The Extent to Which the Quality Standards are Achieved in Teaching Social Sciences in the University of Mosul

Fadhil Khalil Ibrahim
College of Basic Education, University of Mosul (IRAQ)

Abstract
The follow-up of the literature and related studies, as well as researcher experience in university teaching and university leadership, concluded that: there is a contradiction between what the literature and modern teaching theories said about the need for qualitative adjustment of staff members in planning, implementation, evaluation and communication with the students. The aim of the research was to know the extent to which the quality standards are achieved in teaching social sciences in the departments of history, geography and sociology, at the University of Mosul?
Questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents which is consists of four teaching domains, and (53) items : planning (12) items, implementation (13) items, evaluation (10) items, communication (13) items. Five alternative responses were attached to the questionnaire: Always, mostly, sometimes, rarely, never.
The sample consists of (96) staff members during the academic year 2013-2014.
The results show that the whole staff members in social sciences departments in different colleges are achieved the quality standards in their teaching at(Moderate) level, especially in planning, implementation, and communication, except evaluation, which at (High) level. No significant differences were found in Scientific Degrees and Years of experience variables. While there were a significant difference in type of Colleges/ Departments variable.
Keywords: Quality, standards, teaching, university, social sciences.

1. Definition of the problem
University teaching is one of the cornerstones of university instruction. Teaching, scientific research and community service formed the mission of the university, but the university teaching has special rule in carrying that message to the students. Therefore, this teaching has its standards that evaluate its quality in practice, any deficient in those criteria, will necessarily reflect on the quality university students.

The follow-up of the literature and related studies, as well as researcher experience in university teaching and university leadership, concluded that: there is a contradiction between what the

members performances in planning, implementation, communication with the students, as well as promoting creative activities.

All those standards facing the reality of teaching social sciences based on the recitation of one side (lecturer), and the other (students) just receive and listen, without activating their minds and thinking critically and creativity.

In order to know if that conclusion (right or wrong), it is necessary to conduct a field study aimed at knowing the availability of quality standard in university teaching components.

2. Aim of the research
The extent to which the quality standards are achieved in teaching social sciences in the departments of history, geography and sociology, at the University of Mosul?

3. Research questions
Are there significant differences in the responses of staff members according to the colleges / departments, scientific degree, and years of experience?

4. The value of the research
Universities in our country need to develop their teaching operation, especially teaching methods, educational technology, students evaluation, preparation tests, understanding students and help them to adapt with the university environment, and solve their problem. So the researcher try to discover the situation of teaching in specific case (social sciences) to show the quality of teaching process in this field.

It is expected that the results of the research will be benefit to the Quality Section at the University, as well as staff members in social sciences departments.

5. Theoretical background and previous related studies
The global quality of higher education institution, depend on the quality of staff members, because they are the main and active component of the programs quality, educational activities, and outputs, and that reflect

positively on internal and external of institution competence (Alshareef,2014, p.120).

Alhadaby and alhamadany (2010, p.117) indicates that today the roll of staff members is changing according to the huge development of knowledge. The basic roll of them is teaching, so the university administration should search for different tools to develop their skills and academic aspects, besides upgrading the scientific levels of their students.

The quality of university teaching can verifying during two ways: firstly, the skills of faculty members in exciting the intellectual abilities and positive communication with students in creative manner. Secondly, The kinds of students learning styles, their levels of consciousness, emotional development, and motivation (Muhammad, 2009,128).

Referring to the requirements of the quality of university teaching, Ismail (2012) in his PhD study concluded the following:

((Mastering the scientific subject, developing the study syllabus in order to consist with the modern demanding, using recent teaching strategies, acquiring students knowledge and skills requiring by labor market, and applying various kinds of measurement and test in evaluating university students)).

Finally, Alshareef (2014,pp. 127-128) indicates to the following standers for staff members quality:
-   Competency in their academic field of study.
-   Good preparation of lecture.
-   Keep students in a positive teaching- learning classroom climate.
-   Using different teaching methods and strategies.
-   Respect students and communicates with them.
-   Develop scientific, critical, creative, and analytical thinking in the students.
-   Simulate motivation and give students the freedom to present their ideas.
-   Have a good classroom administration.
-   Train students how to conduct research.

Many previous studies have been conducted, the researcher chose the most related, as follow:

Alsir (2004) . This study aimed at evaluating the quality of teaching skills by the staff members of Al-Aqsa university. The result revealed that the skills of planning and the skills of communication reached the level of quality (82% - 87%). Also the result show that there was a significant effect of qualification, while the variables of experience and knowledge did not show any effect.

Arawashda and Yahgoop (2009). The aim of the study was to determine the students point of view about the level of their lecturers teaching activities in the college of education / university of Alyarmook. The outcomes revealed that the average means of the effective teaching were 64% to 70% from the level of acceptance to good.

Alhadaby and alhamadany (2010). The purpose of this study is to show the extent to which the staff members in Yamani university perform their teaching tasks. The result showed that the three aspects of teaching (Planning ,Application, Evaluation), are verified largely. No statistical differences was found in the gender, scientific degree, and college variables.

Alababina (2011). The purpose of this study was to determine the degree of practicing the indicators of university performance quality in the college of arts / Musurata university from the perspective of academic staff . The results revealed that the teaching quality was moderate. No significant differences were found due to academic rate and qualification, but found in favor to1-3 year of experience.

Al- Sumadi (2013). This research aimed at evaluating teaching practices of Najran University staff members as excepted by them. Level of quality of mastering the four skills (planning, performance, evaluating students and communication) reached (91%).

Level of experience was significantly affecting these skills in favor to high level (10 years and more). Type of the college was another affecting variable in favor to scientific colleges.

6.Research methodology and procedures
6.1 Research methodology
Descriptive approach is used in this study which 'is concerned with how what is, or what exists is related to some preceding event that has influenced or affected a present condition or event " (Adams and Schvaneveldt, 1985, p.110).

Questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents which is consists of four teaching domains, and (53) items: planning (12) items, implementation (13) items, evaluation (10) items, communication (13) items. Five alternative responses were attached to the questionnaire: Always, Mostly, Sometimes, Rarely, Never.

To achieve the validity of the questionnaire, the researcher presented it to (7) juries, they accepted all the items with few corrections. Also to verify the reliability of the instrument, Split- half method was used.The reliability coefficient was 0.78.

6.2 The Sample

The sample consists of (96) staff members during the academic year 2013-2014, from the social sciences departments in the University of Mosul, in particular: History , Geography and Sociology departments in the colleges of Arts, Education and Basic Education .Table (1) show the details of the sample:

Table 1. The distribution of sample.

College of Arts		College of Education		College of Basic Education		The total
History	Sociology	History	Geography	History	Geography	
39	21	4	12	13	7	96

7. Statistical Procedures

T .test for one sample, Analysis of variance, Scheffe- test for post-comparisons, (Lewis, 1973, pp. 134,140), were used as statistical methods, according to the consultation between the researcher and the statistician.

8. Results and Discussion

The results will be presented according to the aim of the research and the its questions:

8.1 The extent to which the quality standards are achieved in teaching social sciences in the departments of history, geography and sociology, at the University of Mosul?

To answer this question the collected data were analyzed by using Means, Standard Deviations - test , and the levels of verification : High level (75% and above), Moderate level (50%- 75%), Low level (50% and below). Table (2) show the result.

Table 2. levels of Quality standards achieved by the sample. (No: 96)

Domains	Means	Working Means	Standards Deviations	T- value		Significant	Levels of verification	Levels of Quality
				Calcul.	Tabul.			
Whole Degree	0208,144	106	26619,16	902,22		Signf.	67,93%	Moderate
Planning	2188,32	24	48722,5	675,14	1,988	Signf.	67,12%	Moderate
Implementation	8542,43	36	27936,7	572,10	(0.05	Signf.	60,91%	Moderate
Evaluation	1042,30	20	44020,4	296,22	(95)	Signf.	75,26%	High
Communication	8438,37	26	32388,5	797,21		Signf.	72,78%	Moderate

It seems from table (2) that the staff members achieved quality standards at the Moderate level. The whole degree of verifications was 67,93%. Three of the domain were in the Moderates levels which are: communications, planning, and implementation, their levels of verifications were: 72,78%, 67,12% ,60,91% respectively. The only domain gain High level was Evaluation, its verification level was 75,26%.

The possible reason for this results is that most of teaching staff members have identical background knowledge and practices in teaching. Also they acquired teaching skills only from teaching methods courses sponsored by Training and Teaching Methods Centre at the university. Most of them did not renew their skills for a long time, so the majority were under the level of Moderate in planning their lectures and when they presenting them to their students, except the Evaluation domain, which was got High quality and High verification level. This is because the Quality Department in the university obliged all the teaching staff to apply uniformed system of evaluation which include different kinds of questions and tests.

The results of this aim agree with the results of Arawashda and Yahgoop (2009) study, and disagree with the studies of Alsir (2004), and Al- Sumadi (2013).

8.2 Are there differences in the responses of the sample according to Kind of College/ department?

To answer this question, the data were tabulated according to types of department, by using the mean and standard deviation. The results declared in table (3):

Table 3. show the results of the colleges / departments variable.

College / Department	Mean	Standard deviation
Education / Geography	3333,169	06297,12
Basic Education/ Geography	0000,161	70801,2
Arts / History	6923,148	99682,6
Education / History	5000,140	38048,2
Basic Education / History	3846,130	77037,4
Arts / Sociology	3333,124	97209,2

It is clear from the means of departments , that Geography departments in both colleges Of Basic Education and Education have the highest means comparing with departments of History in all the colleges, while the department of sociology has got the less mean (124,3333).

To discover if there were significant differences between the colleges/ departments, One Way Analyses of

Variance and Scheffe- test for post-comparisons were used . The results show in table (4) and (5) :

Table 4. The results of colleges/ Departments variables

The source of variance	Degree of freedom	Squares Sum.	Squares Sum. Mean	T. value		Significant
				Calcul.	Tabul.	
Between Groups	**5**	**240,21164**	**484,7232**	**917,95**	**3,2**	Significant
With in Groups	90	718,3971	130,44		**05),(0**	
The Whole	95	958,25135				

Table 5. The results of Scheffe test.

College/ Department	Edu./ Geography	B.Edu. /Geography	Arts /History	Edu/. History	B. Edu. /History	Arts/ Sociology
Edu/. eography,		391,1	* 719,17	303,11	* 901,42	* 082,70
B.Edu./Geography			074,4	848,4	* 328,19	* 989,31
Arts/ History				103,1	* 810,14	* 707,36
Edu./ History					418,1	980,3
B. Edu/. History						333,1
Arts/ Sociology						

- Scheffe value : 11, 65 at 0,05

It is obvious from tables (4) and (5), there is a significant differences between the colleges/ departments staff members in achieving quality standards in their teaching, with the favour of the two Geography departments in both colleges of Education and Basic Education. The possible reason for this results is belongs to the Geographical sciences themselves which demand using more technology in their lecture and more participation of students in discussions, laboratory and field work.

The results of this study disagree with Alhadaby and alhamadany (2010) study in college/ department variable.

8. 3 Are there differences in the responses of the sample according to their scientific degree.

To verity this question the scientific degree of the teaching staff were classified with Means and St. Deviations and tabulated in table (6):

Table 6. Scientific Degrees of the Teaching Staff.

Scientific Degrees	NO.	Mean	St. Deviation
Professor	**4**	**7500,140**	**42956,9**
Assistant Professor	**27**	**5556,147**	**35140,20**
Lecturer	**54**	**4259,144**	**85450,13**
Assistant Lecturer	**11**	**5455,134**	**97100,15**

To see if their a significant differences between teaching staff according to their scientific degrees, Analyses of Variance was applied .Table (7) show the results.

Table 7. The Results of Scientific Degree Variable

The source of variance	Degree of freedom	Squares Sum.	Squares Sum. Mean	T. value		Significant
				Calcul.	Tabul.	
Between Groups	**3**	**611,1376**	**870,458**	**777,1**	**717,2**	not
With in Groups	92	348,23759	254,258		**05),0**	Significant
The Whole	95	958,25135				

The outcomes of table (7) revealed that the scientific degree had no effect to differentiate the staff in achieving quality standards. This results may be caused by the background of the majority of them is academic, few of them have educational background. This result agreed with Alhadaby and alhamadany (2010),and Alababina (2011).

8 .4 Are there differences in the responses of the sample according to the years of experience variable ?

The data collected about years of experience classified according to three groups: (1-5), (6-10), (11 and more), the Means and St. Deviations were found, as shown in table (8).

Table 8. The results of years of experience variable

Years of experience	NO.	Mean	St. Deviation
1-5	**8**	**7500,136**	**36096,11**
6-10	45	**9333,145**	**00212,15**
11-and more	43	**3721,143**	**07659,18**

To know if there is a differences between the sample belonged to their years of experience Analyses of Variance was used , Table (9) show the results:

Table 9. Result of analyses of variance for years of experience variable.

The source of variance	Degree of freedom	Squares Sum.	Squares Sum. Mean	T. value		Significant
				Calcul.	Tabul.	
Between Groups	2	612,605	806,302	1,148	106,3	not Significant
With in Groups	93	347,24530	767,263		05),(0	
The Whole	95	958,25135				

It seems from table (9) that there is no significant differences between teaching staff acording to their years of experience . That mean the staff members did not renew their previous knowledge, they fail in reaching the quality standards in their teaching life in the university.

The result of this variable disagree with Alababina (2011) study.

9. Conclusion, Recommendations and suggestions

As a conclusion, the whole teaching staff in social sciences departments in different colleges were achieved the quality standards in their teaching at (Moderate) level, especially in planning, implementation, and communication, except evaluation, which at (High) level. No significant differences were found in Scientific Degrees and Years of experience variables. While there were a significant differences in type of Colleges/ Departments variable.

According to the results of the research, the following Recommendations can be made:
- Teaching Staff should be participated in a training courses about recent quality standards in social sciences sponsored by University Training Centre.
- Special attention should be go to participate teaching staff in practical workshops about planning, implementation the lectures.
- Meeting should be organized between teaching staff and students about the best way to communicate each others.

Advices may be benefit for further studies as follow:
- Comparative study between social sciences departments and natural sciences departments in both Education and Basic Education colleges.
- The same study repeated from the students points of view.

References

Adams, G. and Schaneveldt, J. (1985) . Understanding Research Methods. Longman, New York.

Alrawashda, A. and Yagoob, A. (2009) . The Electiveness of Teaching in the College of Education/ University of Alyarmook (Jordan). Journal of Arab Universities Union for Education and Psychology, 7(2),. 126-166.

Alsir, k. (2004). An Evaluation of University Teaching Skills Quality by Allaqsa University (Kaza). Alakza Journal ,8 (2), 275- 314.

Alshareef , F. (2014). To What Extent Teaching Staff Participated in verifying the quality of Instruction , The Global Almadena University as a Model, 5,.119-138.

Ahadaby, D. and Alhamadany, R. (2013). The Extent to Which Staff Members in Alsana University achieving their Duties. Arab Journal for Higher Education Quality Assurance,3(6), 116- 146.

Alababina. S. (2011). An Evaluation of University Teaching Quality From Staff Point of View in Musrata University (Liypia). Arab Journal for Higher Education Quality Assurance, 8,.1-24.

Alsumady, M. (2013). Evaluating Quality of Teaching Practices of Najran University Staff Members. Educational Global Jornal,2 (8),. 732-753.

Ismail, M. (2012). Quality and Accreditation Requirements in Egyptian Higher Education, Sohaj University as a Model. Unpublished PHD Theses, College of Education, University of Sohaj.

Lewis, D. (1973). Statistical Methods in Education. University of London Press .