

The Factors Affecting Quality of Human Relationship (QHR) among Academic Staffs and Students in the University of Guilan, Iran : Case Study Faculty of Humanities

By

*Nader Ofoghi*¹, *Abbas Sadeghi*², *Elyas Nekooy*³, *Maryam Babaei*⁴

¹Assistant Professor, University of Guilan, Iran,

²Associate Professor, University of Guilan, Iran,

^{3&4}Counselling Student, University of Guilan, Iran.

Abstract

This study examined the factors affecting Quality of Human Relationship (QHR) in the University of Guilan. Five research questions were posed which is consisted of: are there enough trusts between academic staffs and students? Are there enough academic acceptances between academic staffs and students? Are there enough interactions between academic staffs and students? Are there academic discussions between academic staffs and students? Is there two way respects between academic staffs and students? What is the most important factor in their viewpoints? Is there any difference between students about QHR with respect to gender? Are there any differences between students about QHR with respect to age? Are there any differences between students about QHR with respect to discipline? One researcher made questionnaire with thirty Likert scale questions were distributed to 300 students (who selected by using Kerejegy and Morgan table and classified sampling method) across the Faculty of Humanities. Results revealed there are enough trusts between academic staffs and students. There are not academic acceptances between academic staffs and students. There are not enough interactions between academic staffs and students. There are not enough academic discussions between academic staffs and students. There are two way respects between academic staffs and students. The most important factor in QHR in their viewpoints was two way trusts; the last one was respect one there were differences between students about QHR with respect to gender. Female students think about QHR more than male. There were differences between students about QHR with respect to age. The age between 19-24 think about QHR more than male 25-up. There were differences between students about QHR with respect to discipline.

Keywords: *Quality, relationship, human, university,*

1. Introduction

Human relationship is an important issue in any kind of group and management process such as family, sport, school, university and etc. This matter has a specific importance inside the university in particular inside the class. All of us experience different kind of the human relationship. But the main question is related to the QHR. It seems the QHR concentrate on the good and proper relationship which bring satisfaction for two sides of this process. The people, who have some responsibilities as a father, mother, manager, teacher and so forth, it is necessary to promote the QHR. Through QHR we can institutionalize some human concepts such as trust, interaction and respect to each other which will help us to enjoy our group or team working and have better life. The relationship between teacher and students has two different aspects: quantitatively and qualitatively. In quantitative aspect, the amount of the relationship is considered with respect to minute, hour and number. But in qualitative one, satisfactions, trust, encouragements, enjoyments have the main role. Any way the author of the present paper tried to concentrate on QHR between academic staff members in the University of Guilan.

The Place of QHR in teaching and learning Process

The study of effective higher education depends to different the conditions including class management and human relationship. In fact if an academic staffs have not had this skills, even have had academic capabilities, can not be an effective and successful teacher. According to Reynolds and Muijs (1999) and

Emmer and Evertson (1981) effective academics manage and organize their classes for effective learning. Marzano (2003) emphasized that the recent studies concentrated on the importance of human relationship inside the class and Evertson (1985) focused on the using of the results of these researches inside the classes. Thus, the importance of the human relationship inside the classes is the key factor for an effective class with high quality in teaching and learning.

Effective training depends on proper use of good communication quality. Professors using their own knowledge and text a teaching skills and provide the right environment help student; learning. It's professors properties that make easy the learning process and even compensation defects of books and educational facilities or vice versa .Trans form the best opportunity and teaching subjects into nonphysical environment and unattractive by their in ability of good communication (Torabi and Zahiri ,2011). Dena and et al (2011), In a study named »teaching in university« cognitive ability and Emotional control concluded cognitive-behavioral factors Emotional having social good relations play a great role in student teaching. Also another study shows that students are consider. The ability of good communication is as important among four other element of a good professors (Zoohor and Slaminejad, 2004).

Amini (2001) implied that teachers should think and act about human relationship inside class management as an instrument for better teaching and learning process. Also, Emmer & Stough (2001) believe that class comprehensive management has five main characteristics: understanding theories and researches about human relationship and students mental and learning needs, establishment of right relationship between students and academic staffs, using methods for facilitating students educational needs, using management methods for maximizing duty oriented behaviors and helping students with behavioral difficulties through counseling.

It seems with respect the above mentioned viewpoints about the importance of human relationship inside the class, we should think about *QHR*. Obviously, QHR requires having so many knowledge about teaching and learning process and also students' mental needs. As Sanford Emmer & Clements (1983) emphasized the needs of students inside the class are different and as follows:

- Students' participation inside the class
- Students' knowledge about the expectations and performances
- Time management
- Class good atmosphere

According to Mahmood Sahebi and et al (2013) mutual respect and creation of a social environment with student is the important teacher performance characteristic in process of teaching. (Sharifi rad at el, 2011). Also Sharifi Rad at el (2011) believes that only experience is not that effective indeed learning through teacher good communication is take place. Training instructors especially university professors must be familiar to the quality of human relations (QHR).In order to Facilitate teaching and learning processes in fact effective training depends on communication skill of professors (Spencer, 2003).. Where there is trust, conflict and confrontations are reduced and tolerance toward each other are increases. Indeed trust not only increase the spirit of cooperation in group - activities but efficiency and academic achievement of students increased. (Goddard and et al, 2001). Also another study emphasis on professors know ledge building trust, mutual respect to improve communication (Gilles Pie, 2005).

Rahman Zade A, Nagafi Neasar T, (2012) concluded that there is a significant relationship between professors' communication skills with the effectiveness of scientific groups. and students which is neglected in many cases (Torabi and Zahiri ,2011). However, according to which relationship between professors and student is a dynamic two-way communication what is most important in this interaction and continued generous dynamic relationship between professors and student. Is the mutual respect among professors and students .Darakhshan and et al (2013) concluded that in communication skills factors the highest score is given to mutual respect. In fact, mutual respect between professors and students causes an honest environment with sincere cooperation in education which is improved initiative

in student. Also in study that Jazeb Zadeh and Karimi (2007) resulted that there is an average interest about the trust between professors and student from students point of view.

Yazhan et al (2013) concluded that of the professors professional specifications are the greatest impact respectively related to respect to student and student problems. In on hand according to professors important role and professors and student's Interactions in training , knowing the properties of a professors from learner point of view and trying to proving to be true by professors promote the training quality. If professors and student familiar with their point of view. Truing process and investigation can be bitterly effective in its excursion of evolutional (Mansori, 2001). Also Nabavi and Safar, (2011). show that there is exist strong evidence the relation between professors and student and their interest and also class participation has a formative issue such as acquiring cognitive skills and positive behavior changing and attitude. According to this definition the fundamental conception in training is the reciprocal in interaction between the professors and students (Saif, 2000)

Research Questions:

The following research questions have been considered in the study:

1. Are there enough trust between academic staffs and students?
2. Are there enough academic acceptances between academic staffs and students?
3. Are there enough interactions between academic staffs and students?
4. Are there academic discussions between academic staffs and students?
5. Is there two way respects between academic staffs and students?
6. What is the most important factor in their viewpoints?
7. Is there any difference between students about QHR with respect to gender?
8. Are there any differences between students about QHR with respect to age?
9. Are there any differences between students about QHR with respect to discipline?

Instruments

The specifics for each of the two data collection instruments used in the study are as follows:

Questionnaire: this instrument had three sections dealing with demographic items such as gender, age and etc, questions about students' trust, academic acceptance, interactions, academic discussions, respect, and one open-ended question about QHR.

The main instruments used for this study were *one researcher made* questionnaire with thirty Likert scale question and a semi-structured interview. The researcher designed the questionnaire by generating a list of items which solicited students' responses on Factors affecting Quality of Human Relationship (QHR) between academic staffs and students. The items in the questionnaire were derived from literature and the researchers' experiences in the field. The range of data collection instruments employed increased the researchers' ability to examine the nature and frequency with certain variables occurred in the research setting.

The validity of the instrument was ascertained by presenting the questionnaire to some experts in behavioural sciences. The experts made some observations and modifications on the items. The section on trust had 6 items; the section on acceptance had 6 items, the section on interaction had 6 items, the section on discussion had 6 items while the section on respect also had 6 items. There were 30 items in the questionnaire. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was calculated by using coronach alpha and it was found to be 0.79.

Interview: academic staff members were interviewed about QHR academic staffs and students in the University of Guilan, Faculty of Humanities.

2. Methodology

Population and Samples

The population of this study included students in faculty of Humanities. There are over 3000 students in the faculty. 200 students selected by using Kerejcy and Morgan (1970) and classified sampling method across the Faculty of Humanities.

Research design

This is essentially a survey research utilizing a questionnaire based on the likert, type rating scale. The statistical tests used for the study were the descriptive and inferential statistics for all questionnaire items. Since sections 2 and 3 of the questionnaire Likert scales comprise five response ratings of very frequently (5), frequently (4), occasionally (3), seldom (2), and never (1), respectively a theoretical mean value of 3.0 was determined as a criterion to judge the means of the items in these sections of the questionnaire.

Data collection

All the 200 students randomly selected for the study were given the questionnaire to examine their experiences with the quality of the teaching and learning of Russian language as well as the conduciveness of their class environment to effective learning. All 200 of the questionnaire were returned properly filled, thus representing 80% return rate.

In addition to the questionnaire, semi-structured interview we also used as instrument for data collection from academic staff members in QHR. This was done to complete of answers given by students in the questionnaire.

3. Findings

Questionnaire:

Research question 1: "Are there enough trust between academic staffs and students?"

The students considered for students' trust to academic staff members, 81% high and 19% low trust. Then, there were enough trusts between academic staffs and students.

Research question 2: "Are there enough academic acceptance between academic staffs and students?"

The students considered academic acceptances 23% with satisfaction and 77% with no satisfaction. Then, there were not enough academic acceptances between academic staffs and students.

Research question 3: "Are there enough interactions between academic staffs and students?"

The students considered interactions 31% high and 69% low interaction. Then, there were not enough interactions between academic staffs and students. .

Research question 4: "Are there enough discussions between academic staffs and students?"

The students considered for discussion 65% with no agreement and 35% with agreement. There were not enough academic discussions between academic staffs and students

Research question 5: "Are there enough two way respect between academic staffs and students?"

The students considered for two way respect 79% with satisfaction and 21% with no satisfaction. There were enough two way respect between academic staffs and students

Research question 6: "What is the most important factor in their viewpoints?"

The most important factor in QHR in the students' viewpoints was two way trusts with 81%. The next factors were academic acceptance with 77%, discussions with 35%, interactions with 31%, and two way respects with s 21% agreement.

Research question 7: "Are there any difference between students about QHR with respect to gender?"

Table 1: QHR Split on Gender : ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	d.f	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between	1	1.5455	1.49	6.77*
Within	299	46.1987	.22	
Total	300	48.1002		
Male with Female		D.F=299 (P<0.026)*		

*Significant P<0.05

According to table 1 there were significant differences between students about QHR with respect to the gender. Female students think about QHR more than male

Research question 8: "Are there any difference between students about QHR with respect age?"

Table 2: QHR Split on age: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	d.f	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
BETWEEN	1	1.8821	1.25	4.46*
WITHIN	299	45.1444	.28	
TOTAL	300	47.3429		
Under 19-25 up with		D.F=299 (P<0.035)*		

*Significant P<0.05

According to table 2 there were significant differences between students about QHR with respect to the disciplines. Under-19 students think about QHR more than 25 –up

Research question 9: "Are there any difference between students about QHR with respect to age?"

Table 3: QHR Split on disciplines: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	d.f	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
BETWEEN	1	1.9921	1.67	3.88*
WITHIN	201	44.6785	.43	
TOTAL	300	45.2345		
Disciplines with each other		D.F=201 (P<0.022)*		

*Significant P<0.05

According to table 3 there were significant differences between students about QHR with respect to the age. The discipline of, Psychology, Social Sciences, Counselling, Management, Political Sciences, Law think about QHR more than the others

4. Discussions and conclusion

The purpose of present research is to consider The factors affecting quality of Human Relationship (QHR) among academic staffs and students in the University of Guilan, Iran. For this purpose, questions were analyzed using statistical tests.

In related to the first question of this research "Are there enough trust between academic staffs and students?", according to research finding this question with %81 per high trust and %19 per low trust validation. This result is consistent with Gillespie (2005) and Ghadami et al, (2000) with the result and inconsistent with the result of Mosavi Bazaz and Zabihi (2011).

In fact, trust the process of converting multi-sided one-way links. In which correlation and dependence among people are increase and facilitate the Self control. There is no interest which Is the base of social life is no possible. (Shan and Moren, 2000). In related to the second question ("are there enough academic acceptance between academic staffs and students?"), according to present research result with %23 per satisfaction and %77 per dissatisfaction there is no academic acceptance among academic staffs and student.

In the study of Gashmar et al (2011), professors Dominance of teaching and offering new presentation is the properties of a good professors. Gillespi (2005), wrote about this case that lack of command in training content reduced the Self confidence I teacher and having knowledge and experience of professors in teaching is the key factors. Over all mastery of scientific concepts has the greatest impact in academic acceptance. Also the third question ("are there enough interactions between academic staffs and students?") according to research finding %31 per interaction and %69 per lack of interaction. Is exist among professors and students and this finding is consistent with Najar and Abdol Malek,(2011) research. But is inconsistent with Pyman et al (2010), findings of Glaser in (2003), is also shows that the interaction among professors and students which developed teachers quality of teaching.

Also the forth question. ("are there enough discussions between academic staffs and students"), according to present research with %65 per disagreement and %35 per agreement among student Indicates a lack of adequate scientific discussion between academic staffs and students.(from Richardson and Arunde,2006),point of view the important properties of professors defined domination to teach and involve student to participate and respect to student and using teaching method.

In fact involving student to participate and create interest among them developed the quality of training. According to Shamikhan et al (1997) and Nahan and Safari,(2011) %50 of students knowing quality of training as the important factor of attracting in class participation. Also the final question of research: "Is that are there enough two way respect between academic staffs and students?" According to finding of table above with %79 satisfactions and %21 dissatisfaction between students indicate that there exists mutual respect among student and academic staffs. And this finding is consistent with (Drakhshan et al .2013, Abedi et al, 2010, Ghadmi et al, 2007, Yazhan et al, 2013).

In training process respect to learners can be effective on learning objectives. In this context research of Salami et al, 2010 Shows that 67.5 per of student and in Mobaraki, 2007; 96 per of student expect that the professors treat being respect full. Overall, the whole studies indicate the effective of individual factors and moral principles and human professors should also scientific development in addition moral and human principle which is significant from student point of views has special attention.

B. Interview

Our interview with academic staff members revealed the following general viewpoints about QHR

- (a) In many classes, there are not enough trust among academic staffs and student due to lack or shortage on intrinsic motivation..

- (b) Using traditional teaching methods in which academic staffs are very active and we can say teacher oriented classes. These are why that there are not enough interactions in many classes,
- (c) There are some opportunities for free discussions or teacher directed discussions, but not all the time due to busy classes.
- (d) Some of Russian language academic staffs have individual methods for their teaching
- (e) Morally there are enough respects among students and academic staffs, but it is reducing, day by day.

5. Conclusion

The present research indicate that from the diverse individual factors moral., professional and workplace, individual and moral factors have the greatest effect on relation between professors and student. Professor in addition to develop of level of their scientific quality in class should so develop their quality of human relationship. This factor requires the good condition in classroom increase the level of learners significantly or to prove this action need significant attention which need consulting work shops that could develop the interaction between professor and student. However authorities design a plane for develop quality of professors and student relationship as they design for quality of scientific level which directly effect on education and learning.

References

- Abbas Zadgan S M. (1900). Principles and basic concepts of management, Tehran: Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting School.
- Alaghaband, A. (1995). Public administration, Tehran: Ravan.
- Andarson , J, D (2001), Increasing the effectiveness of teachers in the classroom (Translated by Mohammad) Tehran: school.
- Bahador, H. FarajiArmaki, A. Ghorbani, R. Dehghani, E. (2014). Effective factors on communication between teacher and student: Medical student of Basic Science level view, (4) 195-200.
- Curzon, L. B. (1990). *Teaching in further education*, London: Cassell.
- Dana, O. Mirla- calbaze, Adrian opre, (2011). didactic expertise reflected by met cognitive abilities and emotional control, *Procedia social and Behavioral Science* [29], 670- 677.
- Drakhshan, A. Daraei, M. Saedi, M. Keani, M. (2013). The point of view of medical students Mashad The criteria for a good teacher, *Iranian Journal of Medical Ethics* , 7(25) ,98-122.
- Ellis, R & Tomlinson, B. (1980). *Teaching secondary English: a guide to the teaching of English as a second language*. London: Longman group ltd.
- Emmer, E., & Evertson, C. (1981). Synthesis of research on classroom management, *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 83 (4), 342-347.
- Emmer, E., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education, *Journal of Educational Psychologist*, 36 (2), 103-112.
- Espeland K.(2001). Empowering versus enabling in academia. *J Nurs Edu*; 40(8)342-6.
- Evertson, C. (1985). Training teachers in classroom management: An experimental study in secondary classrooms, *Journal of Educational Research*, 79 (3).

- Evertson, M., & Harris, A. (1992). What we know about managing classrooms, *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 49 (7), 74-78.
- Gashmard, R. Moatamed, N. Vahedparasti, H. (2011). Faculty Members and student viewpoints on characteristics of a good university teacher in Boucher university of Medical sciences] *Iranian journal of Medical Education*, 11(1): 48-57.
- Gal M, Borg V and Gal G (2003). *Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods in Psychology and Education* ((Translator Ahmad Reza Nasr et al.), Tehran, samt and university shahed bahashti.
- Gallihier, R. O'Neil, P. Parks, M. B. & Wimmer, B. J. (1995) Preparing technical educators for interactive instructional technologies: a review of research and practice. Paper presented at the annual American vocational association convention, Denver co.
- Ghadmi, A. Salehi, B. Sajjadi, S, H and Nagi, H. (2007). [student point of view Regarding Effective Factors in Establishing communication between students and faculty Members. *Iranian journal of medical Education*, 7(1): 149-153.
- Gillespie M. (2005). Student –teacher connection: a place of possibility. *J Adv nurs.* 52(2): 211-9.
- Glaaser. William. (2003). Enhancing in struction , teaching in the quality classroom. *Journal of effective teaching*. Vol 1. 5, pp66-57.
- Goddard, R. T Shannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teachers in urban elementary schools. *The Elementary school journal*, 102,1.
- Jazebizadeh, M. and Karimi, M. (2007). The study of factors influencing the improvement of Relationship between professors and student of Islamic Azad University of Shooshtar, vol.4, No.5, 34-46.
- Kolawole, C.O (1998). Linguistic inputs and three models of presentation as determinants of students' achievement in senior secondary schools essay writing. Unpublished ph. D Dissertation University of Ibadan.
- Krueger, P, M. Neutens, J. Bienstock, J. Cox, S. Goepfert, A et al. (2004). To the point : reviews in medical education teaching techniques. *A M J obstet Gynecol*, 191(2) : 408-11.
- Levin, N., & Nolan, J. (1991). *Principles of classroom management*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). The key to classroom management, *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 61 (1).
- Mahmodi Sahabi, M. Nasri, S and Gholi Nea Gholzam, H.(2013). Identify criteria for evaluating the performance of teachers teaching in engineering education, **SCIENTIFIC educational technology research**, 7(4) :324-315.
- Malinowski, P.A. (1991). *A writing course designed for Development College students*. New York: community college of the Finger Lakes.
- Mobaraki, A. koldvi, A. (2007). The specialities of a good Master from the viewpoint of students of Yasouj University of Medical Science , 2(2) 55-60.
- Mohsani Tabreze, A and Fadaei Sabar P. (2011). identify the impact of the quality of human relations staff In their assessment of the quality of working life, *Quarterly sociological studies Iran*, 1(3) 23- 39.
- Momeni Danaei, S, H. Zarshenas, L. oshagh, M. (2011). omid khoda SM, which method of teaching would be better; cooperative or lecture? *Iranian journal of Medical Education*, 2011; 11(1): 24-31.

- Nabovi G, Savavi, M. (2011). Causes of absenteeism and lack of attention to the course Among medical students Areas of basic sciences at the Islamic Azad University Tehran Medical Branch,21(3), 232-227.
- Nicoll, K., & Harrison, R. (2003). Constructing the good teacher in higher education: The discourse work of student, *Journal of Studies in Continuing Education*, 25 (1), 23-35
- Payman, H. Zarean, A. sadagi far, G. alizade, M. yaghobi, M. yamani, N. Rostami, A. Dalpesha, A. (2010). [Features a powerful master from the perspective of medical students], *Iranian Journal of Medical Education*, 10(5),1139-1131.
- Rahman zade A, Nagafi neasar T, (2012) Study the relationship between communication skills Teachers College Girls vali asr with The effectiveness of training, *Iranian Media Studies*, 11(5), , 186-196.
- Reyner, K. Foorman, B. R. Perfetti, C.A, Pesetsky, D. and Seidenberg, M.S. (2001). How psychological science informs the teaching of reading. *Psychological science in the public interest: a journal of the American psychological society*. 2, 31-67.
- Reynolds, D. & Muijs, D. (1999). The effective teaching of mathematics: A review of research, *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, 19 (3), 273-288.
- Richardson,A.G. and Arundell,A.(2006).characteristics of the Effective teacher as perceived by pupils and teachers A Caribbean case study: Eric Document Reproduction, service, No: ED 311-13.
- Saif, AA. (2000). *Educational psychology* 5th ed. Tehran: Agah publication
- Sanford, J., Emmer, E., & Clements, B. (1983). Improving classroom management, *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 4 (7), 56-60.
- Santra. (2002). Promote of classroom quality. [on line]. [2007,7,6,18].
- Sharifirad, G, H, R. Rezaeian, A. Etemadi, Z, S. (2011). The knowledge, Attitude and performance of the Academic Members towards Effective communication skills in education. *Health system Research* ,6(2), 217-25.
- Spencer, J. (2003). ABC of learning and teaching in medicine, 8; 326(7388): 543-50.
- Torabi, A and Zaheri M. (2012). Factors influencing the communication between the student and teachers of view point student university Medical science Jandi Shapor Ahvaz, *Iranian Journal of Medical Education*, 11(5).
- Trifonovith, G. (1981). English as an international language: an attitudinal approach. In smith L. (Ed) *English for cross cultural communication Hong Kong: McMillan press ltd*.
- Tschannen- Moran, M. Hoy, W.K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70.
- Yaghobian, M. Yaghobi, T. Salmeh, F. Golmohamadi, F. Safari, H. Savasari, R and et al. (2010). [comparing the Effect of teaching using Educational Booklets and lecture along with Educational Booklets on Nurse knowledge about professional laws and Regulation],(4), 372-80.
- Yazhan, S. Tavakkolifar, M. torab islami, S. yaghoobifar, A. Safari, E.(2013). investigating effective factors for establishing effective student-teacher communication from sabzevar university of medical Science nursing students view point in ,19(3), 66-77.
- Zoohor, A. Eslaminejad, T. (2004). Teachers effective teaching criteria as viewed by the students of kerman university Of medical education, 4 (2), 65-70.