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ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study was to investigate and also to find out the important variables that affect the teaching performance of the full-time instructors of Assumption Business Administration College. The researcher constructed a questionnaire concerning teaching performance variables. The samples were Assumption Business Administration College full-time instructors and students. The data were factor-analyzed by the use of Arithmetic Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness and t-test. The factors which were used to determine the evaluation of the teaching performance of the instructors were the teaching approach, teaching ability, the relationship between instructors and students and personal attributes.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

ASSUMPTION BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION COLLEGE

GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Assumption Business Administration College is one of the leading business institutions of the country. It succeeds the Assumption School of Business founded in 1969 by the Brothers of Saint Gabriel - the religious congregation that owns and administers the Assumption group of schools in Thailand with the approval of the Education Ministry. On June 16, 1972, Assumption Business Administration College (ABAC) was formally established and accredited by the Education Ministry; by May 30, 1975 the school was recognized by the National Educational Commission, the State of University Bureau and the Civil Service Commission.

At present, ABAC offers a four-year bachelor's degree in business administration in any one of the following five major fields:

1. Accounting
2. Finance and Banking
3. General Management
4. Marketing and,
5. Business Computer (which has been introduced in 1979)

Aimed at fulfilling the nation's need for quality university level education, the college has adopted as its teaching philosophy academic excellence, freedom of expression, integrity and rationality.

To date, the student body numbers about one thousand and two hundred. The faculty consists of thirty-four full-time instructors and forty part-time lecturers from other universities and leading business enterprises.

Future plan

The administration of the Assumption Business Administration College has been making every effort to enhance its already impressive image by improving both academically and materially. The administration is not content to rest on its laurels but continuously seeks to elevate its status. They feel that it is important that the college steadily moves forward toward developing itself into the most outstanding education institution in the country.
The ABAC five-year plan (1977-1981), aiming at increasing the number of students, is on its way to completion. After completing the first five-year plan, then the second five-year plan (1982-1986) will be started and it is expected that the number of students will be increased to two thousand.

In the academic area, the administration, under the two plans which will be carried out in accordance with the current National Education Plan, will revise the present core curricula while introducing additional modern business administration type courses.

To cope with the expected increase in the number of students, the administration will have to add more educational facilities and expand its library facilities.

The college also believes a healthy body contributes to a healthy mind. Thus the physical education programme will be expanded in the form of the construction of a standard gymnasium.

In the continuous programme of upgrading the standard of teaching, additional technical assistance in academic fields will be requested from overseas. Scholarships to study abroad will also be made available to instructors and students who demonstrate the capacity to meet the challenge
of a foreign educational programme.

Selection of Faculty Members

a) Full time Instructors: In the selection of staff members, academic and professional preparation are taken into consideration. Attention is also given to teaching ability, personality, character and health. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs, together with the Department Head, jointly makes personal interviews. Personal records and past experiences are examined. The process described above is the preliminary stage of acceptance of the full-time instructors. The candidate is then given a period of six months as a period of probation to show his or her ability and efficiency in the teaching assignment. Work is observed. If the work assigned is done efficiently and productively or with satisfied result, admission to the full status of the staff member follows.

b) Part-time instructors: In the selection of the part-time instructors, there is no fixed or systematic recruitment program. First attention is paid to academic qualification. Then the number of years of experience of the person concerned in outstanding institutions determines the rest.
Statement of the Problem

From the time Assumption Business Administration College was formally established and accredited by the Education Ministry in 1972 up to 1979, the total number of graduates has been at least 500 (Assumption Business Administration Report, 1977). The number of graduates is increasing year after year. In the foreseeable future, the number of graduates will increase greatly.

All the administrators of college and university levels are conscious of the importance of the quality of their graduates and the evidence can be seen from the seminars and meetings conducted for this purpose. In evaluating the standard or quality of the graduates, emphasis formerly was on the personal qualities of the instructors (Mapoung, 1977). The shift in the emphasis now is on the efficient teaching performance of the instructors. Many research papers have been written in this field and on various particular subjects. Nothing whatever has been done for this purpose at ABAC. Moreover, in researching the efficiency of teaching performance of instructors in a particular subject, it is hard to get accurate results due to the very limited number of instructors.
The purpose of this study is to answer three questions:

a) What are the factors that influence the teaching performance of the instructors?

The researcher, then, will try to look for common performance criteria of the instructors of all the subjects. Variables of effective teaching performance must be formed so as to find criteria of judgment.

b) Then, how good is the teaching performance of the full-time instructors at ABAC? And,

c) What should be done to improve or uplift this standard teaching performance?

From their behavior and the result of their teaching, it is therefore possible to find the variables that are connected to the efficient teaching performance of the instructors. The result of the research will be used in the placement and training of the instructors to produce efficient and effective teaching.

Importance of the Study

This study is important because its objective is to find out how effective and efficient is the teaching performance of the full-time instructors of ABAC and eventually lead to the improvement and development in their
ways of teaching. The tremendous growth of the country depends significantly on the role of the instructors, since the quality of the nation's manpower depends on education.

To the administrators, in terms of selection and assignment of the instructors, the study will provide an additional source of information in an attempt to improve the quality of the faculty's teaching performance. A search to understand the problems on the part of the college as well as on the part of the instructors will offer a proper way to arrive at a proper solution.

To the researcher, this study should provide a varied and meaningful experience and give a broader understanding of the teaching performance of the instructors in general and of his own in particular. And this work may be used for future reference.

Any findings and recommendations from this study can be used as an educational source for further study and a reference to the administration and the staff-members of ABAC. The suggestions made would be flexible, and are not intended to be the absolute answer to any problem.

In as much as ABAC is one of a total of fourteen private colleges with similar inner structures and problems,
and following the same regulations of University Bureau, then ABAC can be considered as a valid sample of the whole population. Thus the findings that the researcher has made can be applied not only to the private colleges but also to any other similar institutions in Thailand.

**Purpose of the Study:**

To study the factors and variables that influence the teaching performance of the instructors in ABAC and also to find out the important variables that are connected to them.

**Assumptions:**

The researcher, in making this study, hereby assumes that

1. The chosen random sampling of various groups of students and instructors are a representation of the population of ABAC and other students elsewhere in similar institutions.

2. The questionnaires are valid and reliable enough for the analysis.

3. All answers and replies to the questionnaires are taken in good faith.
4. Personal observation, experience and judgment are valid and can be accounted for.

Limitations

1. In this research, the author aims at evaluating the teaching performance of the full-time instructors in ABAC. The population studied is the administrators, all full-time instructors, and sample groups from first, second, third, fourth year students and the graduates of the Assumption Business Administration College.

2. The researcher has mentioned the variable factors that influence and are connected with the teaching performances according to the assumptions set up by the use of a questionnaire with the said population. Other variables will not be considered.

3. In this research, the only data that has been gathered is from questionnaire given to the above mentioned population.

4. Interview and observation by the researcher was limited.

5. The study of the teaching performance of the full-time instructors was concerned with only a group of instructors and the constitution of the group may alter year after year.
Definition of terms

ABAC: is the initials of Assumption Business Administration College.

Full-time Instructors: The instructors whose main job is only to teach at ABAC and whose compensation is on a monthly basis. One has to spend his official time according to the rules and regulations laid down for the full-time instructors of ABAC.

Teaching performance: An instructor's behaviour exhibited when he interacts with students while teaching them, both in and outside class.

Class atmosphere: Relationship between instructors and students.

Attitude of the instructors towards the subject taught: A disposition or attitude
of the mind an instructor holds towards the subject whether he likes it or not.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To come to know the teaching performance of the instructors concerned, it is necessary to understand the meaning of "teaching", "learning" and to know the good qualities that belong to good educators. The following discussion is based on a representative sample of the literature in the field.

It is understood that the principles of teaching on the college level are no different from those of other levels. It is a process of learning, starting from the experience of observation from which a concept is formed. This grows into understanding and this understanding is then tested (Singkanipa, 1977).

Lots of meanings of "teaching" have been written. Different persons give different meanings as follows:

Sumit Kunakorn (1975) concludes:

'Teaching is a process in which a person exposes his own thought, feeling, ideas and way of life to another person so that he may analyze and select and adopt as his own the attitude quality and social value that he wants to follow and act in accordance with.'
In teaching, according to the State University (1975), the principle is not only in giving but there must also be a feedback. Aaporn Suwan (1975) believes that teaching also means to arrange the experiences in such a way that it is in line with the aims laid down which is to enable the college students to acquire knowledge for creative thinking and to solve problems. Thus this will give rise to the change in attitude of the students to take interest in the subject and appreciate its value so as to enable them to move or change their personality towards the better.

In a book edited by Smith (1971), Frederick J. McDonald said that in teaching, one aspect of educating is an interaction between a teacher, a person who can induce intelligent behaving, and a learner, a person who is acquiring intelligent behavior and it is limited to those instructional interactions in which the behavior of the teacher is a necessary and sufficient condition for producing learning.

According to Elizabeth Monroe Drews (1972) schools will be the source of the new generation's development of new goals and values. It is here that the youth culture is formed: here that students meet the great ideas of the past and can be, if fortunate, caught up in learning; here that
the most outstanding teachers inspire the young to become their best possible selves.

Divid K. Heenan (1966) claims that education consists of something more than programs, instruction and learning processes; basically, it is concerned with the enlightenment and fulfillment of human beings. Since this is a basic concern, it is important to know as much as is impossible about the individuals who are being educated.

Ronald T. Hyman (1970) quotes several different definitions of teaching as follows:

1. "In its generic sense, teaching is a system of actions intended to induce learning" (B. Othanel Smith);
2. "Teaching is what occurs when teachers by virtue of their instructional activities succeed wholly or in part in enabling students to learn" (Elliot Eisner);
3. "Teaching may be characterized as an activity aimed at the achievement of learning and practiced in such manner as to respect the student's intellectual integrity and capacity for independent judgment" (Scheffer); and
4. "Instruction, training is then a matter of teaching with due regard to the criteria appropriate to the field in question indoctrination, drilling the reverse" (Atkinson)
According to Mr. Richard C. Anderson and companions (1969), instead of considering the role of the teacher as "imparting knowledge" they had presented a new dimension of bringing about those changes in behavior which are said to be the conspicuous manifestations of knowledge.

According to the findings of John M. Leonard, John J. Fallon, and Harold von Arx (1966), the teacher can no longer merely furnish facts, he must:

1. Focus attention on problems for investigation:
2. Introduce the skills required in investigation:
3. Help develop and sharpen the student's abilities in critical thinking, reasoning capability, and creative expression; and
4. Encourage a spirit of self-motivation in the student that will help him continue the learning process throughout his life.

Vernon S. Gerlach and Donald P. Ely (1971) pose the quality of a teacher as a coordinator of learning resources. According to them, learning must somehow be related to behavior. Schools are concerned with behavior, firstly, to develop the ability to make a new response, to behave differently, and secondly, to use existing responses or behaviors in a new context. Then the function of a teacher
in the learning process is to facilitate learning. He is to establish conditions which make it probable that learning will occur within a reasonable period of time.

Looking at the psycho-social point of view, teachers, according to Clinton I. Chases (1973), are in the business of changing their students behavior in certain socially approved directions. Educational programs are designed to change behavior in accordance with a particular value system. It is then that a teacher performs a collection of acts because he believes his students will acquire behaviours they have not yet evidenced. The teacher has outcomes in mind when he plans the instructional unit; he believes that the students are capable of attaining the outcomes and that the instruction is adequate to lead the students to the objective.

Gail M. Inlow (1963) proposes teaching effectiveness as a product of the personal adequacy of teachers: that what they are as dynamic personalities determines, in large part, what they are, and what they will become, as professional persons. A related theme is that learner growth is a broadly dimensioned phenomenon encompassing the rational, the effective, and the psychomotor domains. Formal education is depicted as having three interlocking
functions: to transmit cultural essentials, to help learners adapt to their environments, and to help them develop as total personalities. The teacher, being central in all these, cannot simply be an imparter of knowledge. He needs, additionally, to be a social engineer, to be a human-relations guide. When playing the role of academician only, he fails many vital needs of the learners that are as complex as a personality is complex.

Through the interaction between teacher and student and through guiding principles in forms of lessons, experiences and observations, the teaching-learning process aims at sharpening the student's abilities, creating independent judgment, facilitating learning, helping adapt to their environments and ultimately helping change behavior for the enlightenment and development of total personalities which is the fulfillment to human beings.

To reach the above goal, an instructor must be aware and be conscious of his profession and the manner he should go about conducting his business. Any deviation from that objective would not be profitable nor useful to the students. One point that should be kept in mind is that the instructor is not the only factor that affects the teaching-learning process; the administrators, students
and environments also have a great share in it. The researcher keeps other factors as constant and considers only those factors that affect the instructor which is the subject under this study.

The researcher, therefore, is interested to know the mixed variables in acquiring knowledge, contents of subject matters, ability, attitude of the instructors and things connected with the teaching process to evaluate the teaching performance of the instructors of Assumption Business Administration College. To evaluate the teaching performance, some criteria must be laid down and put as a standard of judgment. Opinions of the authorities on this matter and those of the researchers will be presented as follows:

Saengchan and Nuan Sagnuansub propose the following qualities of good teachers responsible for the future of the students:

1. Good knowledge:
   a) Knowledge of the subject matter to be taught.
   b) Knowledge of pedagogy - methods of imparting knowledge and the nature of the student.
2. Teach well: he must possess the art of teaching.
3. Good behavior: he must give good examples to the students.
4. Proper control of the class.

5. Good health: though this is something personal, yet it affects learning on the part of the students.

The research of Planning Section of College of Education, Somdej Chao Pharaya (1975) claims that the teaching-learning result does not depend solely on the philosophy of education, its curriculum or pedagogy of the instructors but mainly depends on the person of the "instructor." Qualities of a good instructor, as a result and the findings of his research, are as follows: He must be kind, just, polite and humble, able to be proficient in his knowledge and way of teaching. Other research provides different aspects of a good teacher:

1. Behavior: a good teacher must possess good moral standing that is acceptable in the community in which he lives.

2. Academic Knowledge: he must love reading, do research, improve himself and keep himself always up-to-date.

3. Method of teaching: his role as a teacher should not be just imparting knowledge or supplying everything to the student as done before. Instead he should create inquisitive minds, guide them in such a way that they can
think creatively, know how to decide thing and take a course of action freely and with reason.

4. Class atmosphere: a good teacher should not be too strict but lenient on some occasion.

5. Human relationship: a good teacher should try to help the students. He must cooperate with parents as well as teachers and the community, be equal with the students, take care of them, help them whenever need arises both academically as well as with personal problems.

6. Personality: a good teacher must have a pleasing appearance. He should be polite and kind in words. Good health is also very essential.

7. Extra work: outside working time, there is no research make concerning the appropriateness of the work done by the teachers.

After studying the characteristics of fifty outstanding teachers, the psychologist Philip Jackson, reported that the best teachers are spontaneous and informal. They not only prize their own autonomy, but are concerned for the development of the individual student (Monroe Drews, 1971).

To decide upon the criteria for good teaching, or excellent teaching, Ronald T. Hyman (1975) suggests that
there is no single list which all educators accept as the "standard authority" on good teaching. Authorities along with their colleagues must draw up the criteria they will use. They must consider if each accepted criterion applies to all the instructors. He further suggests to try these criteria for good teaching:

1. The teacher should be dynamic. That is, he should be energetic, outgoing, and assertive.

2. The teacher should ask creative questions. That is, he should ask questions which require the students to be creative in responding.

3. The teacher should not ridicule or humiliate the students, but accept them as they are positively, and move from there.

4. The teacher should strive to instill proper and effective communication skills in the students.

5. The teacher should exemplify the social values of our nation.

6. The teacher should be a model of the rational decision maker and problem-solver during his lessons.

   Good teacher - effective teachers - have always had these as their major objectives. Their techniques and approaches depended on the exigencies of their day, but
the best have always been alert, adaptable, and aware of their students as individuals. John M. Leonard, John F. Fallon, and Harold von Arx (1966) stated that another three characteristics of flexibility, awareness, and preparation are essential for the effective teacher in reaching the students where they are and helping them to broaden the base of their experience, in helping them move from "seeing" to "looking", from "bearing" to "listening".

Review of the Related Literature:

The following description is the work of research done in the field of evaluation of the teaching performance given different variables and environments that create efficiency in teaching-performance.

In 1964, Issacson and others worked on the evaluation of the instructors teaching psychology in the university, analyzing from 145 questionnaires for various activities and using five rating scales to analyze six variables as follows:

1. Skill: know how to use teaching aids effectively and interestingly. At the same time, create incentive and eagerness to seek knowledge to explain things clearly.

2. Overload: whether the teacher gave too much work or too difficult work.


5. Group Interaction: cooperation in common talk, discussion, free expression to be ready to help and work together freely and voluntarily.

6. Student-Teacher Rapport: to be ready to listen to the ideas of the students. There is flexibility, sincerity, friendliness, and discussion of things with reasons.

Othanel B. Smith (1971) gave us two sources of development on performance criteria. The first is the emphasis in the current literature on behavioral objective instruction. The second source is the series of experimental studies which have been conducted in teacher education.

Descriptive studies have been used to develop normative data on teaching as it occurs in typical classrooms. The descriptive behavioral data obtained from these classroom studies was then compared with what the educators believe "should" occur in classrooms.

According to Smith (1971), the best potential source of variables for teacher education programs is class
experimental studies in which various instructional procedures are used and the effects of these different procedures on pupils are reported. In order to furnish conclusions which can be applied to teacher education programs, we need studies in which:

1. the teacher is the statistical unit of analysis;
2. teachers or classes are randomly assigned to treatment;
3. observational data are obtained on the fidelity of teacher behavior to the experimental or contrast treatment and on the behavior of the students, while similar observational data are obtained on events in the classrooms of teachers who follow their normal procedures; and
4. student performance is assessed by a variety of end-of-course tests. Such studies are rare. To date we have found no more than ten studies which satisfy all four criteria.

Process-product studies in Smith (1971) have produced some of the best variables on the relationship between teacher behavior and student achievement. Some fifty process-product studies have been reported on all of the studies where naturally occurring teacher behavior was observed and, in most of the studies the teacher was the
sampling unit. This review covered only the relationships between teacher behaviors and student achievement. Other important outcome variables were not considered here. The eleven strongest variables contained in this research were presented below. The best results were obtained on the first five variables: the results were best conclusive on the last six variables.

1. Clarity. The cognitive clarity of a teacher's presentation includes whether the points the teacher made were clear and easy to understand, whether he was able to explain concepts clearly and had facility with material and enough background to answer questions intelligently, whether the cognitive level of the teacher's lesson appeared to be just right most of the time.

2. Variability. The focus is on the teacher's use of variety or variability during the lesson. Rating scales were made on the teacher's flexibility in procedure, whether the teacher was adaptable or inflexible and the amount of extra equipments and student activities used.

3. Enthusiasm. Teacher enthusiasm has been assessed by

observer ratings on paired adjectives such as "stimulating and dull", "original and stereotyped", or
"alert and apathetic"
- observer estimation of the amount of vigor and power exhibited by the teacher during classroom presentation.
- student ratings on the teacher's involvement, excitement, or interest regarding his subject matter.
- significant results relating enthusiasm to student achievement on at least one criterion measure were obtained in which the variable was studied.

4. Task-Oriented and/or Business-like Behaviors. In seven investigations, rating scales were used to estimate the degree to which a teacher was task-oriented, achievement-oriented, and/or business-like.

5. Student Opportunity to Learn Criterion Material. In three investigations an attempt was made to assess the relationship between the material covered in the class and the class criterion score. Overall, the correlations between measures of opportunity to learn and student achievement are positive, significant, and consistent.

6. Use of Student Ideas and General Indirectness. Research has been conducted using the following behaviors: acknowledging the student idea, modifying, applying comparing, and summarizing. The results were not
7. Criticism. Teacher use of behaviors labeled "criticism" has been one of the most frequently counted variables. In no study was there a significant negative correlation between mild forms of criticism and student achievement.

8. Use of Structuring Comments. These refer to statements designed to provide an overview or a cognitive scaffolding for what is to happen or has happened.

The results to data indicate that the various forms of structuring merit further study, but it is impossible to synthesize the results in a manner which can be translated into teaching competencies.

9. Types of questions. The classification of questions and/or types of discourse into three or more types appears to offer greater potential for future research.

10. Probing. The variable "probing" generally refers to teacher responses to student answers which encourage the students to elaborate upon his answer.

11. Level of Difficulty of Instruction. Student perceptions of the difficulty of the instruction have been assessed in four studies through student questionnaires. The issue is complex.
Summary

Of all the variables which have been investigated in process-product studies to data, five variables have strong support from correlational studies and six variables have less support but appear to deserve future study. The five variables which yielded the strongest relationships which measures of student achievement are: clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task orientation and/or business like behavior, and student opportunity to learn. The six less strong variables are: use of student ideas and/or teacher indirectness, use of criticism, use of structuring comments, use of multiple levels of discourse, probing, and perceived difficulty of the course. The relationships are positive for ten of the variables and negative for use of criticism (Smith, 1971).

From the year 1976 a group of fifty researchers in Thailand (Dr. Chaleo Buriphakdee, et al, 1977) worked together to bring about the characteristics of a good teacher in three ways:

a) Characteristics of "good teachers according to experienced persons and researchers":

Buddha has given 7 variables to be the main traits of a good teacher to teach effectively.
1. A good teacher must be lovable to all the students and the people around him:
   2. He must be steady in his temperament.
   3. Behave well.
   4. Be diligent and tactful in giving advice.
   5. Patient and have good intention in using words.
   6. Moving from simple things to a more complex one.
   7. Give advice in a good and correct way.

According to Dr. Thanu Sawangsak, (Chaleo Buriphakdee, et al, 1977), to develop and teach students efficiently and effectively, a good teacher should possess the following qualities:

1. Have a good relationship with the students.
2. Love his profession.
3. Possess the good traits of his profession.
4. Have a pleasing personality.
5. Should have acceptable outward appearance.

b) Characteristics of a good teacher according to the good Thai teachers in the past:

From a good Thai teacher: Kru Boon Ong Raor gave the following qualities:

1. Pay attention in teaching.
2. Always find and increase additional knowledge.
3. Know how to use audio-visual aids and other instructional instruments.
4. Devote his time to his profession.
5. Love children.

From Kru Lamphao Sukluman Chan

1. Really devoted to the profession.
2. Pay attention in teaching.
3. Devote his time both inside and outside official time.
4. Trust worthy.
5. Patient and hard working.
6. Well disciplined.
7. Sincerely friendly.
8. Cheerful.
12. Increase his knowledge.
13. Give moral lesson regularly and be lovable.
c) Characteristics of a good teacher as the result of a work:

Dr. Chaleo Buri Phakdee and friends launched a research survey project in 1973 and finished it in 1976. The work had been done with the help of eleven teacher colleges in Thailand. Questionnaires had been used with various groups of students in different parts of Thailand. They set questionnaires with only the highest rating scales between .85 to .97 being chosen. The following variables are given as good traits of good instructors:

1. Teaching ability: Know how to teach.
2. Behaviour: Show good example.
3. Pay good attention in teaching and be clear.
4. Be understanding and friendly.
5. Be responsible.
6. Be just and kind.
7. Be jovial and humorous.
8. Be polite.
10. Prepare his lesson very well.
12. Enjoy good health.
13. In search of knowledge.

15. Good personality.

To summarize the above qualities of a good teacher, they can be grouped into 5 categories:

1. Good knowledge: search for knowledge and use it profitably.

2. Teach well: express clearly and use different methods and techniques in teaching.

3. Good Health: physically and mentally.

4. Behave well: be trustworthy, just, kind, hard working patient and know how to face difficulties.

5. Be democratic: to be reasonable, ready to accept the ideas of others.

From the Research Works:

In 1948, from the finding of Smith (1971), David G. Ryans and friends started on a research project to find out the characteristics of a good teacher that would produce efficient work in the students. When this research was published for the first time in 1960, five aspects were proposed as follows:
1. Class behaviour  
   a. Be understanding, friendly.
   b. Be responsible and systematic towards one's duty.
   c. Arouse and stimulate progress in the student.

2. Attitude  
   a. Be interested in the students' ideas.
   b. Be democratic in the class.
   c. Give room to the ideas of the administrators and others.

3. Subject matter  
   Be Learning Centered-Traditional.

4. Linguistic ability  
   Know how to express himself very well.

5. Emotional aspect  
   Be steady and adaptable.
Norman E. Gronlund (1971) has said,

Broadly conceived, the main purpose of classroom teaching is to change pupil behavior in desired directions. When viewed in this light, evaluation becomes an integral part of the teaching-learning process. The "desired directions" are the educational objectives established by the school and the teacher; evaluation is the process of determining the extent to which these objectives are being achieved.

According to Gail M. Inlow (1963), the evaluation serves the following five purposes:

1. It enables teachers to keep abreast of the progress they are making in teaching.
2. It enables the administrators to be aware of the progress their instructors are making in teaching.
3. It gives teachers insight into their instructional effectiveness.
4. It provides school administrators and college admissions personnel with data on which to base selected education decisions.
5. It provides the profession of education and other interested social group with an overview of the quality of teacher performance en masse.

From the variables used in the study of teaching-behavior, it can be seen that acquisition of knowledge alone is only a part of the whole picture. The crucial
thing is in the pedagogy of teaching.

Dr. Uthumporn Thong-Uthai in his article "A Construct of Teaching Effectiveness" has proposed research works done abroad concerning the evaluation of the teaching performance of the instructors at college level as follows:

a) In 1968, Younge and Sassenrath studied the college teaching behavior of the instructors by applying questionnaires with the third and fourth year students. Nine variables were obtained from the analysis:

1. Confidence and Fluent Delivery: To be confident of oneself, reasonable, flexible in teaching.

2. Clarity of Course: To be clear in the aim of teaching, meaningful in content, reasonable in exercises and clear in explanation.

3. Open and Sympathetic Attitude towards Students: Being ready to help the students. Permit students to express their ideas, and at the same time be ready to accept their ideas. Give time for discussion and open questions, to be humorous.

4. Interesting and Stimulating Teachers: See the importance of the stimulating factors, know how to use the educational tools interestingly, use the environments to suit the classes.
5. Fairness of Evaluation: Use the standardized tests and be fair in giving grades.

6. Suitable Class Material and Value of Course: See the importance of preparation for teaching. The subject matter should not be too complex but suitable to the class.

7. Frequency of Evaluation: This includes frequency of assignments and tests.

8. Interest in and Knowledge of Subject Matter.


b) In 1974, Greenwood developed a kind of measurement called "Student Evaluation of College Teaching Behavior" to measure what could be observable in the Instructors. The random sampling group were the instructors, students and the administrators. He concluded that to be efficient in teaching, the instructors must possess the following qualities:

1. To be able to make the lesson easy to understand.

2. To have a modern method of teaching.

3. To be responsible to his profession.

4. To be friendly with the students.

5. Ready to listen to the ideas of the students.
6. To know the techniques of evaluation, give clear and proper assignment.

7. Possess the knowledge of the events of the day.

8. Understand the problems of the students well.

c) In 1975, Wotruba and Wright constructed a set of questionnaires to evaluate the efficiency of instructors in teaching business administration. The following categories were used in building up the questionnaires:

1. The attitude of the instructors towards the students.
2. Methods of teaching.
3. Personality of the instructors.
4. Class atmosphere.
5. Teaching aids.
6. Attitude of instructors towards the subject.

Five rating scales were used with three groups of students, instructors and administrators. As the result, the efficiency in teaching of the instructors is composed of the following variables:

1. Know the subject matter well and always keep it up-to-date.
2. Stimulate the students to use their own thinking.
3. To be enthusiastic in teaching.

4. Create good relationship among the students.

5. Give clear explanation of the subject matter especially that of abstract ideas.

6. Make them know how to think by giving examples from real life situation.

7. To be fair in evaluation.

8. Render help to students in class as well as outside class time.

9. To be lively and interesting in teaching.

The research in this line in Thailand on the college level is not as extensive. According to Thong-Uthai 1979, in 1977, some Thai researchers Ms. Chintana Mapoung, et al, 1977, had ventured on the project in Social Sciences, Applied Biological Sciences, Human Science and Physical Sciences. They were Theses submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Education, Department of Educational Research, Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University, 1977.

The following factors were used:

1. Relationship between the instructors and students.

2. Method of teaching.
3. Personality of the instructors.
4. Attitude of the instructors towards the subject.
5. Knowledge of evaluation.
6. Ready to listen to ideas of the students.
7. The use of teaching aids.
8. To be good leaders (Thong-Uthai, 1975)

From the research done abroad as well as in Thailand, common qualities have been found that create efficiency in teaching. The following factors are among the most important:

1. Personality: outward appearance, sincerity, interest in the students, leadership, knowledge of the subject and being up-to-date.

2. Method of teaching: preparation of the lesson, use different techniques, clarity in explanation, and development in ideas.

3. Relationship between instructors and students: good relationship, ready to listen to students, ready to help them in and outside classtime.

4. Teaching aids: including laboratory and library.

5. Evaluation: including feedback, standardization and fairness.
6. Attitude of the instructors towards teaching the students: being professional, respecting them as individuals.

There must be a process which helps in measuring the efficiency of the instructors. Evaluation of the efficiency in teaching can help the administrators, instructors and students greatly in their learning development. The administrators can evaluate the instructors' works. At the same time, the instructors know their own abilities and can find room to improve themselves. The end-results would go to the students who would benefit from it all.

In the light of this, the researcher proceeded to formulate the questions to evaluate the teaching performance of the full-time instructors at ABAC to define the present situation, in the hope of uplifting their teaching standards and thus increasing the over-all effectiveness of the teaching performance.
CHAPTER 3
PROCEDURES EMPLOYED

The aim of this research was to evaluate the teaching performance of full-time instructors in Assumption Business Administration College. The researcher made use of Descriptive Research by developing a set of questions with a random sampling group. The questionnaire was composed of variables connected with the efficiency of teaching at the college level, built up by the researcher himself. The data obtained was analyzed in terms of the arithmetic mean, standard deviation, coefficient of skewness, t-test, and then finally factor analyzed.

Sources of data (Population)

The researcher contacted the administrators, the full-time faculty members and students of various years as a sampling group to answer the questionnaire. Since the researcher is one of the members in the administration, it was not hard for him to contact all the 34 full-time instructors. As for the students, a stratified sampling was used with different groups of students according to their status in the college. Seventy graduates, fifty
seniors, fifty juniors, fifty sophomores and thirty freshmen were employed giving total sampling group as 250.

Tools of Research

The main tool of this research was a questionnaire constructed basing its questions on the good qualified and authorized researchers. It had five rating scales which were outstanding, excellent, good, less than satisfactory and unsatisfactory, with the scores of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. It contained 35 items concerning teaching approach, teaching ability, organization and clarity in explaining the subject matter, group interaction and dynamism, enthusiasm and personal qualities of the instructors. The sample groups were the full-time instructors and the students of ABAC during the academic year 1979-1980. Out of 284 questionnaires, 250 were distributed to the students and 34 were handed over to the instructors and the returns were 192 and 30 respectively. The researcher made use of the complete questionnaires to find the arithmetic mean, standard deviation and skewness to find the value of each item and analyze the results.

Questionnaire Content

Five rating scale units have been used in the questionnaire which contained 4 variables. The first
variable was the "teaching approach" containing 5 items, as, discussing others' points of view, contrasting implications of various theories, discussing recent developments in the field and presenting origins of ideas and concepts, giving references for more interesting and related points, and, choosing texts for the course which added depth to lectures and discussions.

The second variable was the "teaching ability, organization and clarity of the subject matter." There were 13 items altogether regarding competency in the teaching areas, preparation for lectures and discussions, beginning and ending class with vigor and promptness, clear outline of the course, efficient use of class time, appropriate pacing of the course, coherent presentation of the matter, using illustrations and examples, encouragement of student participation and also independent thought and action, giving appropriate assignments and promptly returning them and, lastly, giving clear and meaningful test questions.

The third variable was concerned with group interaction and the instructor. Eleven items were used: teaching at an appropriate level, being aware of their understanding of the lecture, making them feel free to express their ideas,
stimulating them to work more than the minimum requirement of the course, giving feedback to their works, using proper instruments to evaluate the students' achievement, appropriate testing, showing clearly the method to determine the grade, being fair and impartial, respecting them as individuals and being available to the students for personal discussion outside of class. And the last variable was about "the dynamism, enthusiasm, and personal qualities" of the instructor. There are six items: ability to communicate, ability to hold students' attention during class, being intellectually stimulating, being lively and enthusiastic in teaching, following through on commitments and considering criticism as part of professional growth. This set of questions was first answered and tested by my five co-college instructors. A few places had been corrected and improved upon such as the language and the order of grouping. A "try out" of the paper was done with other five senior students and one college instructor.

The improved questionnaire was a five scale rating unit to know the actual performance of the full-time instructors related to teaching efficiency given in 35 items.

To facilitate the collection of data, the investigator put a code number on every questionnaire.
Collection of Data

Since the investigator was making a research with the population and the random sampling groups of the college where he was working, the permission from the Director was obtained. Direct contact had been made with the full-time instructors and various groups of students of different years. Close co-operation was obtained on various levels. The researcher spent two months to finish the job. Out of 284 questionnaires distributed, 222 were returned, which accounted for 78.17% of the total.

Procedure in the Analysis of Data

In the analysis of the data, the researcher selected only 180 perfect questionnaires (42 were incomplete) and then analyzed the data obtained using the following procedures:

1. Grouped the questionnaire into two groups of students and instructors;

2. Then found out the arithmetic mean, standard deviation and coefficient of skewness of each item; and

3. Factor analyzed in the following manners:
   3.1 Found the arithmetic mean (X) of each item of the results obtained from the two groups and interpreted their meanings;
3.2 Found the standard deviation of each item of the two groups and gave their interpretation;

3.3 Found also the coefficient of skewness of each item of the two groups and gave their interpretation.

3.4 Used t-test to find the difference between the arithmetic means of the two groups and gave its interpretation.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The research made use of statistical analysis and the following symbols were used:

\[ \bar{X} \] represents arithmetic mean

S.D. represents standard deviation

Sk represents coefficient of skewness

Statistical Analysis:

From the total questionnaires distributed to the instructors and students of different groups, 222 questionnaires were returned and 180 questionnaires were in the analysis as shown in Table 1.
### TABLE 1

#### TABLE OF SIZE SAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Nos. Distributed</th>
<th>Nos. returned</th>
<th>Nos. applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The graduates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior students</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior students</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore students</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year students (2nd semester)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the research was limited only to the college in which he is working, the return of the questionnaires was of no problem. Freshmen were omitted from the sample population and this was due to the fact that freshmen were new to the college's life and to the way of teaching of the instructors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>0.8748</td>
<td>0.5814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.4074</td>
<td>0.8282</td>
<td>0.3229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.2593</td>
<td>0.6986</td>
<td>0.1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.5926</td>
<td>0.9132</td>
<td>-0.3198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.6296</td>
<td>0.8233</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>4.1852</td>
<td>0.7219</td>
<td>-0.1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4.1852</td>
<td>0.8181</td>
<td>-0.3848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>0.7371</td>
<td>-0.0754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>0.6669</td>
<td>-0.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>0.6286</td>
<td>0.0632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>0.7857</td>
<td>-0.1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>4.2593</td>
<td>0.6434</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>4.2593</td>
<td>0.6986</td>
<td>0.1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>3.8889</td>
<td>0.6849</td>
<td>-0.0162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>3.8519</td>
<td>0.4471</td>
<td>-0.1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>3.8148</td>
<td>0.6688</td>
<td>-0.1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3.5926</td>
<td>1.0974</td>
<td>0.3122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>3.8519</td>
<td>1.0611</td>
<td>-0.2338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>4.0370</td>
<td>0.6931</td>
<td>-0.0332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>3.8148</td>
<td>0.7221</td>
<td>-0.1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>0.7203</td>
<td>-0.4917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>3.9630</td>
<td>0.9991</td>
<td>-0.2873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>3.6296</td>
<td>0.9088</td>
<td>-0.3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>3.8148</td>
<td>0.8182</td>
<td>0.0356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>4.0740</td>
<td>0.8578</td>
<td>-0.4966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>0.8750</td>
<td>-0.4054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>4.5185</td>
<td>0.5691</td>
<td>-0.3374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>4.3704</td>
<td>0.6747</td>
<td>-0.3897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>0.7857</td>
<td>-0.6081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>4.2593</td>
<td>0.6434</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>3.8519</td>
<td>0.8027</td>
<td>0.6300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>0.7369</td>
<td>-0.1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>4.0741</td>
<td>0.6623</td>
<td>0.0279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>0.6851</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.1547</td>
<td>-0.6877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

**ARITHMETIC MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATION AND SKEWNESS OF THE STUDENT RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.9869</td>
<td>0.8856</td>
<td>0.1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.5621</td>
<td>0.8388</td>
<td>0.3492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.5621</td>
<td>0.8185</td>
<td>0.3472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.6863</td>
<td>0.7738</td>
<td>-0.1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2.6863</td>
<td>0.7738</td>
<td>-0.1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.6993</td>
<td>0.7761</td>
<td>-0.0653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.1895</td>
<td>0.7819</td>
<td>-0.0340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>0.8085</td>
<td>-0.0392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2.9085</td>
<td>0.8429</td>
<td>-0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.0392</td>
<td>0.6251</td>
<td>0.0157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2.5033</td>
<td>0.8865</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2.8366</td>
<td>0.7090</td>
<td>-0.0867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2.5490</td>
<td>0.8852</td>
<td>0.1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>3.1176</td>
<td>0.9072</td>
<td>-0.1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2.9608</td>
<td>0.8994</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>3.0458</td>
<td>0.8580</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>2.4379</td>
<td>0.9622</td>
<td>0.1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>2.4641</td>
<td>1.8929</td>
<td>-0.2730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>3.1046</td>
<td>0.7767</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1.9935</td>
<td>1.8471</td>
<td>-0.2874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>3.2614</td>
<td>0.8987</td>
<td>-0.1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>2.9608</td>
<td>0.8994</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>1.7908</td>
<td>0.9050</td>
<td>0.5055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>0.8706</td>
<td>-0.2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>2.9020</td>
<td>0.9617</td>
<td>0.0419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>3.6536</td>
<td>1.0310</td>
<td>-0.3085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>2.9150</td>
<td>1.1714</td>
<td>-0.0307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>3.2026</td>
<td>0.7264</td>
<td>0.0688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>3.3007</td>
<td>0.9716</td>
<td>0.0843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>2.7451</td>
<td>0.7367</td>
<td>-0.1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>2.7451</td>
<td>0.7367</td>
<td>-0.1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>2.8954</td>
<td>0.9713</td>
<td>0.0278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>0.8085</td>
<td>-0.0392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>0.8706</td>
<td>-0.2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>3.2026</td>
<td>0.7264</td>
<td>0.0688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4

QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE EVALUATION OF THE TEACHING PERFORMANCE OF ABAC INSTRUCTORS AND THE ARITHMETIC MEANS OF THE FACULTY RESPONSES ($X_1$) AND STUDENT RESPONSES ($X_2$) COMPARED.

Evaluate your teaching performance and give the score you deserve in each item below. Put a check mark (√) in appropriate column as your rating.

5 - outstanding
4 - excellent
3 - good
2 - less than satisfactory
1 - unsatisfactory

$\bar{X}_1 / \bar{X}_2$

A. With Respect to Teaching Approach, How Well Did You

1. Discuss points of view other than your own?

2. Contrast implications of various theories?

3. Discuss recent developments in the field and present origins of ideas and concepts?

4. Give references for more interesting and related points?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>2.9869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.4074</td>
<td>2.5621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.2593</td>
<td>2.5621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.5926</td>
<td>2.6863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Choose texts for the course which added depth to lectures and discussions?

B. With Respect to Teaching Ability, Organization and Clarity, How Well Did You

6. Possess competency in the knowledge of the subject matter and teaching areas?

7. Prepare for lectures or discussions?

8. Begin and end the class with vigor and promptness?

9. Outline clearly at the beginning of the course your expectations of the class and did not surprise the students with major assignments at the end of the course?

10. Make efficient use of class time?

11. Pace the course so that you did not have to hurry over large amounts of material toward the end of the semester?

12. Present the material coherently, emphasizing the major points and making clear their relationships?

13. Use examples and illustrations which made the material clearer?

14. Encourage wide student participation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \frac{x_1}{x_2} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6296 / 2.6863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1852 / 2.6993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1852 / 3.1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1111 / 3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3333 / 2.9085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1111 / 3.0392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1111 / 2.5033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2593 / 2.8366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2593 / 2.5490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8889 / 3.1176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Direct your efforts, by example and precept, toward situations which encourage independent thought and action?

16. Give adequate instructions concerning assignments?

17. Usually return assignment promptly?

18. Write test questions for which the meanings were usually clear?

C. With Respect to the Group Interaction and You, How Well Did You

19. Teach at an appropriate level for the course?

20. Usually have the awareness of whether the class members are following your discussion or lecture with understanding?

21. Make the students feel free to ask questions, disagree, and express ideas?

22. Stimulate the students to work on their own beyond what the course itself required?

23. Comment individually on the student's work, either orally or in writing as to give them encouragement and support?

24. Have sufficient demonstrable evidence, in terms of class participation and written work, to evaluate the students' achievement in your course?

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{R}_1 / \textbf{R}_2 & \\
\hline
3.8519 / 2.9608 & \\
\hline
3.8148 / 3.0458 & \\
\hline
3.5926 / 2.4379 & \\
\hline
3.8519 / 2.4641 & \\
\hline
4.0370 / 3.1046 & \\
\hline
3.8148 / 1.9935 & \\
\hline
4.3333 / 3.2614 & \\
\hline
3.9630 / 2.9608 & \\
\hline
3.6296 / 1.7908 & \\
\hline
3.8148 / 2.6667 & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
25. Give tests which provided the students with an adequate opportunity to show what they have learned?

26. Explain clearly and early in the semester how the course grade would be determined?

27. Possess fairness and impartiality in your dealings with students?

28. Respect them as individuals in your dealings with students?

29. Make yourself available for meetings or personal discussions outside of class?

D. With Respect to Dynamism, Enthusiasm and Personal Qualities, How Well Did You

30. Use your ability to communicate?

31. Usually hold the students attention during class?

32. Be intellectually stimulating?

33. Reveal enthusiasm in your teaching? (Seem to enjoy working with the class?)

34. Follow through on commitments such as conferences, paper grading, etc?

35. Consider criticism as part of professional growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.0740</td>
<td>2.9020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>3.6536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.5185</td>
<td>2.9150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.3704</td>
<td>3.2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>3.3007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.2593</td>
<td>2.7451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.8516</td>
<td>2.7451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>2.8954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.0741</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>3.2026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some suggestions given to improve your own teaching performance.
TABLE 5
T-TEST FOR VARIABLES OF THE FACULTY AND THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables used</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_1$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_2$</th>
<th>$s^2_1$</th>
<th>$s^2_2$</th>
<th>N$_1$=N$_2$</th>
<th>t=value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching Approach</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.697</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6007@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching Ability</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>2.688</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7204**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group Interaction</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1470**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal Qualities</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4837*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. This is a one-tailed test with

$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2$

$H_1 : \mu_1 > \mu_2$

using $N_1 + N_2 - 2$ degree of freedom and
5% and 1% range of levels of significance.

@ means acceptance of null hypothesis.

* means the difference of $\bar{x}_1$ and $\bar{x}_2$ is significant.

** means the difference of $\bar{x}_1$ and $\bar{x}_2$ is highly significant.
The Analysis of the Data

From the two sets of data, (1) the self-evaluation and (2) students-evaluation of the instructors, some comparisons and conclusions can be drawn.

1. Considering the Teaching Approach from the point of view of the instructors themselves as well as the students evaluation, the results of the two coincide. The highest weight falls on the discussion of the points of view other than their own, followed by proper choice of texts, giving references for more interesting and related points, contrasting implications of various theories and discussing recent developments in the field and presenting origins of the ideas and concepts. In the student evaluation table, "the references for more interesting and related points" has the same weight as "the proper choice of texts". And this same incident occurs also with contrasting implications of various theories and discussing recent developments in the field and presenting origins of ideas and concepts. As a whole the trend is more or less the same with the lesser weight given by the students.

2. With regards to Teaching Ability, Organization and Clarity, from Table 2 of self-evaluation, No. 9 "outline clearly at the beginning of the course the expectations of
the class and did not surprise the students with major assignments at the end of the course" carries the highest weight and the lowest weight in this area is No. 17 "returning assignment promptly." The order of highest weight to the lowest is NOS. 9, 12, 13, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 16, 17.

On the contrary, the students evaluation is of different opinion. The highest point is with No. 7 "to prepare for lectures or discussions" and the lowest is No. 17 concerning the return of assignment promptly. The order of weight obtained from highest to lowest is NOS. 7, 14, 16, 10, 8, 15, 9, 12, 6, 13, 11, 18 and 17.

3. With respect to the "Group Interaction and the Instructors", from the instructors' own evaluation, the highest in the list of arithmetic means is No. 27 concerning "fairness and impartiality in your dealings with students" and the lowest is No. 23 which is about "commenting individually on the student's work, either orally or in writing as to give them encouragement and support". Compared to Table 3 of Students Evaluation, the highest weight is on No. 26 "explaining clearly and early in the semester how the course grade would be determined".
On the other hand No. 23 "commenting individually on the student's work, either orally or in writing as to give them encouragement and support" obtains the lowest mean and this evaluation coincides with self-evaluation.

4. With respect to "Dynamism, Enthusiasm and Personal Qualities", the highest arithmetic mean belongs to No. 30 "using ability to communicate" and No. 32 "be intellectually stimulating" gets the lowest mean. In contrast with Table 3 of Students evaluation, No. 35 considering "criticism as part of professional growth" gets the highest mean and No. 34 "following through on commitments such as conferences, paper grading, etc." has the lowest mean.

Of all the variables, in instructors evaluation, the highest arithmetic mean obtained is 4.5185 on No. 27 "possess fairness and impartiality in dealings with students". And the lowest arithmetic mean is 3.2593 on No. 3 "discuss recent developments in the field and present origins of ideas and concept."

From Table 3 of students evaluation, the highest is 3.6536 on No. 26, "explain clearly and early in the semester how the course grade would be determined" and the lowest is 1.7908 on No. 23 "to comment individually on the student's work, either orally or in writing as to give them
encouragement and support". The two groups of evaluators have different opinions on the issue. It can be noticed that the weight of each variable in the list of arithmetic means of the self-evaluation is generally higher than that the students evaluation and this may be due to the bias of self-esteem.

To treat each table differently, consider

a) first, the arithmetic mean of self-evaluation. The highest weight obtained is No. 27. The instructors mostly feel that they possess fairness and impartiality in their dealings with students. The lowest is No. 3 concerning the discussion on recent developments in the field and presentation on origins of ideas and concepts. Though the score is the lowest yet it is above average.

In Table 3, all the arithmetic means are lower than in Table 2. The highest is 3.6536 of No. 26, "explaining clearly and early in the semester how the course grade would be determined". The lowest arithmetic mean is 1.7908 of No. 23 "commenting individually on the student's work, either orally or in writing as to give them encouragement and support". It goes to show that the students as a whole are not satisfied with the correction of the assignments given to the students. This may be due to lack of training.
b) Standard deviation of the variables: In Table 2, the highest standard deviation is 1.1547 of No. 35 "considering criticism as part of professional growth". Comparatively, the instructors have different opinions regarding this personal trait. As for other variables, their standard deviation values are slightly lower than that of No. 35. Most of the instructors are of the same opinion in this respect.

Consider Table 3, the opinion of the students: The highest standard deviation is 1.8929 of No. 18 "writing test questions for which the meanings were usually clear". This goes to show that among 153 students, there is a considerable spread of opinion on the matter. The spread of ideas and opinions show that some students may be very biased in judging their instructors, because the standard deviation on the question is 1.8929 which most other standard deviation are closer to 1.000. Comparatively, the opinion of the students is only spread out a little bit. In relation to the above mentioned arithmetic mean, the conclusion that may be made from the standard deviation is that the opinions of students cluster at the average level. The two sets of data support each other.
c) Skewness: Consider the self-evaluation of the instructors (from Table 2). The highest negative data obtained is -0.6877 of No. 35. This means that most of the instructors give high scores on the item "consider criticism as part of professional growth", and few do not have that attitude. The highest positive value is 0.6300 of No. 31 which shows that only few of them give high scores on holding the students' attention during class by the instructors. The quality is not up to the mark, though it may be above average. The values of other variables are between that range.

The values of skewness shown in Table 3 of the students' evaluation give No. 26 as the highest negative value at -0.3085. Most of the instructors give high scores on this point. It shows that most of the instructors "explain clearly and early in the semester how the course grade would be determined" while No. 23 gives the highest positive value at 0.5055, which concerns the comments of the instructors on the student's work individually, either orally or in writing, so as to give them encouragement and support. This means that very few gives high scores on this matter. In general, the students see their instructors as in the average level.
From Table 5, the general arithmetic means of variables of the faculty and student questionnaire items have been formed. The ranking of the arithmetic means of the variables within the faculty questionnaire items from the highest to the lowest are as follows: Group Interaction, Teaching Ability, Personal Qualities and Teaching Approach. Whereas, within the student questionnaire items, the arithmetic means of the variables from the highest to the lowest are as follows: Group Interaction, Personal Qualities, Teaching Approach and Teaching Ability. And from the t-test analysis, the conclusion obtained is that there is no significant difference in arithmetic means of the "Teaching Approach" of the faculty and student questionnaire items. The differences are highly significant when comparing the arithmetic means of the faculty and student questionnaire items concerning "Teaching Ability" and "Group Interaction". Whereas, the difference is significant only in the arithmetic means of the faculty and student questionnaire items concerning "Personal Qualities". As a whole, the arithmetic means of the faculty responses to the questionnaire items are higher than those of the student responses to the questionnaire items.
The self-evaluation of the instructors indicates that they do best in "Group Interaction" which is the same as that of student-evaluation. The lowest performance of the instructors according to self-evaluation is in the area of "Teaching Approach" whereas according to the student-evaluation the lowest performance is in the area of "Teaching Ability".

The ranking of the general means of variables of the responses to the questionnaire items of the two groups almost coincide except in the areas of "Teaching Approach" and "Teaching Ability". Even in these two areas there is not much difference. Hence the conclusion can be drawn to the effect that the ranking of the general means of variables of the responses to the questionnaire items of the two groups are the same.

**Interpretation of the Data**

There are four main areas in the questionnaire items; namely, Teaching Approaching, Teaching Ability, Group Interaction and Personal Qualities of the instructors.

From the result of the one-tailed test, there is an acceptance of the null hypothesis. That is, the arithmetic mean of the faculty response \( \bar{X}_1 \) and the arithmetic mean of the student response \( \bar{X}_2 \) concerning
"Teaching Approach" is not significantly different. The instructors, in this area, are probably at least "good" and the faculty can be commended for that. Although they are good, the faculty rates itself higher than the students do. (Appendix III)

Consider the other three areas of Teaching Ability, Group Interaction and Personal Qualities, there seems to be a problem in these three areas. Table 5 of the one-tailed test shows that there is a highly significant difference between the arithmetic mean of the faculty response ($\bar{x}_1$) and the arithmetic mean of the student response ($\bar{x}_2$) in the areas of Teaching Ability and Group Interaction, while there is only a significant difference in the area of Personal Qualities. The arithmetic means of the faculty responses tend to be consistently higher than those of the student responses. The problem may be that there is an over-estimation by the instruction of their talents. To come to this interpretation, the researcher thinks that the students are in a better position to evaluate the effect of the teaching performance of the instructors on them. By comparing the arithmetic means of the student responses in these three areas, the researcher suspects that the instructors have over-rated
themselves.

The researcher, then, can form these three areas into one and focuses on the instructors as the major target. From the faculty and student responses, it may be that the opinions of the instructors do not correspond with reality. Their abilities may be questionable in terms of their teaching background and method of teaching. Teaching effectively needs time and experience to master the art and it has to be developed. The quality of their English is another aspect to be considered. Since English is the medium of communication and it is not the mother tongue, it is natural that the instructors as well as the students would find it hard to communicate with each other in the best way they can. The students still rated the instructors as "good". The need, then, is not so much to improve the teaching approach of the instructors but to get the instructors and students to be more consistent in their opinions. Probably the quality of communication between the instructors and students could be of prime importance.

As a whole, the achievement on the part of the instructors is good but not as good as their opinions reveal. There is a gap between the opinion of the
instructors and the teaching performances of the instructors. The result of the responses of the questionnaire items No. 20 and No. 23 show this.

The researcher also personally perceives the self-evaluation of the instructors to be excellent as something over-estimated. The reason is due mainly to a lack of experience and methodology in imparting knowledge. The language may be another barrier to effective teaching. The barrier can either be created by the instructors themselves because of the low quality of English as a second language created or may be by the students due to their inability in using English as a medium of communication. In either way, the teaching performance of the instructors will not be as effective as it would normally be. Just as important may be the Thai custom of putting the teacher "on a pedestal" and insisting on total respect for the teacher by the student.

Last, but not least, is that devotion and commitment to the teaching profession is very essential. In modern times, teaching is business-like. The special care, sacrifice and the devotion of the former days are gone. Moreover, the standard of living is so high that
it forces the instructors to have other jobs in order to earn enough for their living. They are more materialistic. That is the reason why they cannot wholeheartedly devote themselves to the profession, but divide themselves among so many other things which they think they need in life.

The instructors should take the initiative to be sensitive to the needs of the students. Unless and until the instructors come to know the needs of the students, there will remain a communications gap and the teaching performance of the instructors will be hard to improve.

To bridge this gap, the instructors must know the students' needs and this can be done through, first, observation of the students' reactions during class-time. Then, through teaching techniques, the instructors may prepare a kind of test to check their understanding and at the same time to detect their needs. It may be done orally or in writing. To be sensitive to their needs, the instructors may talk to some of pupils privately outside class-time and seek their opinions so that lessons may be better prepared and more relevant.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study will be presented in three parts, namely, the qualities of the instructor based on previous research, the findings from the questionnaire and the findings from interviews, personal observations and experiences.

1. From previous research: Factors that affect the efficiency of the teaching performance of the instructor are:
   a) Personal traits: The instructor must possess pleasing personality, good and up-to-date knowledge of the subject matter, inquisitive mind, and qualities as a leader;
   b) Method of teaching: He must know different techniques of presentation. At the same time, he must know how to make use of teaching aids to properly facilitate the learning of the students.
   c) Relationship with students: A readiness to listen and to help the students both inside and outside
class-time is very essential. He should be friendly with every one and create an atmosphere of trust and confidence.

d) Evaluation: A teacher should know the art of measurement and evaluation and use the feedback and criticism as a stepping stone to the change and improvement for the better.

2. From the questionnaire: From the data gathered the following findings have been obtained:

a) The instructors tend to highly evaluate themselves than the students normally do. From Table 2 and 3, we know that the arithmetic mean of the faculty responses to the questionnaire item is about 4 whereas the Arithmetic mean of the student responses is less than 3.

b) According to self-evaluation of the instructors, what is the lowest of all the items presented is in "discussing recent developments in the field and present origins of ideas and concepts". More importantly, the students feel that the instructors come to class unprepared for lectures and discussions.

c) Of all the four variables, the weakest point according to the students is in "Teaching Ability, Organization and Clarity" and in view of the instructors'
evaluation "Teaching Approach" is their weakest asset.

d) In general, and according to the t-test performed, the evaluation of the two groups are the same in ranking of the variables of the responses to the questionnaire items. But the significant and highly significant differences show that there is something wrong either with the faculty members or the demand on the part of the students is too high.
CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the self-evaluation, the instructors see themselves as already functioning well. The standard of teaching is rather high. If the measurement is right and if the instructors are sincere, then the teaching performance of the instructors as a whole is at a high level. The instructors are doing their best and they are putting efforts into their work. This may show that their achievement in teaching is quite satisfactory. There is a few defects here and there. The instructors readily listen to the complaints and criticism of the students. This also indicates that the instructors seem to be ready to correct themselves. Thus the future standard of teaching performance of the instructors will continue to improve.

Viewing the teaching performance of the instructors from the students point of view, the outcome of the standard is average. According to the students, there is
a need for a lot of improvement in many areas, since teachers are accounted as the developers and builders of the nation.

According to the students, the standard of the teaching performance of the full-time instructors is not up to the mark. Instructors do not put their heart and soul into the work; sometimes, it might happen that the teaching ability of the instructors is so limited. Sometimes, perhaps, instructors possess teaching ability but due to personal problems and their relationship with the students the results are not good.

Though the students play a great role in the educational process, yet one of the major keys is in the instructors themselves. If the instructors, with their good will and intention, want to improve themselves for the better, then things would be much easier. From the students' viewpoint, the instructors should improve themselves in several areas: First, the instructors must prepare better for lectures and discussion; secondly, the instructors should take more interest in gaining more knowledge daily, have additional or private studies to keep them up-to-date, and know how to make effective use of evaluation and
measurement. They should make the students feel free to ask questions, disagree and express ideas. And one of the most important things is the readiness to listen to the complaints and criticism and consider them as part of their professional growth. Oftentimes, the instructors overlook their own deficiencies. They should listen then to criticism for their own good individually and collectively to increase the standard of the teaching performance of the instructors.

Taking the two points of view into consideration, certain ideas coincide with each other while the rest differ. This may be due to the fact that

Case 1. The instructors are really good. They are well prepared for their classes. If the students cannot understand the lesson, they may project it as unpreparedness on the part of the teacher.

Case 2. In another sense, the instructors may not be prepared for their classes but keep on thinking that they have done their best.
From Case 1, the instructors do not do their utmost to make the students understand their lessons. The instructors must try to motivate and arouse the eagerness in studies in the students. The result is that the students cannot understand their lessons. The suggestion is that the instructors should take more interest in teaching and try to understand the student's difficulties and problems.

In Case 2, an instructor may think that he is well prepared but actually he knows very little. Each instructor must know himself very well and how much he knows the subject he is teaching. Then he must listen a lot to the students themselves. From there, he can consider these deficiencies and improve himself.

Therefore, if the instructor plays his role properly, if he guides the students well, they should naturally respond to their calling.

The Main Qualities of a Good Instructor

In my personal opinion and from the variables I have put forth in my questionnaire, a good teacher must possess the following qualities:
1. With respect to teaching approach: He should give his own ideas apart from what is given in the text. Personal opinions presented to the class should help to increase the students' range of vision and perspectives. This also stimulates the students in their studies and, at the same time, increases personal confidence of the students in their instructor.

In the explanation of various theories, he should contrast their implications. This approach would help them to better understand and to solve problems that may arise. The instructor must read books and magazines widely so as to be able to discuss recent developments in the field he is teaching and present origins of ideas and concepts. Everytime he uses ideas from other books, references must be cited. Before all else, the instructor must choose the proper text for the course which adds depth to lectures and discussions.

2. With respect to teaching ability, organization and clarity: The good instructor should be competent in his knowledge of the subject matter and teaching areas. This competency of knowledge should increase confidence,
zeal and enthusiasm in the students. To be competent means that he needs to prepare for his lectures. All the more, he should keep up-to-date in his art. Outward appearance also plays a great role. He should outline clearly at the beginning of the course his expectations of the class and should not surprise them with major assignments at the end of the course. Then everyday, he should begin and end the class with vigor and promptness to increase interest in the students. Class time should be used efficiently. Materials should be presented coherently, emphasizing the major points and making clear their relationships. In the art of teaching, he should use examples and illustrations which will make the material clearer. With tact and skill, he should try to encourage wider student participation and direct his efforts towards situations which encourage independent thought and action. He should give adequate assignments and once he finishes his corrections, return them promptly.

3. With respect to the group interaction and the instructor: Good instructor must be aware of whether the students are following his discussion and lectures with
understanding or not. He should create an atmosphere of trust and confidence in his class so that the students feel free to ask questions, disagree, and express ideas. During the course stimulate the students to work on their own beyond what the course itself requires. Occasionally he should give them encouragement by commenting on their work. He also should possess adequate tools to evaluate students' achievement in the course apart from regular examinations. The students should know how they will be graded. In this regard he must be fair and impartial in dealing with the students. He should respect them as individuals and most important of all, he must try his best to make himself available for meetings and personal discussions outside of class.

4. With respect to dynamism, enthusiasm and personal qualities: A good instructor knows how to communicate his ideas to the students. With this ability of his, he can hold the students' attention during class. If he enjoys his career, the students should feel enthusiastic in their study. Then if he loves his profession, he will not only enjoy teaching but enjoy
everything that follows in teaching. But no one is perfect and all are liable to some criticism or another. Even a good instructor will have difficulty, but he will take it to his own advantage and, at the same improve his professional growth. The achievement in the teaching performance then is the outcome of both the parties, that is, the instructors on one hand and the students on the other. If they cooperate and try to understand each other and possess good relationship then some problems, if not all, can be solved.

Recommendations:

From the above research and findings, the researcher makes the following recommendations to improve the teaching performance of the instructors:

1. The instructors must prepare for lectures and discussions more extensively. They must also use stimulating teaching approach.

The lack of teaching experience and a clear understanding of the function of the instructor-training program has led to many problems for beginning instructors. This problem will be solved by providing a good intensive
orientation program. The program should be made worthwhile, realistic, and sincere for all new instructors. It should stimulate them to be responsible, encourage them to create quality, give them direction, and provide them with an understanding of the general nature of the instructor-training program.

A committee should be formed to make a review and also revise the instructor-training program for the college to train and improve the quality of teaching.

2. Since the self-evaluation and the students-evaluation of the instructors differs, there should be a system of feedback for the instructors so as to measure their teaching performance. Consequently, they can come to know themselves better. To this purpose, confidential student-evaluation of each course can be conducted either by the instructor himself or by the college toward the end of the course to know at least partly the effectiveness of the performance.

3. The administration should set up a general guideline for the faculty members to follow so that, at least, the minimum requirements as instructors of the
college would be fulfilled, if not more, in various aspects of the teaching performance.

Related Recommendations

1. There should be systematic method of selection of the staff members. Special emphasis should be on observation, follow up and the evaluation of the selected member before the final admission is decided.

2. For unexperienced instructors, there should be someone initiating them into this new profession, guiding and helping them whenever it is necessary.

3. In-service training should be provided to all the members during or at the end of the year to keep themselves always up-to-date in this profession.

4. Informal gathering for the instructors teaching in the same field or even of different fields to come together and discuss their difficulties and methods of teaching for effective teaching.

Other fields relating to teaching should be exposed to the instructors for the betterment of teaching.

5. Course in measurement and evaluation must be given to all the instructors so that they know how to use
the tools of measurement effectively.

6. At the proper time, instructors should be sent to attend seminars conducted outside to broaden their outlook.

7. Experts on the matter should be invited to conduct seminars and give illustrations on effective teaching.

8. The students should be free to present personal opinions to the administration for consideration. Anonymous questionnaire will be employed for every student to evaluate the instructors and give feedback for improvement.

9. Consider the qualifications and job experiences of the full-time instructors, as shown in Table 6. From this data it is quite clear that most of the instructors become professional after acquiring their job. Out of 34 instructors, only 11 got their degrees in education and all of them are from foreign universities. They naturally have little experience of teaching in the Thai milieu.

The researcher therefore suggests having special training for the new, inexperienced instructors undergo for
a certain period of time a special training before they launch themselves into a full-time instruction.

10. Instead of waiting for outside application, it is better to launch a programme of preparing required and efficient instructors for the College by the College itself and this may be labeled as the "Instructors Programme".

Recommendations for Further Studies

1. Apart from the class-room atmosphere and personal traits of the instructors, other factors that affect the teaching performance of the instructors should be researched and looked into.

2. Not only the full-time instructors, but also part-time instructors who form the majority of the members of the staffs should be taken into consideration to increase the efficiency in teaching performance of the instructors.

3. Continue research with other groups of students to confirm the results of this questionnaire.

4. Further study should be done on how to close the
communication gap between the instructors and the students.

These recommendations for future studies will help the College to see clearer the obstacles that black the efficiency of the teaching performance of the instructors. Little by little, it can get rid of these difficulties and initiate new efforts to form man in his totality.
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APPENDIX I

FORMULAE USED IN RESEARCH

1. Arithmetic Mean:

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum fx}{f} \]
\[ \bar{x} = \text{arithmetic mean} \]
\[ \sum fx = \text{sum total scores} \]
\[ f = \text{total number of responses} \]

2. Standard Deviation:

\[ \text{S.D.} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum fX^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\sum fx}{N}\right)^2} \]
\[ \text{S.D.} = \text{standard deviation} \]
\[ \sum fx = \text{sum total scores} \]
\[ \sum fX^2 = \text{sum of power two of the scores} \]
\[ N = \text{total number of responses} \]

3. Coefficient of Skewness:

\[ Sk = \frac{\bar{x} - \text{mode}}{\text{S.D.}} \]
\[ Sk = \text{Coefficient of Skewness} \]
Mode = \( L_1 + C \left[ \frac{\Delta_1}{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2} \right] \)

- \( L_1 \): actual lower limit of the modal class.
- \( C \): size of class interval
- \( \Delta_1 \): the difference between frequency in the modal class and pre-modal class.
- \( \Delta_2 \): the difference between frequency in the modal class and post-modal class.

4. T-Test

\[ t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{N_2}}} \]

- \( t \): t-test
- \( \bar{x}_1 \): mean of the variables of the faculty responses to the questionnaire items.
- \( \bar{x}_2 \): mean of the variables of the student responses to the questionnaire items.
\begin{align*}
S_1^2 &= \text{variance of the variables of the faculty responses to the questionnaire items.} \\
S_2^2 &= \text{variance of the variables of the student responses to the questionnaire items.} \\
N_1 &= \text{number of responses in the faculty group.} \\
N_2 &= \text{number of responses in the student group.}
\end{align*}
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE

VARIABLES CONNECTED TO THE TEACHING PERFORMANCE OF THE INSTRUCTORS
Feb. 1, 1980
Assumption Business Administration College.

Dear Instructors,

Presently, I am working on "An Evaluation of the Teaching Performance of Full-Time Instructors of ABAC" which forms part of my work in my studies. I would very much appreciate your help in evaluating your personal class behaviour, characteristics and professional competencies exhibited. Kindly present the fact as close to reality as possible. Feel free to utilize the space on the last page for additional comments you wish to make.

Thank you very much in advance for the time and concern you have given to this paper of mine.

Yours sincerely,

(Bancha Saenghiran)
EVALUATION OF THE TEACHING PERFORMANCE

PERSONAL INFORMATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30 Yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 Yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50 Yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60 Yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student taught:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject taught:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experiences in College/University level:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 Yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 15 Yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluate your teaching performance and give the score you deserve in each item below. Put a check mark (✓) in appropriate column as your rating.

5 - outstanding
4 - Excellent
3 - good
2 - less than satisfactory
1 - unsatisfactory
A. With Respect to Teaching Approach, How Well Did You

1. Discuss points of view other than your own?

2. Contrast implications of various theories?

3. Discuss recent developments in the field and present origins of ideas and concepts?

4. Give references for more interesting and related points?

5. Choose texts for the course which added depth to lectures and discussions?

B. With Respect to Teaching Ability, Organization and Clarity, How Well Did You

6. Possess competency in the knowledge of the subject matter and teaching areas?

7. Prepare for lectures or discussions?

8. Begin and end the class with vigor and promptness?

9. Outline clearly at the beginning of the course your expectations of the class and did not surprise the students with major assignments at the end of the course?

10. Make efficient use of class time?
11. Pace the course so that you did not have to hurry over large amounts of material toward the end of the semester?

12. Present the material coherently, emphasizing the major points and making clear their relationships?

13. Use examples and illustrations which made the material clearer?

14. Encourage wide student participation?

15. Direct your efforts, by example and precept, toward situations which encourage independent thought and action?

16. Give adequate instructions concerning assignments?

17. Usually return assignment promptly?

18. Write test questions for which the meanings were usually clear?

C. With Respect to the Group Interaction and You, How Well Did You

19. Teach at an appropriate level for the course?

20. Usually have the awareness of whether the class members are following your discussion or lecture with understanding?

21. Make the students feel free to ask questions, disagree, and express ideas?
22. Stimulate the students to work on their own beyond what the course itself required?

23. Comment individually on the student's work, either orally or in writing as to give them encouragement and support?

24. Have sufficient demonstrable evidence, in terms of class participation and written work, to evaluate the students' achievement in your course?

25. Give tests which provided the students with an adequate opportunity to show what they have learned?

26. Explain clearly and early in the semester how the course grade would be determined?

27. Possess fairness and impartiality in your dealings with students?

28. Respect them as individuals in your dealings with students?

29. Make yourself available for meetings or personal discussions outside of class?

D. With Respect to Dynamism, Enthusiasm and Personal Qualities, How Well Did You

30. Use your ability to communicate?

31. Usually hold the students attention during class?
32. Be intellectually stimulating?
33. Reveal enthusiasm in your teaching? (Seem to enjoy working with the class?)
34. Follow through on commitments such as conferences, paper grading, etc?
35. Consider criticism as part of professional growth?

Some suggestions given to improve your own teaching performance.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
APPENDIX III

THE TALLY OF THE INSTRUCTOR-EVALUATION
AND STUDENT-EVALUATION
The tally of the Instructor-Evaluation and Student-Evaluation.

### Instructor-Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student-Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV

TABLE SHOWING THE
DEGREES AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN
TEACHING PROFESSION IN COLLEGE OF THE INSTRUCTORS OF ABAC
TABLE 6

QUALIFICATIONS AND JOB EXPERIENCE OF THE FULL-TIME INSTRUCTORS

OF ABAC IN COLLEGE-TEACHING PROFESSION IN 1978-79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of Instructors</th>
<th>Degrees Acquired</th>
<th>Number of Instructors</th>
<th>Range of Job Experience in College Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>From 6 months to 7 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Com.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Ed.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Ed.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of Instructors: 34
EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Bro. Bancha Saenghiran finished grade twelve at St. Gabriel's College, Bangkok, Thailand, in 1963. One year was spent in Loyola College, Madras, India for pre-university Course in 1966. Then a Bachelor Degree of Science in Mathematics (cum laude) was undergone from 1971 to 1974 in St. Louis University, Baguio City, Philippines. Masters Degree program in School Administration was initiated by St. Mary's College California, U.S.A., in 1976. Presently, he is working at Assumption Business Administration College occupying the seat of Vice-president for Student Affairs.