Effective Teaching Characteristics in Vocational Education

by

Mohd Ashraff Mohd Anuar

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 6, 2016

Keywords: teaching characteristics, student perception, instructor perception, vocational education, community college, teaching effectiveness.

Approved by

James Witte, Chair, Professor, Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
Maria Witte, Professor, Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
David DiRamio, Associate Professor, Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
Leslie Cordie, Assistant Professor, Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology

Abstract

This study explored the students' and instructors' perception of effective teaching characteristics as well as investigating the distinction between them as perceived by 137 students and six instructors in a Community College in Southeastern United States. Convenience sampling method was used to select the population and sample of the study. Using the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC), students and instructors in vocational education were asked to rate the 28 teacher qualities that they considered effective teaching. Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage and mean score), were used to explain the respondent preferences. In order to study the existence of any difference perception between both groups, a one-way MANOVA analysis of inferential statistics was used at .05 level of significant. An analysis of the results revealed students prefer their instructor to be confident, accessible, realistic and fair in testing and grading, knowledgeable about subject matter, good at listening, humble, punctual and manage class time. Instructors believe in order to be an effective teacher, these characteristics are more important; accessible, confident, creative and interesting, effective communicator, flexible/open minded, good listener, punctual and manage class time. Overall, both groups place a greater emphasize on instructional competency than personality/ interpersonal factors. The analysis of data found no statistical significant difference between students' and instructors' perception on effective teaching characteristics, both have strong agreement on seven out of 28 most effective characteristic: accessible, confident, good at listening, punctual and manage class time, strives to be a better teacher and technology competent. Both students and instructors have agreement on

happy/ positive attitude/ humorous as a relatively least important characteristic. In conclusion, this exploratory study highlights the importance of instructors' teaching competencies as effective characteristics in teaching in a vocational education setting.

Acknowledgments

First and the foremost, I would like to praise Allah, for all the blessing and grace he has bestowed upon of this study.

To my beloved wife, Nor Ashikin; and children, Sarah and Iskandar,

I would like to express my endless gratitude for your support, understanding, patience and sacrifice throughout the duration of this program completion. This appreciation extended to my parent, brother and sisters for always remembering me in their prayers.

To my Supervisor, committee member and EFLT,

Special thanks to Prof. Dr. James Witte, who served as chairperson, for your commitment, wisdom and assistance which greatly aided continuing to keep the project moving, Dr. Darin Baldwin, Dean of Technical Education and Workforce Development, Southern Union State Community College (SUSCC) for assisting and giving me permission to conduct this study and collect the data at his division. To Prof. Dr. Maria Witte for her consultation and suggestions for the improvement to the manuscript, and to Associate Prof. Dr. David DiRamio and Dr. Leslie Cordie for their guidance. I would like to express my gratitude to the University Reader, Prof. Dr. Leane Skinner for her time and effort. Acknowledgement also given to the Chair and administrative staff of Educational, Foundations, Leadership and Technology Department at Auburn University for their support and cooperation.

To my sponsor and employer,

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Malaysia Ministry of Education for the faith and confidence on me by awarding the opportunity to complete this program of study abroad, to my employer Universiti Putra Malaysia for their strong encouragement and motivation to obtaining my PhD in the states. Without them, I don't think I will be here for my doctoralship. Indeed, the experience of pursuing highest level of academic achievement in an overseas institution is completely different and challenging.

To my affiliates and acquaintances,

Thank you for always being there, day or night, for everything and anything, for your thoughtfulness and generosity, from you I have learned much of life's philosophy. Thank you sincerely.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii

Acknowledgments iv

List of Tables x

List of Abbreviations xi

Chapter 1. Introduction 1

Statement of Problem 3

Purpose of the Study 7

Research Questions 8

Significance of the Study 9

Limitations 9

Assumptions 10

Definitions of Terms 10

Organization of the Study 11

Chapter 2. Literature Review 12

Purpose of the Study 12

Research Questions 13

Effective Teaching Characteristics 13

Community College Student 19

Student Rating 23

Self-Rating Assessment 33
Students' Perception on Effective Teaching Characteristics 37
Instructors' Perception on Effective Teaching Characteristics 52
Differences between Student and Instructor Perceptions on Effective Teaching Characteristics 59
Conceptual/ Theoretical Framework 62
Summary 63
Chapter 3. Methods 64
Purpose of the Study 64
Research Questions 65
Research Design 65
Population and Participants 66
Students group 66
Instructors group 67
Instrumentation, Scales and Variables 67
The Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) 68
Procedures and Data Collection 73
Data Analysis 75
Validity and Reliability 75
Ethics 77
Summary 78
Chapter 4. Findings 79
Purpose of the Study 79

Research Questions 80
Response Rate 80
Demographic Results 80
Discussion of Findings 81
Research Question 1 83
Research Question 2 87
Research Question 3 92
Summary 95
Chapter 5. Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations 96
Purpose of the Study 96
Research Questions 97
Summary 97
Discussion 98
Research Question 1 98
Research Question 2 100
Research Question 3 101
Conclusions 103
Implications 104
Community College Instructor 104
Administrators 105
Policy makers 105
Contribution to the body of knowledge 106
Recommendations 107

References 109

Appendix A. Teacher Behavior Checklist Survey 143

Appendix B. Authorization Letter from the Dean of Technical Education and Workforce Development of Southern Union State Community College 147

Appendix C. Authorization Letter from the Instructors of Technical Education and Workforce Development of Southern Union State Community College 149

Appendix D. Authorization letter from Dr. Buskist 151

Appendix E. Informed Letter 154

Appendix F. Approval letter from Office of Research Compliance of Auburn University 156

List of Tables

Table 1. Graduate Students' Perspectives on the Characteristics of Effective Teachers and Frequency of Mention 42

Table 2. Characteristics of Effective Professor 52

Table 3. Importance of Instructional Dimensions using Two Different Indicators of Importance 53

Table 4. Lowman's Two-Dimensional Model of Effective College Teaching 61

Table 5. Theories of Learning Applied to University Teaching 64

Table 6. TBC Subscales, Variables and Items 72

Table 7. Instrument's Reliability Analysis 79

Table 8. Respondents' Response Rates 82

Table 9. Frequency Distribution of Respondents 83

Table 10. Descriptive Statistic 83

Table 11. Rank Order of Importance of the 28 Teacher Qualities from Students' Perspectives 85

Table 12. TBC Quartile Rank for each item from Students' Perspectives. 86

Table 13. Rank Order of Importance of the 28 Teacher Qualities from Instructors' Perspectives. 90

Table 14. TBC Quartile Rank for each item from Instructors' Perspectives 91

Table 15. Multivariate Test 95

Table 16. Descriptive and Analysis of Variance Table 95

Table 17. Comparison of Students' and Instructors' Perspectives of the 28 Qualities/ Behavior 96

List of Abbreviations

AACC	American Association of Community Colleges
AACSB	Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business
AASA	American Association of School Administrators
AAUP	American Association of University Professors
ABE	Adult Basic Education
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
CEU	Continuing Education Unit
ESL	English as Second Language
HSBC	Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation
IRB	Institutional Review Board
MANOVA	Multivariate Analysis of the Variance
SEEQ	Student Evaluation of Educational Quality
SET	Student Evaluation of Teaching
SUSCC	Southern Union State Community College
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Science
TBC	Teacher Behavior Checklist
US	United States of America

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Teaching is being seen as increasingly more important relative to the research goals of higher education" (Delaney, Johnson, Johnson, & Treslan, 2010, p. 1). Nevertheless, during the last couple of years, the quality of teaching and learning in colleges and universities has sharply dropped and become a major problem in most of the countries all over the world (Chen & Hoshower, 2003; Slate, LaPrairie, Schulte, & Onwuegbuzie, 2011).

Researchers who are experts in evaluation involving college teaching have established that teaching is multidimensional, that is, teaching involves several behaviors and activities. It follows, then, that students' assessments must document students' perceptions in regards to the various dimensions of an instructor's teaching behavior and performance (Marsh & Dunkin, 1997). In addition, Theall and Feldman (2007) proposed that the number and variety of issues affecting teaching and learning is exceptionally large and complex. For instance, Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) and Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates (2005) demonstrated that student performance was influenced by a number of circumstances beyond classroom teaching and other efforts of the faculty members. College instructors, existing in this same set of conditions, are affected in their teaching and their students' perceptions of it (Cranton & Knoop, 1991).

In clarifying teaching performance, there are important common factors that need to be identified. Teacher performance is influenced by the teachers' personality characteristics (Bridgwater, 1982; Curtis & Liying, 2001; Hughes, Costner, & Douzenis, 1988; Mayhew, 1986;

Mullins, 1992; Polk, 2006; Sherman & Blackburn, 1975). Furthermore, personality plays a significant role in the way teachers are evaluated on their teaching performance and their being effective in teaching. Typically, the behavior attributed to good teaching coincides with certain personal characteristics such as being friendly, approachable, warm, kind, appreciative, and inspiring (Young & Shaw, 1999). According to Sockett (1993), we often overlook the element of character by focusing on performance of the teaching act. He also postulated that it is impossible to separate the character of the individual teacher from the act of teaching.

A number of scientific studies point out the importance of the personality of the instructor (e.g. Clayson, 1999; Curran & Rosen, 2006). For example, Clayson and Haley (1990) found that the personality of the professor is the strongest element of the final evaluation of the professor's teaching effectiveness. Using structural equation modeling (SEM), Marks (2000) revealed a similar strong impact of liking/concern on the evaluation of the instructor. More recently, Clayson and Sheffet (2006) also found a consistent positive relationship between personality measures and course and instructor evaluations. Their results indicate that students associate instructional effectiveness with perceived personality and student evaluations of teaching (SET) are therefore "largely a measure of student-perceived personality" (Clayson & Sheffet, 2006, p. 158). The character/ personality of the professors is not something they possess but rather it is an interpretation of the professor's behavior by the student. Further research findings suggest that for students, excellent teaching seems to have more to do with who professors are than what they do or know or what efforts students themselves show (Delucchi, 2000; Moore & Kuol, 2007). Wayne and Young (2003) in their studies on a review of teacher characteristics and student achievement gains, confirm that students learn more from teachers with certain characteristics. Furthermore, Tichenor and Tichenor (2005) emphasized, "Interestingly, teachers discussed the

"character" component of the professionalism more than any other aspect. It is apparent that this is an important part of being a professional teacher." (p. 94). Thompson, Greer, and Greer (2004) at the beginning of each semester, have asked their university students about their favorite instructor, that is, the one from whom they able to learn the most. They found their answers are not surprising. The surprise is the consistency in the answer over time. Semester after semester, they collected data from students enrolled in their classes. At the beginning of a new semester, they engaged to their students, all teacher candidates, in a discussion of what indicates good teaching and they consistently recalled the very same characteristics year after year. These characteristics of teachers uniformly affect students in a positive way.

Realizing the importance of the teaching characteristics and its relation to the teaching effectiveness, this study has been conducted to explore the perception of students and instructors in adult and higher education regarding the significant characteristics of effective teaching as well as to identify the distinction between students and instructors' perceptions' correspondingly.

Statement of Problem

At the beginning of career transition as academicians, many new faculty members find a dilemma (Magnuson, Shaw, Tubin, & Norme, 2004). Involvement in the academic world requires new perspective adjustment as new faculty members are making the progression from student to a professor (Magnuson, 2002). They are not only adapting to a new identity, as a consequence of economic pressure in higher education, they also encounter increased teaching and advising duties in this rapidly changing environment (Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004).

Unfortunately, the majority of new faculty members obtained little or almost no teacher training (Jones, 2008) although they report spending most of their time with teaching duties rather than in research activities (Gale & Golde, 2004; Golde & Dore, 2001; Magnuson, 2002).

Due to this matter, most of new faculty members lack of basic teaching knowledge and skills. Pascarelli and Terenzini (1991) supported the view that faculty members do not know much about what effective teachers do in the classroom or what they think about effective teaching.

It corroborates with Cross (1990) who conceded "Most of us are naive observers of teaching and naive practitioners of the art and science of teaching as well" (p. 10). She contended that, "We don't know enough about the intricate processes of teaching and learning to be able to learn from our constant exposure to the classroom … as they are not prepared to observe the more subtle measures of learning" (p. 10). Cross stressed that "College teachers at every level need to know how to teach, not in an amateur way, in which some classes go well and others do not." Rather, professors "need to know how to teach in an expert way, with the ability to diagnose, analyze, evaluate, prescribe, and most importantly, improve the quality of teaching and learning in college classroom" (p. 11).

Researchers and practitioners (e.g. Abrami & D'Apollonia, 1991; Cashin & Downey, 1992; Feldman, 1997; Marsh & Roche 1993) concur that teaching is complex activity consisting of multiple dimensions (e.g. clarity, teachers' interactions with student, organization, enthusiasm) and that formative-diagnostic evaluations of teachers should reflect this multidimensionality (e.g. a teacher is organized but lacks enthusiasm). This correspond with Hill (2014) which stated, "Teaching involves not only requisite content knowledge but also skills to convey the content, the ability to organize and manage teaching, personal empathy to make connections with students, and ability to care about students' learning" (p. 64).

Learning is more than transmitting a basic fact. Hyland (2010) asserts, learning involves "the development of knowledge, values, emotions, understanding, reason, skill, experience and insight" (p. 525). Learning involves not only knowledge acquisition but also guiding students so

they may realize how their learning fits into their lives, how it is applicable to their roles and responsibilities, and, ultimately, how it is relevant to their life experiences (Hooks, 1994; Kanuka, 2010; Kasworm, 2008). Berry (2002) claimed, "Effective instructor must also know "how to organize and teach their lessons in ways that assure diverse students can learn those subjects…Highly qualified teachers don't just teach well-designed, standards-based lessons: They know how and why their students learn…" (p. 2). Chism, Lees, and Evenbeck, (2002) stressed, inappropriate teaching preparation, decrease in student attainment, and ineffective communication are some of the problems that will occur because of the lack of knowledge and skill in teaching adult learners.

Increasingly, higher education has viewed as a service industry and universities has started to emphasize more on meeting or even exceeding the needs of their students (Davis & Swanson, 2001; DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005). According to The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation (HSBC)'s 2014 report on the costs of studying abroad in different location, the United States (US) emerged as the third most-expensive option overall, behind Australia and Singapore. HSBC estimates the average annual cost of study in the US including tuition fees and living expenses around US$36,564. Multiply by four for most undergraduate courses and by two for most master's degrees, and for the majority of prospective students, attending university in US may seem really expensive while you look for a place to live. When transport and other living expenses are factored in, College Board estimates the following annual budgets for undergraduate students in 2014/15 is $16,325 (community college), $23,410 (in-state students at a four-year public college) and $37,229 (out-of-state students at a four-year public college) (Top Universities, 2015).

When people are really struggling paying for colleges, the college and university should seriously revise their frontline competency and service quality. Instructors would be expected to possess some sort of teaching qualities instead of focusing on conducting research and publishing papers. For that reason, the students' satisfaction assessment becomes more substantial to institutions that want to retain current and recruit new students (Helgesen & Nesset, 2007). Research has shown that the recruitment associated with college students is several times more costly compared to their retention (Joseph, Yakhou, & Stone, 2005) and therefore student retention becomes an important management task for institution, which gives rise to increasing emphasis on student satisfaction with the learning experience (Lala & Priluck, 2011). In this regard, Arambewela, Hall, and Zuhair (2006) consider student satisfaction as a key strategic variable in maintaining a competitive position, with long-term benefits arising from student loyalty, positive word-of-mouth, and image of the higher education institution. As a consequence, improving levels of student satisfaction and also reducing reasons for dissatisfaction would be beneficial to universities (Douglas, McClelland, & Davies, 2008).

Pozo-Munoz, Rebolloso-Pacheco, and Fernandez-Ramierz (2000) and Marzo-Navarro Pedraja-Iglesias and Rivera-Torres (2005) posited that teaching staff are main actors in a university exercising the largest positive influence on student satisfaction. Aaronson, Barrow, and Sander (2007) and Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain (2005) demonstrated that teaching is the most important factor influencing student performance, a study corroborated by Kristoff (2009) and Felch, Song, and Smith (2010). Given the strong link between this important construct and students' achievement, the power an effective teacher wields is unquestionable. (Mattar & El Khoury, 2014). Thus, the behaviors and attitudes of faculty should be primary determinants of students' satisfaction in higher education.

To address deficiency and to enhance instructor competency in teaching, perceptions from students should be seriously examined. Learning what exactly students value and even dissatisfactory components helps professors improve the classroom experience either by improving interpersonal skills or by just having a better understanding of the student's perspective (Davis & Swanson, 2001). Similarly, Desai, Damewood, and Jones (2001,) propose that "the more faculty members understand about students, the better they can provide educational services to them" (p. 136). Gained insights can then be used to be more responsive to students during student-professor encounters without compromising integrity. As clients of higher education, students should expect to receive good quality teaching and learning experience.

Nowadays, the roles and responsibility of the effective teacher are getting tougher and challenging. Rubio (2010), stressed that:

> These days, many people can be a teacher, but the question is, if many people can be effective teacher. Clearly, to be an effective teacher is more complicated and difficult than many people think. To be an effective teacher does not only involve having a deep content knowledge, but also organizational, management and communication skills, being able to organize instructions, and providing relevant assessment and fair evaluations. In addition, an effective teacher is responsible to create a warm classroom climate, to promote enthusiasm, motivation and an interactive teacher-student relationship. Also, it implies to be caring and understandable, and above all, to enhance learning (p. 35).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the student and instructor perception of effective teaching characteristics as well as to investigate the distinction between them. This research was

conducted to determine the association of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between student and instructors in a vocational setting. The objectives are: 1) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of students in vocational education; 2) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education; 3) to identify if there is any significant difference perception on effective teaching characteristics between students and instructors. This study was to determine if there were disparities of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between college students and faculty especially in a vocational education setting. For example, some instructors might believe mastering the content of subject knowledge is more important than building rapport with the student. They may also think by obtaining an advanced degree and possessing a number of experiences in their teaching areas, these efforts will enhance their teaching effectiveness. The student may expect the educator to develop rapport and display openness crucial to understanding.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of students in vocational education?
2. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education?
3. Is there a difference between students and instructors in vocational education based on teaching qualities?

Significance of the Study

Knowledge gained from this study should be helpful in better understanding the views of participants concerning characteristics of effective instructors. This information can be used to build a deeper literature on, as perceived by college students, what comprises effective instructors. Prospective educators can use the finding study to guide them in preparing for the teaching profession and providing ideas about the profession. Moreover, it is crucial to discern whether universal characteristics of effective college faculty differ substantially by student demographic characteristics.

Limitations

This study has several limitations and will be conducted within the following parameters:

1. This study is limited to students aged 18 years old and above and instructors in technical and vocational education.
2. This study is conducted with a majority of undergraduate students from two academic programs at a two-year higher education institution located in the South.
3. The data sources of this study solely rely on survey data collection. The most typical drawback of the survey research methods is the low response rate of the participants. (Fowler, 2002).
4. Results and findings of the study are subjected to the two strategies assessment of measuring effective teaching which is students rating and self-evaluation.

Hence, the generalization application from the findings of this study to a larger populations or group among other college or other higher education institutions is not suggested or should be manage with full consideration.

Assumptions

In this study, some assumptions will be expected and acknowledged by the researcher. Researcher assumes that:

1. There is significant difference of perceptions on effective teaching characteristics between students and instructors.
2. Respondents understood the survey questions.
3. Respondents will provide sincere and truthful answers in reflecting their actual perceptions and attitudes.
4. Participants in this population would have an equal opportunity to participate.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in the study:

1. Community college: A local two-year college at which students can learn a skill or prepare to enter a university (Cambridge Dictionaries Online, 2016).
2. Effective Teaching: "The process of selecting the materials, resources, teaching strategies, and assignments that have the greatest potential to contribute to student learning" (Lowman, 1996, p. 38).
3. Faculty/ Faculty member: In North American usage refers to the academic staff of a university: professors of various ranks (adjunct professors, assistant professors, associate professors, and (full) professors) lecturers, and/or researchers, and usually tenured (or tenure-track) in terms of their contract of employment (Wikipedia: Faculty, 2016).
4. Higher education: Education beyond the secondary level; especially education provided by a college or university (Merriam-Webster Dictionaries, 2016).

5. Instructor: A teacher in college or university who ranks below an assistant professor (Dictionary.com, 2016).
6. Master teacher: “The ability to stimulate strong positive emotions in students is what separates the competent from the outstanding college teacher” (Lowman, 1995, p. 23).
7. Teaching Characteristics: “The values and standards a teacher holds as observed through the operational approaches used to transmit them. Examples include the teacher’s degree of flexibility, perceptions of the most importance of what and how much is taught and/ or learned, and the amount of direction and supervision provided to students” (Dun & Dun, 1979, p. 242).

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the effective teaching characteristics from students’ and instructors’ perspectives. This chapter includes the presentation of the problems statement, research questions, purpose and significant of the study as well as limitations, assumption and definition of terms. Chapter 2 focuses on the review of the related literature and previous studies of students’ and instructors’ perceptions on effective teaching and comparison of their perception. Chapter 3 reports and rationalizes the utilization of every procedures and method selection in this study, such as in population determination, instrument, data collection and data analysis. Chapter 4 informs the data interpretation and presents the findings of the study. Finally, Chapter 5 includes the summary of the study, conclusions, implications and recommendations for further practice and research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to get the ideas and bigger picture about this topic, this chapter reviewed the related literature, finding and previous studies on effective teaching characteristics from student and instructor perspectives. Intellectual arguments, academic debates and reasonable disputes of this chapter will be used as the foundation and critics of the discussion in Chapter 5.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the student and instructor perception of effective teaching characteristics as well as to investigate the distinction between them. This research was conducted to determine the association of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between student and instructors in a vocational setting. The objectives are: 1) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of students in vocational education; 2) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education; 3) to identify if there is any significant difference perception on effective teaching characteristics between students and instructors. This study was to determine if there were disparities of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between college students and faculty especially in a vocational education setting. For example, some instructors might believe mastering the content of subject knowledge is more important than building rapport with the student. They may also think by obtaining an advanced degree and possessing a number of experiences in their teaching areas, these efforts will enhance their teaching effectiveness. The

student may expect the educator to develop rapport and display openness crucial to understanding.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of students in vocational education?
2. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education?
3. Is there a difference between students and instructors in vocational education based on teaching qualities?

Effective Teaching Characteristics

Prior to gaining a better understanding of characteristics of effective teaching, it is necessary to provide the definition of what effective teaching is. Effective teaching was defined as systematic (Hativa, Barak, & Simhi, 2001), stimulating, caring (Cohen, 1981; Marsh, 1982; McKeachie & Kulik 1975) well-planned, determined and high expectations (Allan, Clarke & Jopling, 2009; Hativa et al., 2001). Lowman (1996) expended the scope of effective teaching by defining it as "the process of selecting the materials, resources, teaching strategies, and assignments that have the greatest potential to contribute to student learning" (p. 38).

On the other hand, Walker (2010) generally described effective characteristics as the special personal qualities of the teacher who was most successful in helping students to learn; which enabled them to become a successful educator. Cruickshank, Jenkins, and Metcalf (2003) added "most people would agree that good teachers are caring, supportive, concerned about the welfare of students, knowledgeable about their subject matter, able to get along with

parents…and genuinely excited about the work that they do…Effective teachers are able to help students learn" (p. 329). Swank, Taylor, Brady, and Frieberg (1989) considered teacher effectiveness as increasing academic questions and decreasing lecture.

Murray (1997) defined effective teaching in terms of the faculty member characteristics of enthusiasm and expressiveness, clarity of expression, and rapport/ interaction. This consistent with Kane, Sandretto, and Heath (2004) who concluded that effective teaching includes the characteristics of personality, skills, subject knowledge, and reflective practice. While Rubio (2010) expressed that "An effective teacher has been considered, sometimes, as a perfectionist, encouraging, approachable and caring, other times as intelligent, but above all, as enthusiastic, funny, clever, affective and understanding, open, and with a relaxed style while teaching" (p. 36).

However, Theall (1999) viewed effective teaching as a "complex, multidimensional, dynamic process affected by the individuals who involved in the process as well as by the circumstances in the classroom" (p. 30). This coincides with Stronge, Tucker and Hindman (2004) stated that an effective teacher is always in a constant learning process due to changes in terms of the students' characteristics, the curriculum, the community, and finance among many others. However, he also added that teaching is vocational, and most effective teachers are passionate about their chosen profession.

Numerous researchers have conducted studies to reveal what qualities and corresponding behaviors make for effective teaching (e.g. Buskist, 2004; Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, & Saville, 2002; Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn, & Buskist, 2003). Effective teaching is complex and research indicates that measures of effective teaching are multifaceted and multidimensional (Marsh & Roche, 1997; Sheehan & DuPrey, 1999; Tang, 1997).

Important characteristics of effective instructors have been debated in the literature for many years (Oesch, 2005). Some researchers focused on addressing ineffective attributes of teaching which impede student learning and suggest strategies for improvement. Carson (1996) suggests three dominant characteristics shared by ineffective professors: (1) lack of passion for their subject matter; (2) inability to connect students to academic subjects; and (3) indifference or hostility to students. While arrogance, dullness, rigidity, insensitivity, self-indulgence, vanity, and hypocrisy were stated at the seven deadly sins of teaching (Eble, 1983). On the contrary, modesty, use of humor, showing care for student and respecting others' point of view were attributes that are correlated to highest students rating for instructors (Murray, 1985). This also oppositely corroborates with Ramsden (2003) which emphasized concern and respect for students and student learning as one of six key principles of effective teaching in higher education, besides appropriate assessment and helpful feedback; making the subject interesting and explaining it clearly; clear goals and intellectual challenge; independence, control and engagement i.e. students feeling control over their learning and finally, learning from students e.g. being open to change and continually improving.

Allan, Clarke, and Jopling (2009) summarized effective teaching into four domains: providing a supportive learning environment; having high academic expectations; scaffolding learning; and providing clear explanations/ clarity. Five components for highly effective teaching and learning have been identified (Kentucky Department of Education, 2013): learning climate, classroom assessment and reflection, instructional rigor and student engagement, instructional relevance and knowledge of content.

As part of a teacher assessment project, Collins (1990) was able to determine five criteria for an effective teacher that included his/her commitment to students and learning, knowledge

about the subject matter, management of students, reflection on own practice, and participation in a learning community. Qualities of effective teaching or teachers extracted from a review study by Wotruba and Wright (1975) highlighted: (a) communication skills, (b) favorable attitudes, (c) knowledge of subject, (d) good organizational skills, (e) enthusiasm, (f) fairness, (g) flexibility, (h) encouraging to students, and (i) providing interesting lectures.

According to Seldin (1999), effective teachers have the following attributes: 1) respect and care for students, 2) use active student learning, 3) use different instructional modes, 4) provide frequent and prompt feedback to students on their performance, 5) offer relevant and practical real-world examples, 6) draw inferences from models and use analogies, 7) provide clear expectations for assignments, 8) create a conducive class environment which is comfortable for students, 9) communicate to the level of their students, 10) present themselves in class as "real people", 11) assess and improve their teaching through the use of feedback from students and others too and 12) consistently reflect on their own performance in classroom for continues improvement.

According to Miller (as quoted in Seldin, 1999, p. 156) effective teachers personify enthusiasm for their students, their area of competence, and life itself. They know their subject, can explain it clearly, and are willing to do so-in or out of class…Class periods are interesting and, at times, alive with excitement. They approach their area of competence and their students with integrity that is neither stiff nor pompous, and their attitude and demeanor are more caught than taught.

Previous research has found that effectiveness is related to physical attractiveness and vocal clarity (Feeley, 2002), teacher likeability and interpersonal interactions, a positive experience (Delucchi & Pelowski, 2000; Sinai, Tiberius, de Groot, Brunet, & Voore, 2001),

teaching style (McKeachie, Lin, Moffett, & Daugherty, 1978), teacher extroversion and age (Radmacher & Martin, 2001), humor (Kher, Molstad, & Donahue, 1999), proper workload (Marsh, 2001), clear presentation of the material and preparedness of the instructor (Carkenord & Stephens, 1994; Tang, 1997), rapport (Lowman & Mathie, 1993; Perkins, Schenk, Stephan, & Vrungos, 1995), and encouragement of questions (Carkenord & Stephens, 1994). Schaeffer, et al., (2003) found that of the factors related to teaching effectiveness approachability, creativeness and interest, encouragement and caring, enthusiasm, flexibility and open mindedness, knowledge, realistic expectations and fairness, and respectfulness ranked at the top. Feldman (1976) identified teacher's interest, knowledge, public speaking skills, value of the course material, and intellectual expansiveness as important elements to effective teaching. Jackson, Teal, Raines, Nansel, Force, and Burdsal (1999) found that rapport with students, course value, course organization, fairness in grading, difficulty of the course, and course workload for the students were key indicators of teaching effectiveness. Although it may be difficult to define effective teaching, it is a construct that is stable, with a high degree of agreement among students (Harrison, Ryan, & Moore, 1996) and instructors (Miller, Dzindolet, Wienstein, Xie, & Stones, 2001; Schaeffer et al., 2003).

In a meta-analysis that focuses on empirical studies of teacher quality and qualifications, Rice (2003) found five broad categories of teacher attributes that appear to contribute to teacher quality: (1) experience, (2) preparation programs and degrees, (3) type of certification, (4) coursework taken in preparation for the profession, and (5) teachers' own test scores. Wayne and Youngs (2003) also targeted teacher quality in their analysis of studies that examined the characteristics of effective teachers and their link to student effectiveness. Similar to Rice, Wayne and Youngs (2003) examined ratings of teachers' undergraduate institutions, teachers'

test scores, degrees and coursework, and certification status. They concluded that "students learn more from teachers with certain characteristics…Teachers differ greatly in their effectiveness, but teachers with and without different qualifications differ only a little" (p. 100-101). Berry (2002) posits that while these teacher qualities are indeed important they appear to have a "singular focus on content knowledge" (p. 1). Highly qualified teachers must also know "how to organize and teach their lessons in ways that assure diverse students can learn those subjects…Highly qualified teachers don't just teach well-designed, standards-based lessons: They know how and why their students learn…" (p. 2).

Some studies showed that qualities of effective teaching can be universal. The plain definition (while somewhat cynical) is that effective teaching is anything that results in positive evaluations of teaching (Neath, 1996; Nussbaum, 1992). This somehow sound almost similarly like Cashin (1989) who expressed that effective teaching constitute "all the instructor behaviors that help students learn" (p. 4), and college teaching involved several areas as follows: subject matter mastery, curriculum development, course design, delivery of instruction, assessment of instruction, availability to students, and administrative requirements, and as a matter of course, these aspects should be addressed while assessing teaching effectiveness. Brown and Atkins (1988) concluded effective teaching is best estimated in relation to your own goals of teaching. What is clear that effective teaching has been defined a number of ways without a consensus of what it is.

The goal of this paper is not to detail every factor that contributes to effective teaching (there are many), but rather, to propose a method for evaluating what works and what does not in the certain teaching environment. This literature on effective characteristics also yields evidence

as to the importance of the traits, practices and behaviors of teachers. These finding are primarily based on students' perspective of what constitutes effective teaching.

Community College Student

Approximately 45% of almost 14 million higher education students are enrolled in college today, are enrolled in a community college or other 2-year college (Saunders & Bauer, 1998). Between 1978 and 1991, enrollment at U.S. community colleges increase by 31% compared to 23% at universities (Greenberg, 1999). Since the 1990's both universities and community colleges have experienced the average student age rise, but the proportional increase of non-traditional students has been significantly higher in the community colleges (American Association of Community Colleges, 2002).

According to Saunders and Bauer (1998), universities typically have a uniform student body that share similar goals and objectives. Instead of one uniform student body, community colleges have many subgroups within their student bodies. Community colleges usually relying on upon commuter students, while many universities have student bodies consists of resident students and commuters (Saunders & Bauer, 1998). Amount of time spent on campus differs greatly, just like the programs offered by both the different institutions. Community colleges normally have few students who participate in campus life activities that keep them on campus beyond that of class and study time. Universities, along with their fraternity and sorority activities, many clubs and organizations, maintain campus activities that keep students on-campus and taking part in campus life (Oesch, 2005).

Sanders and Bauer (1998) informed that the community college students include: A sixteen year old student who happens to be tired of high school and is also simultaneously utilizing the last two years of high school as well as the first year of college. Then, will

transfer and finish a four year degree. Although some universities allow dual enrollment students, that vast majority of these students attend the community colleges. A nineteen year - old completing the second year of a two year transfer program frequently lives at home to spend less.

Whenever a few universities offer specialized vocational training programs, the community colleges took on this particular responsibility in numerous states. For instance, a jobless individual in their mid-twenties opted in for basic reading to enhance literacy skills to be able to get a new job. While 81% of universities offer basic literacy skills training, 100% of community colleges offer literacy skills training (Hansen, 1998). A local student who failed English at the local university and is attempting to increase her grade point average (GPA) to re-enter the university. A thirty-three-year-old man taking conversational Spanish during the night for a visit to Mexico. While universities offer foreign language classes, they usually are tailor-made for degree seeking students. The community colleges offer many non-credit courses that come with useful knowledge and skills that universities do not commonly provide. A recent immigrant from Russia currently joining English as a Second Language and citizenship courses. While some universities offer ESL courses and citizenship course, the community colleges have already been assigned this responsibility in many states. ESL enrollment increased nearly 50% throughout the last decade (Greenburg, 1999).

Although some universities offer non-degree and Continuing Education Unit (CEU) computer classes, the community colleges offer these classes at convenient times for working adults. The client service group from a national known insurance provider company attending a workshop together on conflict resolution and quality improvement. The mother of four year old twins, who is attending a parenting skills class as the twins are attending a pre-

school. Even though some universities offer parenting skills programs, the community colleges have already been assigned this responsibility in lots of states.

Universities and community colleges differ greatly when comparing students' ages and gender. Nation-wide the average age of a postsecondary education student is twenty one, however the average age for a community college student is twenty-nine (American Association of Community College, 2002). This average age as a result of the fact that the community college students range in age from young teenagers to senior citizens. Females represent 58% of all of the community college students, which is slightly more than the 55% of the student body at universities and other 4-year institutions (American Association of Community Colleges, 2002).

Dual enrollment students, while presently only comprising a small percentage of the community college population, are steadily increasing in numbers on the community college campus. Andrews (2000) reported that dual enrollment high school students accounted for approximately 3.6% (123,039 students) of the community college student body in 1995. List of researchers' project the number of dual enrollment students will significantly increase during the first decade of the 21st century. This will be due aided by the fact that state lawmakers will seriously consider funding dual enrollment programs to stimulate faster progression through college, and moreover to help relieve overcrowding in the national schools.

Ethnic diversity differences can certainly be observed between the community colleges and four-year institutions. Since community colleges traditionally draw students from a local population, they are consists of the ethnic diversity of the community. Students in the community college range from recent arrivals to the US (immigrant) to longtime permanent residents or citizens. Community colleges' open door policies are alluring to newcomers to the

United States and also to ethnic minorities. Minority students comprised 31.8% from the total population of community college students in 1997. That number has risen significantly since 1976, once the composition of minority students at community colleges was 19.8% (Foote, 1997). Community colleges enroll approximately 45% of African Americans enrolled in higher education, 52% of all the Hispanic students, and 56% of Native Americans enrolled in college (AACC, 2002). Community college students, similar to their traditional four-year institution counterparts, will tend to be employed. By far the most current national data propose that up to 70% of community college students have a job either full or part-time while enrolled in classes (AACC, 2002). Those students who are employed on a fulltime basis are greater at the community college level than at the four-year institution level (Saunders & Bauer, 1998). Part-time enrollment reached an increased of 64% of the total community college enrollment in 1997 (Bryant, 2001).

Community colleges provides a better atmosphere especially for those students with jobs and family to enroll on a part-time basis. According to Bryant (2001), students age 35 and older make up a larger percentage of part-time students than fulltime students. Community colleges are incredibly appealing to returning students, particularly for people that have children. Numerous community colleges offer affordable daycare which makes it feasible for these students to join classes. A lot of students with children, as a consequence of related time restraints, tend not to involve themselves in co-curricular activities at the college. Generally, due to their professional or family obligations, community college students would not have enough time to involve themselves in co-curricular activities on campus. On the other hand, lots of students at the university level take part in co-curricular activities mainly because of the different lifestyles that they lead. Community college students frequently have different

personal, career, and life goals from the majority of the typical four-year college or university student. Since community college students have a really wide range of goals, the institutions are likely to offer a wide selection of programs. Most students attend community colleges to reinforce or upgrade their job skills as well as to strengthen their economic outlooks (Saunders & Bauer, 1998). Remedial courses, adult basic education (ABE), ESL classes are featured in the community college setting and draw students who most likely is not enrolled in higher education elsewhere.

Finally, based on the 15 years' experiences teaching at the community college, Oesch (2005) predicted that students may attend the community college for a variety of reasons compared to those students who decided to attend a university. Whether students have started their college career with thoughts of transferring to some university, upgrading their skills, or attending a course to study a new hobby, students attend the community college for their own purposes. Students are interested in the community college simply because of smaller class sizes, personalized attention, including a student/learning centered environment which large major universities are unable to provide. Cohen and Brawer (1996) speculate that students attend two-year institutions because community colleges are instantly responsive, they tend not to have punitive grading, and they have forgiveness for past educational failings.

Student Ratings

"With the surge in public demand for accountability in higher education and the great concern for quality of university teaching, the practice of collecting student ratings of teaching has been widely adopted by universities all over the world as part of the quality assurance system" (Kwan, 1999, p. 181). Ratings reflect students' opinion about teaching, and they do correlate with learning (Cohen, 1981), but some degree they also indicate students' general satisfaction with

their experiences. Obtaining feedback from students is an essential requirement of reflective teaching, allowing teachers to refine their practice and to continue developing as professionals (Gonzalez & Gonzalez, 2013). Many methods can be used to obtain feedback, but the literature suggests that satisfaction surveys predominate (Frick, Chadha, Watson, Wang, & Green, 2009; Kember & Leung, 2009) and student ratings are used as one, sometimes the only, and often the most influential, measure of teaching effectiveness (Harvey, 2003; Kwan 1999). Student feedback is considered a valuable instrument to improve the quality of teaching as it provides the teachers with useful insights into the strength and weakness of their teaching practice (Kember, Leung, & Kwan, 2002; Kulik, 2001; Penny, 2003). It is certain that most researchers believe that the results of student ratings provide evaluators with valid, reliable and valuable data concerning the quality and effectiveness of teaching (Penny, 2003). In fact, Marsh (1987) and McKeachie (1997) conceded, as a result of an extensive review of the research literature, that student evaluation of teaching is probably the only indicator for teaching effectiveness of which validity has been proved this thoroughly. Theall and Franklin (2001), for instance, state that:

> Students spend a full term in the courses, observe the instructor in class and interactions with students and can accurately judge what or how much they have learned with respect to their knowledge at entry. Students can report the frequencies of teacher behaviors, the amount of work required, and the difficulty of the material. They can answer questions about the clarity of lectures, the value of readings and assignments, the clarity of the instructor's explanations, the instructor's availability and helpfulness, and many other aspects of the teaching and learning process. No one else is as qualified to report on what transpired during the term simply because no one else is present for as much of the term. (p. 48)

The most controversial issue in teaching effectiveness measures is revolve around student ratings. Student ratings have been used in a systematic way for a long period of time at universities and colleges in Northern America. Marsh (1984) explained that although they are reasonably supported by research findings, student ratings are controversial for several faculty, who usually lack formal training in teaching and are supposed to demonstrate teaching skills so as to get tenure, promotion, or merit increase. Consequently, they will be threatened by any procedure used to evaluate teaching effectiveness and criticize it. These ratings of controversy were initially used for the purpose of helping students select courses and professors while inadvertently attracting administrators in making personnel and program decisions (Ory, 1991). Started on voluntary basis on instructor's part, students' ratings of instructors turned out to be a required participation due to student demands for faculty accountability and improving courses in the 1960's.

Consequently, administrators agreed on considering very low rating results when reviewing teaching assignments as well as tenure and promotion to some extent. In the 1970's, myriad research was conducted to investigate the reliability and validity of student ratings, some of which were factor analytic studies. The 1980's ushered in the administrative use of student ratings. Ory (1991) stated "…many administrators who were satisfied with the research supporting the validity and reliability of ratings began to view student ratings as a useful and necessary indicator of a professor's teaching ability" (p. 32). While the controversy still continues with regard to their validity and reliability, student ratings constitute the primary portion in evaluating teaching. Today, almost every higher education institution incorporates student ratings in assessing teaching effectiveness.

Marsh and Roche (1997) affirmed that the reason why student ratings are used as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness is due to lack of support for the validity of other indicators of effective teaching. However, this does not suggest that students cannot provide accurate judgment of teaching quality. As a matter of fact, students are believed to serve as source of data in delivery of instruction (e.g. methods, skills, aids), assessment of instruction (e.g. tests, papers and projects, practicums, grading practices), availability to students (e.g. office hours, other, and informal contacts), and administrative requirements (e.g. book orders, library reserve, syllabi on file, comes to class, grade reports) (Cashin, 1989), and in judging instructor's approach, fairness, and clarity of explanations (Chism, 1999). Marsh (1984) explains that:

> Student ratings are multidimensional; reliable and stable; primarily function of the instructor who teaches a course rather than the course that is taught, relatively valid against a variety of indicators of effective teaching. Student ratings relatively unaffected by a variety of variables hypothesized as potential biases. It also seen to be useful by faculty as feedback about their teaching, by students for use in course selection, and by administrators for use in personnel decisions (p. 707).

In concert with Marsh's statements, student ratings are regarded as valid and reliable source of data of teaching effectiveness and are argued to be supplemented with other evidence with regard to teaching effectiveness by several researchers (Alsmadi, 2005; Cashin, 1988, 1995; Greenwald, 1997; Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997; Marsh, 1982; Marsh & Roche, 1997; McKeachie, 1997; Obenchain, Abernathy, & Wiest, 2001). Cashin (1995) reviewed literature related to research on assessing teaching effectiveness in multiple section courses, in which the different sections were instructed by different instructor but employed the same syllabus, textbook, and external exam. Based on his review, Cashin concluded that the classes in which

students gave high ratings tended to be the classes where the students learned more, measured by the external exam; the correlation between students' and instructors' ratings yielded coefficients of .29 and .49, whereas it yielded coefficients of .47 to .62, .48 to .69, .40 to .75, and .50 between student ratings and administrators', colleagues', and alumni's, and trained observers' ratings, respectively. This review contributes to supporting the validity and hence the reliability of student ratings.

Students are considered to provide the most essential judgmental data about the quality of teaching strategies applied by the teachers as well as the personal impact of the teachers on their learning (Chism, 1999). Their feedback can be used to confirm and supplement teachers' self-assessment of their teaching. Nevertheless, they should not be considered as accurate judges in determining the competency of teachers in that particular area or the currency of their teaching strategies (Chism, 1999). In those domains, peer judgments seem to provide more accurate and, hence, useful information.

Involving students in the assessment of teaching quality seems to be a simple procedure as long as the measure is clearly defined, and it also possesses credibility for several reasons: Since the input is from a number of raters, reliability estimates tend to be usually quite high, and ratings are made by students who have continually observed the teaching behaviors in considerable amount, suggesting they are based on representative behavior. Also, as students are the observers who have been personally affected, these ratings demonstrate high face validity (Hoyt & Pallett, 1999). Marsh (1984) stated that there are various purposes of student evaluation ranging from diagnostic feedback to improve teaching to measure of evidence for tenure and promotion. They also provide useful information for students to choose from different sections, when publicized, and they can also be used in research on teaching.

While a plethora of research has shown evidence that support the reliability and validity of student ratings, several researchers and academicians have been concerned regarding these issues due to potential biases such as gender of the student, gender of the professor, major of the student, and the expected grades, to name a few. Numerous studies have been conducted to shed light upon these issues. To illustrate, Basow and Silberg's research (1987) indicated gender bias in their investigation of the influence of students' and professors' gender in the assessment of their teaching effectiveness. They found a significant teacher and student genders' interaction on students' evaluation of college professors. The results implied that male students rated male professors higher than female professors in dimensions such as scholarship, organization/clarity, dynamism/enthusiasm, and overall teaching ability, while female students rated female professors more negatively than they rated male professors on instructor/individual student interaction, dynamism/ enthusiasm, and overall teaching ability. Student major was also found to have an effect on the evaluations of professors. That is, on all measures, scholarship, organization/clarity, instructor-group interaction, instructor-individual student interaction, dynamism-enthusiasm, and overall teaching effectiveness, engineering students provided the most negative ratings of teaching effectiveness, while humanities students the most positive.

In another study, Basow (1995) analyzed the effects of professor gender, student gender, and discipline of the course on student evaluations of professors within four semesters, while controlling for professor rank, teaching experience, student year, student grade point average, expected grade, and the hour the class meet. The research results indicated that overall student gender did not have a significant effect on the ratings of male professors, whereas it did on the ratings of female professors as the highest ratings were provided by the female students and the lowest were by the male students. The male and female students perceived and evaluated male

professors similarly, whereas female professors were evaluated differently depending on the divisional affiliation of the student. In the same study (Basow, 1995), female professors were rated higher by female students especially those in humanities, but received lower ratings by male students, especially those in social sciences. There were also differences between the ratings of the male and female professors in different dimensions of teaching effectiveness. For example, male faculty tended to received higher ratings than female faculty in terms of knowledge, and the female faculty received higher ratings in respect, sensitivity, and student freedom to express ideas.

Professor characteristics such as attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness were also found to influence teaching effectiveness (Freeman, 1988), suggesting a relationship between perceptions of teacher characteristics and teaching effectiveness. Another non-teaching factor, the perceptions of how funny the professor is, was also reported to be positively correlated with the student ratings of teaching effectiveness (Adamson, O'kane, & Shevlin, 2005). In addition, the proximity to the teacher in the classroom was found to be a factor in how professors are rated by their students (Safer, Farmer, Segalla, & Elhoubi, 2005). That is, the closer students were to the professor, the higher did they rate them. In the same study, it was found that higher grades were positively correlated with higher ratings, while the time of the class indicated no statistical significance in student ratings.

In 1970's grading leniency was a prime concern for researchers who were skeptical of the validity of student ratings (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997). "Grading leniency hypothesis proposes that instructors who give higher-than-deserved grades will receive higher-than-deserved student ratings, and this constitutes a serious bias to student ratings" (Marsh, 1984, p. 737). This suggests that professors who are after high ratings although they are not effective in

teaching will resort to giving higher grades to their students, which becomes a threat to the validity of these ratings. Marsh (1984) argued that when there is correlation between course grades and students rating as well as course grades and performance on the final exam, higher ratings might be due to more effective teaching resulting in greater learning, satisfaction with the grades bring about students' rewarding the teacher, or initial differences in student characteristics such as motivation, subject interest, and ability. In his review of research, Marsh (1984) reported grading leniency effect in experimental studies. Marsh concluded the following: "Consequently, it is possible that a grading leniency effect may produce some bias in student ratings, support for this suggestion is weak and the size of such an effect is likely to be insubstantial in the actual use of student ratings" (p. 741). While stating that the grading leniency may account for little influence on student ratings if any, Greenwald and Gillmore (1997) pointed out that understanding the third variable that contributes to the correlation between expected grades and student ratings prevents drawing causational conclusions between these two variables. Greenwald and Gillmore introduced instructional quality, student's motivation, and student's course-specific motivation, as possible third variables, which explains the correlation between these two variables, suggesting no concern about grades having improper influence on ratings. They also proposed that the students tend to attribute their unfavorable grades to poor instruction, and hence give low ratings to professors. Greenwald and Gillmore's (1997) research indicated that "giving higher grades, by itself, might not be sufficient to ensure high ratings. Nevertheless, if an instructor varied nothing between two course offerings other than grading policy, higher ratings would be expected in the more leniently graded course" (p. 1214). Freeman (1988) asserted that professors' attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness influence teaching effectiveness. Likewise, students' perceptions of professors' sense of humor

was also reported to be positively correlated with the student ratings of teaching effectiveness (Adamson, O'Kane, & Shevlin, 2005) and about 93 percent student viewed humor as an essential ingredient in teaching (Check, 1979). Instructors who are successful use humor in the classroom, interact with students formally by means of office visits, email or phone and informally such as conversations between classes (Aylor & Oppliger, 2003).

Another non-teaching factor influencing teaching effectiveness was found to be the proximity to the teacher in the classroom (Safer, Farmer, Segalla, & Elhoubi, 2005). Accordingly, the closer students were to the professor, the higher ratings they gave to their professors. In the relevant research study, it was reported that higher grades were positively correlated with higher ratings; however, the time the class was offered had no statistical significance relation to the student ratings.

Cashin (1995) asserted that although they seem to show little or no correlation at all, instructor characteristics such as gender, age, teaching experience, personality, ethnicity and research productivity, students' age, gender, GPA, or personality does not cloud the measure of teachers' effectiveness. However, faculty rank, expressiveness, expected grades, student motivation, level of course, academic field, and workload are prone to correlate with student ratings. Cashin suggested that student motivation and academic field should be controlled, the students should be informed about the purpose of the evaluation, and the instructor should not be present during the student evaluations so as to receive valid scores.

Besides potential biases as mentioned earlier, researchers also raised concerns with regard to whether the student evaluations should provide single score or multiple scores of different dimensions. For example, Marsh (1984) provided an overview of research findings in the area of student evaluation of teaching in terms of methodological issues and weaknesses

trying to provide guidance in designing instruments that would effectively measure teaching and their implications for use. Marsh pointed out that, despite the fact that student ratings should be undeniably multidimensional as the construct it builds on is that way, most evaluation instruments fail to reflect this multidimensionality. With regard to instrumentation, Marsh (1984) contended the following:

> If a survey instrument contains an ill-defined hodgepodge of items, and student ratings are summarized by an average of these items, then there is no basis for knowing what is being measured, no basis for differentially weighting different components in the way most appropriate to the particular purpose they are to serve, nor any basis for comparing the results with other findings. If a survey contains separate groups of related items derived from a logical analysis of the content of effective teaching and the purposes the ratings are to serve, or a carefully constructed theory of teaching and learning, and if empirical procedures such as factor analysis and multi-trait-multimethod analyses demonstrate that items within the same group do measure separate and distinguishable traits, then it is possible to interpret what is being measured (p. 709).

Marsh (1984) stated that "there is no single criterion of effective teaching" (p. 709); therefore, a construct validation of student ratings is required, which would show that student ratings are related to a variety of indicators of teaching effectiveness. Under this procedure, it is expected that different dimensions of teaching effectiveness will correlate highly with different indicators of it. Similarly, Marsh and Roche (1997) advocated the multidimensionality of student ratings both conceptually and empirically, just like the construct they are built on. They believed that if this is ignored, the validity of these ratings will be undermined as well. Student ratings of effective teaching are also believed to be better understood by multiple dimensions instead of a

single summary of score (Marsh & Hocevar, 1984), while some researchers argue in favor of the opposite.

For example, Cashin and Downey (1992) investigated the usefulness of global items in the prediction of weighted-composite evaluations of teaching and reported that the global items explained a substantial amount of the variance (more than 50%) in the weighted-composite criterion measure. This view is also supported D'Apollonia and Abrami (1997), who declared that even though effective teaching might be multidimensional, student ratings of instruction measure general instructional skills such as delivery, facilitation of interactions, and evaluation of student learning, and they state that these ratings have a large global factor.

There are several limitations of student ratings. For example, Hoyt and Pallett (1999) insisted that some of the instruments are poorly constructed due to unrelated items, unclear wording, ambiguous questions, and response alternatives which fail to exhaust the possibilities; unstandardized results, which inhibit comparisons among faculty members; and the fact that while interpreting the results, extraneous variables such as class size, student motivation, and course difficulty, which are beyond instructor's control, are not taken into account. Despite the evidence to support their validity and reliability; and their prevalence in higher education, student ratings are to be treated with caution.

Self-Rating Assessment

While student feedback is relevant and fruitful, instructor self-evaluation is also an important informative and beneficial source of evidence to consider. Despite this possibly biased estimate of our own teaching effectiveness, this evidence can provide support for what we do in the classroom and can present a picture of our teaching unobtainable from any other source (Berk, 2005). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1994) found that 82%

of four-year colleges and universities reported using self-evaluations to measure teaching performance. The American Association of University Professors, (AAUP) (1974) concluded that self-evaluation would improve the faculty review process. Further, it seems reasonable that our assessment of our own teaching should count for something in the teaching effectiveness equation.

The instructor can also complete the student rating scale from two perspectives: as a direct measure of his or her teaching performance and then as the anticipated ratings the students should give. Faculty input on their own teaching completes the triangulation of the two direct observation sources of teaching performance: students and self. Overall, an instructor's self-evaluation demonstrates his or her knowledge about teaching and perceived effectiveness in the classroom (Cranton, 2001). Gruber, Chowdhury, Lowrie, Brodowsky, Reppel, and Voss, (2012) in their study recommend for researchers interested in the measurement of service quality and satisfaction in higher education should also take the perspectives of other stakeholders (e.g. families, the government, and faculty) into consideration as well. Thus, the fellow researchers could investigate whether student perception differ greatly from what other stakeholders believe students want. Researchers could then compare the results to highlight different views. Insight gained should help make professors aware of differing perceptions and serve as a basis for continuing development and improvement (p. 174).

Self-assessment involves teachers' evaluation of their own teaching. Cashin (1989) advocated self-assessment in evaluating teaching as there might be aspects of teaching that only the instructor might know, while urging that it should be compared with other data obtained from other measures to get a better picture of how effective the teaching is. Cashin claims that teachers themselves could provide useful information in domains that constitute effective

teaching such as subject matter mastery, curriculum development, course design, delivery of instruction, assessment of instruction, availability to students, and administrative requirements. Airasan and Gullickson (1994) explained that teacher self-assessment is both self-referent and controlled. There are numerous procedures to obtain a measure of self-assessment, which is self-controlled and referent, such as personal reflection, analyses of lecture recordings and lesson plans, considering students' opinions, observation by others, and the results of teaching (Airasan & Gullickson, 1994). With regard to self-assessment, Boyer (1990) stated:

> As to self-evaluation, it seems appropriate to ask faculty, periodically, to prepare a statement about the courses taught-one that includes a discussion of class goals and procedures, course outlines, descriptions of teaching materials and assignments, and copies of examinations or other evaluation tasks (p. 37).

Several researchers are in favor of using self-reports in assessing teaching effectiveness (e.g. Arbizu, Olalde, & Castillo, 1998; Cashin, 1989; Chism, 1999; Feldman, 1989; Marsh & Roche, 1997; to name a few). To begin with, Arbizu et al. (1998) argued that teachers' views on their own effectiveness should be taken into consideration as they are a part of the teaching and learning process. They explained that self-assessment can be complemented with other sources, it aims to train rather than punish teaching behaviors, and it leads to personal efforts for self-improvement, while it also creates opportunities for collective reflection with exchanges of information among teachers. Similarly, Marsh and Roche (1997) asserted that self-assessments can be beneficial as they can be collected in all educational settings, provide insights with regard to teachers' view about their own teaching, and be utilized during interventions for improvements in teaching as teachers evaluate themselves (p. 1189). Chism (1999) also drew

attention to the role teachers play in their measure of teaching effectiveness by stating the following:

> Instructors being evaluated are the primary sources of descriptive data in that they are the generators of course materials, the teaching philosophy statement and information on number and kind of courses taught, participation in classroom research, leadership in the department or discipline in the area of teaching, thesis and dissertation supervision, mentoring of graduate teachers, and other pertinent descriptions (p. 4).

Although there is tendency of any individual to have a higher self-concept than actual, self-assessment measures could provide evidence of teaching effectiveness provided that it is complemented with other measures such as peer review, students rating, and the like. It should be valued as important source of information and personal motivation as a part of teaching effectiveness assessment devices (Arbizu et al., 1998).

Feldman (1989) synthesized research comparing various ratings of instructional effectiveness of college instructors and found similarity between the ratings teachers gave themselves and those given by their current students, while suggesting that some teachers rate themselves higher and some lower than their current students in their classes. Feldman also examined the profile similarity consisting of weaknesses and strengths of teachers and their current students on their assessment of teaching effectiveness by correlating their average ratings on specific evaluation items. The results indicated that as a group, teachers' perceptions of their strengths and weaknesses are quite similar to their current students.

While another benefit of using self-assessment as a measure of teaching effectiveness is to use it in validity studies, Feldman (1989) warned researchers to be cautious as the ratings might not demonstrate independence. Feldman (1989) contended the following:

> Considering another comparison pair of rating sources, it can also be argued that faculty judgments of themselves as teachers, too, are not independent of their students' evaluations. Not only are students' impressions often visible to teachers in the classroom (and therefore students' ratings anticipated) but students' actual prior ratings over the years are known to the faculty members who have been evaluated, at least at those colleges and universities where student ratings are regularly determined and made known to the faculty (p. 165).

The credibility of self-assessment has been questioned due to the lack of systematic procedures used in this approach to assess teaching effectiveness (Arbizu et al., 1998). However, through using the procedures mentioned earlier such as personal reflection, analysis of recordings of one's lectures, analyses of class plans and other documents, consideration of the opinions of students, observations made by other teachers and supervisors, and the results of micro-teaching, self-assessment could potentially contribute to assessing teaching performance through independent ratings and another complementary source.

Students' Perception on Effective Teaching Characteristics

In order to understand students' needs, universities can collect feedback from them. According to Leckey and Neill (2001), student feedback plays a major role in delivering quality in higher education institutions. "Student feedback can be defined as the expressed opinions of students about the service they receive as students. This may include perceptions about the learning and teaching, the learning support facilities (such as libraries, computing facilities), the learning environment (lecture rooms, laboratories, social space and university buildings), support facilities (refectories, student accommodation, health facilities, student services) and external aspects of being a student (such as finance, transport infrastructure)" (Harvey, 2003, p. 3).

Knowledge of the subject content, mastery teaching methods, class preparation and time management are some of the student usually relate it to when discussing about the characteristic of effective teacher. These interpretations were expected and represent characteristics most often measured in teaching evaluations.

Messenger (1979) surveyed 577 high school business students in California regarding their perceptions of "good" and "poor" business teachers. The questionnaires were categorized into four areas: personal traits, teaching traits, teacher-student relationships, and grading assignments. These students determined that good teachers were those who had a sense of humor, made learning interesting, and were able to relate to students. They likewise determined that poor teachers were those who did not explain subject matter well and did not care about students.

Wilkinson (1979) surveyed 517 high school business law students, from various high schools in Philadelphia, on effective and ineffective behaviors of secondary business law teachers. Analyzing the questionnaires using the chi-square test for independence, effective teachers were found to be the ones who organized and presented materials at paces appropriate for student learning, allowed for student participation, controlled classroom behavior problems, and listened to the opinions of students. Ineffective teachers were ones who only used the lecture method of teaching, did not provide sufficient guidance in terms of expected results, did not control classroom disruptions, and criticized and/or embarrassed students in class.

Delaney, Johnson, Johnson, and Treslan (2010) in their study over 17,000 graduate and undergraduate students at Memorial University of Newfoundland identify nine instructor behaviors that demonstrate effective in teaching in following order which are respectful of students, knowledgeable, approachable, engaging, communicative, organized, responsive,

professional and humorous. However, in different study, students also spoke about the relationship between the teacher and students and the need for teachers to create a safe environment for learning, demonstrate respect for students and for the subject matter, be flexible regarding the competing demands on adult students' time, and value what students bring to the learning environment (Hill, 2014). Vella (2002) articulated the importance of creating a relationship between teachers and learner that involves respect, safety, open communication, affirmation, listening and humility. Her concept of safety consistently resonates with Hill (2014) study of the graduate students. Hill specifically explained, classroom safety involves trust in the design of the course including the sequencing of activities, feasibility and relevance of course objectives, and maintenance of a non-judgmental environment.

Hill (2014) in her study of graduate students' perspectives on effect teaching find out students describe effective teacher characteristics are organized into three categories (a) teacher competencies (knowledge of content and teaching), (b) teachers' relationships with student (having the best interest of students at heart), and (c) teachers' attitude (with respect to teaching and learning) (See Table 1).

Table 1

Graduate Students' Perspectives on the Characteristics of Effective Teachers and Frequency of Mention

Frequency of Mention	Teaching competence: Knowledge of content and teaching	Relationships with students: Having the best interests of students at heart	Teacher attitude: With respect to teaching and learning
7	• Have relevant practice experience, share experiences	• Approachable, accessible to students outside class hours	• Has enthusiasm • Is fun and energetic

	• Provides relevant, real time information • Down to earth, makes connection • Provides examples-helps students move from easier to more complex topics • Teaches practice as well as theory • Knowledgeable about their subject matter: • Prepare and up-to-date • Presents evidence-based information	• Provides contact information • Has adequate office hours and is available during promised office hours • Answers e-mail in timely manner • Answers their phone	
5	• Utilizes a variety of techniques with class • Use humor appropriately • Needs to be tactful	• Values/ validates students' experience	
4	• Motivating to students • Has the skills to facilitates movement of students through material • Knows how to engage students • Able to stimulate discussion and enhance communication • Good time management	• Demonstrates fairness • Provides timely feedback • Completing grading in a timely manner • Is flexible • Knows when to bend rules, be flexible about class activities • Flexible about demands in adult learners' lives	• Interested in his/ her students • Listens to students

	skills and organized • Uses classroom time effectively • Follows syllabus and if changes are necessary, negotiates them with students		
3	• Culturally adaptive • Knowledgeable of students' cultural backgrounds • Can work with all groups (race, class, gender, nationalities) yet sees the individual • Understands the nature of adult learners		• Respects students, has positive regard for students • Values learners' experiences • Sees students as having knowledge • Does not treat them like blank slates • Has compassion, is empathetic
2	• Can communicate, get information across • Uses up-to-date technology	• Able/ willing to say, "I don't know, but I'll find out." • Does not fake answers and follows through on promise to bring back relevant information • Knows, understands their audience • Mentor students • Challenging, encourages students to do their best	• Honors learning processes
1	• Has interpersonal skills • Has faith in students/ students have	• Creates safe, non-threatening environment • Provides warmth, inviting welcome	• Understands and knows him/herself • Creative

	confidence in instructor • Speaks at a good pace and is audible • Uses appropriate language for level of learner • Uses a multidisciplinary approach • Brings in different ideas from different disciplines, holistic	• Articulates clear expectations for students • Serves as a resource to students • Act like a servant to the learner, not a dictator • Favors interaction • Develops rapport • Sees students as individuals • Takes time with individuals • Help students build self-esteem • Keep promises that they make • Does not look for specific answers • Can accept and affirm a variety of responses	• Believes in what they are talking about • Open-minded • Understanding and patient • Let's their personality show • Is personable • Likes teaching, passionate about what they teach • Maintains appropriate personal boundaries

Note. Adopted from *Graduate Students' Perspectives on Effective Teaching* by Lilian H. Hill, 2014, *Adult Learning, 25:2*, 57-65.

In a study of ranking exemplary teachers, Pietrzak, Duncan, and Korcuska (2008) found graduate students in a counselling program ranked teachers' degree of knowledge and delivery style to be most important, as well as organization and the amount of assigned homework. They also found the students valued faculty they perceived as friendly and found them to be effective when they concern for students' learning. This coincides with Witcher, Onwuegbuzie, Collins, Filer, Wiedmaier, and Moore (2003) research on college students, both undergraduate and graduate, regarding the characteristics of effective college teaching. Finding in their study shown students considered nine characteristics as indicators of effective teachers: being student-centered, knowledgeable about subject matter, professional, enthusiastic about teaching,

effective at communication, accessible, competent at instruction, fair and respectful, and a provider of adequate performance feedback.

Jackson's (2004) survey of pre-1974 graduates revealed that people remember good and poor teaching long after the fact. Jackson found the key distinguishing feature of good teaching was that it was student-centered; there were only occasional references to teachers' preparedness for their classes, well-organized lectures and content mastery.

Latif and Miles (2013) conduct a study of students' perception of effective teaching at Thompson Rivers University, Canada. 387 students enrolled in various levels of Economics courses were involved in this study. Of the students surveyed, 60% are male, and 61% are of domestic (Canadian) origin, with the rest being international students. Findings show as overall students perceived instructor's knowledge is the most valued characteristic, followed by instructor's ability to explain clearly and instructor's preparedness. Other important characteristics are instructor's helpfulness and instructor's enthusiasm. To the females, domestic students, first-year students, and second-year students, instructor's knowledge is the most valued characteristic. Instructor's ability to explain clearly is the most valued characteristic to the males, third-year students, and fourth-year students. International students consider instructor's preparedness as the most important characteristic among all instructor qualities.

Hande, Kamath, and D'Souza (2014) conducted a study on students' perception of effective teaching practices in a medical school at Manipal University, India. 451 medical students were enrolled in this study. Findings revealed student responses very high rating (85.6%) for clear and easy understanding of the subject. While the other qualities such as making the topic fun to learn (73.6%), student friendliness (58.4%), not monotonous (style of teaching)

(56%), motivating the students (53.6%), interaction more with students (52.8%), willingness to explain repeatedly (47.2%).

A similar analysis performed by Saroyan, Dangenais, and Zhou (2009) of graduate students enrolled in a course on curriculum design and teaching methods, they found the students conveyed four ideas about effective teachers' action. Students indicate effective teacher convey knowledge, prepare and manage instruction, promote learning, and help students grow so they can learn independently. By the end of the course, the students were inclined to place more emphasis on the promotion of learning and student growth.

Consistent with the aforementioned characteristics of effective teaching, several authors (e.g. Desai, Damewood, & Jones, 2001; Lincoln, 2008; Smart, Kelly, & Conant, 2003; Sweeney, Morrison, Jarratt, & Heffernan, 2009) have explored the main characteristics of effective professors. Typical attributes mentioned frequently are communication skills, enthusiasm, empathy, rapport, and use of real-life examples in class. In addition, Hativa et al. (2001) asserted clarity, organization, stimulating students' interest, engaging and motivating students, enthusiasm, establishing rapport with students, and maintaining positive classroom environment as effective practices of teaching.

Faranda and Clarke (2004) conducted interviews with undergraduate senior business students in an U.S. university to determine what these students considered "effective performance" for a professor. Faranda and Clarke found five major categories (with subcategories). In order of student cited importance, these categories were: (1) rapport (approachability, accessibility, personality, empathy), (2) delivery (communication, personal style, pedagogy), (3) fairness (performance evaluation, assignments), (4) knowledge/credibility

(expertise, experience, intelligence), and (5) organization/ preparation (clarity, thoroughness, instructional materials).

Thompson, Greer, and Greer (2004) in their study, yield 12 characteristics that every teacher should possess for successful teaching which are displaying fairness, having positive attitude/ outlook, being prepared, using a personal touch, possessing sense of humor, possessing creativity, willingness to admit mistakes, being forgiving, being respectful, maintaining high expectations, showing compassion and developing sense of belonging for student – center around the theme of caring.

Foster and Finley (1995) reported that effective agriculture teachers were individually strong in human relation and personal attitudes, adept at conflict resolution, highly motivated, committed to personal feelings, utilized good public relation skills, accepted by co-workers, demonstrated leadership and cooperation, possessed good human relation skills, and demonstrated good professional etiquette.

Defining the student learning experience in terms of alienation and engagement emphasizes the importance of concern and respect for students (Mann 2001). Mann recommends five ways in which academics can help students become more engaged in the learning community: solidarity - dissolve the separation between ‘them’ and ‘us’; hospitality - make students feel welcome and at home; safety - provide safe, supportive environments where students are accepted and respected; redistribution of power - give students power over their own learning and criticality - being aware of/examining the conditions in which academics work.

Fiedler, Balam, Edwards, Dyer, Wang, and Ross (2004) conduct a study on college students’ perceptions of effective teaching. This study consists of business, education, and engineering students of all academic levels with the exception of graduate level. The study

yielded similar characteristics of effective teaching as the other studies suggested. The themes that emerged from this relevant research are availability and accessibility during office hours and through emails; organization in terms of course objectives and the course content; methodology such as incorporating classroom discussions, encouraging questions from students, and using examples; rapport and enthusiasm; and learning that promotes a challenging and stimulating context.

Another perspective was added by Young, Rush, and Shaw (2009) in their study of 912 both undergraduate and graduate college students in 152 different disciplines to investigate multiple-dimensions of teaching effectiveness. Their results revealed that "value of interest, motivating students to do their best, comfortable learning atmosphere, course organization, effective communication, concern for student learning, and genuine respect for students were highly related to effectiveness" (p. 682). Ramsden (2003) also emphasized concern and respect for students and student learning as one of six key principles of effective teaching in higher education, besides appropriate assessment and helpful feedback; making the subject interesting and explaining it clearly; clear goals and intellectual challenge; independence, control and engagement (i.e. students feeling control over their learning and finally, learning from students i.e. being open to change and continually improving).

Fuhrman, Fuhrman and DeLay (2010) revealed graduate teaching assistant believed effective teachers exhibit passion for their subjects, are knowledgeable about subject and care for students, use a variety of teaching strategies, and help students appreciate the relevance of information to their own context. Research on enthusiasm of the teacher is closely related to student achievement (Bettencourt, Gillett, Gall, & Hull, 1983; Cabello & Terrell, 1994).

On the other hand, Sprinkle (2009) tested hypotheses regarding graduate students' perception of effective teaching, including teachers' age, gender, personality traits, and teaching style. Students tended to prefer teacher similar in age and gender to themselves, but did not necessarily favor teachers whose teaching was compatible with the students' learning styles. Instead, they valued a variety of teaching styles and the presentation of real-world application. Graduate students "viewed educators as effective when they exhibited humor, enthusiasm, compassion, empathy and were interested in and concern for students outside the classroom" (p. 1351). This consistent with Cruickshank, Jenkins, and Metcalf (2003) who reported that effective teachers are enthusiastic, warmth and possess a sense of humor.

Koutsoulis (2003) identified 94 characteristics of effective teachers by 25 high school students in Cyprus. Koutsoulis found that the 94 characteristics could be classified into three categories: human characteristics such as the ability to show understanding and teacher friendliness; communication characteristics such as the ability to communicate with students and to handle teacher-student relations; and teaching and production characteristics such as making lessons interesting and motivating and teacher's subject matter knowledge. Another finding of this study was that students at different achievement levels understood teacher effectiveness differently. The low achieving students endorsed more human and communication characteristics than the high achieving students, whereas the high achievement students acknowledged more teaching and production characteristics than their counterparts did.

According to Luft and Thompson (1995), students identified an effective agriculture teacher as having the following characteristics: showing enthusiasm for teaching, serving as good role models for students, being committed to helping students learn, showing their commitment to teaching by belonging to professional teacher organizations, enjoying teaching,

being self-confident and poised, being prompt and on time, and being neatly dressed and well groomed.

Upon exploring characteristics of teaching excellence, Yankowski (1993) disseminated a 63 item questionnaire to administrators, award winning faculty, non-award winning faculty, and students at six Hawaii community colleges. Then, he asked participants to indicate teaching excellence by ranking the most important factors given. Nine factors were identified to be most important. These factors were: (1) enjoys teaching, (2) respects students, (3) makes complex concepts easy to understand, (4) shows enthusiasm in teaching the material, (5) is available to students when they need help, (6) listens to students, (7) answers student questions clearly in ways that promote understanding, (8) enjoys the subject matter they teach, and (9) organizes materials well.

Cravens (1996) conducted a study at Saint Louis Community College, in Missouri, to determine the characteristics that students associated with excellence in teaching. In the first phase of the study, using an open-ended survey, 497 full-time students enrolled primarily in English, Natural Sciences, the Social Sciences, and Business courses were asked to list methods and behaviors which they felt resulted in teaching excellence. After establishing the 20 most frequently cited characteristics and behaviors, a second questionnaire was administered to 423 students in introductory Biology, Business, Chemistry, Psychology, and Sociology courses to develop a point value score for each characteristic. An analysis of the results from both phases revealed little overall agreement among students regarding the characteristics of teaching excellence. The analysis found dissimilar pairs of items both making the top 20; which are "uses facts and examples not in the text" and "lectures on contents of the text," and another pair of dissimilar characteristics included, "flexibility" with "an adherence to regulations". From the

second phase, the top five ranked characteristics were the following: (1) use of relevant examples; (2) clear emphasis on facts; (3) use of visual aids; (4) use of humor; and (5) projects enthusiasm. The bottom five ranked items were: (1) provides extra credit; (2) is flexible with regulations in the syllabus; (3) tests students frequently; (4) adheres to regulations in the syllabus; and (5) lectures on the contents of the text.

Using Student Evaluations of Educational Quality (SEEQ), Oesch (2005) asked 1047 students enrolled at one community college in central Florida to rate the elements of teaching excellence in his study. Finding revealed top 12 dimensions as follow: (1) the instructor is fair and unbiased in his/ her treatment of all students (Diversity) (2) the instructor's explanations are clear (Organization/ Clarity) (3) the instructor demonstrates respect for all students (e.g. not demeaning to either individuals or subgroups) (Diversity) (4) the methods for evaluating student's work are fair and appropriate (Examinations) (5) the instructor is enthusiastic about teaching the course (Enthusiasm) (6) you are able to learn and understand the subject materials in the course (Learn/ Value) (7) the course materials are well prepared and carefully explained (Organization/ Clarity) (8) the instructor's style of presentation holds your interest during class (Enthusiasm) (9) you learn something in the course, which you consider valuable (Learn/ Value) (10) the instructor makes students feel welcome in seeking help/ advice outside the classroom (Rapport) (11) feedback on evaluations/ graded materials is valuable (Examinations) (12) the instructor is dynamic and energetic in conducting the course (Enthusiasm).

In a similar procedure as Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley and Saville (2002), Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn, and Buskist, (2003) in their follow up study asked community college faculty and students what they perceived as the qualities or behaviors of effective teachers. They find out almost identical results in U.S. community college and master's level school settings. Finding in

Schaeffer et al. (2003) study revealed both groups agreed that these qualities were among the top 10: being approachable; being creative and interesting; being encouraging and caring; being enthusiastic; being flexible and open-minded; being knowledgeable; having realistic expectations and being fair; and being respectful. However, in both studies, there were interesting discrepancies between faculty and students in what they ranked as the most and least important characteristics of master teachers.

In sum, the studies on effective teaching summarized above revealed that some of the characteristics of effective teachers were universal, that other characteristics were group dependent, and that numerous effective characteristics could be classified into a few categories including subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and socio-affective skills, with different endorsement rates according to groups such as teachers and students, male and female students, and high achieving and low achieving students.

Table 2

Characteristics of Effective Professor

Authors	Characteristics of Effective Professors
Sweeney, Morrison, Jarratt, and Heffernan (2009)	Clear communication, assessment fairness, dynamic delivery, real-world knowledge, rapport
Lincoln (2008)	Nonverbal communication, enthusiasm, and rapport
Voss, Gruber, and Szmigin (2007); Brown (2004)	Competent, approachable, willing to answer questions, show flexibility and willing to explain things in different ways, treat their students as individuals
Swanson, Frankel, and Sagan (2005)	Knowledgeable, empathetic, friendly, helpful, reliable, responsive, and expressive
Hill, Lomas, and MacGregor (2003)	Knowledgeable, well organized, encouraging, helpful, sympathetic, and caring to students' individual needs
Lammers and Murphy (2002)	Knowledgeable, enthusiastic about their subject, inspiring, and helpful

Andreson (2000)	Enthusiastic, caring, and interested in the students' progress
Husbands (1998); Ramsden (1991)	Expertise
McElwee and Redman (1993)	Reliable: turn up to classes on time and keep records of student performance

Note. Adopted from *Investigating the Influence of Professor Characteristics on Student Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction: A Comparative Study* by Gruber et al., p.168. Copyright 2012 by The Author(s).

Table 3

Importance of Instructional Dimensions Using Two Different Indicators of Importance

Instructional Dimension	C(1) Correlation with Student Achievement (Larger = More Important; Rank in Parentheses)	(2) Average Standardized Rank Based on correlation with Overall Evaluation (Smaller = More Important; Rank in Parentheses
1. Teacher's preparation, organization of course	.57 (1)	.41(6)
2. Clarity and understandableness	.56 (2)	.25 (2)
3. Perceived outcome or impact of instruction	.46 (3)	.28 (3)
4. Teacher's stimulation of interest in the course and its subject matters	.38 (4)	.20 (1)
5. Teacher's encouragement of question and discussion and openness to opinions of other	.36 (5.5)	.60 (11)
6. Teacher's availability and helpfulness	.36 (5.5)	.74 (16)
7. Teacher's elocutionary skills	.35 (7.5)	.49 (10)
8. Clarity of course objectives and requirements	.35 (7.5)	.45 (7)
9. Teacher's knowledge of the subject	.34 (9)	.48 (9)
10. Teacher's sensitivity to, and concern with, class level and progress	.30 (10)	.40 (5)
11. Teacher's enthusiasm (for subject or for teaching)	.27 (11)	.46 (8)
12. Teacher's fairness, impartiality of evaluation students; quality of examination	.26 (12)	.72 (14.5)
13. Intellectual challenge and encouragement of independent thought (by teacher and the course)	.25 (13)	.33 (4)
14. Teacher's concern and respect for students; friendliness of teacher	.23 (14.5)	.65 (12)
15. Nature, quality and frequency of feedback from teacher to students	.23 (14.5)	.87 (17)
16. Nature and value of course material		

(including its usefulness and relevance)	.17 (16)	.70 (13)
17. Nature and usefulness of supplementary materials and teaching aids	-.11 (17)	.72 (14.5)

Note. Adopted from *Identifying Exemplary Teaching: Using Data from Course and Teacher Evaluations* by Feldman, K. A., p.43. Copyright 1996 by Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Instructors' Perception on Effective Teaching Characteristics

While extensive literature exists about students' perception of teaching effectiveness in K-12 education, research on perspectives of faculty members' thoughts, ideas, and insights regarding the nature of effective teaching is overwhelmingly missing. Since faculties are a large and growing segment of university instruction, and an increasing demand for quality instruction, their perspectives on effective teaching need to be researched.

Based on his longitudinal retrospective qualitative quasi-research study of in-service and pre-service teachers, Walker (2008) identifies 12 personal and professional characteristics of an effective teacher emerged from the essays written by students majoring in education. Respondents supposed effective teacher: (1) came to class prepared, (2) had a positive attitude about being a teacher and about her/ his students , (3) had high expectation for all students, (4) was very creative in how she/ he taught the class (5) was fair in how she/ he treated students and in grading, (6) displayed a personal touch with her/ his students and was approachable, (7) develops a sense of belonging in the classroom; students felt welcomed and comfortable in the classroom, (8) was able to admit mistakes when she/ he made an error, (9) had a sense of humor, (10) gave respect to students and did not deliberately embarrass them, (11) was forgiving and did not hold grudges, and (12) displayed compassion and student felt that the teacher was genuinely concerned about their problems and could relate to them.

Unlike in United States, Mehdinezhad (2012) in his study of faculty members' understanding of teaching efficacy criteria and it relation to their characteristic at four state universities in Iran, find out that the faculty members felt efficacious in order of importance, in the following areas: communication, assessment, subject matters, curriculum and instruction, learning environment, and to implement technology.

In 2013, a study has been conducted by Komos to examine effective teaching characteristics as perceived by undergraduate adjunct faculty members. This study involved 441 adjunct faculty members who teach undergraduate courses in the general education curriculum in a large proprietary university. According to the findings, he identified three characteristics of effective teaching on which adjunct faculty members want to be evaluated: Regard for the Student, Instructor Competence, and Instructional Proficiency. There are four elements comprised Regard for the Student; "The instructor is available for consultation with students"; "The instructor motivates students to do their best"; "The instructor encourages students' personal responsibility for their learning"; and "The instructor creates a safe learning environment." However, a number of additional comments did not fit entirely under the four items yet speak to the importance of having regard for students. Additional comments that showed up several times under caring themes have reinforced the factor of Regard for the Student at a high level. Instructor competence comprised five items; "The instructor is well-prepared for class"; "the instructor demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the subject"; "the instructor is articulate in how he or she presents material"; "the instructor communicates effectively and teaches to the level of the student"; and "the instructor clearly defines class objectives." A number of these comments matched to the five items from the survey. However, a number of these comments did not fit entirely under the five items yet speak to the importance of

instructor competence. These participant comments included the following: “The instructor creates a positive class atmosphere,” “the instructor is adaptable and flexible,” “the instructor has a passion to share knowledge, “the instructor keeps creativity at the top of the teaching style,” “the instructor is passionate,” and “patience is a teacher’s greatest asset.” Instructional Proficiency comprised four items: “The instructor is enthusiastic about the subject matter”; “the instructor presents material in an informative and interesting way”; “the instructor is able to show practical application of the course material”; and “the instructor is personable and has a sense of humor.” Again, a number of these comments matched to the four items from the survey. But others added nuance to the factor beyond what the items provide. These participant comments included the following: “The instructor brings additional teaching materials to the class and shares with the students and explains why additional information may solve or create a better understanding of the material presented,” “the instructor ensures the material presented is current and not outdated and offers credibility to both the instructor and the instruction,” and “the instructor is able to adapt teaching material to the different types of learners.” These additions reinforce the importance of instructional proficiency as a component of effective teaching.

Brandenburg's (1985) approach differed. He studied the relationship between instructor communicator styles and teacher effectiveness. He defined teacher effectiveness as student attainment of instructional objectives as measured by subject matter mastery. Fifty-one College of Business faculty at two mid-western universities participated. One section of students for each faculty participant completed Norton's Communicator Style Questionnaire. The instructor communicator style "friendly/animated" was the only one found to have a relationship at the .05 level of significance with student attainment of instructional objectives.

There is also precedent for looking to award recipients for characteristics of teacher effectiveness.

Ahem (1969) surveyed 83 recipients of local and national Outstanding Teaching awards from New England institutions of higher education and determined that the majority of award winners chose teaching as a first career and continued to teach for the sheer joy of it.

Self-perceptions of faculty and teaching behaviors were the criteria used by Hyslop (1988) in his study of teacher effectiveness. 21 business faculties, who had received teaching awards from 1982 to 1987 at Bowling Green State University, responded to questions regarding methodology and overall philosophy of teaching. Respondents' most common perceptions about effective teaching included: possessing high concern for students, possessing high expertise in the discipline, willingness to be flexible, projecting enthusiasm for teaching, and creating caring classroom environments.

Ruff (1989) found that the most common criteria used in evaluating teacher effectiveness were (a) teacher preparation, (b) personal motivation and abilities, (c) the teacher-student relationship, (d) professional roles and practices, and (e) teaching environment. These criteria are consistently reported in the business education literature (Golen, 1980; Gruber, 1978; Gruber and Wilkinson, 1979; Messenger, 1979)

Singh, Pai, Sinha, Kaur, Soe, and Barua (2013) conducted a study to explore medical teachers' perspectives of characteristics of effective teachers at a Medical College in Malaysia. 57 faculty members of medicine and dentistry field participated in this study. They were asked to response to each statement based on a 5-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree in a questionnaire comprising of 24 items relating to perceived qualities of effective teachers. Finding shows medical teachers ranked highest on three desirable qualities of

an effective teacher; knowledge of subject (mean 4.70 ± 0.53), followed by enthusiasm/ passion to teach (mean 4.69 ± 0.54) and communication skills (mean 4.68 ± 0.54). Faculty with longer teaching experienced ranked classroom behavior/ instructional delivery higher than their less experienced counterparts.

Meanwhile, Choi (1988) also used teacher perceptions in his study of teacher effectiveness. He surveyed 465 secondary business teachers in New York State, excluding New York City. He asked them to rank the teaching competencies, identified by the National Business Education Association as effective, in order of perceived importance. Competencies in the management and instruction categories, which included being able to control classrooms and being able to give feedback, was ranked highly. The evaluation and student organization categories were ranked lowly.

Kelly and Kelly (1982) conducted in-depth interviews with each of nine university professors who had won prestigious teaching effectiveness awards since 1972. It was determined from the interviews that these award winners stressed enthusiasm for teaching, commitment to students, thorough knowledge of subject matter and maintaining a sense of humor are the key to retain students' learning and teaching effectiveness.

Tursman (1981) also chose to interview 11 teachers who had won Teacher of the Year awards regarding their perceptions on effective teaching. These teachers viewed effective teachers as those who were flexible, student centered, and democratic. In addition, they were always willing to grow personally and professionally and were willing to change teaching styles to meet the needs and skills of students while creating supportive and caring classroom climates. Effective teachers also encourage problem-solving and critical-thinking skills as students learn the subject matter.

Witcher, Onwuegbuzie, and Minor (2001) examined pre-service teachers' perceptions about the characteristics of effective teachers by asking the participants to identify, rank, and define three to six characteristics that excellent teachers possessed. Of the 219 respondents, they found a total of 125 characteristics which were classified into the following six categories in order of endorsement rate: student-centeredness (79.5%), enthusiasm for teaching (40.2%), ethicalness (38.8%), classroom and behavior management (33.3%), teaching methodology (32.4%), and knowledge of subject (31.5%). Among the demographics variables, gender made the strongest contribution to the participants' responses with females endorsing learner-centeredness and males endorsing classroom and behavior management.

In a following study in 2002, Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, and James investigated the educational beliefs of preservice teachers as well as their perceptions of effective teachers. Seven themes, through the use of mixed methods analyses from 134 student surveys, were discovered: student-centeredness, effective in term of classroom and behavior management, competent instructor, ethical, enthusiastic about teaching, knowledgeable on subject matter, and professional, which reflect effectiveness in teaching.

Kane, Sandretto, and Heath (2004) interviewed 17 lecturers who had been nominated by their heads of department as excellent teachers. The authors used three data collection methods with each participant: semi-structured interviews, repertory grid interviews and stimulated recall interviews where participants discussed their teaching while watching a video of themselves teaching. Kane et al. (2004) then identified five common attributes of excellent teachers: subject knowledge; teaching skills (including communication skills, making real world connections, clear expectations, use of strategies to stimulate the interest of students, being able to improvise and respond and being a teachable person); interpersonal relationships with students 'caring

about students' needs, and what and how they think' (p. 296); integration of research and teaching; and personal attributes (e.g. enthusiasm, sense of humor, being yourself). All five attributes were integrated by 'regular, purposeful reflection' on teaching (p. 300).

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) reported 15 characteristics of effective teachers in two categories: management and instructional techniques; and personal characteristics (Demmon-Berger, 1986). "These characteristics were found among the teachers who tended to be good managers, use systematic instruction techniques, have high expectations of students and themselves, believe in their own efficacy, vary teaching strategies, handle discipline through prevention, are caring, are demographic in their approach, are task oriented, are concerned with perceptual meanings rather than with facts and events, are comfortable interacting with others, have a strong grasp of subject matter, are accessible to students outside of class, tailor teaching to student needs, are flexible and imaginative" (Park & Lee, 2006, p. 237).

Along the same line, Lowman (1995) also proposes a powerful, empirically derived model of teaching excellence. This model was developed as a result of his research analyzing the adjectives used to describe excellent teachers from 500 teaching awards nominations of faculty members widely acknowledged to be exemplary teachers. Lowman clustered the characteristics that he observed into two categories, intellectual excitement (clarity of presentations and the ability to stimulate a strong, positive emotional impact among students) and interpersonal rapport, (awareness of interpersonal nature of the classroom and communication skills that enhance motivation and enjoyment of learning and that foster independent learning). In order to be excellent, the teacher must succeed in both of these domains.

Table 4

Lowman's Two-Dimensional Model of Effective College Teaching

Dimension 1: Intellectual Excitement • Clarity of presentations (what is presented) • Emotional impact on students (way material is presented)
Dimension 2: Interpersonal Rapport • Awareness of interpersonal nature of the classroom • Communication skills that enhance motivation and enjoyment of learning and that foster independent learning

Note. Adopted from *A Model for Understanding University Teaching and Learning* by Groccia, J. E., p. 6. Copyright 2012 by Groccia, J. E.

Differences between Student and Instructor Perceptions on Effective Teaching Characteristics

By using Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC), Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, and Saville (2002) asked a group of students and a group of teachers to rank the importance of the 28 qualities of master teachers. Students and faculty agreed on 6 of their top 10 qualities: (1) teachers have realistic expectations and fair grading, (2) they are knowledgeable about the topic, (3) they are approachable and personable, (4) they are respectful, (5) they are creative and interesting, and (6) they are enthusiastic about teaching. In general, faculty members ranked the technical aspects of teaching (such as promoting critical thinking) higher than students did, but students emphasized the interpersonal aspects of teaching (such as a teacher being understanding) more than faculty did.

The differences between students and faculty on the characteristics they ranked as most important reflect an emphasis on different aspects of teaching. Whereas students tended to emphasize characteristics that focus on student-teacher relationships (e.g. the teacher cares for students and is understanding), faculty stressed more technical aspects of teaching (e.g. the teacher focuses on developing critical thinking skills and presents current information). For example, Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, and Saville, (2002) found that students ranked happy/

positive/ humorous" as the seventh most important characteristic; in contrast, faculty rated it twenty-seventh. Similarly, whereas faculty ranked "promoting critical thinking" and "preparing" in their top 10, students did not rank these characteristics highly (Schultz & Marchuk, 2006). However, while several studies have been conducted that show what faculty and college students perceive to be good teacher traits, few have been conducted to determine disparity between them.

A number of studies use the direct approach of conducting surveys to explore students' expectations of and preferences in teaching. Using a large U.S. national database, Cochran and Hodgin (2001) find that enthusiasm, careful preparation, clarity of communication, and fair grading standards contribute to enhancing student satisfaction. Enthusiasm is given equal importance by instructors and students. However, students place about three times as much emphasis on fair grading and nearly twice as much weight on preparation as do instructors.

Research has shown differences between students' and professors' perception of teaching effectiveness. Research by Sojka, Ashok, and Down (2002) indicated that while faculty believed that professors of less demanding courses tend to received better grades and student ratings are influenced by the entertaining characteristic of faculty, students were less likely to agree with these arguments. Compared to faculty members, students were less likely to believe that student evaluations of teaching encourage faculty to grade more leniently, have an influence on professors' academic career, or that their ratings lead to changes in courses and/or teaching styles. Faculty members, on the other hand, believed that students do not take ratings seriously and hence rate easy and entertaining instructors more highly, while students disagreed with this contention.

Factor analyses used in several studies (Marsh, Hau, & Chung, 1997; Marsh & Hocevar, 1984; 1997;) and validity and reliability studies demonstrated the multidimensionality of student

ratings and supported the validity and reliability of student ratings. While some researchers still remain skeptical about their accuracy, student ratings are widely used in almost every higher education institution. McKeachie (1997) calls for research with regard to ways to teaching students to become more sophisticated raters and find ways to make this experience beneficial for them. Accordingly, once the faculty is educated about the evaluation and encouraged to explain the importance of the ratings, the students' input might be valued highly as they could most probably demonstrate their credibility in evaluation.

Lang, McKee and Conner (1993) developed a list of 32 characteristics of effective teachers through interviews with college teachers, and asked 167 participants (administrators, chairpersons, college teachers and students) to identify and rank three characteristics considered important to teaching. They found that the teachers rated 16 characteristics significantly different from the students and that the overall difference was significant. The mean ratings for three characteristics including being knowledgeable of world events and knowing students and teaching them in ways which they learn best were higher for student respondents, whereas the remaining 13 characteristics including knowing the subject well and encouraging students to learn independently received higher mean ratings from teacher respondents.

In the United Kingdom, Revell and Wainwright (2009) investigated what constitutes an "unmissable lecture" by comparing the views of geography students and faculty. Qualitative interviews conducted by the researchers found remarkable consistency between students and teachers. Both agreed on the importance of providing a good structure to the lesson that incorporates student involvement (technical aspects), as well as adequate interpersonal interaction and passion on the part of the professor (interpersonal aspects).

Conceptual/ Theoretical Framework

In order to get better understanding about university teaching, Humanistic Learning Theory approach was selected in this study. This theory was chosen since it has typical and parallel features related to the concept and principal of adult education. Table 5 shows a brief summary of theories of learning that pertinent to university teaching setting, general application and specific classroom suggestions for faculty member guidance.

Table 5

Theories of Learning Applied to University Teaching

Theory	General Applications to University Teaching	Specific Classroom Suggestions
Behavioral Learning Theory	• Consequences of behavior determine future behavior • Learning occurs in response to rewards, absence of rewards, or punishment • Positive consequences shape learning better than negative consequences	• Attention and reward patterns will influence learning behaviors • Reward good behavior rather than punish bad • Match reward level with task difficulty • Provide frequent and clear feedback
Information Processing Theory of Learning	• Information is processed in stages in the brain • Amount of information that can be processed is limited • Learning is an interactive process	• Teach class as series of mini-units • Chunk information into connected parts • Teach new material first then practice and review
Cognitive Theory of Learning	• Learning occurs through struggle with mental imbalance • Learner actively constructs knowledge	• Use discovery, active learning techniques (cooperative learning, discussion, hands-on experiments) • Create opportunities for mental critical thinking and mental conflict (debates, case studies)
Humanistic Learning Theory	• Learning involves affective as well as cognitive growth • Students have natural need for knowledge • Cognitive growth only after lower order needs met (i.e., safety, belonging, esteem)	• Move from teacher-centered to student centered learning • Reduce threat in classroom • Build on successful learning experiences • Scaffold task difficulty pairing challenge with support • Provide opportunities for students to take responsibility for own learning

		(e.g. choosing assignments and assessments)

Note. Adopted from *A Model for Understanding University Teaching and Learning* by James E. Groccia, p.10. Copyright 2012 by The Author(s).

Summary

In summary, there are two main factors of effective teaching in higher education has been discussed in this chapter. One factor related to interpersonal aspect of student-teacher relationship and the other factor related to technical aspects including teaching skills or expertise. Actually, the literature on excellent teaching has been remarkably consistent regarding these two factors. Across a variety of modalities and study methods, these two major categories-technical and interpersonal aspects of teaching-have emerged as the primary components of excellent teaching (Addison, 2005; Keeley, Smith, & Buskist, 2006, Lowman, 1995).

Buskist (2004) in his recent research of Teacher Behavior Checklist shows that there is a great association between teachers and students on those teacher qualities and behaviors key to effective teaching although important differences exist. He clarified teachers tend to place more weight on particular techniques of teaching than students do; students tend to emphasize the importance of the student-teacher relationship more than teachers do. This situation led researcher to explore more about the issue. In this chapter, previous literature and findings related on this topic will be discussed and reviewed.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

This chapter reports and justifies the utilization of tools and research design that been performed in this study. Researcher specified the process of population determination, respondents and instrument selection, procedure and method of data collection and data analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the student and instructor perception of effective teaching characteristics as well as to investigate the distinction between them. This research was conducted to determine the association of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between student and instructors in a vocational setting. The objectives are: 1) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of students in vocational education; 2) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education; 3) to identify if there is any significant difference perception on effective teaching characteristics between students and instructors. This study was to determine if there were disparities of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between college students and faculty especially in a vocational education setting. For example, some instructors might believe mastering the content of subject knowledge is more important than building rapport with the student. They may also think by obtaining an advanced degree and possessing a number of experiences in their teaching areas, these efforts will enhance their teaching effectiveness. The

student may expect the educator to develop rapport and display openness crucial to understanding.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of students in vocational education?
2. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education?
3. Is there a difference between students and instructors in vocational education based on teaching qualities?

Research Design

Numerous studies have used either quantitative or qualitative method to explore students (Allan, Clarke, & Jopling, 2009; Anderson, Ingram, & Buford, 2012; Carson, 1996; Delaney, Johnson, Johnson, & Treslan, 2010; Feldman, 2007; Gruber & Voss, 2010; Gruber, Reppel, & Voss, 2010; Hande, Kamath, & D'Souza, 2014; Hawk & Lyons, 2008; Heffernan, Morrison, & Sweney, 2003; Hill, 2014; Johnson & Johnson, 2010; Kashif & Ting, 2014; Kreider, 2009; Latif & Miles, 2013; Liu, Keeley, & Buskist, 2015; Loes, Salisbury, & Pascarella, 2014; MacLin, MacLin, Desoto, Hitlan, & Williams, 2009; Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, Collins, Filer, Wiedmaier, & Moore, 2007; Saville, Zinn, Brown, & Marchuk, 2010; Schultz & Marchuk, 2006; Slate, LaPraire, Schulte, & Onwuegbuzie, 2011; Su & Wood, 2012; Thompson, Greer, & Greer, 2004; Tootoonchi, Lyons, & Hagen, 2002; Wang, Gibson, & Slate, 2007) and faculty members' (Fajet, Bello, Leftwich, Mesler, & Shaver, 2005; Gao & Liu, 2013; Granitz, Koernig, & Harich, 2009; Komos, 2013; McCannon & Stitt-Gohdes, 1995; Mehdinezhad, 2012; Miller, Kahler, & Rheault,

1989; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, & James, 2002; Roberts & Dyer, 2004; Singh, Pai, Sinha, Kaur, Soe, & Barua, 2013; Walker, 2008) perception on effective teaching characteristics (Balam & Shannon, 2010; Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, & Saville, 2002; Cochran & Hodgin, 2001; Hsu & Chiu, 2009; Jahangiri & Mucciolo, 2008; Lang, McKee, & Conner, 1993; Layne, 2012; Revell & Wainwright, 2009; Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn, & Buskist, 2003; Schultz & Marchuk, 2006; Sojka, Ashok, & Down, 2002; Wentzell, Richlin, & Cox, 2013; Yoo, Schallert, & Svinicki, 2015).

This study utilized quantitative methods and a cross-sectional sectional research design, conducted at public 2-year institution at the South. This study was aimed to identify the characteristics of effective teaching from the perspective of students and faculty members of vocational education background. The Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) was used as instrument; distributed to the respondents of the study for data collection.

Population and Participants

The participants in this study constituted two different groups. The first group consisted of 137 regularly enrolled vocational students at a public two-year postsecondary institution in Southeastern of United States of America. The second group consisted of six teaching instructors from the same institution. However, since there were limited resources and data access, researcher choose to invite the student and faculty from Division of Technical Education and Workforce Development to participate in this study.

Students group

Approximately, there were about a total of 5000 technical and vocational students enrolled in this institutions each semester. (About SUSCC, 2016). The precise data on the total number of students under Division of Technical Education and Workforce Development who were eighteen years old and above was not accessible to the researcher; therefore, the exact

number of 137 students' available participants was unknown. The participants who were under the age of eighteen years old were prohibited from participating in this study. Participants of this study were selected using Non-Probability Convenience Sampling Method. Some student group participant in this study were enrolled on Associate Degree in Applied Science while the rest of them were enrolled on Associate Degree in Occupational Technologies program of studies.

Instructors group

A total of six college instructor from Division of Technical Education and Workforce Development participated in this study (N=6) while the rest were not directly involve teaching areas. These participated instructor teaching various areas such as Air Conditioning and Refrigeration, Automotive Service Technology, Cosmetology, Engineering Graphics and Design, Industrial Electricity/Electronics Technology, Manufacturing Technology, Machine Shop Technology, Welding Technology programs; Technical Education Career Coach and Technical Education Director. This information was obtained from a list generated from Office of Technical Education and Workforce Development.

Instrumentation, Scales and Variables

In order to gather the data, The Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) was used in this study. This study used a non-experimental descriptive design with no treatment, and utilized a survey as instrument to collect data. Survey research is appropriate in investigations concerning preferences, attitudes, and opinions. For this research, the survey was used to identify higher education faculty members' perceived need for pedagogical training in graduate programs (Robinson & Hope, 2013, p. 4). Furthermore, the survey method is the most efficient means of collecting a large amount of data from a large sample. Use of survey is useful in collecting

statistical estimates for a target population assuming that characteristics of the collected sample are present and distributed in same way they are in the targeted population (Fowler, 2008).

Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC)

The Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) was originally developed from Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley and Saville (2002) investigation of the traits of master teachers. In their study, students listed qualities of master teachers, resulting in a list of 47 characteristics. Then, in a separate group of undergraduate students, generated behaviors that corresponded to those characteristics in an effort to operationalize how those characteristics are observed by students in the classroom. Most cases in the list of behaviors overlapped across characteristics so the list was reduced to 28 items. In a new sample, both students and teachers rank ordered the importance of these 28 qualities.

Although there is a substantial overlap in the extent to which teachers and students agree on those teacher qualities and behaviors key to effective teaching, important differences exist Teachers tend to place more weight on particular techniques of teaching than students do; students tend to emphasize the importance of the student-teacher relationship (interpersonal factors) more than teachers do. (Buskist, et al., 2002).

The TBC entails three measures: a total scale reflective of overall good teaching (28 items) and two subscales labeled Caring and Supportive (13 items) and Professional Competency and Communication Skills (11 items). Four items included in the total scale do not appear in the subscales. An example of an item on the Caring and Supportive scale reads "*Approachable/ Personable* (Smiles, greets students, initiates conversations, invites questions, responds respectfully to student comments)," where the personal quality appears in italics and the corresponding behaviors are listed in parentheses. An example item of the Professionalism and

Communication Skills scale is "*Effective Communicator* (Speaks clear/ loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples)." Averaging the values of the items on each scale produces the scale scores (Keeley, Furr, & Buskist, 2010, p. 17).

The survey used in this study comprises two main sections. Section 1 include demographic information, which asked participants to specify their group (students or instructors). Section 2 of the survey consisted of the 28-item inventory of teacher qualities/ behaviors and descriptions of each. All participants were required to complete the 28-item in TBC by rating the extent to which a master teacher displays each quality and its attendant behaviors ranging from 1 = Instructor always exhibits/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality, 2 = Instructor frequently exhibit/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality, 3 = Instructor sometimes exhibit/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality, 4 = Instructor rarely exhibit/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality, to 5 = Instructor never exhibit/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality, Likert-type scale. (See Appendix A). The dependent variable was the 28 teacher qualities/behaviors of teaching excellence in the TBC while independent variables are two group of respondents; vocational education students and instructors. Permission to use TBC in this study has been granted before the study was conducted. (See Appendix D). However, in this research, no other identifying data were collected, attention was only paid to 28-item inventory of qualities/ behaviors as to serve the research questions purpose.

Table 6

TBC Subscales, Variables and Items

Item No.	Subscale (Keeley, Smith, & Buskist, 2006)	Teacher Qualities	Description
1	Caring and Supportive	Accessible	Posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-mail information
2	Professional competency and communication skills	Approachable/ Personable	Smiles, greets students, initiates conversations, invites questions, responds respectfully to student comments
3	Professional competency and communication skills	Authoritative	Establishes clear course rules; maintains classroom order; speaks in a loud, strong voice
4	Professional competency and communication skills	Confident	Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly
5	This item do not appear in the subscales.	Creative and Interesting	Experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone
6	Professional competency and communication skills	Effective Communicator	Speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples
7	Caring and Supportive	Encourages and Cares for Students	Provides praise for good student work, helps students who need it, offers bonus points and extra credit, and knows student names

8	Caring and Supportive	Enthusiastic about Teaching and about Topic	Smiles during class, prepares interesting class activities, uses gestures and expressions of emotion to emphasize important points, and arrives on time for class
9	This item do not appear in the subscales.	Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals	Prepares/ follows the syllabus and has goals for each class
10	Caring and Supportive	Flexible/ Open-Minded	Changes calendar of course events when necessary, will meet at hours outside of office hours, pays attention to students when they state their opinions, accepts criticism from others, and allows students to do make-up work when appropriate
11	Professional competency and communication skills	Good Listener	Doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making
12	Professional competency and communication skills	Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous	Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students
13	Caring and Supportive	Humble	Admits mistakes, never brags, and doesn't take credit for others' successes
14	Professional competency and communication skills	Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	Easily answers students' questions, does not read straight from the book or notes, and uses clear and understandable examples
15	Professional competency and communication skills	Prepared	Brings necessary materials to class, is never late for class, provides outlines of class discussion

16	This item do not appear in the subscales	Presents Current Information	Relates topic to current, real life situations; uses recent videos, magazines, and newspapers to demonstrate points; talks about current topics; uses new or recent texts
17	This item do not appear in the subscales.	Professional	Dresses nicely [neat and clean shoes, slacks, blouses, dresses, shirts, ties] and no profanity
18	Caring and Supportive	Promotes Class Discussion	Asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class
19	Caring and Supportive	Promotes Critical Thinking/ Intellectually Stimulating	Asks thoughtful questions during class, uses essay questions on tests and quizzes, assigns homework, and holds group discussions/ activities
20	Caring and Supportive	Provides Constructive Feedback	Writes comments on returned work, answers students' questions, and gives advice on test-taking
21	Professional competency and communication skills	Punctuality/ Manages Class Time	Arrives to class on time/early, dismisses class on time, presents relevant materials in class, leaves time for questions, keeps appointments, returns work in a timely way
22	Caring and Supportive	Rapport	Makes class laugh through jokes and funny stories, initiates and maintains class discussions, knows student names, interacts with students before and after class
23	Caring and Supportive	Realistic Expectations of Students/ Fair Testing and Grading	Covers material to be tested during class, writes relevant test questions, does not overload students with reading, teaches at an appropriate level for the majority of students in the course, curves grades when appropriate

24	Professional competency and communication skills	Respectful	Does not humiliate or embarrass students in class, is polite to students [says thank you and please, etc.], does not interrupt students while they are talking, does not talk down to students
25	Caring and Supportive	Sensitive and Persistent	Makes sure students understand material before moving to new material, holds extra study sessions, repeats information when necessary, asks questions to check student understanding
26	Caring and Supportive	Strives to Be a Better Teacher	Requests feedback on his/ her teaching ability from students, continues learning [attends workshops, etc. on teaching], and uses new teaching methods
27	Professional competency and communication skills	Technologically Competent	Knows how to use a computer, knows how to use e-mail with students, knows how to use overheads during class, has a Web page for classes
28	Caring and Supportive	Understanding	Accepts legitimate excuses for missing class or coursework, is available before/ after class to answer questions, does not lose temper at students, takes extra time to discuss difficult concepts

Procedures and Data Collection

Since these students on campus were taking different classes and were enrolled in different degree programs, the researcher obtained a letter from the Dean of Technical Education and Workforce Development division which allowed the researcher to recruit participants, distribute the survey, and collect the data. (See Appendix B).

Of the 12 college staff, six teaching instructors (100%) agreed to participate in this study and granted the researcher permission to recruit their students. (See Appendix C). Once the letter

of authorization received, researcher compiled it and submit it together with the Auburn University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Research Protocol Review Form application. As soon as the IRB Research Protocol Review application approved for use from November 18, 2015 to November 7, 2018 (Protocol #15-375 EX 1511) (See Appendix F) researcher return to research location to distribute the invitation/ informed letter to participate in this study (See Appendix E), surveys and collect the data.

The researcher collected the data in class with the cooperation of the instructors who were in charge of the classes. The students were attending two associate degree program in 10 courses. Then, researcher delivered survey to each participating class. Researcher explained voluntarism, data treatment and data protection. The students were assured that their responses to the questionnaires would be kept confidential and not be used for other purposes. After assuring their cooperation, the researcher explained instruction of the survey. The students were encouraged to ask questions if the meaning of the items were not clear to them and they were informed that it will only took about 20 minutes to response to the survey. Completing the survey serves as a consent and the informed letter were provided as a cover attachment to the survey. Volunteered instructors took the survey at the same time the students do. Surveys completed were placed in box at the back of room.

To minimize disruption and coercion, the surveys were completed towards the ends of the class session and data collected anonymously. All participant demographic background and unrelated information to research questions were not collected in this study. Completed surveyed and data sheets were securely placed by researcher in locked file drawer in researcher's supervisor office. No incentives were offered by the researchers to the participants.

Data Analysis

In order to identify the most important teaching characteristics selected by both groups, and answering the first and second research questions, the rating of each characteristic selected (number 1 to number 5) by respondents were recode into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 using reverse coding approach. Next, the series of number from each characteristic were summed and the total were divided by the overall number of teaching characteristics to get their mean score. Then, those mean score value were sorted from highest to lowest to obtain the rank order. To produce more specific and usable results, 28 ranked items were divided into quartiles and each quartiles consists of seven characteristics rated by the respondents.

To address the third research question, which is to compare the student and instructor perspective on effective teaching characteristics, researcher conducted a between-subject, two-group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), with demographic participant as the factor and each of the 28 teacher qualities serving as dependent variables. The results of the analysis were discussed in Chapter 4.

Validity and Reliability

Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) has been used widely in numerous studies. For example; in one study, Keeley, Smith and Buskist (2006) had conducted the research to study TBC as a potential tool for assessing teaching. According their study, the internal consistency (coefficient alpha) of the two subscales was .93 (caring and supportive) and .90 (professional competency and communication skills), respectively, with a coefficient of .95 for the total scale. Test-retest estimates of reliability from the middle to end of the semester were .68 for the caring and supportive scale, .72 for the professionalism and communication skills scale, and .71 for the

total scale, with the understanding that actual value of the ratings increased an average of half a point across the term. Overall, the internal consistency of the scale appears to be excellent.

To examine the TBC construct validity, Keeley, et al. (2006) performed two one-way ANOVAs across the four professors with the two subscales as dependent measures. The analysis for the first subscale, caring and supportive, produced significant results, $F(3, 307)=36.59$, $p<.001$. They, then performed Tukey post-hoc tests. Professor 1 scored the lowest and was significantly different from the other professors. Professor 2, who scored highest, was different from Professors 1 and 3, but about equal to Professor 4. (They obtained similar results using the more conservative Scheffé and Bonferroni tests.) The analysis of the second subscale was also significant, $F(3, 308) = 19.11$, $p < .001$. Again, we used Tukey's honestly significant difference to examine the pattern of differences (the interpretation of the results was the same using Scheffé and Bonferroni corrections). Professor 1 scored significantly lower than all other professors, who were approximately equal to each other. The pattern of results for both subscales was consistent not only with our informal knowledge of these professors' reputations as teachers, but also with students' evaluations of them using the standard Auburn University eight-item teaching evaluation form. They rank ordered the mean of each professor's ratings using this form from the same four classes that also completed the TBC. Professor 1 averaged the lowest overall mean score ($M = 4.30$) and Professors 2, 3, and 4 averaged higher (4.70, 4.73, and 4.69, respectively). Post-hoc comparisons of the students' standard teaching evaluations showed only Professor 1 performing less well than the other professors and did not clearly distinguish the performances of the remaining three. This result is not consistent with their findings on the caring and supportive subscale, which differentiated professors further. However, the students' standard teaching evaluations did match the general pattern of results they obtained using the professional

competency and communication skills subscale. Their examination of the eight items that comprise the standard teaching evaluation explain these data. Six of the eight items reflected course organization and communication skills, whereas only one item directly addressed the instructor's personal style ("Instructor was actively helpful"). The remaining item could be seen fitting either scale ("Instructor motivated me"). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the standard teaching evaluation mostly addressed issues similar to those found on the second subscale, hence its similarity to the results of the standard form. Although this evidence is far from conclusive, it does provide initial support for the validity of the two subscales, warranting their further development and investigation. In other words, the TBC appears to provide a relatively clean measurement of teacher quality (Keeley, et al., 2010). The results of Buskist et al. (2002) have been replicated in American, Canadian, and Japanese community colleges, public universities, and private schools (Epting, Zinn, Buskist, & Buskist, 2004; Keeley, Christopher, & Buskist, 2012; Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn, & Buskist, 2003; Vulcano, 2007; Wann, 2001).

However, in this study, this instrument also showed high reliability with Cronbach's of the 28-items as one-factor solution at $\alpha = .943$.

Table 7

Instrument's Reliability Analysis

Reliability Statistic	*N*	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items
Teacher Behavior Checklist	28	.943	.945

Ethics

In compliance with the Auburn University Institutional Review Board (IRB), all ethical concerns were addressed (See Appendix G). The IRB Research Protocol Review Form was filed

to provide the detailed information regarding this study such as contact information of both the researcher and advisor, proof of mandatory CITI training, research methodology, participant information, risks to participants, research purpose and title, research location, recruiting process of participants, data collection procedures, data analysis procedure, and protection of the data.

The investigator also provided the information letter, email invitations for participants, TBC, and the authorization letter from the Office of the Dean of Technical Education and Workforce Development. The submitted IRB Research Protocol was approved by the Office of Research Compliance. The participants of the study were provided with a copy of the information letter attach on the first page of the survey. Participation in this study was voluntary and participants were allowed to withdraw the process at any time of the study.

All the quantitative data was only accessible to the researcher, and the data were securely placed by researcher in locked file drawer in researcher's supervisor office. After completing the study, all the data including surveys, files, and notes were destroyed. The researcher also informed the participants that the collected data would be only used for a doctoral dissertation, conference presentations, and future publication. None of the data were identifiable.

Summary

This chapter covered the research design, tools and implemented data collection procedures used in responding to the research questions. The participants sample consisted of vocational education students and instructors from the two-year higher education institution in Southeastern of United States. The instrument used to collect the data was the TBC along with demographic information. The collection and analysis procedures of data were discussed. The descriptive statistics and MANOVA analysis were conducted with the use of the SPSS software to compute and analyze the data. Ethical and credential issues were also specified in this study.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of the study including demographic reports, response rate, discussion of results and summary.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the student and instructor perception of effective teaching characteristics as well as to investigate the distinction between them. This research was conducted to determine the association of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between student and instructors in a vocational setting. The objectives are: 1) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of students in vocational education; 2) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education; 3) to identify if there is any significant difference perception on effective teaching characteristics between students and instructors. This study was to determine if there were disparities of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between college students and faculty especially in a vocational education setting. For example, some instructors might believe mastering the content of subject knowledge is more important than building rapport with the student. They may also think by obtaining an advanced degree and possessing a number of experiences in their teaching areas, these efforts will enhance their teaching effectiveness. The student may expect the educator to develop rapport and display openness crucial to understanding.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of students in vocational education?
2. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education?
3. Is there a difference between students and instructors in vocational education based on teaching qualities?

Response Rate

Table 8

Respondents' Response Rates

Category	Number of Responses	Response Percentage
Students	137	68.5%
Instructors	6	100%

One hundred thirty-seven students and six instructors at a Southeastern community college participated in the study. Surveys were distributed to six instructors (100% return rate) and 200 students (68.5% return rate). The response rate of the survey was considered acceptable. However, researcher eliminated 10 student surveys because of respondent errors.

Demographic Results

Table 9

Frequency Distribution of Respondents

Demographic	*n*	**%**
Student	137	95.8
Instructors	6	4.2

n = 143

A total of one hundred forty-three respondents involved in this study. 95.8% of the respondents consists of vocational students, while 4.2% represent the faculty members.

Discussion of Findings

Table 10

Descriptive Statistic

Teacher qualities	Demographic	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Accessible	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.7687	.48919	134
Approachable	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.6861	.68333	137
Authoritative	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.6119	.69272	134
Confident	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.7721	.62024	136
Creative	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.4891	.81454	137
EffecComm	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.6277	.66429	137
Encourages	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.6569	.63522	137
Enthusiastic	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.6715	.66542	137
EstablishGoal	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.4672	.84932	137
Flexible	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.5985	.69091	137
GoodListener	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.7226	.60306	137
HappyHumor	Instructor	4.6667	.51640	6

	Student	4.5985	.74221	137
Humble	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.7059	.64541	136
Knwldgble	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.7299	.66976	137
Prepared	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.6324	.66454	136
PresentCurInf	Instructor	4.5000	.83666	6
	Student	4.6350	.62868	137
Professional	Instructor	4.6667	.81650	6
	Student	4.6277	.75739	137
PromoDisc	Instructor	4.5000	.83666	6
	Student	4.6176	.71033	136
PromCriThkg	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.5956	.71366	136
ProvFdbck	Instructor	4.5000	.83666	6
	Student	4.5839	.69285	137
Punctuality	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.6934	.62499	137
Rapport	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.5401	.77663	137
Realistic	Instructor	4.8333	.40825	6
	Student	4.7591	.58819	137
Respectful	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.6350	.78474	137
Sensitive	Instructor	4.6667	.51640	6
	Student	4.6058	.67907	137
Strivebebetter	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.6861	.66146	137
TechCmptnt	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6

	Student	4.6569	.70124	137
Undrstnding	Instructor	5.0000	.00000	6
	Student	4.6176	.81703	136

Answering Research Question 1

The first research question for this study was "What is the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of students in vocational education?" In order to examine the most favorable characteristics selected by student, 137 responses were analyzed. 28 teacher qualities were rank ordered from the highest to lowest based on their item means score as shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Rank Order of Importance of the 28 Teacher Qualities from Students' Perspectives

Quality/ Behavior Category	Mean		Rank
Accessible	4.769	2	(2)
Approachable/ Personable	4.686	8.5	(8)
Authoritative	4.612	20	(20)
Confident	4.772	1	(1)
Creative and Interesting	4.489	27	(27)
Effective Communicator	4.628	16.5	(16)
Encourages and Cares for Students	4.657	11.5	(11)
Enthusiastic about Teaching and about Topic	4.672	10	(10)
Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals	4.467	28	(28)
Flexible/ Open-Minded	4.599	22.5	(22)
Good Listener	4.723	5	(5)
Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous	4.599	22.5	(23)
Humble	4.706	6	(6)
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	4.730	4	(4)
Prepared	4.632	15	(15)
Presents Current Information	4.635	13.5	(13)
Professional	4.628	16.5	(17)
Promotes Class Discussion	4.618	18.5	(18)
Promotes Critical Thinking/ Intellectually Stimulating	4.596	24	(24)
Provides Constructive Feedback	4.584	25	(25)
Punctuality/ Manages Class Time	4.693	7	(7)

Rapport	4.540	26	(26)
Realistic Expectations of Students/ Fair Testing and Grading	4.759	3	(3)
Respectful	4.635	13.5	(14)
Sensitive and Persistent	4.606	21	(21)
Strives to Be a Better Teacher	4.686	8.5	(9)
Technologically Competent	4.657	11.5	(12)
Understanding	4.618	18.5	(19)

To determine more specific areas of agreement and disagreement in characteristic the rankings were then divided into quartiles so that the top seven characteristics received a quartile rank of 1, the next seven characteristics received a quartile rank of 2, the next seven characteristics received a quartile rank of 3 and the bottom seven characteristics received a quartile rank of 4. (Lammers, Savina, Skotko, & Churlyaeva, 2010). Table 12 displays the resulting ranks.

Table 12

TBC Quartile Rank for each item from Students' Perspectives

Qualities	Quartile	Rank
Confident	1	(1)
Accessible	1	(2)
Realistic Expectations of Students Fair Testing and Grading	1	(3)
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	1	(4)
Good Listener	1	(5)
Humble	1	(6)
Punctuality/ Manages Class Time	1	(7)
Approachable/ Personable	2	(8)
Strives to Be a Better Teacher	2	(9)
Enthusiastic about Teaching and about Topic	2	(10)
Encourages and Cares for Students	2	(11)
Technologically Competent	2	(12)
Presents Current Information	2	(13)
Respectful	2	(14)
Prepared	3	(15)
Effective Communicator	3	(16)

Professional	3	(17)
Promotes Class Discussion	3	(18)
Understanding	3	(19)
Authoritative	3	(20)
Sensitive and Persistent	3	(21)
Flexible/ Open-Minded	4	(22)
Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous	4	(23)
Promotes Critical Thinking/ Intellectually Stimulating	4	(24)
Provides Constructive Feedback	4	(25)
Rapport	4	(26)
Creative and Interesting	4	(27)
Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals	4	(28)

Table 12 shows that characteristics were selected by student as most favorable and in their preference related to teaching effectiveness. Seven characteristics in first quartile were ranked with means of 4.693 and above. The top seven items (with their associated dimensions) were:

1) Confident (Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly)
2) Accessible (Posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-mail information)
3) Realistic Expectations of Students/ Fair Testing and Grading (Covers material to be tested during class, writes relevant test questions, does not overload students with reading, teaches at an appropriate level for the majority of students in the course, curves grades when appropriate)
4) Knowledgeable about Subject Matter (Easily answers students' questions, does not read straight from the book or notes, and uses clear and understandable examples)
5) Good Listener (Doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making)
6) Humble (Admits mistakes, never brags, and doesn't take credit for others' successes)

7) Punctuality/ Manages Class Time (Arrives to class on time/early, dismisses class on time, presents relevant materials in class, leaves time for questions, keeps appointments, returns work in a timely way)

In general, students in vocational education place more priority to instructors' student - teacher relationship instead of interpersonal dimensions. Instructor were expected to speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly, accessible to students outside class hours, demonstrates fairness, mastering the subject knowledge and listens and value's student experiences. Furthermore, student prefer their instructor to not interrupt while they are talking, maintains eye contact, never brags, admits mistakes, doesn't take credit for others' successes, keeps appointments, exercising good time management.

However, there were several qualities that were poorly rated by the students and ranked low in their association with effective teaching. The item in fourth quartile had means of 4.599 and less. These qualities (with their associated dimensions) included:

22) Flexible/ Open-Minded (Changes calendar of course events when necessary, will meet at hours outside of office hours, pays attention to students when they state their opinions, accepts criticism from others, and allows students to do make-up work when appropriate).
23) Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous (Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students).
24) Promotes critical thinking/ intellectually stimulating (Asks thoughtful questions during class, uses essay questions on tests and quizzes, assigns homework, and holds group discussions/ activities).
25) Provides constructive feedback (Writes comments on returned work, answers students'

questions, and gives advice on test-taking).

26) Rapport (Makes class laugh through jokes and funny stories, initiates and maintains class discussions, knows student names, interacts with students before and after class).

27) Creative and interesting (Experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone).

28) Establishes daily and academic term goals (Prepares/ follows the syllabus and has goals for each class).

Among the lowest ranked items were "Establishes daily and academic term goals" and "Creative and interesting" with the means between 4.467 (*SD*= 0.849) and 4.489 (*SD*=0.815). It also appears the students believe that instructors who "Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals" (e.g. prepares/ follows the syllabus and has goals for each class) and who are "Creative and Interesting" (e.g. experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone) are less favored and ranked among the lowest rated items in their relationship to effective teaching. A detailed discussion of these results is provided in Chapter Five.

Answering Research Question 2

In addressing the second research question, responses from six instructors were analyzed to describe the instructor preference of effective characteristics. Same procedure was implemented to the data. Mean of each responses were ranked in order from highest to lowest in Table 13. Top ten characteristics were ranked with means of 5.00 were identified as follow:

Table 13

Rank Order of Importance of the 28 Teacher Qualities from Instructors' Perspectives

Quality/ Behavior Category	Mean		Rank
Accessible	5.000	1.5	(1)
Approachable/ Personable	4.833	13.5	(13)
Authoritative	4.833	13.5	(14)
Confident	5.000	1.5	(2)
Creative and Interesting	5.000	1.5	(3)
Effective Communicator	5.000	1.5	(4)
Encourages and Cares for Students	4.833	13.5	(15)
Enthusiastic about Teaching and about Topic	4.833	13.5	(16)
Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals	4.833	13.5	(17)
Flexible/ Open-Minded	5.000	1.5	(5)
Good Listener	5.000	1.5	(6)
Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous	4.667	23.5	(23)
Humble	4.833	13.5	(18)
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	4.833	13.5	(19)
Prepared	4.833	13.5	(20)
Presents Current Information	4.500	25.5	(26)
Professional	4.667	23.5	(24)
Promotes Class Discussion	4.500	25.5	(27)
Promotes Critical Thinking/ Intellectually Stimulating	4.833	13.5	(21)
Provides Constructive Feedback	4.500	25.5	(28)
Punctuality/ Manages Class Time	5.000	1.5	(7)
Rapport	5.000	1.5	(8)
Realistic Expectations of Students/ Fair Testing and Grading	4.833	13.5	(22)
Respectful	5.000	1.5	(9)
Sensitive and Persistent	4.667	23.5	(25)
Strives to Be a Better Teacher	5.000	1.5	(10)
Technologically Competent	5.000	1.5	(11)
Understanding	5.000	1.5	(12)

To distinguish characteristic accordingly, the rankings were then divided into quartiles so that the top seven characteristics received a quartile rank of 1, the next seven characteristics received a quartile rank of 2, the next seven characteristics received a quartile rank of 3 and the bottom seven characteristics received a quartile rank of 4. (Lammers, et al., 2010). Table 14 illustrates the resulting ranks

Table 14

TBC Quartile Rank for each item from Instructors' Perspectives

Qualities	Quartile	Rank
Accessible	1	(1)
Confident	1	(2)
Creative and interesting	1	(3)
Effective communicator	1	(4)
Flexible/open minded	1	(5)
Good Listener	1	(6)
Punctuality/ Manages Class Time	1	(7)
Rapport	2	(8)
Respectful	2	(9)
Strives to Be a Better Teacher	2	(10)
Technologically Competent	2	(11)
Understanding	2	(12)
Approachable/ Personable	2	(13)
Authoritative	2	(14)
Encourages and Cares for Students	3	(15)
Enthusiastic about Teaching and about Topic	3	(16)
Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals	3	(17)
Humble	3	(18)
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	3	(19)
Prepared	3	(20)
Promotes Critical Thinking/ Intellectually Stimulating	3	(21)
Realistic Expectations of Students/ Fair Testing and Grading	4	(22)
Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous	4	(23)
Professional	4	(24)
Sensitive and Persistent	4	(25)
Presents Current Information	4	(26)
Promotes Class Discussion	4	(27)
Provides Constructive Feedback	4	(28)

Table 14 displays that qualities were selected by instructors as most favorable and in their preference related to teaching effectiveness. Seven characteristics in first quartile were ranked with means of 5.000. The top seven items (with their associated dimensions) were:

1) Accessible (Posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-mail information)
2) Confident (Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly)
3) Creative and interesting (Experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone)
4) Effective communicator (Speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples)
5) Flexible/open minded (Changes calendar of course events when necessary, will meet at hours outside of office hours, pays attention to students when they state their opinions, accepts criticism from others, and allows students to do make-up work when appropriate)
6) Good Listener (Doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making)
7) Punctuality/ Manages Class Time (Arrives to class on time/early, dismisses class on time, presents relevant materials in class, leaves time for questions, keeps appointments, returns work in a timely way)

Based on the result of the analysis, instructor in vocational education prefer student-teacher relationship more than interpersonal dimensions. This can be interpreted when six out of top ten ranked item consists of professional competency and communication skills item. Instructor of vocational education postulated, as a means to become master teacher they have to be reachable to the student. For example: gives out phone number and email information, certain when answering the questions, speaks clearly, and making eye contact while communicating.

Instructor also viewed practicing various teaching method, interesting, relevant and giving personal example as well as effective communication is important to enhance learning.

Moreover, excellent instructor also was expected to accept criticism from others, doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, implementing effective time management, maintain interacts with students before and after class, does not humiliate, talk down or embarrass students in class and always find the way to improves themselves others than requests feedback on his/ her teaching ability from students.

In contrast, seven teaching behaviors in fourth quartile were hardly chosen and have little association with effective teaching from instructors' perspective with the means between 4.500 (*SD*= 0.837) and 4.833 (*SD*=0.408). These qualities (with their associated dimensions) as follow:

22) Realistic Expectations of Students/ Fair Testing and Grading (Covers material to be tested during class, writes relevant test questions, does not overload students with reading, teaches at an appropriate level for the majority of students in the course, curves grades when appropriate).
23) Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous (Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students).
24) Professional (Dresses nicely [neat and clean shoes, slacks, blouses, dresses, shirts, ties] and no profanity).
25) Sensitive and Persistent (Makes sure students understand material before moving to new material, holds extra study sessions, repeats information when necessary, asks questions to check student understanding).
26) Present Current Information (Relates topic to current, real life situations; uses recent

videos, magazines, and newspapers to demonstrate points; talks about current topics; uses new or recent texts).

27) Promotes Class Discussion (Asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class).

28) Provides Constructive Feedback (Writes comments on returned work, answers students' questions, and gives advice on test-taking).

It also appears the instructors believe that instructors who provides constructive feedback (e.g. writes comments on returned work, answers students' questions, and gives advice on test-taking) and those who are promotes class discussion (e.g. asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class) are less effective and should be avoided when teaching students in vocational settings. Further discussion on this finding is present in next chapter.

Answering Research Question 3

Table 15

Multivariate Test

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Non-cent Parameter	Observed Power
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.971	126.229	28.000	104.000	.000	.971	3534.404	1.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.029	126.229	28.000	104.000	.000	.971	3534.404	1.000
	Hotelling's Trace	33.985	126.229	28.000	104.000	.000	.971	3534.404	1.000
	Roy's Largest Root	33.985	126.229	28.000	104.000	.000	.971	3534.404	1.000
Demographic	Pillai's Trace	.134	.577	28.000	104.000	.952	.134	16.144	.474
	Wilks' Lambda	.866	.577	28.000	104.000	.952	.134	16.144	.474
	Hotelling's Trace	.155	.577	28.000	104.000	.952	.134	16.144	.474
	Roy's Largest Root	.155	.577	28.000	104.000	.952	.134	16.144	.474

To analyze the third research question, a one-way MANOVA tested whether the mean scores of students' perception compared to instructors' perception. Results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference on perception of effective teaching characteristics

between students and instructors, Wilks' λ = .866, F (28, 104) = .577, p = .952, partial η² = .134. The multivariate effect size was estimated at .134, which implies that 13.4% of the variance in the canonically derived dependent variable was accounted for by group or population perspectives. Further, Cohen's effect size value (*d* = .134) suggested a high practical significance. Result of the univariate ANOVA was provided in Table 16.

Table 16

Descriptive and Analysis of Variance Table

	Student		Instructor			
Quality	**M**	**SE**	**M**	**SE**	***F*(1, 131)**	**η²**
Accessible	4.772	.043	5.000	.197	1.288	.010
Approachable/ Personable	4.677	.061	4.833	.282	.292	.002
Authoritative	4.622	.060	4.833	.278	.552	.004
Confident	4.764	.055	5.000	.255	.823	.006
Creative and Interesting	4.496	.072	5.000	.330	2.223	.017
Effective Communicator	4.630	.059	5.000	.271	1.784	.013
Encourages and Cares for Students	4.669	.055	4.833	.255	.396	.003
Enthusiastic	4.693	.057	4.833	.262	.275	.002
Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals	4.488	.073	4.833	.336	1.010	.008
Flexible/ Open-Minded	4.606	.060	5.000	.277	1.929	.015
Good Listener	4.732	.050	5.000	.228	1.315	.010
Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous	4.583	.067	4.667	.307	.071	.001
Humble	4.685	.058	4.833	.267	.294	.002
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	4.756	.052	4.833	.237	.102	.001
Prepared	4.669	.052	4.833	.239	.449	.003
Presents Current Information	4.646	.056	4.500	.259	.303	.002
Professional	4.630	.069	4.667	.317	.013	.000
Promotes Class Discussion	4.606	.065	4.500	.298	.121	.001
Promotes Critical Thinking	4.598	.063	4.833	.288	.634	.005
Provides Constructive Feedback	4.583	.063	4.500	.291	.077	.001
Punctuality/ Manages Class Time	4.724	.050	5.000	.229	1.378	.010
Rapport	4.567	.064	5.000	.297	2.035	.015
Realistic	4.780	.051	4.833	.233	.051	.000
Respectful	4.654	.068	5.000	.312	1.174	.009
Sensitive and Persistent	4.583	.061	4.667	.281	.085	.001
Strives to Be a Better Teacher	4.685	.059	5.000	.270	1.297	.010
Technologically Competent	4.654	.062	5.000	.287	1.391	.011

Understanding	4.630	.072	5.000	.330	1.201	.009

Table 17

Comparison of Students' and Instructors' Perspectives of the 28 Qualities/ Behavior

Quality/ Behavior Category	Student Rank	Instructor Rank
Accessible	**2**	**1**
Approachable/ Personable	8	13
Authoritative	20	14
Confident	**1**	**2**
Creative and Interesting	27	3
Effective Communicator	16	4
Encourages and Cares for Students	11	15
Enthusiastic about Teaching and about Topic	10	16
Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals	28	17
Flexible/ Open-Minded	22	5
Good Listener	**5**	**6**
Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous	**23**	**23**
Humble	6	18
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	4	19
Prepared	15	20
Presents Current Information	13	26
Professional	17	24
Promotes Class Discussion	18	27
Promotes Critical Thinking/ Intellectually Stimulating	24	21
Provides Constructive Feedback	25	28
Punctuality/ Manages Class Time	**7**	**7**
Rapport	26	8
Realistic Expectations of Students/ Fair Testing and Grading	3	22
Respectful	14	9
Sensitive and Persistent	21	25
Strives to Be a Better Teacher	**9**	**10**
Technologically Competent	**12**	**11**
Understanding	19	12

Although the finding shows that there is no statistically significant difference between student and instructor on perspective of effective teaching characteristics, student and instructor only jointly agreed on seven out of 28 teacher qualities, however, in different order: (a)

accessible, (b) confident, (c) good listener, (d) happy/ positive attitude/ humorous, (e) punctuality/ manages class time, (f) strives to be a better teacher and (g) technology competent.

These data also revealed five qualities or behaviors- accessible, confident, good listener, punctuality/ manages class time, strives to be a better teacher and technologically competent as important to students and instructors, suggesting slightly more student-faculty agreement in this sample. Both students and instructor have perfect agreement on "Punctuality/ Manages Class Time" and "Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous". However, item "Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous" considered as relatively least important characteristics which ranked 23rd by both group.

Summary

Based on quantitative analysis of this study, student in vocational education setting viewed their instructor as an effective educator when they are confident, accessible, realistic and fair in testing and grading, knowledgeable about subject matter, good listener, humble, punctual and manage class time. Meanwhile, instructor believed accessible, confident, creative and interesting, effective communicator, flexible/open minded, good listener, punctuality and manage class time is more important in order to perform their teaching effectively. Although the analysis of the results discovered no statistical, significant difference between student and instructor perception on effective teaching characteristics, both group have mutual agreement on seven out of 28 behavior or qualities which are: accessible, confident, good listener, punctuality/ manage class time, strives to be a better teacher and technology competent. Both student and instructor also agreed that happy/ positive attitude/ humorous as relatively least important characteristics.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides the summary of the study, discussion of the findings, conclusions based on results of data analysis, implications of the study and recommendations for further and future research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the student and instructor perception of effective teaching characteristics as well as to investigate the distinction between them. This research was conducted to determine the association of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between student and instructors in a vocational setting. The objectives are: 1) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of students in vocational education; 2) to identify the effective teaching characteristics from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education; 3) to identify if there is any significant difference perception on effective teaching characteristics between students and instructors. This study was to determine if there were disparities of perceptions of effective teaching characteristics between college students and faculty especially in a vocational education setting. For example, some instructors might believe mastering the content of subject knowledge is more important than building rapport with the student. They may also think by obtaining an advanced degree and possessing a number of experiences in their teaching areas, these efforts will enhance their teaching effectiveness. The

student may expect the educator to develop rapport and display openness crucial to understanding.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of students in vocational education?
2. What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education?
3. Is there a difference between students and instructors in vocational education based on teaching qualities?

Summary

This study explored the students' and instructors' perception of effective teaching characteristics as well as investigating the distinction between them as perceived by 137 students and six instructors in a Community College in Southeastern United States. Convenience sampling method was employ on selecting the population and sample of the study. Using the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC), students and instructors in vocational education were asked to rate the 28 teacher qualities in their preference which resulted to effective teaching. Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage and mean score), were used to explain the respondent preferences. In order to study the existence of any difference perception between both groups, a one-way MANOVA analysis of inferential statistics was used at .05 level of significant. Data were analyzed using the Statistic Package for the Social Science version 21.0 (SPSS v21.0) for windows software.

An analysis of the results revealed students prefer their instructor to be confident, accessible, realistic and fair in testing and grading, knowledgeable about subject matter, good listener, humble, punctual and manage class time. Instructors believe in order to be an effective teacher, these characteristics are more important; accessible, confident, creative and interesting, effective communicator, flexible/open minded, good listener, punctuality and manage class time. The analysis of data found no statistical, significant difference between student and instructor perception on effective teaching characteristics, both have strong agreement on seven out of 28 most effective characteristic: accessible, confident, good listener, punctuality/ manage class time, strives to be a better teacher and technology competent. Both students and instructors have agreement on happy/ positive attitude/ humorous as relatively least important characteristics.

Discussion

Research Question 1: What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of students in vocational education?

Among seven teaching qualities which were rated as most important by students in first quartile, five of them (confident, knowledgeable about subject matter, good listener, humble and punctuality/ manage class time) are under professional competency and communication skills dimensions. While the characteristics of accessible and realistic expectations of students/ fair testing and grading, fall under caring and supportive factor. The classification of both the component of professional competency and communication skills and caring and supportive characterizes a division recognized in Keeley, Smith and Buskist's research (2006). Since the item of the professional competency and communication skills outnumbered caring and supportive component, therefore, in general, students in vocational education place more priority to instructors' teaching competencies instead of interpersonal dimensions.

The finding of this study exhibit that students highlight the importance of instructional competencies over personality factors in effective teaching concurs with McElwee and Redman, 1993; Cravens, 1996; Husband, 1998; Berry, 2002; Witcher, Onwuegbuzie, Collins, Filer, Wiedmaier, & Moore, 2003; Faranda and Clarke, 2004; Brown, 2004; Voss, Gruber, and Szmigin, 2007; Pietrzak, Duncan, and Korcuska, 2008; Saroyan, Dangenais and Zhou, 2009; Sweeney, Morrison, Jarratt, and Heffernan, 2009; Delaney, Johnson, Johnson, and Treslan, 2010; Latif and Miles, 2013. This finding also corresponds with Miron's research (1983) indicating that, when evaluating lecturers, the student brings up the academic component in the evaluation of a good teacher, including knowledge of the subject taught, as well as good teaching methods, while interaction between instructor and student is only of secondary importance. In a number of studies that checked how student regarded an exceptional teacher, there was clear preference for the teacher competency as the most desired characteristic.

Research has also shown that although similar constructs emerge from studies about student beliefs on good teaching, the importance of certain characteristics is dependent on student background (Bullock, 2015). Kutnick and Jules (1993) assert that student perceptions are individual and subjective based on student age, background and experiences and this is supported by more current research (Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2005; Komarraju, 2013).

The criteria chosen indicate that students in vocational education tend to see the instructor primarily as a 'trainer'. It focuses on development of some specific skill and by practicing the skill; the trainee tries to become expert in that skill. It limits independent thinking and the trainee is bound to repeat the same activities. They must do what they have been 'asked to do', to be competent in the workplace task. (Watson, 2015). The trainees receive particular training relevant at a particular time and in a particular context. Instructors are regarded from the

standpoint of their function as highly skilled teachers and this focuses on the acquisition of some specific 'skill' where drill as an essential part of training.

This finding is particularly remarkable given that students do not value the interpersonal aspects of teaching as reported in many contemporary studies. The premise behind the present study is that community college students differ in their perception of education from those who attend universities. The findings of this study suggest that students in vocational education believe instructors professional competency and communication skills are important elements in effective teaching and it is recommended that instructors' competency should be prioritized in the future measurement especially in vocational education setting. This reinforces the importance of instructional proficiency as a main component of effective teaching.

Research Question 2: What are the most important teaching qualities from the perspectives of instructors in vocational education?

Generally, instructors' who participated in this study held stronger beliefs that technical competencies are more important than interpersonal dimensions. This can be interpreted when five out of seven most important effective teaching characteristic chosen (confident, effective communicator, good listener and punctuality/ manage class time) consists of professional competency and communication skills dimensions. It was not surprisingly when instructors themselves place more emphasize on teaching techniques in order to become master teachers based on discussion in many prior studies. Interestingly, the greatest number of characteristics was identified within the area of instruction. This verifies the continued belief that for teachers to be effective, they must first master those characteristics that guide instruction – that is, teaching methods (Roberts & Dyer, 2004).

These findings seem to support the importance of technical competence and proficiency for every effective instructor as suggested by Choi, 1988; Larsen, 1992; Wann, 2001; Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, and Saville, 2002; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, and James, 2002; Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn and Buskist, 2003; Mowrer, Love and Orem, 2004; Roberts and Dyer, 2004; Mehdinezhad, 2012; Komos, 2013; Singh, Pai, Sinha, Kaur, Soe and Barua, 2013.

However, this result contrasts with some authors who propose the importance of creating a student-friendly environment (e.g. Ahem, 1969; Tursman, 1981; Hyslop, 1988; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991; Foster and Finley, 1995; Mann, 2001; Witcher, Onwuegbuzie, and Minor, 2001)

The primary place accorded by instructors to the professional competency and communication skills dimensions in the concept of effective teacher in comparison to the caring and supportive dimensions may also be explained as expressing a reduction in the status, importance and command of knowledge among instructors themselves. These might be the possibility that instructors have internalized by the fact 81% of universities offer basic literacy skills training, 100% of community colleges offer literacy skills training (Hansen, 1998).

Research Question 3: Is there a difference between students and instructors in vocational education based on teaching qualities?

Past research has shown significant differences between students' and professors' perception of teaching effectiveness (e.g. Sojka, Ashok, and Down (2002); Buskist et al. (2002); Schaeffer et al. (2003). On the other hand, finding in this current study reported that there is no statistically significant difference between student and instructor on the perspective of effective teaching characteristics. This study has similar finding with O'Meara, (2007); Berg and Lindseth (2004); and Keeley, Smith, and Buskist (2006) but with different sample populations.

However, seven characteristics or qualities in this study jointly endorsed by students and instructors; accessible, confident, good listener, punctuality/ manages class time, strives to be a better teacher and technology competent were considered very important for every effective instructor. According to this finding, most students and instructors agreed professional competency and communication skills are a dominant and important factor of effective instructor behavior. This correspondent with the findings of several researchers (e.g. Burdsal and Bardo, 1986; Feldman, 1988; Lammers and Smith, 2008; Mowrer et al., 2004). In addition, the effective instructor was not perceived as happy/ positive attitude/ humorous since it has been as relatively least important characteristic which ranked by both students and instructors in 23rd.

In 1988, Feldman examined 31 studies that were about effective teaching to determine similarities and differences in the views of students and instructors. Overall, more similarities in their views were reported, but Feldman also found some differences. For example, in comparison to instructors, students consistently placed more emphasis on teachers' good elocutionary skills, availability, helpfulness, stimulating learner interest, and outcomes as a result of instruction. However, studies examining the views of both students and instructors regarding effective teaching since Feldman's study were not very much found.

In the United Kingdom, Revell and Wainwright (2009) investigated what constitutes an "unmissable lecture" by comparing the views of geography students and faculty. Qualitative interviews conducted by the researchers found remarkable consistency between students and teachers. Both agreed on the importance of providing a good structure to the lesson that incorporates student involvement (technical aspects), as well as adequate interpersonal interaction and passion on the part of the professor (interpersonal aspects).

Some research also shows that teacher's perceptions of characteristics that define a good teacher vary from those of students. Beishuizen, Hof, Van Putten, Bouwmeester and Asscher, (2001) found that teachers displayed a majority personality view on good teaching which contrasted with student's majority ability view. This finding aligns with those of Murphy, Delli and Edwards (2004) in the sense that teachers in their study agreed that good teachers needed to be caring, not boring and polite, which are personality traits. Teachers may provide insights into good teaching characteristics that students might not realize until presented to them. (Bullock, 2015).

This study suggests that instructor as a trainer are unique in the way that both students and instructors group acknowledged the same item characteristic that is belong to the same factor (professional competency and communication skills). Instead, it seems that they may represent instructional competency is the most appreciable teaching approach in vocational education setting.

Conclusions

This research has shown that students in vocational education who are studying at a two-year community college in Southeastern United States perceived confident, accessible realistic expectations of students/ fair testing and grading knowledgeable about subject matter, good listener, humble and punctuality/ manage class time as the most effective teaching characteristics with an emphasis an emphasis on professional competency and communication skills aspects. On the other hand, instructors at the same institution identified teacher behavior variables that contributed to teaching effectiveness including: accessible, confident, creative and interesting, effective communicator, flexible/open minded good listener and punctuality/ manage class time.

Overall, both group, students and instructor place a greater emphasize on professional competency and communication skills factor than caring supportive factor. Although finding shown there is no statistically significant between student and instructor perception on effective teaching characteristics, both group has acknowledged that accessible, confident, good listener, punctuality/ manages class time, strives to be a better teacher and technology competent as very popular characteristics of effective teaching and both of them have a perfect agreement that happy/ positive attitude/ humorous was among the least important teaching characteristic for effective instructor. In conclusion, this exploratory study highlights the importance of instructors teaching competencies dimension as effective characteristics in teaching in vocational education setting.

Implications for practice

The present findings of this study proposed salient implications for community college instructors, administrators, and policy makers to enhance vocational instructors' teaching competencies as a mean to establish the education quality as well as to provide a better learning environment.

Community College Instructor

The current educational system can no longer afford to offer services that fail to meet students' expectations and needs. Many students enroll in community colleges to improve or upgrade their job skills and to improve their economic outlooks (Saunders & Bauer, 1998). Based on the findings of the study, community college instructors (in vocational education) were in need of to enhancing their instructional competency to improve their teaching standards.

Meanwhile, according to Bryant (2001), students age 35 and older make up a larger percentage of part-time students than full-time students. In addition, the most current national

data suggest that as many as 70% of community colleges students are employed either full or part-time while enrolled in classes (American Association of Community Colleges, 2002). Those students who are employed on a fulltime basis are greater at the community college level than at the four-year institutional level (Saunders & Bauer, 1998). Since the learning session involving more of adult students with working experience, instructors were advised to be more humble (as suggested in this current finding) in order to maintain the conducive learning environment.

Furthermore, community colleges students in general are extremely attractive to returning students, especially those with children. (Oesch, 2005). Because of that, they have busy lives and hectic schedule. Therefore, instructors need to be more accessible, good listener, punctual manage class time and having realistic expectations of students and fair testing and grading as perceived by the students in this study to remedy a matter.

Administrator

By taking advantage of this finding, administrator would be able to compile and create a profile of an effective vocational education instructor, providing a new perspective to effective teaching in specific fields of study. Understanding and documenting effective teaching has only increased in importance in this era of educational standards and accountability.

Policy makers

It is crucial for those who are involved in organizing the curriculum and instruction for teacher development programs to provide some opportunity for instructors discuss contemporary teaching approaches and students' need during professional development programs. This reflection session should be transparent and open because there is no single image of a good teacher as Kutnick and Jules (1993) assert that student perceptions (on good teaching) is individual and subjective based on student age, background and experiences and this is supported

by more current research (Furnham & Chamorro, Premuzic, 2005; Komarraju, 2013). Thus, this critical discussion should be constructivist. If possible it should relate to students' and teachers' experiences, to how they process these experiences and to their abilities to connect to both the theoretical material they have learned and their attempts to give significance to their experiences. (Baxter-Magolda, 1999).

Contribution to the body of knowledge

This research contributes to literature on effective teaching by enlighten on the importance component of characteristics valued in vocational education setting. This study provides an empirical findings by increasing understanding of effective teaching from the students' and instructors' perspectives and by providing the research based of explanation of this perceptions.

In contrast to some people might expect, the students in vocational education responses was clearly inconsistent with the prior study. This study stress that student highlight the importance of instructor teaching competency more than personality factor not as reported in the most contemporary higher education studies. The underlying factor is that 2-years community college students' perception is different from students who attend 4-years higher education institution. The finding of this study also shown that, there is no significant difference between what students' and instructors' perceived about the characteristics of effective teaching.

Interestingly, instructional competency dimension still be the preference dimension jointly chosen by the students and instructors. These additions reinforce the importance of instructional proficiency as a component of effective teaching. The real understanding of effective teaching characteristics from students' and instructors' perspective is substantial not just for the instructors but also to administrators and policy makers to promote and assist them to

monitor their own teaching, to become effective educator and to create a better environment for the retention of knowledge.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. Further research is necessary as the results of this study are based on a limited, specific demographic and relatively small sample. In addition, the study was conducted at only one location. It would be interesting to replicate the study in another discipline, in another academic field, culture, geography and also to continue conducting the study as longitudinal approach to detect any views change over time. Some researchers predicted that age, life and academic experience affects student's perception on good teaching. It would be very useful if the future researcher can consider and include this component into the study.
2. The researcher employed quantitative methods to determine effectiveness and survey instruments predominated. Results of quantitative research, for the most part, generated lists of competencies that defined effectiveness; but they failed to provide any depth of understanding about teacher effectiveness. Furthermore, by using quantitative methods that participants are only subjected are given to rate the constructs given, and might have other ideas that are not included or measured. As a triangulation or complement to the study, mixed methods of study is proposed as qualitative research can provide rich in-depth information because it is essentially concerned with what people and events mean (e.g. the why as well as the what). (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).
3. It is strongly recommended for future research to investigate the qualities that were absent from the representation of effective characteristics: Does the absence of caring and

supportive dimension from the effective teaching characteristics reflect the disregard of humane aspect in teaching? Etcetera.

4. Future research is recommended to investigate how instructors perceived their capability in some construct of teaching and the discrepancies with what they are really able to teach. The relations between instructors' perception of teaching efficacy and their actual teaching practices could be examined by direct observation in future studies.

References

Aaronson, D., Barrow, L., & Sander, W. (2007). Teachers and student achievement in the Chicago Public High Schools. *Journal of Labor Economics, 25*, 95-135.

Abrami, P. C., & D'Apollonia, S. (1991). Multidimensional students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness- Generalizability of "*N=1"* research. Comment on Marsh (1991). *Journal of Educational Psychology, 30,* 221-227.

About SUSCC (2016). In *Southern Union State Community College online*. Retrieved from http://www.suscc.edu/about-suscc/about-suscc.cms.

Adamson, G., O'Kane, D., & Shevlin, M. (2005). Students' ratings of teaching effectiveness: A laughing matter? *Psychological Reports, 96,* 225–226.

Addison, W. E. (2005, August). The multidimensionality of effective teaching: Evidence from student evaluations. Paper delivered at the American Psychological Association convention, Washington, DC.

Ahem, J. (1969). Characteristics of teachers who have received an "Outstanding Teacher" award from New England institutions of higher education in the five-year period beginning with the academic year 1963-64 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 30,* 2717 A.

Airasian, P. W., & Gullickson, A. (1994). Examination of teacher self-assessment. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 8*(2), 195-203. doi: 10.1007/BF00972263.

Allan, J., Clarke, K., & Jopling, M. (2009). Effective teaching in higher education: Perceptions of first year undergraduate students. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 21*(3), 362-372.

Alshare, K. A., & Miller, D. S. (2009). Student perceptions of the importance of instructor traits:

A cross-cultural study. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, *13*(2), 107-134.

Alsmadi, A. (2005). Assessing the quality of students' ratings of faculty members at Mu'tah University. *Social Behavior and Personality, 33*(2), 183-188.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2002). *"Facts about community colleges."* Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/facts/fact.htm.

Anderson, M. R., Ingram, J. M., & Buford, B. J. (2012). Doctoral students' perceptions of perceptions of characteristics of effective college teachers: A mixed analysis. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 7*, 279-309.

Andrews, H. A. (2000). Lessons learned from current state and national dual-credit programs. In J. C. Palmer (Ed.). *How can community colleges create productive collaborations with local schools?* New Directions for Community Colleges. Number 111 (pp. 3139). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Arambewela, R., Hall, J., & Zuhair, S. (2006). Postgraduate international students from Asia: Factors influencing satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 15*(2), 105-127. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J050v15n02_05.

Arbizu, F., Olalde, C., Castillo, L. D. (1998). The self-evaluation of teachers: A strategy for the improvement of teaching at higher education level. *Higher Education in Europe, 23*(3), 351-356.

Aylor, B., & Opplinger, P. (2003). Out-of-class communication and student perceptions of instructor humor orientation and socio-communicative style. *Communication Education, 52*, 122-134. doi: 10.1080/0363452032000085090.

Balam, E. M., & Shannon, D. M. (2010). Student ratings of college teaching: A comparison of faculty and their students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. 35*(2). 209-

221.

Basow, S.A. (1995). Student evaluations of college professors: When gender matters. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*(4), 656–665.

Basow, S. A., & Silberg, N. T. (1987). Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 79*(3), 308–14.

Baxter-Magolda, M. B. (1999) *Creating contexts for learning and self-authorship: Constructive developmental pedagogy.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Beishuizen, J. J., Hof, E., Van Putten, C. M., Bouwmeester, S., & Asscher, J. J. (2001). Students' and teachers' cognitions about good teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 71*, 185-201.

Berg, C. L., & Lindseth, G. (2004). Students' perceptions of effective and ineffective nursing instructors. *Journal of Nursing Education, 43*(12), 565-568.

Berk, R. A. (2005). Survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 17*(1), 48-62. Retrieved from http:// www.isetl.org/ijtlhe.

Berry, B. (2002). What it means to be a "highly qualified teacher". Southeast Center for Teaching Quality. Retrieved from http://www.teachingquality.org/resources/pdfs/defining HQ.pdf

Bettencourt, E., Gillett, M., Gall, M., & Hull, R. (1983). Effects of teacher enthusiasm training on student on-task behavior and achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 20*, 435-450.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brandenburg, M. (1985). Communicator style and its relationship to instructional effectiveness in collegiate business education (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 47, 1160 A.

Bridgwater, C. A. (1982). Personality characteristics of ski instructors and predicting teacher effectiveness using the PRF. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 46,* 164-168.

Brown, G., & Atkins, M. (1988). *Effective teaching in higher education*. New York: Chapman and Hall/ Routledge,

Bryant, A. N. (2001). ERIC Review: Community college students: Recent findings and trends. *Community College Review, 29*(3), 7794.

Bullock, M. (2015). What makes a good teacher? Exploring student and teacher beliefs on good teaching. *Rising Tide. 7.* 1-30.

Burdsal, C. & Bardo, J. W. (1986). Measuring student's perceptions of teaching: Dimensions of evaluation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46*(1), 63-79.

Buskist, W., Sikorski, J., Buckley, T., & Saville, B. K. (2002). Elements of master teaching. In S. F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.). *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (pp. 27–39). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cabello, B., & Terrell, R. (1994). Making students feel like family: How teachers create warm and caring classroom climates. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 29,* 17- 23.

Carkenord, D. M., & Stephens, M. G. (1994). Understanding student judgments of teaching effectiveness: A "policy capturing" approach. *Journal of Psychology, 128*(6), 675-682.

Carson, B. H. (1996). Bad News in the Service of Good Teaching: Students Remember

Ineffective Professors. Reports Research (143) Speeches/Meeting Papers (150). Paper presented at the Annual Lilly Conference on College Teaching (16th, Oxford, OH, November 22-24, 1996).

Carusetta, E., & Cranton, P. (2009). Learning to teach: An illustrative case from the Canadian community college system. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 124*, 73-81.

Cashin, W. E. (1988). Student ratings of teaching: A summary of research. IDEA Paper no. 20. Manhattan: Kansas State University, Division of Continuing Education.

Cashin, W. E. (1989). Student ratings of teaching: Recommendations for use. IDEA Paper no. 22. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Cashin, W. E. (1995). Student ratings of teaching: The research revisited. IDEA Paper no. 32. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Cashin, W. E., & Downey, R. G. (1992). Using global student rating items for summative evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 563-572.

Check, J. F. (1979). Wanted! A humorous teacher. *The Physical Educator, 36*, 119-122.

Chen, Y., & Hoshower, L. B. (2003). Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness: an assessment of student perception and motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(1), 71-88. doi: 10.1080/0260293032000033071.

Chism, N.V.N. (1999). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook.* Bolton, MA: Anker Pub. Co.

Chism, N. V. N. (2004). Characteristics of effective teaching in higher education: Between

definitional despair and certainty. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 15*(3), 5-36.

Chism, N. V. N., Lees, N. D., & Evenbeck, S. (2002). Faculty development for teaching innovation through communities of practice. *Liberal Education, 88* (3). 34-41.

Choi, A. K. (1988). The ranking of professional competencies for business teachers identified by the National Business Education Association and its implications for business teacher education in New York state (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany). Dissertation Abstracts International. 49, 2078 A.

Clayson, D. E, & Haley, D. A. (1990). Student evaluations in marketing: What is actually being measured? *Journal of Marketing Education, 12*(3), 9-17.

Clayson, D. E., & Sheffet, M. J. (2006). Personality and the student evaluation of teaching. *Journal of Marketing Education, 28*(2), 149-160.

Clayson, D. E. (1999). Students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness: Some implications of stability. *Journal of Marketing Education, 21*(1), 68-75.

Cochran, J. H., & Hodgin, G. (2001). Instructor versus student perceptions of teaching effectiveness in economics. *International Advances in Economic Research, 7*(1), 267-269.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). *The American community college* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, P. A. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: a meta-analysis of multi-section validity studies. *Review of Educational Research, 51*(3), 281-309. doi: 10.3102/00346543051003281.

Collins, A. (1990). Transforming the assessment of teachers: Notes on a theory of assessment for

the 21st century. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Catholic Education Association, Boston, MA.

Community college. (n.d). In *Cambridge Dictionaries Online*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/community-college

Cranton, P. (2006). Fostering authentic relationships in the transformative classroom. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 109,* 33-46. doi: 10.1002/ace.203

Cranton, P. (2001). Interpretive and critical evaluation. In C. Knapper & P. Cranton (Eds.), *Fresh approaches to the evaluation of teaching* (pp.11-18). New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 88. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cranton, P. A., & Hillgarten, W. (1981). The relationships between student ratings and instructor behavior: Implications for improving teaching. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 11*, 73-81.

Cranton, P., & Knoop, R. (1991). Incorporating job satisfaction into a model of instructional effectiveness. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 48,* 99-109.

Cravens, T. F. (1996, March). Students' perceptions of the characteristics of teaching excellence. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Social Science Conference. Reno, Nevada.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, K. P. (1990). Teaching to improve learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, *1*(10), 9-22.

Cruess, R. L., & Cruess, S. R. (2006). Teaching professionalism: general principles. *Medical Teacher, 28*(3), 205-208. doi: 10.1080/01421590600643653

Cruickshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. B., & Metcalf, K. K. (2003). *The act of teaching*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Curran, J. M. & Rosen, D. E. (2006). Student attitudes toward college courses: an examination of influences and intentions. *Journal of Marketing Education, 28*(2), 135-148.

Curtis, A. & Liying, C. (2001). Teachers' self-evaluation of knowledge, skills and personality characteristics needed to manage change. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 29,* 139-143.

Davis, J. C. & Swanson, S. T. (2001). Navigating satisfactory and dissatisfactory classroom incidents. *Journal of Education for Business, 76*(5), 245-250.

D' Apollonia, S., & Abrami, E. C. (1997). Navigating student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist, 52,* 1198-1208.

Delaney, J., Johnson, A., Johnson, T. & Treslan, D. (2010). Proceeding from 26th Annual Conference on Distance Teaching & Learning: Students' perceptions of effective teaching in higher education, WI: Madison.

Delucchi, M. (2000). Don't worry, be happy: Instructor likability, student perceptions of learning, and teacher ratings in upper-level sociology courses. *Teaching Sociology*, 28 (July), 220-231.

Delucchi, M., & Pelowski, S. (2000). Liking or learning? The effect of instructor likeability and student perceptions of learning on overall ratings of teaching ability. *Radical Pedagogy, 2*(2), NP.

Demmon-Berger, D. (1986). *Effective teaching: Observations from research*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators. (ERIC Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 274 087).

Desai, S., Damewood, E. & Jones, R. (2001). Be a good teacher and be seen as a good teacher. *Journal of Marketing Education, 23*(2), 136-143.

DeShields, O. W., Kara, A., & Kaynak, E. (2005). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: Applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. *International Journal of Educational Management, 19*(2), 128 – 139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513540510582426.

Douglas, J., McClelland, R., & Davies, J. (2008). The development of a conceptual model of student satisfaction with their experience in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *16*(1), 19 – 35. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684880810848396.

Dun, R. S., & Dun, K. J. (1979). Learning styles/ Teaching styles: Should they… Can they … Be matched? *Educational Leadership.* 238-244.

Eble, K.E. (1983). *The aims of college teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Epting, L. K., Zinn, T. E., Buskist, C., & Buskist, W. (2004). Students' perspectives on the distinction between ideal and typical teachers. *Teaching of Psychology, 31,* 181-183.

Faculty (academic staff). (n.d.). Retrieved in May 10, 2016 from the Faculty Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Faculty_(academic_staff)

Fajet, W., Bello, M., Leftwich, S. A., Mesler, J. L., & Shaver, A. N. (2005). Pre-service teachers' perceptions in beginning education classes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21,* 717-727.

Faranda, W. T. & Clarke, I. (2004). Student observations of outstanding teaching: Implications for marketing education. *Journal of Marketing Education, 26* (3), 271-281.

Feeley, T. H. (2002). Evidence of halo effects in student evaluations of communication instruction. *Communication Education, 51*(3), 225-236.

Felch, J., Song, J., & Smith, D. (August 14, 2010,). Who's teaching L.A.'s kids? The Los Angeles Times.

Feldman, K. A. (1976). The superior college teacher from the student's view. *Research in Higher Education, 5*, 243-288.

Feldman, K. A. (1988). Effective college teaching from the students' and faculty's view: Matched or mismatched priorities? *Research in Higher Education, 28*(4), 291-344. doi: 10.1007/BF01006402

Feldman, K. A. (1989a). Instructional effectiveness of college teachers as judged by teachers themselves, current and former students, colleagues, administrators, and external (neutral) observers. *Research in Higher Education, 30*, 137-194.

Feldman, K. A. (1989b). The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multi-section validity studies. *Research in Higher Education, 30*(6), 583-645. doi: 10.1007/BF00992392.

Feldman, K. A. (1997). Identifying exemplary teachers and teaching: Evidence from student ratings. In R. P. Perry & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *Effective teaching in higher education: Research and practice* (pp. 368-395). New York: Agathon Press.

Fiedler, R. L., Balam, E. M., Edwards, T. L., Dyer, K. S., Wang, S. C., & Ross, M. E. (2004). College students' perceptions of effective teaching and end-of course instructor evaluations. Unpublished manuscript.

Fisler, J. L., & Firestone, W. A. (2006). Teacher learning in a school-university partnership: exploring the role of social trust and teaching efficacy beliefs. *Teachers College Record, 108*, 1155-1186.

Foote, E. (1997). *Community colleges; General information and resources*. ERIC digest. Los Angles, California: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. (ERIC Reproduction Service Document No. ED 417 771).

Foster, B. B., & Finley, E. (1995). The relationship of teacher knowledge and personal development of human relation skills in agricultural education. Paper presented at the Southern Agricultural Education Research Meeting. Wilmington, NC.

Fowler, F. J. (2002). *Survey research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc**.**.

Fowler, F. J. (2008). *Survey research methods (applied social research methods series, no. 1) 4th edition.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc**.**

Freeman, H. R. (1988). Perceptions of teacher characteristics and student judgment of teacher effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology, 15*(3), 158–60.

French, G. R., & Coppage, R. E. (2000). Educational issues challenging the future of the accounting profession. *The Ohio CPA Journal, 59*(3), 69.

Frick, T. W., Chadha, R., Watson, C., Wang, Y., & Green, P. (2009). College student perceptions of teaching and learning quality. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 57, 705–720.

Fuhrman, N. E., Fuhrman, R. G., & DeLay, A. M. (2010). Defining "good teaching" at the graduate level: Are we meeting the instructional expectations of doctoral students? *Journal of Faculty Development, 24*(2), 19-24.

Furnham, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2005). Individual differences in students' preferences for lecturers' personalities. *Journal of Individual Differences, 26*(4), 176-184.

Gale, R., & Golde, C. M. (2004). Doctoral education and the scholarship of teaching learning. *Peer Review, 6*(3), 8-12.

Gao, M., & Liu, Q., (2013). Personality Traits of Effective Teachers Represented in the Narratives of American and Chinese Preservice Teachers: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science 3*(2), 84-95.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *76,* 503-511.

Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Philadelphia: Pew Charitable Trusts.

Golen, S. (1980). Characteristics of an effective business educator. *Journal of Business Education, 56* (2), 69-71.

Gonzalez, P. D. & Gonzalez, M. I. D. (2008). This research has been supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of Spain under the research project ECO2008-05589.

Granitz, N. A., Koernig, S. K., & Harich, K. R. (2009). Now it's personal: Antecedents and outcomes of rapport between business faculty and their students. *Journal of Marketing Education, 31*(1), 52-65. doi: 10.1177/0273475308326408

Greenberg, R. (1999). Where college paths converge. *Techniques: Making education & career connections, 74* (6), 34-37.

Greenwald, A. G. (1997). Validity concerns and usefulness of student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist, 52,* 1182-1186.

Greenwald, A. G., & Gillmore, G. M. (1997). Grading leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings. *American Psychologist, 52*(11), 1209–1217.

Greer, T. S., J. G. & Greer, B. B. (2004). *Highly Qualified for Successful Teaching: Characteristics Every Teacher Should Possess*. The University of Memphis. Retrieved from http://www.usca.edu/essays/vol102004/thompson.pdf?word=susan

Gruber, J. L. (1978). The description of teaching competencies by selected Utah business teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University). *Dissertation Abstract International,* 38, 7112A.

Gruber, T., Reppel, A., & Voss, R. (2010). Understanding the characteristics of effective professors: The student's perspective. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *20*(2), 175-190. doi: 10.1080/08841241.2010.526356.

Gruber, T., Lowrie, A., Brodowsky, G. H., Reppel, A. E., Voss, R., & Chowdhury, I. N. (2012). Investigating the influence of professor characteristics on student satisfaction and dissatisfaction: A comparative study. *Journal of Marketing Education, 34*(2), 165–178. doi: 10.1177/0273475312450385

Groccia, J. E. (2012). A model for understanding university teaching and learning. In J. Groccia, M. Alsudairi, & W. Buskist (Eds.), *Handbook of college and university teaching: A global perspective.* (pp. 2-15). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412996891.n1

Hande, H. S., Kamath, S. R., & D'Souza, J. (2014). Students' perception of effective teaching practices in a medical school. *Education in Medicine Journal, 6*(3), 63-66. doi: 10.5959/eimj.v6i3.247.

Hansen, E. J. (1998). Essential demographics of today's college students. In T. J. Marchese (Ed.). *AAHE Bulletin*, 51 (3) (pp. 35). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Harrison, P. D., Ryan, J. M., & Moore, P. S. (1996). College students' self-insight and common implicit theories in rating of teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(4), 775-782.

Hart, S. P., & Marshall, J. D. (1992). The question of teacher professionalism. *ERIC*, 1-34. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED349291

Harvey, L. (2003) Student feedback. *Quality in Higher Education*, *9*(1), 3-20.

Hativa, N., Barak, R., & Simhi, E. (2001). Exemplary university teachers: Knowledge and beliefs regarding effective teaching dimensions and strategies. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(6), 699-729.

Hawk, T. F., & Lyons, P. R. (2008). "Please don't give up on me: When faculty fail to care", *Journal of Management Education, 32*(3), 316-338.

Heffernan, T., Morrison, M., & Sweeney, A. (2003). Attributes of an effective marketing academic: qualitative insights from an Australian university. *ANZMAC 2003 Conference Proceedings Adelaide 1-3 December 2003,* Conference Proceedings, 1400-1406.

Helgesen, Ø., & Nesset, E. (2007). What accounts for students' loyalty? Some field study evidence. *International Journal of Educational Management, 21*(2), 126-143.

Higher Education. (n.d). In *Merriam-Webster Dictionaries*. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/higher%20education

Hill, L. H. (2014). Graduate students' perspectives on effective teaching. *Adult Learning*, *25*(57), 57-65. doi: 10.1177/1045159514522433

Hill, Y., Lomas, L. L., & MacGregor, J. (2003). Students' perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *11*(1), 15-20.

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Hsu, J. L., & Chiu, H. Y. (2009),"Perceived differences in teaching performance from

viewpoints of lecturers and students", *International Journal of Educational Management, 23*(7), 564-573. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513540910990807

Hughes, T. M., Costner, M. J., & Douzenis, C. (1988). Personality and motivation variables in tomorrow's teachers: A center of excellence. *Education, 108,* 393-400.

Hyland, T. (2010). Mindfulness, adult learning and therapeutic education: Integrating the cognitive and affective dimensions of learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 29,* 517-532.

Hyslop, D. J. (1988). Instructional traits of effective teachers. *The Ohio Business Teacher, 48,* 16-21.

Hoyt, D. P., & Pallett W. H. (1999). Appraising teaching effectiveness: Beyond student ratings. IDEA Paper No. 36. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Instructor. (n.d). In *Dictionary.com.* Retrieved from ttp://www.dictionary.com/browse/instructor.

Jackson, M. (2004). 'Memories of teaching, good and bad'. Abstract from the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. October 21-24, Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University. Retrieved from: http://www.issotl.indiana.edu/issotl/04/abstract/abstracts-final.pdf

Jackson, D. L., Teal, C. R., Raines, S. J., Nansel, T. R., Force, R. C., & Burdsal, C. A. (1999). The dimensions of student's perceptions of teaching effectiveness. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59*(4), 580-596.

Jaeger, R. M. (1997). *Complementary methods for research in education (2nd edition).* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Organization.

Jahangiri, L., & Mucciolo, T. W. (2008). Characteristics of effective classroom teachers as

identified by students and professionals: A qualitative study. *Journal of Dental Education*, 72 (4), 484-493.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (2009). An educational psychological success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher, 38*, 365-379.

Jones, A. (2008). Preparing new faculty members for their teaching role. *New Directions for Higher Education, 143*, 93-100.

Jones, S. (2010). Measuring the quality of higher education: linking teaching quality measures at the delivery level to administrative measures at the university level. *Quality in Higher Education, 9*(3), 223-229. doi: 10.1080/1353832032000151094.

Joseph, M., Yakhou, M., & Stone, G. (2005). An educational institution's quest for service quality: customers' perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education, 13*(1), 66-82. doi:10.1108/09684880510578669.

Kane, R., Sandretto, S., & Heath, C. (2004). 'An investigation into excellent tertiary teaching: Emphasizing reflective practice', *Higher Education, 47,* 283-310.

Kanuka, H. (2010). Characteristic of effective and sustainable teaching development programmes for quality teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Management Policy*. *11* (22), 1-14. doi: 10.1787/17269822

Kashif, M., & Ting, H. (2014). "Service-orientation and teaching quality: Business degree students' expectations of effective teaching", *Asian Education and Development Studies***,** *3***(**2**)**, 163-180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-06-2013-0038

Kasworm, C. E. (2008). Emotional challenges of adult learners in higher education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 120*, 27-34. doi: 10.1002/ace.311.

Keeley, J., Christopher, A. N., & Buskist, W. (2012). Emerging evidence for excellent teaching

across borders. In J. E. Groccia, M. Al-Sudairy, & W. Buskist (Eds.), *Handbook of college and university teaching: Global perspectives.* (pp. 374-390) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc**.**

Keeley, J., Furr, R. M., & Buskist, W. (2010). Differentiating students' perceptions of their teachers: Evidence for the reliability and validity of the TBC. *Teaching of Psychology, 37,* 16-20.

Keeley, J., Smith, D., & Buskist, W. (2006). The Teacher Behaviors Checklist: Factor analysis of its utility for evaluating teaching. *Teaching of Psychology, 33,* 84–90.

Keeley, J. W. (2012) Choosing an Instrument for Student Evaluation of Instruction. In M. E. Kite (Ed.), *Effective evaluation of teaching: A guide for faculty and administrators*. Retrieved from: http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/evals2012/index.php

Kelly, N., & Kelly, B. (1982). Backgrounds, education, and teaching styles of teaching award winning professors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rocky Mountain Education Research Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 230 080).

Kember, D., & Leung, D. Y. P. (2009). Development of a questionnaire for assessing students' perceptions of the teaching and learning environment and its use in quality assurance. *Learning Environments Research, 12,* 15–29.

Kember, D., Leung, D. Y. P., & Kwan, K. P. (2002). Does the use of student feedback questionnaires improve the overall quality of teaching? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 27*(5), 411-425.

Kentucky Department of Education (2013). Characteristics of Highly Effective Teaching and Learning (CHETL). Retrieved from:

http://education.ky.gov/curriculum/docs/pages/characteristics-of-highly-effective-teaching-and-learning-%28chetl%29.aspx

Kher, N., Molstad, S., & Donahue, R. (1999). Using humor in the college classroom to enhance teaching effectiveness in 'dread courses'. *College Student Journal, 33*(3), 400-406.

Komarraju, M. (2013). Ideal teacher behaviors: Student motivation and self-efficacy predict preferences. *Teaching of Psychology, 40*(2), 104-110.

Komos, M. (2013). "Thanks for asking": Adjunct faculty members' views of effective teaching. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 24*(4), 133-164.

Koutsoulis, M. (2003). *The characteristics of the effective teacher in Cyprus public high school: The students' perspective*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators. (ERIC Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 478 761).

Kreider, V. A. L. (2009). Counseling graduate students' preference for qualities pertaining to teaching effectiveness. A dissertation submitted to the Kent State University

Kristoff, N. (February 14, 2009). Our greatest national shame. The New York Times.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2005). *Assessing conditions for student success: An inventory to enhance educational effectiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kulik, J. A. (2001). Student ratings: Validity, utility, and controversy. In M. Theall, P. C. Abrami, & L. A. Mets (Eds.), *New Directions for Institutional Research.* (No. 109, pp.9-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kutnick, P., & Jules, V. (1993). Pupils' perceptions of a good teacher: A developmental

perspective from Trinidad and Tobago. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 63,* 400-413.

Kwan, K. P. (1999). How fair are student ratings in assessing the teaching performance of university teachers? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 24*(2), 181-195.

Lala, V., & Priluck, R. (2011). When students complain: An antecedent model of students Intention to complain. *Journal of Marketing Education, 33*(3), 236-252.

Lammers, W. J., & Murphy, J. J. (2002). A profile of teaching techniques used in the university classroom: A descriptive profile of a US public university. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 3*(1), 54-67. doi: 10.1177/1468742002003001785.

Lammers, W. J., & Smith, S. M. (2008). Learning factors in the university classroom: Faculty and student perspectives. *Teaching of Psychology, 35*(2), 61-70. doi: 10.1080/00986280802004586

Lammers, W. J., Savina, E., Skotko, D., & Churlyaeva, M. (2010). Faculty and student perceptions of outstanding university teachers in the USA and Russia. *Educational Psychology, 30*(7), 803-815.

Lang, H., McKee, B., & Conner, K. (1993). Characteristics of effective teachers: A descriptive study of the perceptions of faculty and deaf college students. *American Annals of the Deaf, 138,* 252-259

Larsen, C. (1992). Teaching effectiveness: A principal's view. *The Agricultural Education Magazine, 65*(3), 12-13.

Latif, E., & Miles, S. (2013). Students' perception of effective teaching. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 14*(1), 121-129.

Layne, L. (2012). Defining effective teaching. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 23*(1),

43-68.

Leckey, J., & Neill, N. (2001). Quantifying quality: the importance of student feedback. *Quality in Higher Education, 7*(1), 19-32.

Lincoln, D. J. (2008). Drama in the classroom: How and why marketing educators can use non-verbal communications and enthusiasm to build student rapport. *Marketing Education Review, 18*(3), 53-65.

Liu, S., Keeley, J., & Buskist, W. (2015). Chinese college students' perceptions of characteristics of excellent teachers. *Teaching of Psychology, 42*(1), 83-86.

Loes, C. N., Salisbury, M. H., & Pascarella, E.T. (2014). Student perceptions of effective instruction and the development of critical thinking: A replication and extension. *Higher Education, 69*(5), 823-838.

Lowman, J. (1995). *Mastering the techniques of teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lowman, J. (1996). Characteristics of exemplary teachers. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 65*, 33-40.

Lowman, J., & Mathie, V. A. (1993). What should graduate teaching assistants know about teaching? *Teaching of Psychology, 20*(2), 84-88.

Luft, V. D., & Thompson, G. W. (1995). Factoring contributing to the effectiveness of agricultural education teachers: What students say? *The Agricultural Education Magazine, 68*(3), 23-24.

MacLin, O. H., MacLin, M. K., DeSoto, M. C., Hitlan, R. T., & Williams, J. E. (2009). Using the DELPHI method to collect feedback on students' perceptions of teaching quality. *Universitas,* 5(1).

Magnuson, S. (2002). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their 1st year. *Counselor*

Education & Supervision, 41, 306-320.

Magnuson, S., Shaw, H., Tubin, B., & Norem, K. (2004). Assistant professors of counselor education: First and second year experiences. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, & Research, 32,* 3-18.

Mann, S. J. (2001). Alternative perspectives on the student experience: Alienation and engagement. *Studies in Higher Education, 26*(1), 7-19.

Marks, R. B. (2000). Determinants of student evaluations of global measures of instructor and course value. *Journal of Marketing Education August, 22*(2). 108-119. doi: 10.1177/0273475300222005

Marsh, H. (1982). SEEQ: A Reliable, valid, and useful instrument for collecting students' evaluations of university teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 52,* 77-95.

Marsh, H. W., & Dunkin, M. J. (1997). Students' evaluations of university teaching: A multidimensional perspective. In R. P. Perry & J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Effective teaching in higher education: Research and practice.* (pp. 241-320). New York: Agathon.

Marsh, H. W. & Hocevar, D. (1984). The factorial invariance of students' evaluations of college teaching. *American Educational Research Journal, 21,* 341-366.

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1993). The use of students' evaluations and an individually structured intervention to enhance university teaching effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal, 30,* 217-251.

Marsh, H. W. & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias and utility. *American Psychologist Association, 52*(11), 1187-1197.

Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: dimensionality, reliability,

validity, potential biases and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(5), 707-754.

Marsh, H. W. (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: research findings methodological issues and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational Research, 11*(3), 253-388.

Marsh, H. W. (2001). Distinguishing between good (useful) and bad workloads on students' evaluations of teaching. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(1), 183-212.

Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., Chung, C. M., & Siu, T. L. P. (1997). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Chinese version of the students' evaluations of educational quality (SEEQ) instrument. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 568–72.

Marzo-Navarro, M., Pedraja-Iglesias, M., & Rivera-Torres, M. P. (2005). Determinants of satisfaction with university summer courses. *Quality in Higher Education, 11*(3), 239-249.

Mattar, D. M., & El Khoury, M. R. (2014). "Identical instructor, different teaching methodologies: Contrasting outcomes". In *Advances in Accounting Education: Teaching and curriculum innovations.* Published online: 11 Sep 2014; 193-212.

Mayhew, L. B. (1986). Personality and teaching. *Journal of Communication, 2*, 83-89.

McCannon, M. M., & Stitt-Gohdes, W. L. (1995). Effective teaching: Perceptions of secondary business education teachers. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 11*(2), 34-43.

McKeachie, W. J. (1983). The role of faculty evaluation in enhancing college teaching. *National Forum, 63*(2), 37-39.

McKeachie, W. J. (1997). Critical elements in training university teachers. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 2*(1), 67-74.

McKeachie, W. J. (1997). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist, 52*, 1218-1225.

McKeachie, W. J., Lin, Y., Moffett, M. M., & Daugherty, M. (1978). Effective teaching: Facilitative vs. directive style. *Teaching of Psychology, 5*(4), 193-194.

McKeachie, W. J., & Kulik, J. A. (1975). Effective College Teaching. In F.N. Kerlinger (ed.) *Review of Research in Education.* Itaska, Ill. Peacock.

Mehdinezhad, V. (2012). Faculty members' understanding of teaching efficacy criteria and it relation to their characteristics. *International Journal of Instruction, 5*(2), 214-236.

Mehdinezhad, V. (2012). Faculty members' understanding of teaching efficacy criteria. *Education Inquiry. 3* (1). 49-69.

Messenger, F. B. (1979). Characteristics which business students identify with good teachers and poor teachers. *California Business Education Journal, 14*, 30-32.

Miller, J. E., Dzindolet, M. T., Weinstein, L., Xie, X., & Stones, C. R. (2001). Faculty and students views of teaching effectiveness in the United States, China, and South Africa. *Teaching of Psychology, 28*(2), 138-142.

Miller, W. W., Kahler, A. A., & Rheault, K. (1989). Profile of the effective vocational agriculture teacher. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 30*(2), 33-40.

Minor, L. C., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Witcher, A. E., & James, T. L. (2002). Preservice teachers' educational beliefs and their perceptions of characteristics of effective teachers. *Journal of Educational Research, 96*(2), 116-127.

Miron, M. (1983). What makes a good teacher? *Higher Education in Europe, 8*(2), 45-53.

Moore, S., & Kuol, N. (2007). Retrospective insights on teaching: Exploring teaching excellence through the eyes of alumni. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 31*(2), 133-143.

Mowrer, R. R., Love, S. S., & Orem, D. B. (2004). Desirable teaching qualities transcend the nature of the student. *Teaching of Psychology, 31*, 106-108.

Mullins, S. S. (1992). Qualities of the great teachers, *The Instrumentalist, 46*, 17-25.

Murphy, P. K., Delli, L. A. M., & Edwards, M. N. (2004). The good teacher and good teaching: Comparing beliefs of second-grade students. Preservice teachers, and in-service teachers. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 72*(2), 69-92.

Murray, H. G. (1997). Effective teaching behaviors in the college classroom. In R. P. Perry & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *Effective teaching in higher education: Research and practice* (pp. 171-205). New York, NY: Agathon Press.

Murray, H. G. (1985). Classroom teaching behaviors related to college teaching effectiveness. In J.G. Donald & A.M. Sullivan (Eds.), *Using research to improve teaching*, (pp. 21-34). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Nasser, F., & Fresko, B. (2010). Faculty views of student evaluation of college teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 27(2), 187-198. doi:10.1080/0260293022012875s1.

Neath, I. (1996). How to improve your teaching evaluations without improving your teaching. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 1363-1372.

Nussbaum, J. F. (1992). Effective teacher behaviors. *Communication Education, 41*, 167-180.

O'Reilly, M. R. (1998). *Radical presence: Teaching as contemplative practice.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/ Cook.

Obenchain, K. M., Abernathy, T. V., & Wiest. L. R. (2001).The reliability of students' ratings of faculty teaching effectiveness. *College Teaching, 49*(3), 100.

Oesch, G. R. (2005). *Teaching Excellence: Perceptions of Community College Students*

(Doctoral Dissertation), University of South Florida. Retrievable at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1795&context=etd

O'Meara, K. T. (2007). Characteristics of Effective Teachers in the Air Forces Squadron Officer College. (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Alabama).

Onafowora, L. L. (2005). Teacher efficacy issues in the practice of novice teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly, 28,* 34-44.

Ory, J. C. (1991). Changes in evaluating teaching in higher education. *Theory into Practice, 30* (1), 30-36.

Park, Gi-Pyo, & Lee, Hyo-Woong, (2006). The characteristics of effective English teachers as perceived by high school teachers and students in Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 7*(2), 236-248.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How College Affects Students, Vol.2, A Third Decade of Research,* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Penny, A. R. (2003). Changing the agenda for research into students' views about university teaching: Four shortcomings of SRT research. *Teaching in Higher Education 8*(3), 399–411.

Perkins, D., Schenk, T. A., Stephan, L., & Vrungos, S. (1995). Effects of rapport, intellectual excitement, and learning on students' perceived ratings of college instructors. *Psychological Reports, 76*(2), 627-635.

Pietrzak, D., Duncan, K., & Korcuska, J. S. (2008). Counseling students' decision making

regarding teaching effectiveness: A conjoint analysis. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 48,* 114-142.

Polk, J. A. (2006). Traits of effective teachers. *Arts Education Policy Review, 107,* 23-30.

Pozo-Munoz, C., Rebolloso-Pacheco, E., & Fernandez-Ramierz, B. (2000), "The 'Ideal Teacher'. Implications for Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness," *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 25*(3), 253-263.

Radmacher, S. A., & Martin, D. J. (2001). Identifying significant predictors of student evaluations of faculty through hierarchical regression analysis. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 135*(3), 259-268.

Ramsden, P. M., Trigwell, K., & Martin, E. (2003). 'Dissonance in experience of teaching and its relation to the quality of student learning', *Studies in Higher Education, 28*(1), 37-48.

Ramsden, P. (1991). A performance indicator of teaching quality in higher education: The Course Experience Questionnaire. *Studies in Higher Education, 16,* 129–150.

Ramsden, P. (2003). The nature of good teaching in higher education. In *Learning to teach in higher education, 2nd edition,* pp. 85-105. London & NY: Routledge Falmer.

Revell, A., & Wainwright, E. (2009). What makes lectures 'Unmissable'? Insights into Teaching Excellence and Active Learning, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 33*(2), 209-223. doi: 10.1080/03098260802276771.

Rice, J. K., (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes.* Washington, DC**:** Economic Policy Institute

Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica, 73*(2), 417–458.

Robinson, T. E., & Hope, W. C. (2013). Teaching in higher education: Is there a need for

training in pedagogy in graduate degree programs? *Research in Higher Education Journal, 21,* 1-11.

Roberts, T. G., & Dyer, J. E. (2004). Student teacher perceptions of the characteristics of effective cooperating teachers: A Delphi study. Proceedings of the 2004 Southern Agricultural Education Research Conference, 180-192.

Rogalla, M. (2004). Future problem solving program coaches' efficacy in teaching for successful intelligence and their patterns of successful behavior. *Roeper Review, 26,* 175.

Rubio, C. M. (2010). Effective teachers –Professional and personal skills. Retrieved from: http://www.uclm.ess/ab/educacion/ensayos

Ruff, N. S. (1989). The successful secondary marketing teacher: Case studies of teaching award recipients in marketing education, (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University), *Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 2873* A.

Safer, A. M., Farmer, L. S. J., Segalla, A., & Elhoubi, A. F. (2005). Does the distance from the teacher influence student evaluations? *Educational Research Quarterly 28*(3), 28–35.

Sander, P., Stevenson, K., King, M., & Coates, D. (2000). University students' expectations of teaching. *Studies of Higher Education 25,* 309-323.

Saroyan, A., Dangenais, J., & Zhou, Y. (2009). Graduate students' conceptions of university teaching and learning: Formation for change. *Instructional Science: An International Journal of the Learning Sciences, 37,* 579-600.

Saunders, L. E., & Bauer, K. W. (1998). Undergraduate students today: Who are they? In K.Bauer (Ed.). *Campus climate: Understanding the critical components of today's colleges and universities. New Directions for Institutional Research. 98*. 716. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Savage, H. E., Karp, R. S., & Logue, R. (2004). Faculty mentorship at colleges and universities. *College Teaching, 52,* 21-24.

Saville, B. K., Zinn, T. E., Brown, A. R., & Marchuk, K. A. (2010). Syllabus detail and students' perceptions of teacher effectiveness. *Teaching Of Psychology, 37*(3), 186-189. doi:10.1080/00986283.2010.488523.

Schaeffer, G., Epting, K., Zinn, T., & Buskist, W. (2003). Student and faculty perceptions of effective teaching: A successful replication. *Teaching of Psychology, 30*(2), 133-136.

Schoeberlein, D. (2009). *Mindful teaching and teaching mindfulness: A guide for anyone who teaches anything.* Boston, MA: Wisdom.

Schultz, B. S., & Marchuk, K. A. (2006). Student-teacher relationships: Reflections from the students' perspective. E-xcellence in Teaching, 8, June.

Seiler, V. & M. Seiler (2002), "Professors Who Make the Grade," Review of Business, *(Spring),* 39-44.

Seldin, P. (1999). Building successful teaching evaluation programs. In *Changing practices in evaluating teaching: A practical guide to improved faculty performance and promotion/ tenure decisions.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Sheehan, E. P., & DuPrey, T. (1999). Student evaluations of university teaching. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 26*(3), 188-193.

Sherman, B. R., & Blackburn, R. T. (1975). Personal characteristics and teaching effectiveness of college faculty. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 67,* 124-131.

Sinai, J., Tiberius, R. G., De Groot, J., Brunet, A., & Voore, P. (2001). Developing a training program to improve supervisor-resident relationships, Step 1: Defining the types of issues. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine, 13*(2), 80-85.

Singh, S., Pai. D. R., Sinha N. K., Kaur, A., Soe, H. H. K., & Barua, A. (2013). Qualities of an effective teacher: What do medical teachers think? *BMC Medical Education, 13*(128), 1-7.

Slate, J. R., LaPrairie, K. N., Schulte D. P., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2011). Views of effective college faculty: A mixed analysis. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36*(3), 331-346. doi: 10.1080/02602930903428684

Smart, D. T., Kelley, C. A., & Conant, J. S. (2003). Mastering the art of teaching: Pursuing excellence in a new millennium. *Journal of Marketing Education, 25*(1), 71-78.

Sojka, J., Ashok, K. G., & Dawn, R. D. S. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of student evaluations of teaching. *College Teaching, 50*(2), 44–49.

Sockett, H. (1993). *The Moral Basis for Teacher Professionalism*. New York: Teacher College Press.

Spooren, R., & Mortelmans, D. (2007). Teacher professionalism and student evaluation of teaching: Will better teachers receive higher ratings and will better students give higher ratings? *Educational Studies, 32*(2), 201-214. doi: 10.1080/03055690600631101

Sprinkle, J. E. (2009). Student perceptions of educator effectiveness: A follow-up study. *College Student Journal, 43*, 1341-1358.

Stronge, J. H., Tucker, P. D., & Hindman, J. L. (2004). *Handbook for Qualities of Effective Teachers. Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development, Alexandria*, VA:ASCD. 22311-1714. ISBN-10: 1-4166-0010-8

Su, F., & Wood, M. (2012),"What makes a good university lecturer? Students' perceptions of teaching excellence", *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 4*(2), 142-155. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17581181211273110.

Svinicki, M., & McKeachie, W. J. (2010). *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers* (13th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Swank, P., Taylor, R., Brady, R., & Frieberg, T. (1989). Sensitivity of classroom observation systems: Measuring teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Experimental Education, 57* (2), 171-186.

Sweeney, A. D., Morrison, M. D., Jarratt, D., & Heffernan, T. (2009). Modelling the constructs contributing to the effectiveness of marketing lecturers. *Journal of Marketing Education, 31*(3), 190-202.

Tang, T. L. (1997). Teaching evaluation at a public institution of higher education: Factors related to the overall teaching effectiveness. *Public Personnel Management, 26*(3), 379-389.

Theall, M. (1999). New directions for theory and research on teaching: A review of the past twenty years. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 80,* 29-52. doi:10.1002/tl.8002.

Theall, M., & Feldman, K. A., (2007) Commentary and update of Feldman's (1997) "Identifying exemplary teachers and teaching: evidence from student ratings." in R.P. Perry and J.C. Smart, (Eds.), *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: An Evidence-Based Approach.* Springer, 130-143.

Theall, M., & Abrami, P. C. (2001) *The student ratings debate: are they valid? How can we best use them?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Theall, M., & Franklin, J. (2001). Looking for bias in all the wrong places: A search for truth or a witch hunt in student ratings of instruction? *New Directions Institutional Research, 25*(5), 45–56.

Thompson, S., Greer, J. G., & Greer, B. B., (2004). Highly qualified for successful teaching:

Characteristics every teacher should possess. Retrieved from http://www.usca.edu/essays/vol102004/thompson.pdf

Tichenor, M. S., & Tichenor, J. M. (2005). Understanding teachers' perspectives on professionalism. *Professional Educator, 27*(1&2), 89-95. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ728484.pdf

Tootoonchi, A., Lyons, P., & Hagen, A. (2002),"MBA students' perceptions of effective teaching methodologies and instructor characteristics", *International Journal of Commerce and Management, 12*(1), 79-93. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/eb047438.

Top Universities, (2015). *How Much Does it Cost to Study in the US?* Retrieved from http://www.topuniversities.com/student-info/student-finance/how-much-does-it-cost-study-us on Dec 12, 2015

Tursman, C. (1981). Good teachers: What to look for. Arlington, Virginia: National Schools Public Relations Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 482).

Vella, J. (2002). *Learning to listen, learning to teach: The power of dialogue in teaching adults.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vulcano, B. A. (2007). Extending the generality of the qualities and behaviors constituting effective teaching. *Teaching of Psychology, 34,* 114-117.

Walker, B. (2010). Effective schoolwide screening to identify students at-risk for social and behavioral problems. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 46,* 104-110.

Walker, R. J. (2008). 12 characteristics of an effective teacher. *Educational Horizon,* 61-67.

Wang, J., Gibson, A. M., & Slate, J. R. (2007). Effective teachers as viewed by students at a 2 year college: A multistage mixed analysis. *Issues in Educational Research, 17(2),* 272-

295. Retrieved from http://www.iier.org.au/iier17/wang.html

Wann. P. D. (2001, January). Faculty and student perceptions of the behaviors of effective college teachers. Poster presented at the National Institute for the Teaching of Psychology, St. Petersburg Beach, FL.

Watson, B. D. (2015). *Trainer, Teacher, Educationist - Train the Trainer?* Retrieved from https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/trainer-teacher-educationist-train-bruce-d-watson-dr-

Wayne, A. J., & Young, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research, 73*(1), 89-122.

Weasmer, J., & Woods, A. M. (1998). I think I can: The role of personal teaching efficacy in bringing about change. *The Clearing House, 71,* 245-248.

Wentzell, G. W., Richlin, L., & Cox, M. D. (2013). Students' and instructors' views of effective teaching: A message from the editors. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 24*(4), 1-3.

Wilkinson, K. L. (1979). Effective and ineffective teacher behavior as viewed by students in secondary business law classes. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, 21* (I), I-II.

Witcher, A. E., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Collins, K. M. T., Filer, J. D., Wiedmaier, C. D., & Moore, C. (2003). *Students' perceptions of characteristics of effective college teachers.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED482517).

Witcher, A. E., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Minor, L. C. (2001). Characteristics of effective teachers: Perceptions of preservice teachers. *Research in the Schools, 8,* 45–57.

Wotruba, T. R., & Wright, P. L. (1975). How to develop a teacher-rating instrument: A research Approach. *Journal of Higher Education, 46,* 653-663.

Yankowski, L. D. (1993). Perceptions of teaching excellence in the Hawaii community college system. Dissertation Abstracts International, 53 (11), 3791. (UMI No. 9306328).

Yeh, Y. (2006). The interactive effects of personal traits and guided practices on pre-service teachers' changes in personal teaching efficacy. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 37*, 513.

Yoo, J. H., Schallert, D.L., & Svinicki, M. D. (2015). The meaning of flexibility in teaching: Views from college students and exemplary college instructors. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 26*(3), 191-217.

Yoon, J. S. (2002). Teacher characteristics as predictors of teacher-student relationships: Stress, negative affect, and self-efficacy. *Social Behavior and Personality, 30*, 485-494.

Young, S., & Shaw, D. (1999). Profiles of effective college and university teachers. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(6), 670-686.

Young, S., Rush, L., & Shaw, D. (2009). Evaluating gender bias in ratings of university instructors' teaching effectiveness. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 3*(2), 1-14. Retrieved from http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/ijsotl/v3n2/articles/_YoungRushShaw/index.htm.

Appendices

Appendix A: Teacher Behavior Checklist Survey

Appendix B: Authorization Letter from the Dean of Technical Education and Workforce Development of Southern Union State Community College (SUSCC)

Appendix C: Authorization Letter from the Instructors of Technical Education and Workforce Development Division of Southern Union State Community College (SUSCC)

Appendix D: Authorization letter from Dr. Buskist

Appendix E: Informed Letter

Appendix F: Approval letter from Office of Research Compliance of Auburn University

Appendix A
Teacher Behavior Checklist Survey

"Effective Teaching Characteristics in Vocational Education."

Section I: Demographics

Please check the appropriate box:

☐ Instructor

☐ Student

Section II: Teacher Behavior Checklist

Instruction: Please rate your ideal instructor on the extent to which you believe she/ he would possess these qualities and exhibit the corresponding behaviors. Please use the following scale for your ratings.

1 = Instructor **always** exhibits/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality.

2 = Instructor **frequently** exhibit/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality.

3 = Instructor **sometimes** exhibit/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality.

4 = Instructor **rarely** exhibit/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality.

5 = Instructor **never** exhibit/has exhibited these behaviors reflective of this quality.

Please be sure to read each item in this list carefully. Thank you! ☺

Item	Teacher Qualities and Corresponding Behaviors	Scale
1	*Accessible* (Posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-mail information)	
2	*Approachable/ Personable* (Smiles, greets students, initiates conversations, invites questions, responds respectfully to student comments)	
3	*Authoritative* (Establishes clear course rules; maintains classroom order; speaks in a loud, strong voice)	
4	*Confident* (Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly)	
5	*Creative and Interesting* (Experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone)	
6	*Effective Communicator* (Speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples)	
7	*Encourages and Cares for Students* (Provides praise for good student work, helps students who need it, offers bonus points and extra credit, and knows student names)	
8	*Enthusiastic About Teaching and About Topic* (Smiles during class, prepares interesting class activities, uses gestures and expressions of emotion to emphasize important points, and arrives on time for class)	
9	*Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals* (Prepares/ follows the syllabus and has goals for each class)	
10	*Flexible/ Open-Minded* (Changes calendar of course events when necessary, will meet at hours outside of office hours, pays attention to students when they state their opinions, accepts criticism from others, and allows students to do make-up work when appropriate)	
11	*Good Listener* (Doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making)	
12	*Happy/ Positive Attitude/ Humorous* (Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students)	
13	*Humble* (Admits mistakes, never brags, and doesn't take credit for others' successes)	
14	*Knowledgeable About Subject Matter* (Easily answers students' questions, does not read straight from the book or notes, and uses clear and understandable examples)	
15	*Prepared* (Brings necessary materials to class, is never late for class, provides outlines of class discussion)	
16	*Presents Current Information* (Relates topic to current, real life situations; uses recent videos, magazines, and newspapers to demonstrate points; talks about current topics; uses new or recent texts)	

17	*Professional* (Dresses nicely [neat and clean shoes, slacks, blouses, dresses, shirts, ties] and no profanity)	
18	*Promotes Class Discussion* (Asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class)	
19	*Promotes Critical Thinking/ Intellectually Stimulating* (Asks thoughtful questions during class, uses essay questions on tests and quizzes, assigns homework, and holds group discussions/ activities)	
20	*Provides Constructive Feedback* (Writes comments on returned work, answers students' questions, and gives advice on test-taking)	
21	*Punctuality/ Manages Class Time* (Arrives to class on time/early, dismisses class on time, presents relevant materials in class, leaves time for questions, keeps appointments, returns work in a timely way)	
22	*Rapport* (Makes class laugh through jokes and funny stories, initiates and maintains class discussions, knows student names, interacts with students before and after class)	
23	*Realistic Expectations of Students/ Fair Testing and Grading* (Covers material to be tested during class, writes relevant test questions, does not overload students with reading, teaches at an appropriate level for the majority of students in the course, curves grades when appropriate)	
24	*Respectful* (Does not humiliate or embarrass students in class, is polite to students [says thank you and please, etc.], does not interrupt students while they are talking, does not talk down to students)	
25	*Sensitive and Persistent* (Makes sure students understand material before moving to new material, holds extra study sessions, repeats information when necessary, asks questions to check student understanding)	
26	*Strives to Be a Better Teacher* (Requests feedback on his/ her teaching ability from students, continues learning [attends workshops, etc. on teaching], and uses new teaching methods)	
27	*Technologically Competent* (Knows how to use a computer, knows how to use e-mail with students, knows how to use overheads during class, has a Web page for classes)	
28	*Understanding* (Accepts legitimate excuses for missing class or coursework, is available before/ after class to answer questions, does not lose temper at students, takes extra time to discuss difficult concepts)	

Source: Buskist, W., Sikorski, J., Buckley, T., & Saville, B. K. (2002). Elements of master teaching. In S. F. Davis &W. Buskist (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (pp. 27-39). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Appendix B
Authorization Letter from the office of Dean of Technical Education and Workforce Development of Southern Union State Community College (SUSCC)

Southern Union State Community College
Office of the Dean of Technical Education & Workforce Development

August 11, 2015

Auburn University Institutional Review Board
c/o Office of Research Compliance
115 Ramsay Hall
Auburn, AL 36849

Greetings:

Mr. Ashraff Anuar, Auburn University Graduate Student has permission to conduct survey research with the students and faculty of the Technical Education and Workforce Development Division during the Fall Semester of 2015.

If there are any questions, please contact my office.

Respectfully,

Darin Baldwin Ph.D.
Dean

suscc.edu
(334) 745-6437

Appendix C
Authorization Letter from the Instructors of Technical Education and Workforce Development Division of Southern Union State Community College (SUSCC)

Southern Union State Community College

Office of the Dean of Technical Education & Workforce Development

Memorandum

Date: October 9, 2015

To: Dr. James E. Witte
Auburn University

From: Dr. Darin Baldwin
Southern Union State Community College

Subject: Consent for research

By virtue of my signature below:

1) I consent to participate in the research of Mr. Ashraff Anuar.
2) I further agree to my students to voluntarily participating in the research of Mr. Anuar on a date/time that mutually agreed upon.

Name	Signature
Air Conditioning and Refrigeration David Burdette	
Automotive Service Technology Greg McDonald	
Cosmetology Gail Sadler	
Marquita Wright	
Engineering Graphics and Design Steve Manos	
Industrial Electricity/Electronics Carlton Jones	
Barry Duck	
Manufacturing Technology Alvin McCormick	
Machine Shop Technology Sam Fulford	
Technical Education Career Coach Nicole Herzog	
Technical Education Director Sarah Cox	
Welding Technology Derrick Crosby	

Appendix D
Authorization letter from Dr. Buskist

James Witte

From: William Buskist
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 6:33 AM
To: Ashraff MOHD ANUAR
Cc: James Witte; Jared Keeley
Subject: Re: Asking your permission to use Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) in my dissertation.

Dear Ashraff:

Thank you for this note. I am glad to hear that you are interested in using the TBC for your dissertation project. As you may or may not be aware, the TBC was originally developed here at Auburn using a comparison sample of undergraduate students and faculty—so unless you are doing something really different, this research has already been conducted. If you intend to replicate this particular study, there will be no need to alter the instrument to accommodate faculty variables.

Having said that, I am happy to give you permission to use the TBC in your dissertation research, but before you modify any of the items, I would like to see what you intend. Changing any of the items may likely change the psychometric properties of the instrument you create, thereby changing the entire nature of the instrument. Under such circumstances, I would not feel comfortable with the instrument being referred to as the TBC.

I am Colorado this summer, so I am unable to meet with you in person, but I will be happy to correspond with you via e-mail.

I am copying Dr. Witte and the co-developer of the TBC, Dr. Jared Keeley, just so they are in the loop regarding our discussion.

Sincerely,
Bill

William Buskist, PhD
Distinguished Professor in the Teaching of Psychology
Psychology Department
Auburn University, AL 36849-5214
E-mail: buskiwf@auburn.edu
Website: http://www.auburn.edu/~buskiwf/

From: Ashraff MOHD ANUAR <mzm0067@tigermail.auburn.edu>
Date: Monday, June 29, 2015 at 12:32 PM
To: Bill Buskist <buskiwf@auburn.edu>
Subject: Asking your permission to use Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) in my dissertation.

Dear Dr. Buskist,

My name is Ashraff Anuar, and I am a Ph.D Candidate under the supervision of Dr. James E. Witte (EFLT Department) at Auburn University. I hope you are doing great. I am currently working on my dissertation on the comparison study of the college students and faculty member perspectives on effective teaching characteristics here in Auburn University.

I am emailing to ask for your permission to use the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) you developed in my study. I also would like to obtain your permission to alter some of the elements that may work better with the sample respondents (faculty member) I am studying.

I am looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Mohd Ashraff Mohd Anuar, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate,
Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology,
College of Education, Auburn University,
Auburn, AL 36849.
334-707-5566

Appendix E
Informed Letter

EDUCATIONAL
FOUNDATIONS,
LEADERSHIP,
AND TECHNOLOGY

AUBURN UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

INFORMATION LETTER FOR

"Effective Teaching Characteristics in Vocational Education"
November 23, 2015

Dear Participants,
My name is Ashraff Anuar, a Doctoral candidate of Adult Education from the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology at Auburn University. You are invited to participate in my research study to compare the college students and faculty member perspectives on effective teaching characteristics. This study was developed to improve the teaching quality and reinforce professionalism of adult educators in general.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary. However, you may only participate if you are 18 years of age and above. If you wish to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete the survey which will not take more than 20 minutes. However, if you change your mind and decide not to participate after starting the survey, you could withdraw at any time during the study and your data will be destroyed. You will not be penalized and it will not affect your relationship with Auburn University, the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology, your current institution or grades in your classes.

All of the information will be treated **anonymously**. It will not collect any identifying information about you and no one will know what individual responses were to the survey. Some of the questions might ask for information of a personal or private nature. It is important that if you answer these questions, please respond to it honestly. Information obtained from this survey may be published in scholarly journals and presented at professional conferences.

If you have any questions before, during or after participating in this study, please contact me, Ashraff Anuar, at mzm0067@tigermail.auburn.edu or my supervisor, Professor James E. Witte, at witteje@auburn.edu. For more information regarding your rights as a participant you may contact the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334) 844-5966 or e-mail at hsubjec@auburn.edu or irbchair@auburn.edu.

Having read the information provided above you must decide whether or not to offer your consent to participate in this research. Completion of the survey indicates your willingness to participate.

Your cooperation and assistance is highly appreciated. Thank you!

Sincerely yours,

Ashraff Anuar
Doctoral Candidate
EFLT, College of Education

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this Document for use from 11/18/15 to 11/7/18
Protocol # 15-375 EX 1511

4036 Haley Center, Auburn, AL 36849-5221; Telephone: 334-844-4460; Fax: 334-844-3072
www.auburn.edu/eflt

Appendix F
Approval letter from Office of Research Compliance of Auburn University

AUBURN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD for RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

REQUEST FOR EXEMPT CATEGORY RESEARCH

For Information or help completing this form, contact: **THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE**, 115 Ramsay Hall
Phone: 334-844-5966 **e-mail:** IRBAdmin@auburn.edu **Web Address:** http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs/index.htm

Revised 2/1/2014 **Submit completed form to IRBsubmit@auburn.edu or 115 Ramsay Hall, Auburn University 36849.**

Form must be populated using Adobe Acrobat / Pro 9 or greater standalone program (do not fill out in browser). Hand written forms will not be accepted.

Project activities may not begin until you have received approval from the Auburn University IRB.

1. PROJECT PERSONNEL & TRAINING

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (PI):

Name ASHRAFF ANUAR **Title** GRADUATE STUDENT **Dept./School** EFLT/ COE

Address 516 E GLENN AVE., APT 119 **AU Email** mzm0067@auburn.edu

Phone 334-707-5566 **Dept. Head** S. DOWNER

FACULTY ADVISOR (if applicable):

Name JAMES E. WITTE **Title** PROFESSOR **Dept./School** EFLT/ COE

Address 4036 HALEY CENTER

Phone 334-844-3054 **AU Email** witteje@auburn.edu

KEY PERSONNEL: **List Key Personnel (other than PI and FA).** Additional personnel may be listed in an attachment.

Name	Title	Institution	Responsibilities
NONE			

KEY PERSONNEL TRAINING: **Have all Key Personnel completed CITI Human Research Training (including elective modules related to this research) within the last 3 years?** ☑ **YES** ☐ **NO**

TRAINING CERTIFICATES: Please attach CITI completion certificates for all Key Personnel.

2. PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Effective Teaching Characteristics in Vocational Education.

Source of Funding: ☑ **Investigator** ☐ **Internal** ☐ **External**

List External Agency & Grant Number: N/A

List any contractors, sub-contractors, or other entities associate with this project.

N/A

List any other IRBs associated with this project (including those involved with reviewing, deferring, or determinations).

N/A

FOR ORC OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE RECEIVED IN ORC: _____ **by** _____ **APPROVAL #** _____

DATE OF IRB REVIEW: _____ **by** _____ **APPROVAL CATEGOR**

DATE OF ORC REVIEW: _____ **by** _____ **INTERVAL FOR CONTI**

DATE OF APPROVAL: _____ **by** _____

COMMENTS:

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this Document for use from
11/18/15 to 11/7/18
Protocol # 15-375 EX 1511

3. **PROJECT SUMMARY**

a. **Does the research involve any special populations?**

- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Minors (under age 19)**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Pregnant women, fetuses, or any products of conception**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Prisoners or Wards**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Individuals with compromised autonomy and/or decisional capacity**

b. **Does the research pose more than minimal risk to participants?** ☐ YES ☑ NO

Minimal risk means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. 42 CFR 46.102(i)

c. **Does the study involve any of the following?**

- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Procedures subject to FDA Regulation** Ex. Drugs, biological products, medical devices, etc.
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Use of school records of identifiable students or information from instructors about specific students**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Protected health or medical information when there is a direct or indirect link that could identify the participant**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Collection of sensitive aspects of the participant's own behavior, such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior or use of alcohol**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Deception of participants**

If you checked "YES" to any response in Question #3 STOP. It is likely that your study does not meet the "EXEMPT" requirements. Please complete a PROTOCOL FORM for Expedited or Full Board Review.
You may contact IRB Administration for more information. (Phone: 334-844-5966 or Email: IRBAdmin@auburn.edu)

4. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

a. **Subject Population** (Describe, include age, special population characteristics, etc.)

Regularly enrolled vocational education students and faculty at Southern Union State Community College (SUSCC). All students are above the age of 18. No special population focus within this study.

b. **Describe, step by step, all procedures and methods that will be used to consent participants.**

☐ **N/A (Existing data will be used)**

1. Consent letter will be provided as a cover attachment to the survey. Completing the survey constitutes consent.
2. Researcher or Advisor will distribute survey at end of regular instruction. Only student and faculty volunteers will be surveyed.
3. Researcher or Advisor will collect surveys and survey procedure is complete.

c. **Brief summary of project.** (Include the research question(s) and a brief description of the methodology, including recruitment and how data will be collected and protected.)

Project involve passing out surveys at Southern Union State Community College (SUSCC).
Permission is granted by instructors to survey their students (Please refer Attachment 1)
Researcher will explain voluntarism, data will be anonymous.
Instructors consented to participate in this study (Please refer Attachment 1). Instructors can take the survey at the same time the students do.
Participants will place completed surveys in box at back of room.
Data sheets will be entered by researcher and sheets will be secured in locked file drawer in Dr. Witte's office (Room 4010, Haley Center).

d. **Waivers. Check any waivers that apply and describe how the project meets the criteria for the waiver.**

- ☐ **Waiver of Consent (Including existing de-identified data)**
- ☑ **Waiver of Documentation of Consent (Use of Information Letter)**
- ☐ **Waiver of Parental Permission (for college students)**

e. **Attachments.** Please attach Informed Consents, Information Letters, data collection instrument(s), advertisements/recruiting materials, or permission letters/site authorizations as appropriate.

Signature of Investigator _____ Date _____

Signature of Faculty Advisor _____ Date _____

Signature of Department Head _____ Date _____

AUBURN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD for RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

REQUEST FOR EXEMPT CATEGORY RESEARCH

For Information or help completing this form, contact: **THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE**, 115 Ramsay Hall
Phone: 334-844-5966 **e-mail:** IRBAdmin@auburn.edu **Web Address:** http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs/index.htm

Revised 2/1/2014 **Submit completed form to IRBsubmit@auburn.edu or 115 Ramsay Hall, Auburn University 36849.**

Form must be populated using Adobe Acrobat / Pro 9 or greater standalone program (do not fill out in browser). Hand written forms will not be accepted

Project activities may not begin until you have received approval from the Auburn University IRB.

1. PROJECT PERSONNEL & TRAINING

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (PI):

Name ASHRAFF ANUAR **Title** GRADUATE STUDENT **Dept./School** EFLT/ COE

Address 516 E GLENN AVE., APT 119 **AU Email** mzm0067@auburn.edu

Phone 334-707-5566 **Dept. Head** S. DOWNER

FACULTY ADVISOR (if applicable):

Name JAMES E. WITTE **Title** PROFESSOR **Dept./School** EFLT/ COE

Address 4036 HALEY CENTER

Phone 334-844-3054 **AU Email** witteje@auburn.edu

KEY PERSONNEL: **List Key Personnel (other than PI and FA).** Additional personnel may be listed in an attachment.

Name	Title	Institution	Responsibilities
NONE			

KEY PERSONNEL TRAINING: **Have all Key Personnel completed CITI Human Research Training (including elective modules related to this research) within the last 3 years?** ☑ **YES** ☐ **NO**

TRAINING CERTIFICATES: Please attach CITI completion certificates for all Key Personnel.

2. PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Effective Teaching Characteristics in Vocational Education.

Source of Funding: ☑ **Investigator** ☐ **Internal** ☐ **External**

List External Agency & Grant Number: N/A

List any contractors, sub-contractors, or other entities associate with this project.

N/A

List any other IRBs associated with this project (including those involved with reviewing, deferring, or determinations).

N/A

FOR ORC OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE RECEIVED IN ORC: _____ **by** _____ **APPROVAL #** _____

DATE OF IRB REVIEW: _____ **by** _____ **APPROVAL CATEGORY:** _____

DATE OF ORC REVIEW: _____ **by** _____ **INTERVAL FOR CONTINUING REVIEW :** _____

DATE OF APPROVAL: _____ **by** _____

COMMENTS:

3. **PROJECT SUMMARY**

a. **Does the research involve any special populations?**

- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Minors (under age 19)**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Pregnant women, fetuses, or any products of conception**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Prisoners or Wards**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Individuals with compromised autonomy and/or decisional capacity**

b. **Does the research pose more than minimal risk to participants?** ☐ YES ☑ NO

Minimal risk means that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. 42 CFR 46.102(i)

c. **Does the study involve any of the following?**

- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Procedures subject to FDA Regulation** Ex. Drugs, biological products, medical devices, etc.
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Use of school records of identifiable students or information from instructors about specific students**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Protected health or medical information when there is a direct or indirect link that could identify the participant**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Collection of sensitive aspects of the participant's own behavior, such as illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior or use of alcohol**
- ☐ YES ☑ NO **Deception of participants**

If you checked "YES" to any response in Question #3 STOP. It is likely that your study does not meet the "EXEMPT" requirements. Please complete a PROTOCOL FORM for Expedited or Full Board Review.
You may contact IRB Administration for more information. (Phone: 334-844-5966 or Email: IRBAdmin@auburn.edu)

4. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

a. **Subject Population** (Describe, include age, special population characteristics, etc.)

Regularly enrolled vocational education students and faculty at Southern Union State Community College (SUSCC). All students are above the age of 18. No special population focus within this study.

b. **Describe, step by step, all procedures and methods that will be used to consent participants.**

☐ **N/A (Existing data will be used)**

1. Consent letter will be provided as a cover attachment to the survey. Completing the survey constitutes consent.
2. Researcher or Advisor will distribute survey at end of regular instruction. Only student and faculty volunteers will be surveyed.
3. Researcher or Advisor will collect surveys and survey procedure is complete.

c. **Brief summary of project.** (Include the research question(s) and a brief description of the methodology, including recruitment and how data will be collected and protected.)

Project involve passing out surveys at Southern Union State Community College (SUSCC).
Researcher will explain voluntarism, regular instructor will be asked to leave the room.
Participants will place completed surveys in box at back of room.
Data sheets will be entered by researcher and sheets will be secured in locked file drawer in Dr. Witte's office (Room 4010, Haley Center).

d. **Waivers. Check any waivers that apply and describe how the project meets the criteria for the waiver.**

- ☐ **Waiver of Consent (Including existing de-identified data)**
- ☑ **Waiver of Documentation of Consent (Use of Information Letter)**
- ☐ **Waiver of Parental Permission (for college students)**

e. **Attachments.** **Please attach Informed Consents, Information Letters, data collection instrument(s), advertisements/recruiting materials, or permission letters/site authorizations as appropriate.**

Signature of Investigator Ashraff Amuas Date 8/27/15

Signature of Faculty Adviser [signature] Date 8/27/15

Signature of Department Head [signature] Date 8/27/15