

TEACHING AND LEARNING STYLES OF  
COMMUNITY COLLEGE BUSINESS INSTRUCTORS AND THEIR STUDENTS:  
RELATIONSHIP TO STUDENT PERFORMANCE  
AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS

by

Shelia Yvonne Tucker

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In

Vocational and Technical Education

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
B. June Schmidt, Co-Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daisy Stewart, Co-Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jimmie Fortune

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clarence White

\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Wildman

May, 1998

Blacksburg, Virginia

KEY WORDS: Learning Styles, Teaching Styles, Student Performance

TEACHING AND LEARNING STYLES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
BUSINESS INSTRUCTORS AND THEIR STUDENTS: RELATIONSHIP TO  
STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS

By  
Shelia Yvonne Tucker

Committee Co-Chairs: Dr. B. June Schmidt, Dr. Daisy L. Stewart  
Vocational and Technical Education

(ABSTRACT)

The Canfield Instructional Styles Inventory and the Canfield Learning Styles Inventory were used to identify the teaching styles of business instructors and the learning styles of their students. The study purposes included determining if a match existed between students' learning styles and instructors' teaching styles and determining if relationships existed between style match and student success as indicated by course grades and final exam scores and between style match and student evaluations of instructors.

The participants were 5 business instructors and 99 students from two community colleges in Southwest Virginia. The ages of the student participants ranged from 18 to 62 with the average age being 35. The instructors favored the Organization, People, Direct Experience, and A-Influence scales of the Canfield Instructional Styles Inventory, implying that they present material to their students in a clear, logical, and organized manner. Opportunities are created for students to interact in activities that relate to real-world experiences. Their least preferred instructor scales were Competition, Numeric, Reading, and D-Influence. On the Canfield Learning Styles Inventory, the student participants favored the Organization, People, Direct Experience and B-Expectation scales, implying that they like clearly organized and meaningful course work that requires hands-on or performance situations. Additionally, they like interaction with the instructor and classmates involving activities closely related to real-world experiences. Their least preferred scales were Independence, Numeric, Reading, and D-Expectation. In this study, 36% of the students' preferred learning styles matched the instructors' preferred teaching styles. The outcomes of the analysis of variance revealed that there was no significant relationship between learning style/teaching style match and student success as indicated by course grades and final exam scores. Furthermore, there was no significant relationship between learning style/teaching style match and higher evaluations of instructors. However, there was a significant relationship between course grades, final exam scores, instructor evaluations, and GPA as would be expected. Students who were categorized as high achievers according to GPA scored higher on course grades and final exam scores and evaluated instructors higher than those categorized as low achievers.

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to:  
my mother, Velma M. Tucker,  
and  
my father, the late Rev. Thomas Edward Tucker, Sr.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to and appreciative of my dissertation committee members--Dr. B. June Schmidt, my advisor and co-chair; Dr. Daisy Stewart, my co-chair; Dr. Jimmie C. Fortune, Dr. Clarence White, and Dr. Terry Wildman for the patience and guidance they have provided me in the completion of this dissertation. I am grateful for the assistance provided by Dr. Kurt Eschenmann.

I would like to recognize Dr. Nevin Frantz who provided support and encouragement to me and who served on my committee until his passing.

I would like to recognize Dr. Margaret Moore for her assistance, friendship, and support until her passing.

I am grateful for having the support of my family: my mother, Mrs. Velma Tucker; my brothers--Maurice (Shirley) and TT (Jackie); and my sister, CC, and Sakura; Anthony and Tia, Terri and little "T".

I wish to thank my friends Bernice, Jewel, and Mac for their never tiring friendship, encouragement, and support. Thanks for all the lunches, and late night dinners.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES .....	x
Chapter 1 - INTRODUCTION.....	1
Theoretical Framework.....	2
Statement of Purpose.....	3
Significance of the Study.....	4
Delimitation .....	5
Limitations.....	5
Definitions .....	5
Organization of the Study.....	6
Chapter 2 - REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	7
Learning and Teaching Styles .....	7
Learning and Teaching Styles Instruments .....	8
Existence of Learning Style and Teaching Style Preferences .....	10
Student Achievement and Learning Style/Teaching Style Match.....	13
Student Achievement as Indicated by Course Grades.....	14
Student Achievement as Indicated by Exam Scores .....	16
Instructor Evaluations and Learning Style/Teaching Style Match.....	17
Summary.....	18
Chapter 3 - METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	19
Population.....	19
Sampling Technique .....	20
Instrumentation.....	20
Canfield Learning Styles Inventory .....	20
Validity.....	22
Reliability.....	23
Canfield Instructional Styles Inventory .....	26
Validity.....	26
Reliability.....	26
Data Collection Procedures .....	29
Statistical Treatment.....	30
Summary.....	33
Chapter 4 - RESEARCH FINDINGS .....	34
Research Question One .....	34
Research Question Two.....	44
Research Question Three.....	54
Research Question Four.....	54
Research Question Five.....	58
Research Question Six.....	58
Summary.....	62
Chapter 5 - SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS .....	67

Summary.....	67
Procedures .....	68
Discussion.....	72
Conclusions .....	72
Recommendations .....	73
Recommendations for Practice .....	73
Recommendations for Further Research .....	73
Summary.....	74
REFERENCES.....	75
APPENDIX A: Description of Scales, Canfield Learning Styles Inventory .....	81
APPENDIX B: Description of Scales, Canfield Instructional Styles Inventory.....	84
APPENDIX C: Instructions for Completing the Canfield Instructional Styles Inventory .....	87
APPENDIX D: Instructions for Completing the Canfield Learning Styles Inventory .....	89
APPENDIX E: Class Evaluation Form.....	91
APPENDIX F: Student Information Sheet .....	93
VITA .....	95

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	
1	Business Instructors (n=5), Students Taking Business Classes (n=99) And Specific Subject Areas Included in This Study ..... 21
2	Analysis of Variance Comparisons for Research Questions 4, 5, and 6 ..... 32
3	Instructional Style Profile for Business Teacher (n=5) Including Means, Standard Deviations, and ..... 35
4	Learning Style Profile for Business Students (n=99) Including Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges ..... 45
5	Percent of Match of Teaching Styles of Business Instructors (n=5) and Learning Styles of Business Students (n=99) and the Degree of Match and Mismatch..... 56
6	Analysis of Variance Summary for Course Grade With Subjects Grouped by GPA and Teaching/Learning Style Match (n=99) ..... 57
7	Descriptive Statistics for Students' Course Grades Used in ANOVA..... 59
8	Analysis of Variance Summary for Final Exam Scores With Subjects Grouped by GPA and Teaching/Learning Style Match (n=87) ..... 60
9	Descriptive Statistics for Students' Final Exam Scores Used in ANOVA..... 61
10	Analysis of Variance Summary for Instructor Evaluations With Subjects Grouped by GPA and Teaching/Learning Style Match (n=99) ..... 63
11	Descriptive Statistics for Students' Evaluation of Instructors Used in ANOVA..... 64

## LIST OF FIGURES

### Figure

1	Comparison of the Normed Group With Instructor Participants for the Conditions for Instruction Category Scales.....	36
2	Comparison of the Normed Group With Instructor Participants for the Areas of Interest Category Scales.....	39
3	Comparison of the Normed Group With Instructor Participants for the Mode of Instruction Category Scales .....	40
4	Comparison of the Normed Group With Instructor Participants for the Influence Category Scales .....	41
5	Instructor Typology With Expected Percentages and Actual Percentages of the Business Instructors (n=5).....	43
6	Comparison of the Normed Group With Instructor Participants for the Conditions for Learning Category Scales.....	46
7	Comparison of the Normed Group With Instructor Participants for the Areas of Interest Category Scales.....	49
8	Comparison of the Normed Group With Instructor Participants for the Mode of Learning Category Scales .....	50
9	Comparison of the Normed Group With Instructor Participants for the Expectation for Course Grade Category Scales .....	52
10	Learner Typology With Expected Percentages and Actual Percentages of the Students (n=99) in Business Classes.....	53
11	The Degree of Match and Mismatch Determined by Counting Squares Vertically and Horizontally Through the Boxes of the Grid.....	55
12	Summary of the Findings for the Six Research Questions of this Study.....	66