



Full Length Research Article

ANALYZING FAMILIARITY RATE OF FACULTY WITH SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVISM APPROACH AND ITS RELATION WITH STUDENTS' ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT IN ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITY, URMIA BRANCH

***Mostafa Sheikhzadeh**

Department of education, Urmia branch, Islamic Azad University, Urmia, Iran

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 30th November, 2013
Received in revised form
10th December, 2013
Accepted 28th January, 2014
Published online 21st February, 2014

Key words:

Social constructivism,
Faculty members,
Academic improvement and
University students.

ABSTRACT

This research is performed to analyze familiarity rate of faculty with social constructivism approach and its relation with students' academic improvement. This research in terms of research type is related to basic- applied researches and in terms of method it is correlative. Statistical population contains all faculty members and students of Islamic Azad University in Urmia Branch in academic year 2012- 2013. By using Morgan and Kerjesi sampling chart (1997) statistical population selected equal to 118 members of faculty as research sample for human science faculty (38 ones), for science (23 ones), for faculty of engineering (27 ones) and for medical and paramedical faculty (30 ones). For collecting data researcher made questionnaire and students' semester scores were used. Research results show that professors' familiarity rate with social constructivism approach in low level is equal to 5.9%, in moderate level it is equal to 53% and in well level it is equal to 10%. Also there is a significant inverse relation between professors' familiarity rate with social constructivism approach and students' academic improvement.

Copyright © 2014 Mostafa Sheikhzadeh. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Constructivism, prior to being a teaching theory is a theory for understanding and learning. Glasersfield (1987) is one of main explainers of constructivism and in its compilation goes through a path that ends to Giambattista Vico in year 1710. Glasersfield (1987) claims that constructivism is based on two fundamental basics that is summarized as follows: knowledge is not comprehended passively rather it is constructed actively with learner's thinking and thinking is a matching process that helps to the learner to organize his experimental world more than understanding reality and as it is. Academic improvement as one of this research's variables is not affected by one factor as an educational phenomenon. Rather various factors such as academic talent, cognitive factors such as generic intelligence, academic self-efficiency, social adjustment, self-organizing approaches effect on it (Seif, 2009). Main question of research is that how much faculty members are familiar with social constructivism approach and what kind of relation exists between familiarity rate with this approach and students' academic improvement.

METHODS

This research in terms of research type is related to basic-applied researches. The goal of applied researches is to develop applied knowledge in a specific field. This research in terms of method it is correlative. In this type of research the relation between variables is determined based on research goal (Sarmad *et al.*, 2006, P90). Its statistical population contains faculty members and students of Islamic Azad University of Urmia branch in academic year 2012- 2013 equal to 118 persons. For analyzing awareness rate of teachers about social constructivism approach researcher made questionnaire is used. Research's questionnaire is made based on social constructivism approach components. Students' academic improvement rate is according to their semester score in related professor's course. Evaluating the relation between familiarity rate of faculty with social constructivism approach and students' academic improvement shows that there is a significant relation between professors' familiarity rate with constructivism approach and students' academic improvement. According to above chart significant level is lower than 0.05 (sig= 0.000). Correlation coefficient between familiarity rate of faculty with social constructivism approach and students' academic improvement is equal to -0.495 that

***Corresponding author: Mostafa Sheikhzadeh**

Department of education, Urmia branch, Islamic Azad University,
Urmia, Iran

indicates a quite inverse and significant relation between these two variables; this means that whatever professor's familiarity rate with social constructivism approach increases, equally academic improvement decreases and vice versa. In other words the students, whose professors are more familiar with constructivism approach, obtain lower scores in classes and examinations.

faculty with learning and students' academic improvement; because as we see in chart significant level is lower than 0.05 (sig= 0.19).Correlation coefficient between familiarity rate of faculty with learning (as one of social constructivism components) and students' academic improvement is equal to -0.215 that indicates an indirect and weak relation between these two variables.

Schedule 1: the relation of students' academic improvement with familiarity rate of faculty with social constructivism approach

		Students average of scores in professor course in above semester	Professors' constructivism view point
Students average of scores in professor course in above semester	Pearson correlation	1	-.495**
	Significant (2 ranges)		.000
	Number	118	118
Professor's constructivism view point	Pearson correlation	-.495**	1
	Significant (2 ranges)	.000	
	Number	118	118

Schedule 2: the relation between familiarity rate of faculty with social constructivism components and students' academic improvement

		Mean	Reality	Knowledge	Learning
Students average of scores	Pearson correlation	1	-.492**	-.041	-.215*
	Significant (2 ranges)		.000	.663	.019
	Number	118	118	118	118
Reality	Pearson correlation	-.492**	1	-.307**	-.034
	Significant (2 ranges)	.000		.001	.714
	Number	118	118	118	118
Knowledge	Pearson correlation	-.041	-.307**	1	.711**
	Significant (2 ranges)	.663	.001		.000
	Number	118	118	118	118
Learning	Pearson correlation	-.215*	-.034	.711**	1
	Significant (2 ranges)	.019	.714	.000	
	Number	118	118	118	118

(1-1-3-4) analyzing the relation between familiarity rate of faculty with social constructivism components and students' academic improvement. Evaluating the relation between familiarity rate of faculty with knowledge (as one of social constructivism components) and students' academic improvement shows that there is no significant relation between familiarity rate of faculty with reality and students' academic improvement; because as we see in chart significant level is more than 0.05 (sig= 0.663). Correlation coefficient between familiarity rate of faculty with knowledge (as one of social constructivism components) and students' academic improvement is equal to -0.41 that indicates an indirect and weak relation between these two variables. Evaluating the relation between familiarity rate of faculty with reality (as one of social constructivism components) and students' academic improvement shows that there is no significant relation between familiarity rate of faculty with knowledge and students' academic improvement; because as we see in chart significant level is lower than 0.05 (sig= 0.000). Correlation coefficient between familiarity rate of faculty with knowledge (as one of social constructivism components) and students' academic improvement is equal to -0.492 that indicates an inverse and moderate relation between these two variables. This means that whatever faculty's familiarity rate with knowledge (as one of social constructivism components) increases, equally students' academic improvement decreases and vice versa. Evaluating the relation between familiarity rate of faculty with learning (as one of social constructivism components) and students' academic improvement shows that there is a weak significant relation between familiarity rate of

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

By taking advantage of constructivism approach examining tools it was specified that 5.9% have low familiarity, 53% have moderate familiarity and about 10% have well familiarity with social constructivism approach. Findings of Abedi's (2005) research are consistent with this research and indicates that by using examining tools teachers' level of knowledge and understanding hypothesis in Isfahan city in relation with learning hypothesis was lower than moderate level, so that average scores of faculty members during this mentioned examination was equal to 7.61 (in 20 scale) and lower than 10. The highest score averages were related to behaviorism hypothesis 8.78 and the lowest averages were related to metacognitive hypothesis 6.38. These results are consistent with research of Ariyandoost (1996) that in his research teachers' knowledge and understanding from various courses teaching principles and methods was evaluated lower than moderate level and also average was lower than 10. So from this research question's results it is concluded that knowledge of faculty members from learning hypothesis in sample group is evaluated in low level and this is very key point that faculty members in training phase need to refer to learning hypothesis because teaching should be more impressive consistent with learners and various academic courses.

Conclusion

Familiarity rate of faculty with social constructivism approach Study of faculty's familiarity rate with social constructivism approach shows that 6% have low familiarity, 53% have

moderate familiarity and about 5% have high familiarity and just 5% have more than high familiarity or on the other words have very much familiarity. So most of faculty members' familiarity rate is between moderate and high.1- How much relation exists between familiarity rate of faculty with social constructivism approach and students' academic improvement?

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, Gholamreza 2001. Using problem solving method in science teaching. Teaching and training periodical, No. 65, Pages 11- 45.
- Sarmad, zohre and Bazargan, Abas and Hejazi, Elahe 2006. Research methods in behavioral sciences. Tehran: Agah publication institution.
- Seif, Aliakbar 2009. New training psychology: learning and teaching psychology. Tehran: dooran.
- Sheikhzadeh, Mostafa 2005. Designing elementary mathematic teaching software based on constructivism approach. Phd thesis, Islamic Azad University of Khorasegan.
- Abedi, ahmad 2002. Analyzing familiarity rate of elementary period teachers with learning hypothesis and their application in teaching process. Summary of elementary period researches, research group of education and training office of Golestan Province.
