2012) also stated that teaching style significantly influences student learning outcomes.

Recommendations
1. Teachers should make sure that students apply their study skills to the fullest extent possible when taking a course at the university level. They will probably benefit from being able to demonstrate strong academic success.
2. Teachers ought to use styles that promote students' learning. A tool for getting high academic scores is always a motivation.
3. Instead of concentrating on just one institution, future study should compare and evaluate the capabilities of several other universities.

References

Ahmed, M. S. (2015). *Teacher as Facilitator in selected schools of Dhaka city* (Doctoral dissertation, BRAC University).

Ahmed, S., Khan Farooqi, M. T., & Iqbal, A. (2021). A Study of Teachers' Teaching Styles and Students' Performance. *Ilkogretim Online*, *20*(2).

Ali, W. (2020). Online and remote learning in higher education institutes: A necessity in
Light of COVID-19 pandemic. *Higher education studies*, *10*(3), 16-25.

Arora, R. (2016). Academic achievement of adolescents in relation to study habits. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *3*(2), 47-54.

Bohren, A. (2019). Teaching styles: Everything you need to know about teaching methods and strategies.

Cakır, S. G. (2015). Authoritative approach and student empowerment among university students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *186*, 151-154.

Dash, N. R., Guraya, S. Y., Al Bataineh, M. T., Abdullah, M. E., Yusoff, M. S. B., Al-Qahtani, M. F., ... & Mukhtar, W. N. O. (2020). Preferred teaching styles of medical faculty: an international multi-center study. *BMC medical education*, *20*(1), 1-9.

Gomberg, L. E., & Gray, S. W. (2000). Five basic principles for effectively managing the classroom. *Adult Learning*, *11*(4), 24-27.

Gurung, R. A. (2005). How do students really study (and does it matter). *Education*, *39*, 323-340.

Kamel, A. M., Behery, F. A., Kenawy, G. M., El Ghamrawy, T. A., Ali, M. S., Nasr, M. M. ... & Baag, M. M. (2020). Exploring study skills among university students in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Saudi Journal of Oral Sciences, 7(2), 90.

Kumar, P. (2020). Need to acquire democratic competency by Teacher Educator in Global Scenario. *Available at SSRN 3683468*.

Mason, H. D. (2017). Stress-management strategies among first-year students at a South African University: A qualitative study. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, *5*(2), 131-149.

Munir, F. (2016). Most Frequent Teaching Styles and Students' learning Strategies in Public High Schools of Lahore, Pakistan. *Science International*, *28*(2).

14. Orr, F. (2010). *Study Skills for successful students* (2nd ed.).Allen & Unwin.