Views of lecturers on effective teaching in agriculture departments

Opiniones de los docentes sobre la enseñanza efectiva en los departamentos de agricultura

Avin Hamaaziz Allahkaram,
Deniz Ozcan,

Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey

Views of lecturers on effective teaching in agriculture departments

Opiniones de los docentes sobre la enseñanza efectiva en los departamentos de agricultura

Avin Hamaaziz Allahkaram
Deniz Ozcan[1], deniz.ozcan@omu.edu.tr

Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the lecturers' views about effective teaching and teaching methods used in agricultural faculty of Sulaimani University in Iraq through the lecturers' views. The quantitative research method was used in the research. The quantitative data was collected throughout the applied questionnaire that consists of 42 items in the faculty of agricultural science of Sulaimani University which has seven departments and more than 400 lecturers with different titles. The sample of the study consists of 121 lecturers. The data have been collected and categorized into two variables (gender and working experience). Moreover, to conduct statistics techniques, Microsoft Excel and SPSS software has been used. Concerning the view of teaching, finding suggest different views in many items between male and female lecturers however less experienced lecturer candidates view is varying only in terms of communications between lecturer and students and promoting conceptual changing in students from more experienced ones.

Resumen

El objetivo de este estudio es determinar los puntos de vista de los profesores sobre la enseñanza efectiva y los métodos de enseñanza utilizados en la facultad de agricultura de la Universidad Sulaimani en Irak a través de los puntos de vista de los profesores. El método de investigación cuantitativa fue utilizado en la investigación. Los datos cuantitativos se recopilaron a lo largo del cuestionario aplicado, que consta de 42 ítems en la facultad de ciencias agrícolas de la Universidad de Sulaimani, que tiene siete departamentos y más de 400 profesores con diferentes títulos. La muestra del estudio consta de 121 profesores. Los datos se han recopilado y categorizado en dos variables (género y experiencia laboral). Además, para realizar técnicas estadísticas, se ha utilizado el software Microsoft Excel y SPSS. En lo que respecta a la visión de la enseñanza, los hallazgos sugieren diferentes puntos de vista en muchos temas entre profesores y profesoras; sin embargo, la opinión de los candidatos con menos experiencia varía solo en términos de comunicación entre el profesor y los estudiantes y promueve cambios conceptuales en estudiantes de los más experimentados.

---

[1] Corresponding author

1. Introduction

Defining term of teaching could be complicated. However numerous definitions could be drawn by various scholars. Coe et al (2014) defined effective teaching as a main dimension which positively affects students' academic achievement and yields future success in their life. It could be indicated that teaching and learning are the both sides of a coin and higher education plays a substantial role in society by creating new knowledge and then transmitting it to students and enhancing innovation (Eid,2014). Coe et al (2014) have listed main elements which are required for effective teaching. These elements could be summarized as follows; pedagogical content knowledge, quality of instruction, classroom climate, classroom management, teachers' beliefs and professional behaviors (García Laborda, Magal Royo, Litzler & Giménez López, 2014). Onder & Karatas, 2016; Baglama & Demirok, 2016).

Botkin et al (2014) defined the term of learning as a process of engaging new situations. Mclerney (2014) stresses fundamental mechanisms of the effective teaching and learning as a practice which values creativity and innovations with enriched research and learner orientations that play a key role to generate motivated learners which exhibits physical and psychological well-being. Therefore, understanding underlying factors which play crucial roles at learning process is also fundamental. According to Botkin et al (2014) family upbringing, peer groups and communication media are some of the primary factors which may affect learning process. Moreover, it is also argued that teaching style and learning style are related to each other. Thus, teachers should have personal knowledge and personal practices to facilitate student learning. It is suggested that personal knowledge refers to a knowledge about the students and the methodology to be followed and knowledge about the content while personal practices represents the provision of feedback and reports related creation of safe learning environment. Furthermore, it is also indicated that some of the main dimensions which play a key role on the teachers' effectiveness could be suggested as showing enthusiasm, maintaining an academic focus and provision of opportunities to students in order to learn better through well-managed classrooms (Mclerney, 2014; Teurculet, 2016; García Laborda, & Litzler, 2015).

Universities are educational institutions based on teaching different sciences regardless the nature the departments and faculties there is teaching and learning process in all faculties. On the other hand, teachers have different perspectives about the effective teaching styles. Many studies have been employed in agricultural education field over time. Despite the existence of several agricultural colleges in Iraq, only a few studies attempt the investigation of learning and teaching process and most of them conducted in Mosul University which is now unfortunately damaged by ISIS.

Several studies concerning teaching and learning in agricultural education have been addressed in literature previously, in this study the sufficient number of them which are relevant to the objectives of this thesis has been reviewed. Agricultural knowledge systems play an essential role in developing and disseminating knowledge, information, and technologies relevant to developing global food security and environmental sustainability (Cigdem & Ozdemir, 2017). Agricultural education is one of the agricultural knowledge systems components. Acker (1999) assessed the quality of higher education of agriculture in his study whether there is need for reform or not, the result of the study exhibits the necessity for making substantial improvement in the quality of higher agricultural education globally. Earlier study conducted by Cano, Garton, and Raven (1992) by which investigated teaching, learning and personality of pre-service teachers of agricultural education, regarding teaching style. The result indicates that student-centered teaching preferred but different preferred learning styles have been revealed. Torres and Cano (1995) state that learning style provides significant insight into the way learners process information and knowledge to learn as well as how teachers teach and finally how both teachers and students interact. In their study Torres and Cano (1995) of which titled as learning style in agriculture found that independent learning style tend to be preferable to male students in contrary dependent learning style was preferred by female students. The reviewed studies have been employed in the US.

Far away from the US, in the study of teaching styles in Agriculture College at Razi University in Iran Hamdhaidari, Agahi, and Papzan (2007) figured that the education in the agriculture college is based on theory more than practice and the faculty staff facing many challenges and they education system has not change for some decades. In other study Jamel (2006) about Teaching and Learning Styles,it was revealed that instructors chose less students' involvement in active learning styles while independent learning styles were significantly acceptable by the students. The results also showed that third and fourth-year students prefered independent styles of learning comparing to first and second-year students. Similarly, Jamil (2012) deals with teaching clarity in College of Agriculture in Mosul University/Iraq, the result pointed that a big proportion of agri-science has low clarity from student's perspective while students' achievements were better for high clarity teachers than low clarity teachers. Again another research by Idris (2014) investigated the attitude of the staff of college of agriculture in Mosul University in Iraq to assess the students for their teaching, the result shows that the average has negative attitudes toward evaluating students for the teaching and there was a not significant difference for attitudes of faculty members to evaluate students regarding their teaching depending on (sex, qualification, years of service, scientific title) while the result showed significant difference based on scientific departments.

Robinson et al., (2012) examined the perceptions of teaching ability during teaching experience in agricultural education. The result shows that the emerging teacher view identified some areas needed for growth and development but also identified their progress toward becoming a professional. The Self–Assured Teacher view showed that highly comfort and confidence in their teaching ability, which extended to their perception on developing lessons and teaching across the agricultural education curriculum. The Determined Teacher view identified confidence but not comfortable with their teaching ability. Regarding accessibility of technology in agricultural education Coley et al., (2015) in the result of their study in Tennessee points out that Tennessee agricultural teachers are not necessarily adopt technologies for their classroom and many of the teachers didn't access to technologies adequately.This study is attempted to figure out the effective teaching styles in the college of agriculture in Sulaimani University from teacher's point of view. The aim of this study is to determine the teachers' opinions about effective teaching and teaching methods used in agricultural faculty of Sulaimani University in Iraq. More specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions.

1. How are the views of lecturers on teaching? Is there any significant difference between the opinions of teachers about effective teaching according to;
    Their gender
    Working experience

2. Which teaching methods are used by the teachers frequently? Are there any significant differences among the teaching methods used by the lecturers according to;
    Their gender
    Working experience

1.1. Methodology

This study followed survey methodology. The survey was conducted to investigate lecturer's point of view about teaching, teaching methods, teaching tools and factors that hinder the teaching process. The design format of the presented study consists of quantitative data collection exploring the above aspects.

1.1.1. Study group

More than 400 lecturers have been currently working in the faculty of agriculture in Sulaimani University. Approximately 150 hard copies of the study's questionnaire were distributed among them, consequently 121 participants responded to the applied questionnaire. As it were mentioned before, the participants of this study were categorized by gender and working experience. The minimum age of the participants was 24 while the maximum is 65 years old. In

terms of working experiences 66 of the lecturer candidates have experienced of less than fifteen years and 55 of them have been working more than fifteen years. Moreover, 75 (62%) of the participants were male and 46 (38%) were female.

1.1.2. Data collection tool

The instruments used for the investigation of the research questions of the study contains closed end answer questionnaire. The questionnaire of the study was derived from Survey on Teaching (Morin, et al., 2001), however, the original questionnaire was in a way to be consistent with the aim of the current study. The questionnaire of the study consists four major sections, under each of the four heading several particular statements were included pertaining to teaching methods that rate and define the categories. These items included strongest associations and clear rating from the content validation processes. Moreover, the questionnaire was translated into Kurdish language which is the dominant speaking language of the territory; hence, the participants were able to understand the content of the questionnaire before filling it.

1.1.3. Data analysis

The study follows quantitative research methodology. Data collected from the questionnaire was imported to the SPSS software to be analyzed. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the teachers participating in the study. Descriptive statistics for questionnaire responses include the mean and standard deviation for individual teaching method frequencies, as well as a mean and standard deviation of frequency of usage for each main section category. The Mann-Whitney U test is used to compare differences between the variables that categorized in this study which are male versus female and experienced lecturers versus less experienced lecturers.

2. Findings

2.1. Items measuring lecturers' views on teaching

The items that measure lecturers' views on teaching consist of items from 1 to 17 of the applied questionnaire of this thesis. These items were used to measure the lecturers' views on teaching. Table 1 shows these measures and highest percentage and the number of the variables from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Table 1.
Lecturers' Views on Teaching

NO	ıtems	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree		$\overline{X}$	SS
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	Encouraging students to ask questions.	47	38.8	66	54.5	5	4.1	2	1.7	1	.8	4.29	.700
2	Motivating students to learn.	60	49.6	52	43.0	4	3.3	5	4.1	0	0	4,38	.744
3	Promoting discussion about the subject matter.	40	33.1	70	52.9	9	7.4	2	1.7	0	0	4.22	.652
4	Transmitting important knowledge to students.	62	51.2	50	41.3	5	4.1	4	3.3	0	0	4.40	.725
5	Providing up to date and interesting	42	34.7	61	50.4	14	11.6	4	3.3	0	0	4.17	.757

		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean	SD
	resource material for students.												
6	Promoting conceptual changes in students.	25	20.7	64	52.9	24	19.8	8	6.6	0	0	3.88	.812
7	Setting challenging problems and assignment, and helping students to cope with them	30	24.8	60	49.6	25	20.7	6	5.0	0	0	3.94	.809
8	Communicatin g ideas between lecturer and students.	44	36.4	68	56.2	5	4.1	4	3.3	0	0	4.26	.690
9	Supporting and caring for students.	41	33.9	68	56.2	6	5.0	4	3.3	2	1.7	4.17	.803
10	Providing situations where students can learn from each other.	25	20.7	70	57.9	15	12.4	11	9.1	0	0	3.90	.831
11	Passing on lecturers experiences to students	36	29.8	59	48.8	10	8.3	16	13.2	0	0	3.95	.956
12	Giving interesting presentation, using instructional technology.	44	36.4	58	47.9	11	9.1	7	5.8	1	.8	4.13	.865
13	Stimulating Students to think a critical way.	39	32.2	47	38.8	21	17.4	14	11.6	0	0	3.92	.980
14	Producing independent learners	36	29.8	61	50.4	13	10.7	11	9.1	0	0	4.01	.880
15	Equipping students with independent skills for problem solving.	39	32,2	61	50,4	16	13,2	5	4,1	0	0	4,11	,783
16	Helping students to understand important ideas.	39	32,2	72	59,5	5	4,1	5	4,1	0	0	4,2,	,703
17	Displaying enthusiasm for the subject matter.	45	37,2	65	53,7	7	5,8	4	3,3	0	0	4,25	,710

As presented in the table 1, distributions of frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation related with opinions of the lecturers about teaching process are provided. Considering the statements of 1 and 2 that teaching is encouraging students to ask questions and motivating students to learn the majority of the lecturers don't agree. More than 90% of the lecturers think that teaching doesn't transmit important knowledge to students. In contrary of expectations the lecturers believe that the communication between lecturers and students is not a part of teaching. However, the lecture candidates don't reject that teaching is stimulating students to think critically. Moreover, 13.2% of the lecturers indicate that through teaching they

pass their experiences to students. Further, 4.27% of the lecturers think that teaching is supporting and caring for students.

2.2. Views of lecturers on teaching according to their gender

Views of lecturers on teaching according to their gender take place in Table. 2. Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine the results.

Table 2.
Lecturers' Views on teaching according to gender

Items		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
	Male	75	57.87	4340.50	1490.500	.156
	Female	46	66.10	3040.50		
1. Encouraging students to ask questions.	Total	121				
	Male	75	54.24	4068.00	1218.000	.002
	Female	46	72.02	3313.00		
2. Motivating students to learn.	Total	121				
	Male	75	60.79	6559.50	1709.500	.925
	Female	46	31.34	2821.50		
3. Promoting discussion about the subject matter.	Total	121				
	Male	75	56.45	4234.00	1384.000	.041
	Female	46	68.41	3147.00		
4. Transmitting important knowledge to students.	Total	121				
	Male	75	53.38	4003.50	1153.500	.001
	Female	46	73.42	3377.50		
5.Providing up to date and interesting resource material for students	Total	121				
	Male	75	56.85	4263.50	1413.500	.069
	Female	46	66.77	3117.50		
6. Promoting conceptual changes in students.	Total	121				
	Male	75	55.87	4190.00	1340.000	.026
	Female	46	69.37	3191.00		
7. Setting challenging problems and assignment, and helping students to cope with them.	Total	121				
8. Communicating ideas between lecturer and students.	Male	75	56.40	4230.00	1380.000	.036
	Female	46	68.50	3151.00		

	Total	121				
9. Supporting and caring for students.	Male	75	55.50	4162.50	1312.500	.013
	Female	46	69.67	3218.50		
	Total	121				
10. Providing situations where students can learn from each other.	Male	75	57.65	4323.50	1473.500	.132
	Female	46	66.47	3057.50		
	Total	121				
11. Passing on lecturers experiences to students.	Male	75	56.29	4222.00	1372.000	.041
	Female	46	68.67	3159.00		
	Total	121				
12. Giving interesting presentation, using instructional technology.	Male	75	59.12	4434.00	1584.000	.412
	Female	46	64.07	2947.00		
	Total	121				
13. Stimulating Students to think a critical way.	Male	75	58.17	4362.50	1512.500	.232
	Female	46	65.62	3018.50		
	Total	121				
14. Producing independent learners	Male	75	58.09	4357.00	1507.000	.205
	Female	46	65.74	3024.00		
	Total	121				
15. Equipping students with. Independent skills for problem solving.	Male	75	59.92	4492.00	1642.000	.628
	Female	46	64.39	2889.00		
	Total	121				
16. Helping students to understand important ideas.	Male	75	58.92	4419.00	1569.000	.338
	Female	46	64.39	2962.00		
	Total	121				
17. Displaying enthusiasm for the subject matter.	Male	75	58.92	4255.00	1405.000	.055
	Female	46	64.39	3126.00		
	Total	121				

According to the Table 2 which reflects Mann-Whitney U test results, there is a significant difference between the views of lecturers according to their gender in the item "*Motivating*

students to learn". Female lecturers motivate their students to learn more than male lecturers (U=1218.000, P<0.05). Also, significant difference is seen in the item "*Transmitting important knowledge to students*", female lecturers have more positive view about transmitting important knowledge to students more than male (U=1384.000, P<0.05). Moreover, in the item "*Providing up to date and interesting resource material for students*" there is a significant difference between the views of lecturers.

Female lecturers have more positive views about providing up to date and interesting resource material for students than male lecturers (U=1153.500, P<0.05). Furthermore, there is also significant difference between the views of lecturers in the item "*Setting challenging problems and assignment and helping students to cope with them*" female lecturers have more positive view about setting challenging problems and assignment and helping students to cope with them (U=1340.000, P<0.05). In addition to this, ın the item "*Communicating ideas between lecturer and students*", there is a significant difference between the lecturers according to their gender. Female lecturers have more positive views about it than male lecturers (U=1380.000, P<0.05). Also, there is a significant difference between the views of lecturers in terms of their gender about "*Supporting and caring for students*". Female lecturers have more positive views about it more than male lecturers (U=1312.500, P<0.05). Finally, there is also a significant difference between the views of lecturers according to their gender in terms of "*passing on lecturer's experiences to students*". Female lecturers have more positive views about it then male lecturers (U=1372.000, P<0.05). There are no significant differences between the lecturer's views according to lecturers' genders in the other items about views on teaching.

2.3. Views of lecturers on teaching according to their work experiences

Views of lecturers on teaching according to their work experience take place in Table. 2. Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine the results.

Table 3.
Lecturers' views on teaching according to work experience

Items	Experience	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
1. Encouraging students to ask questions.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	64.32 57.02	4245.00 3136.00	1596.000	.197
2. Motivating students to learn.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	62.38 59.35	4117.00 3264.00	1724.000	.596
3. Promoting discussion about the subject matter.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	61.01 60.99	4026.50 3354.50	1814.500	.998
4. Transmitting important knowledge to students.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	64.92 56.29	4285.00 3096.00	1556.000	.130
5.Providing up to date and interesting resource material for students	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	63.83 57.60	4213.00 3168.00	1628.000	.285

6. Promoting conceptual changes in students.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	60.47 61.64	3991.00 3390.00	1780.000	.842
7. Setting challenging problems and assignment, and helping students to cope with them.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	65.61 55.46	4330.50 3050.50	1510.500	.086
8. Communicating ideas between lecturer and students.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	69.80 50.44	4607.00 2774.00	1234.000	.001
9. Supporting and caring for students.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	60.06 62.13	3964.00 3417.00	1773.000	.715
10. Providing situations where students can learn from each other.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	64.38 56.95	4249.00 3132.00	1592.000	.193
11. Passing on lecturers' experiences to students.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	58.30 64.25	3847.50 3533.50	1636.500	.315
12. Giving interesting presentation, using instructional technology.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	64.03 57.36	4226.00 3155.00	1615.000	.256
13. Stimulating Students to think a critical way.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	57.64 65.03	3804.50 3576.50	1593.500	.225
14. Producing independent learners	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	59.09 63.29	3900.00 3481.00	1689.000	.475
15. Equipping students with independent skills for problem solving.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	60.43 64.39	3988.50 3392.50	1777.500	.831
16. Helping students to understand important ideas.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	58.06 64.53	3832.00 3549.00	1621.000	.245
17. Displaying enthusiasm for the subject matter.	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	61.11 60.87	4033.00 3348.00	1808.000	.967

In respect to view of the candidate lecturers distinguished with their work experiences, the analysis output of Mann-Whitney U test is presented in Table 3. Although most of the findings are not significant but differences can still be observed. The working experience in this study is categorized in two categories, first lecturers with 1-15 years experiences and lecturers with more than 15 years experiences. More experienced lecturers are less positive about the statement of transmitting important knowledge to students. Furthermore, less experienced lecturers' views significantly vary from other that agree with the item of Setting challenging

problems and assignment and helping students to cope with them (U=1510.500, P<0.10). Also, there is a significant difference between the views of lecturers in terms of their experience about "*communicating ideas between lecturers and students*". Less experienced lecturers have more positive views about it than more experienced lecturers (U=1234.000, P<0.05). The experienced lecturers are more positive in terms of the item states that teaching encourages students to think in a critical way more than less experienced lecturers. Likewise, the experienced lecturers are supporting item that argues teaching is helping students to understand important ideas more than less experienced lecturers.

2.4. Teaching methods used by lecturers

Views of lecturers on frequency of using teaching methods. Table 4 represents the results about teaching methods used by lecturers.

Table 4.
Teaching methods used by lecturers

NO	Items	Never N	Never %	Seldom N	Seldom %	Occasionally N	Occasionally %	Often N	Often %	Very often N	Very often %	$\bar{X}$	SS
1	Lecture method	2	1,7	2	1,7	6	5,0	46	38,0	65	53,7	4,40	,802
2	Seminar method.	6	5,0	16	13,2	33	27,3	44	36,4	22	18,2	3,50	1,089
3	Problem-based learning.	6	5,0	23	19,0	34	28,1	38	31,4	20	16,5	3,36	1,117
4	Project-based learning.	8	6,6	23	19,0	36	29,8	40	33,1	14	11,6	3,24	1,096
5	Case methods.	16	13,2	20	16,5	35	28,9	32	26,4	17	14,0	3,12	1,238
6	Experiential method.	3	2,5	7	5,8	22	18,2	56	46,3	32	26,4	3,89	,951
7	Collaborative/ Cooperative learning.	6	5,0	15	12,4	25	20,7	50	41,3	25	20,7	3,60	1,099
8	Peer teaching.	12	9,9	19	15,7	36	29,8	38	31,4	14	11,6	3,19	1,152

Table 4 presents the analysis of the findings of second section of our questionnaire which reflect the answer of the second objective of the study. It can be observed that the methods that proposed to the participants are been used by the lecturers generally as they respond positively

to them. From the finding it was discovered large percentage of the lecturer candidates benefiting from using lecture methods, this finding outlined with (Sajjad, 2010; Morin et al., 2001). According to the responses given to the statement of using seminar method as a teaching method, 36.4% of lecturer candidates reported that they are using it often and 27.3% are occasionally. Moreover, regarding the problem based and project-based methods, the lecturers state that they are using them often by 31.4% and 33.1% respectively. Considering the case methods 26.4 % of lecturer candidates indicated that they are using it often but 28.9% of them responded occasionally. Experiential method seems to be preferable in Agriculture College as 46.3% of the lecturers are using it often and 26.4% are using it very often. The candidate lecturers pay a big attention to collaborative/ cooperative learning as 42.3% of them using it often and 20.7% are using it very often. Finally, peer teaching method is used by the lecturer candidates in 20.7% often however 29.8% of them state that they are occasionally about using it.

2.5. Used teaching methods according to gender

Views of lecturers on used teaching methods according to their gender take place in Table 5. Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine the results.

Table 5.
Used teaching methods according to lecturers' gender

Items		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
1. Lecture Method	Male Female Total	75 46 121	59.89 62.82	4491.50 2889.50	1641.500	.616
2.Seminar Method	Male Female Total	75 46 121	62.36 58.78	4677.00 2704.00	1623.000	.571
3.Problem based Learning	Male Female Total	75 46 121	59.44 63.54	4458.00 2923.00	1608.500	.518
4.Project based Learning	Male Female Total	75 46 121	55.52 69.93	4164.00 3217.00	1314.000	.023
5.Case Method	Male Female Total	75 46 121	56.57 66.82	4186.50 3073.50	1411.500	.107
6.Experimental method	Male Female Total	75 46 121	55.14 69.43	4135.50 3124.50	1285.500	.020
7. Collaborative learning	Male Female Total	75 46 121	55.94 69.25	4195.50 3185.50	1345.500	.034
8.Peer Teaching	Male Female Total	75 46 121	56.79 65.09	4146.00 2994.00	1445.500	.186

Mann-Whitney U test provides the variation between male and females lecturers about the teaching methods. It can be seen from table 5 that in respect to project-based learning male lecturers are using the method more than the female lecturers more (U=1314.000, P<0.05). Likewise, Experimental method is more preferable by male lecturers more than female lecturers (U=1285.500, P<0.05). Concerning the collaborative learning, there is a significant difference between the male and female lecturers' views, male lecturers are using it more and significantly than female lecturers (U=1345.500, P<0.05).

2.6. Views of lecturers on teaching according to lecturers' work experiences

Views of lecturers on used teaching methods according to their work experience take place in Table 6. Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine the results.

Table 6.
Lecturers' views on used teaching mehods according to work experience

Items	Experience	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
1. Lecture Method	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	59.21 63.15	3908.00 3473.00	1697.000	.490
2. Seminar Method	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	60.42 61.69	3988.00 3393.00	1777.000	.837
3. Problem based Learning	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	62.19 59.57	4104.50 3276.50	1736.500	.673
4. Project based Learning	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	64.98 56.23	4288.50 3092.50	1552.500	.156
5. Case Method	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	61.72 59.05	4012.00 3248.00	1708.000	.667
6. Experimental method	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	61.07 59.83	3969.50 3290.50	1750.500	.835
7. Collaborative learning	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	63.27 5828	4175.50 3205.50	1665.500	.415
8. Peer Teaching	1-15 15-above Total	66 55 121	59.49 60.59	3807.00 3332.00	1727.500	.858

When we categorized the lecturers based on experience years, as it can be seen in Table 6, there is no significant difference between the views of less experienced and more experienced lecturers meaning that the both categories have the same opinion on the usage of given teaching methods. This can be interpreted as used teaching methods does not depend on lecturers' work experiences.

2. Conclusion and recommendation

Regarding the lecturers view about teaching the finding suggests that the majority of the lecturers are disagree with the statement of (teaching is encouraging students to ask questions and motivating students to learn). More than 90% of the lecturers think that teaching doesn't transmit important knowledge to students. In contrary of expectations the lecturers believe that the communication between lecturers and students is not a part of teaching. However, the lecture candidates don't reject that teaching is stimulating students to think critically. Moreover, 13.2% of the lecturers indicate that through teaching they pass their experiences to students. Further, 4.27% of the lecturers think that teaching is supporting and caring for students.

In the section of view of the lecturers on teaching, the view of the lecturers is significantly different in terms of gender. The female lecturers are more positive and agree with respect of the items of the "*Motivating students to learn, Transmitting important knowledge to students, providing up to date and interesting resource material for students, promoting conceptual changes in students, setting challenging problems and assignment, and helping students to cope with them, communicating ideas between lecturer and students, Supporting and caring for students, passing on lecturers' experiences to students, Displaying enthusiasm for the subject matter*". Also, there is a significant difference between the views of lecturers in terms of their experience in a way that the less experienced lecturers more agree with the statements about "*communicating ideas between lecturers and students and Setting challenging problems and assignment and helping students to cope with them*".

Considering the teaching methods, findings report that the lecturer candidates are highly benefiting from using lecture methods and other teaching methods that are proposed to them which are seminar method, problem-based method, project-based method, case method, collaborative/cooperative learning and peer teaching. Furthermore, it can be seen that in respect to project based learning and collaborative learning male lecturers are using the method more than the female lecturers, these differences are statistically significant. However, there is no significant difference between the views of the lecturer candidates with respect of the working experiences.

From the findings, we recommend that the university should provide more technology in teaching tools. In contrary of our expectations, the lecture candidates were very disappointed about the teaching process that on average they believe that teaching will not encourage students to learn and more than 90% of the lecturers think that teaching does not transmit important knowledge to students on the other hand a few of the lecturer candidate were agree with the statement that teaching is supporting and caring for students and through teaching they pass their experiences to the students. Finally, further researches can be employed in different levels of the educational institutions, different colleges and different universities by using more variables or different variables. Other methodology can be used to investigate the same field of this thesis such as qualitative research.

3. References

Acker, D. G. (1999). Improving the quality of higher education in agriculture globally in the 21st century: Constraints and opportunities. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education,* 6(2), 47-53.

Botkin, J. W., Elmandjra, M., & Malitza, M. (2014). No Limits to Learning: Bridging the Human Gap: *The Report to the Club of Rome. Elsevier*.

Cano, J., Garton, B. L., & Raven, M. R. (1992). Learning styles, teaching styles and personality styles of preservice teachers of agricultural education.*Journal of Agricultural Education*, 33(1), 46-52.

Coe, R., Aloisi, C., Higgins, S., & Major, L. E. (2014). What makes great teaching? *Review of the underpinning research*.

Coley, M. D., Warner, W. J., Stair, K. S., Flowers, J. L., & Croom, D. B. (2015). Technology Usage of Tennessee Agriculture *Teachers. Journal of Agricultural Education,* 56(3), 35-51.

Eid, F. H. (2014). Research, higher education and the quality of teaching: Inquiry in a Japanese academic context. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 24, 1.

Idris, L. M. (2014). Attitudes of Teaching staff of the College of Agriculture and Forestry University of Mosul to Aowards Assessing the Students for Their Teaching. *Journal of Tikrit University For Agriculture Sciences*, 13(2), 204-209.

Jamel, Y.M. (2006). Teaching and Learning Styles in a College of Agriculture – Mosul University, *Journal of Iraqi agricultural Rafidain*. 34(3), 10-14.

Jamil Y.M. (2012). Teaching Clarity at the College of Agriculture Mosul University. *Journal of Iraqi agricultural Rafidain*, 40(3), 16-22.

García Laborda, J.& Litzler, M.F. (2015). Current approaches in teaching English for Specific Purposes. *Revista Onomázein*, 31, 38-51.

García Laborda, J., Magal Royo, T., Litzler, M.F. & Giménez López, J.L. (2014). Mobile phones for a University Entrance Examination language test in Spain. *Educational Technology & Society,* 17(2), 17-30.

McInerney D 2014. *Educational Psychology Constructing Learning.* Australia: Pearson Higher Educational.

Morin, A., Nedzela, M. & Quon, T. (2001). *Summary of the results of the survey on teaching.* http://simulium.bio.uottawa.ca/questionnaire/Teaching.eng.pdf retrieved from 27.05.2015. Review of the underpinning research.

Robinson, J. S., Montgomery, D., & Edwards, M. C. (2012). Perceptions of teaching ability during the student teaching experience in agricultural education. *Aligning Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory with a Comprehensive Agricultural Education Model*, *53*(4), 29-40.

Sajjad, S. (2010). *Effective teaching methods at higher education level.* Available from Internet: http://www. wfate. org. Reterived at 11.10.2015.

Torres, R. M., & Cano, J. (1994). Learning styles of students in a college of agriculture. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 35(4), 61-66.