Disciplinary Differences In between University Teaching

Dr. Angad Tiwary, Professor

Department of Commerce & Management, Arka Jain University, Jamshedpur, Jharkhand, India

Email Id- dr.angad@arkajainuniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT: In the last decade the significance and quality of teaching have gained increasing attention from policy makers as well as from higher educationalists. However, studies of university teaching and learning basically stay focused on generic features, thereby belying their richness and variety. This is in contrast to the understanding that academics identify most closely with their subject. This article brings together previous, but mostly dispersed, research results on teaching and learning within a recognized framework of broad disciplinary categorized cations. In doing so, it analyzes the nature of teaching, teaching and learning processes, and teaching results across the various disciplines. The image provided shows potential for future macro, meso and micro level research to explore reasons for systematic discipline disparities. It proposes how the findings of this study may be utilized to influence institutional and government policy to improve the administration of higher education fairer and more effective.

KEYWORDS: academics, disciplinary, education, learning, teaching.

1. INTRODUCTION

The quality of education has gained ongoing attention in the last decade, within the framework of political acknowledgment of its significance in a market-focused society. Now, not only higher educationalists, but also institutional and government policy makers speak often about the quality of teaching. Studies of the academic incentive system, however, nevertheless reveal a sense that teaching is devalued[1]. Further, information about teaching frequently seems to be taken for granted, with conversations and decision-making at times seeming to be based on previous personal experiences. Consequently, policy makers feel qualified to speak about teaching, but its complexity is seldom recognized and parts of university teaching are still under- researched.

Policy decision and debate need to take place within the framework of information about research in higher education teaching rather than in either a vacuum or a context-free setting. Studies on university teaching have mainly concentrated on generic elements of teaching techniques, student learning, curriculum creation and evaluation. However, the question of whether, and how, instruction differs across the different disciplines has received little consideration. At his important research of academic labor across six disciplines in UK and US institutions, only certain elements of disciplinary variance had been addressed. These included the contention that research and not teaching had received attention, and, that within research, disciplines representing hard pure fields (i.e. science and in particular 'big science') have been well documented, when compared with the other fields of hard applied (technologies), soft pure (humanities and social sciences) and soft applied[2].

Thus, despite the recognized significance of teaching, and the vast amount of research on teaching, the role of disciplines in influencing teaching is a relatively recent emphasis. It is, nevertheless, a focus which has significant consequences for a deeper understanding of practice and the development of effective policy. This article analyzes the current research on disciplinary distinctions in university teaching, using the Biglan–Becher typology of disciplines, and emphasizes policy implications for institutions and governments[3].

Disciplinary Differences in Teaching and Learning

While research in school education has for some time studied instruction in various subject areas, with regard to higher education. researchers have ignored educational attitudes about the field. The teaching portfolios initiative started by the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) in the early 1990s might be regarded the beginning point for recognizing that, within universities, various disciplines integrate general elements of teaching in ways very unique to the field.

This initiative, which has been a springboard for others within the AAHE and, more recently, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, has been significant in examining the nuances and complexity

of teaching in particular academic settings. It is remarkable that the discipline-specific environment of teaching has been neglected, because academics connect most strongly with the field. Some recent research, mainly North American, have begun to explore this problem. From these a picture is developing on the nature of teaching, the methods employed and teaching results[4]. Another growing topic is in connecting student learning to disciplinary beliefs and cultures.

The Nature of Teaching Many studies of academic labor investigate variations in instruction depending on various academic levels and institutional type. Variation by discipline is frequently a component of such research, although it is seldom the main emphasis. An essential starting point is an understanding of how the nature of instruction differs among disciplines. While some aspects, such as the importance of tutorials in the humanities and laboratory experimentation in science and technology, appear self-evident, a picture of the pattern of teaching in different fields is important in illuminating the extent of diversity, and may be important in understanding or exploring reasons for different processes and outcomes. Some recent studies have emphasized disciplinary variations not just in kinds of teaching, but also in hours of interaction and preparation time, as well as in research supervision and undergraduate teaching loads.

Lectures, tutorials and seminars, laboratory practical's, field excursions and practicums are the major teaching modalities within universities. The lecture technique appears to permeate all fields as the main form of instruction. It is not surprising to learn that academics in the humanities spend the most time on lectures, seminars and tutorials, that academics in the natural sciences, technology and medicine spend most time on laboratory teaching, exercises and field trips, and that academics in technological disciplines spend much time on lectures and little on seminars.

Finally, there is significant disciplinary diversity between undergraduate and post- doctoral instruction. Academics in soft pure areas teach more at undergraduate level than academics in other disciplines, whereas those in hard applied fields spend an average of one quarter of their time on supervision[5]. Academics in soft pure disciplines spend the least amount of their time on supervision, but social scientists spend more time on supervision than humanities academics, mainly because they enroll a larger overall number of students and also provide more topic majors. Importantly, academics in hard pure and hard applied areas view their research supervision as linked with their own research. A recent assessment of humanities research in Australia highlighted that postgraduate supervision 'imposes a particularly onerous weight of responsibility' because it is less 'dovetailed with the academic's own research goal than is the case in most other disciplines'[6]. A comprehensive study of graduate education in the UK shows the diversity in the supervisory procedure and research education experience of postgraduate students.

Becher and his colleagues show that there are significant disparities between hard pure and soft pure disciplines. Postgraduate research education in hard pure fields is strongly entrenched in the structure of research itself. The supervisory process is a group-based apprenticeship approach. In soft pure yields a concept of individual apprenticeships is the norm, with student research not always connected directly to an academic supervisor's research[7]. However, Becher et al. emphasize the diversity within disciplines as well, pointing to an increasing trend in certain disciplines (economics and sociology are mentioned) to provide more communal forms of study, along the lines of hard pure disciplines.

In responding on the Findings of his nationwide study, the variations in time spent on instruction and style of teaching show real distinctions between the disciplines owing to paradigm status and unique city of language. However, 'epistemological determination of work' and encourages the disciplines to examine if they might benefit from each other's practices. He concludes that we need to understand how discipline distinctions influence academics' utilization of time for teaching. Indeed, a promising avenue for future study lies in comparing national studies of disciplinary diversity in teaching, to investigate parallels and variations in country cultural trends.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1. Teaching Preferences and Practices:

An understanding of teaching processes inside and across the disciplines includes knowledge of the culture and environment in which teaching happens and the attitudes of academics (and students) regarding teaching,

educational objectives, values, philosophies and orientations. Various studies have begun to shed light on how academics in various disciplines go about their teaching and their views of the curriculum. Academics in soft disciplines tend to exhibit a higher desire for teaching while those in hard fields show substantially greater preference for research. However, these expressed preferences for teaching and research are problematic, because, for example, a stated preference for research over teaching cannot be interpreted as a lack of interest, or ineptitude, in teaching, or even a hatred of teaching.

To illustrate the difficulty of interpreting expressions of choice, while academics in pure fields reported higher preferences for research than those in applied subjects, they did not spend more time on research. Indeed, the discrepancy in reported preferences may be explained by differences in the approach to postgraduate research training. since postgraduate instruction in challenging domains happens in the real research environment, academics perceive this teaching more as research and therefore show a higher research preference. this is an essential component of the socialization process in fields with a strong paradigm. In fields which lack a clear paradigm (soft domains) research tends to be more autonomous and individual[8]. Hence postgraduate research students benefit more from autonomous study than from working closely with a supervisor.

2.2. Teaching Approaches

An intriguing line of current US research emphasizes case studies including extensive observation and questioning of academics regarding their teaching methods within disciplines. These studies take into consideration teacher knowledge, attitudes and values regarding respective subjects and their application within the teaching processes. They also allow some comparison inside and between fields. She discovered that the two academics had distinct conceptions of the discipline—history as a process of understanding facts and history as the narrative of peoples' lives. Consequently, they prioritized distinct objectives in their courses, had teaching methods reflecting their educational views, and evaluation consistently mirrored their beliefs and aims.

2.3. Teaching Outcomes

Studies evaluating results across fields are rare. Perhaps because of the need to understand processes in a more comprehensive manner, the focus on outcomes by academics has not been regarded as essential. However, some information about results of teaching processes comes from the field of student evaluations of instruction. While regular patterns in ratings have been demonstrated for some time, research to explain these tendencies have just lately appeared. Among the most significant tendency is that soft disciplines get better evaluations than hard disciplines. Other significant effects include class size, with smaller classes scoring higher than big ones, and course level, with more senior courses rating higher than early undergraduate ones, and optional courses rating higher than obligatory ones.

In attempting to explain the causes for differing evaluations, different disciplines have distinct course goals for which different teaching techniques are suitable, and that students evaluate congruity between course objectives and teaching methods highly. classroom teaching practices are responsible for disciplinary disparities in perceived teaching efficiency. They discovered that instructors from various academic fields varied in the frequency of employing particular classroom teaching behaviors, but that they did not vary in the connection of these teaching behaviors with student assessments of overall effectiveness[9].

In regard to postgraduate teaching and staff productivity results, it has been shown that supervisors in hard pure and hard applied areas with more postgraduate students publish more than their colleagues with fewer students, even when the impact of shared authorship is taken into account. In soft pure areas there seems to be no connection between numbers of students supervised and production. A reason for this result may be because, as stated above, academics in hard pure and hard applied areas view their supervision as part of their research rather than of their teaching. the degree to which academics collaborate—was a significant determinant in the numbers of students supervised and graduate employment. Hard pure and soft applied (e.g. education and finance) were shown to have a high degree of social connection. Academics in these fields supervised greater numbers of dissertations and the assessed quality of graduates' first employment was higher. However, no relationship between connectivity and graduate employment/job quality in hard applied and soft pure fields. Whether the rationale for the latter is linked to instructional methods or to independent variables, such as market and community views, is open to study.

2.4. Student Learning

He found that differences in student learning style are strongly associated with their undergraduate educational experience, and from his research developed a four-fold typology of disciplines/learning styles which is highly consistent [10]. education in an academic field is a continuing process of selection and socialization to the pivotal norms of the field governing criteria for truth and how it is to be achieved, communicated and used, and secondarily, to peripheral norms governing personal styles, attitudes and social relationships. Over time, these selection and socialization forces combine to create a more impermeable and homogenous disciplinary culture and similarly specialized student orientations to learning.

2.5. Student Evaluation

There are additional consequences for institutional student assessment of instructional methods. In most instances, the assessment tools used are general, suggesting that teaching across the disciplines is the same. Clearly the study into ratings and the present efforts to explain their constant variance would suggest that discipline-specific evaluation of instruction may be more suitable. In this context, the peer review of teaching, the development of discipline-specific teaching evaluation instruments, and the development of a number of instruments which reflect the variety of teaching philosophies suited to the diversity of disciplines.

3. CONCLUSION

The goal of this essay has been to concentrate on the crucial, yet as yet under-recognized, topic of disciplinary disparities in teaching. Research exploring differences in the character of teaching, as well as teaching methods and results, has been addressed. The embryonic advances in the study of disciplinary variety and student learning have also been brought up. There is considerable potential for macro, meso and micro research to investigate variances both between and within disciplines. While the Biglan typology has been confirmed in many investigations, explanations regarding the origins of differences require thorough research. Some ideas for research have lately been made. Becher's famous research of academic tribes and territories needs to be expanded into the domain of teaching and learning, to pull out the epistemological and social aspects.

The research given here have added to the image of the diverse terrain of teaching and learning, but explanations are still required. Indeed, there is still a fair bit of unknown ground in this complex and diverse world of university teaching. Devoted the basic and ubiquitous character of both education and the disciplines, it is remarkable that so little study focus has been given to better understanding their relationship. Considering the concerns expressed by academics about the inadequate recognition that universities accord to teaching, it seems that there is a need not only to examine the value placed on teaching vis-a-vis research activity, but also to understand how teaching varies within each of the relevant knowledge domains. one of the reasons for the isolation of teaching at universities is that it has been detached from the disciplines and therefore from its intellectual community.

The notion that teaching is general reduces it to the technical issue of performance. Consequently, teaching is something you put on top of your actual job, disconnected with the discipline community at the core of being an academic. The significant Influence of disciplines on academics' views, on teaching and on students' learning, would indicate that disciplines ought to be subjected to more systematic research, particularly regarding their influence on the quality of teaching and learning in higher education. The ability of such research to influence policy at both institutional and national levels is essential to the fair, effective and accountable administration of higher education.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. Kember and D. Y. P. Leung, "Disciplinary Differences in Student Ratings of Teaching Quality," *Res. High. Educ.*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 278–299, 2011, doi: 10.1007/s11162-010-9194-z.

[2] S. Staples, D. Biber, and R. Reppen, "Using Corpus-Based Register Analysis to Explore the Authenticity of High-Stakes Language Exams: A Register Comparison of TOEFL iBT and Disciplinary Writing Tasks," *Mod. Lang. J.*, vol. 102, no. 2, pp. 310–332, 2018, doi: 10.1111/modl.12465.

[3] T. J. Lund and M. Stains, "The importance of context: an exploration of factors influencing the adoption of student-centered teaching among

chemistry, biology, and physics faculty," *Int. J. STEM Educ.*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2015, doi: 10.1186/s40594-015-0026-8.

[4] P. Gorsky, A. Caspi, A. Antonovsky, I. Blau, and A. Mansur, "The relationship between academic discipline and dialogic behavior in open university course forums," *Int. Rev. Res. Open Distance Learn.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 49–72, 2010, doi: 10.19173/irrodl.v11i2.820.

[5] S. Mathieson, "Disciplinary cultures of teaching and learning as socially situated practice: Rethinking the space between social constructivism and epistemological essentialism from the South African experience," *High. Educ.*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 549–564, 2012, doi: 10.1007/s10734-011-9458-3.

[6] A. Parpala, S. Lindblom-Ylänne, and H. Rytkönen, "Students' conceptions of good teaching in three different disciplines," *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 549–563, 2011, doi: 10.1080/02602930903541023.

[7] K. Rasmussen, "The emergence and institutional co-determination of sustainability as a teaching topic in interdisciplinary science teacher education," *Environ. Educ. Res.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 348–364, 2017, doi: 10.1080/13504622.2016.1182625.

[8] L. E. Grant, "The frequency and functions of just in British academic spoken English," *J. English Acad. Purp.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 183–197, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2011.05.006.

[9] G. G. Smith, A. J. Heindel, and A. T. Torres-Ayala, "E-learning commodity or community: Disciplinary differences between online courses," *Internet High. Educ.*, vol. 11, no. 3–4, pp. 152–159, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2008.06.008.

[10] S. W. Lyon, M. T. Walter, E. J. Jantze, and J. A. Archibald, "Training hydrologists to be ecohydrologists: A 'how-you-can-do-it' example leveraging an active learning environment for studying plant-water interaction," *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 269–279, 2013, doi: 10.5194/hess-17-269-2013.