Community College Student's and Faculty's Perception of Teaching Excellence

by

Jennifer Genelle Crowder

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
December 14, 2019

Keywords: community colleges, Teacher Behavior Checklist, teaching perceptions, teaching excellence

Approved by

Dr. James Witte, Chair, Professor Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Dr. Maria Witte, Associate Dean of the Graduate School
Dr. Leslie Cordie, Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Dr. David Marshall, Assistant Clinical Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology
Dr. Jane Teel, Assistant Clinical Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between community colleges faculty and students perceptions on the teaching behaviors necessary for excellent teaching. The research questions looked at what faculty's perceptions were in regards to teaching behaviors necessary for excellent teaching. The second research question examined student's views on excellent teaching behaviors. The third research question examined the relationship between faculty and student's views on excellent teaching behaviors.. Participants were recruited from two community colleges in the state of Alabama and were composed of both instructors and students. This study used both an online survey and a paper survey to collect data. The survey used was the Teacher Behavior Checklist (Keeley, Smith, & Buskist, 2006) along with selected demographic variables. There were 76 faculty respondents and 300 student respondents. The researcher used a Chi-square of independence test to determine statistical differences. While there were demonstrated significant differences among the respondents there were also similarities. Faculty and student respondents agreed on the following seven teaching qualities for teaching excellence: 1) knowledgeable about subject matter, 2) approachable/personable, 3) encourages and cares for students, 4) respectful, 5) realistic, 6) accessible, and 7) creative. This study demonstrates that there are some areas where there is disagreement about what makes an excellent instructor. By understanding where there are some discrepancies, instructors are able to build their teaching toolbox with strategies to alleviate these discrepancies and reach their student body.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful for having such a dedicated committee. I am very appreciative of the guidance, support and encouragement my advisor and committee chair, Dr. James Witte gave during the entire process. I am also appreciative of my other committee members. Dr. Maria Witte, you always have such an encouraging and outgoing personality. Dr. Leslie Cordie, thank you for always being there to give an extra push when needed. I also appreciate Dr. Jane Teel who for her guidance and assistance. Dr. Marshall, I appreciate the time you spent time with me discussing all things dealing with statistics. You encouraged and gave me hope far more than you will ever know. I would also like to thank my University Reader, Dr. Melody Russell. To all my committee members, I learned so much through this process with you but also throughout my time in your classes.

To my children Ashley, Anna, and Matthew, you are my driving force and motivation in life. You three constantly encourage, inspire, and uplift me throughout this entire process. I appreciate the help you gave not only during this process but also throughout your lives. I have truly been blessed with outstanding children whom I love very much.

I would also like to acknowledge, Teresa Jernigan who kept me going and always reminded me that it would be worth it in the end. You always told me I could do it, to just keep pushing through. And lastly, but definitely not least Roshun Steele, we went through this process together. We kept a check on one another and helped each other

stay focused, positive, and working. I am deeply grateful for all your help and encouragement. I definitely couldn't have made it this far without your support.

I also would like to acknowledge my mom, Phyllis Crowder. This was your dream to see me walk across the stage and getting my PHD. I wish you were still here on this earth with me to see that I am completing this dream. You made me the woman I am today. You always believed in me no matter what I was up against and always gave me the push needed to accomplish my goals. I hope that you are proud of me. I am truly blessed with all the great people in my life! Thank you everyone, you all played a part in making this happen.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

AACS	Alabama Community College System
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
NSC	National Student Clearinghouse
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
TBC	Teacher Behavior Checklist

Chapter 1

Introduction

According to data from the U.S. Department of Education (2017), there are approximately 1,462 community colleges in the United States. Most students who attend these community colleges will attend part time versus those at four-year universities where the majority of the student population attends full time (Smith, 2018). Students who attend community colleges chose to do so for a variety of reasons such as: lower costs, smaller faculty to student ratio, and only wanting to gain a certificate or vocational occupation. Somers, Haines, Keene, Bauer, Pfeiffer, McCluskey, Settle, and Sparks (2006) showed that the most often cited reasons for choosing to attend community colleges were price and location. At two–year universities, a greater percentage of teachers are adjuncts versus full time instructors (Bickerstaff, 2018).

Community colleges are important as they are accessible and affordable and offer many pathways into postsecondary education (Stanley, 2007). Stanley stated that community colleges are important on a national level because

> They prepare students for transfer to four year institutions, meet workforce preparation needs, provide developmental education, and offer a myriad of support services needed by students with diverse backgrounds, skills and education preparation. (p. 11)

As people begin to recognize the importance of community colleges and develop programs to entice students to begin their college career at the community college level, it is important that we understand just what makes a master teacher. Hutto (2017) wrote, "Recognizing that retaining students in courses contributes to overall student retention highlights the important role of faculty members in retention" (p. 6). What values and teaching attributes should an excellent teacher demonstrate? Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, and Saville (2002) stated, "Knowing which specific behaviors to adopt to augment one's approach to teaching is certainly advantageous in that much of the guess work is removed from wondering how to go about becoming a better teacher" (p. 38). There must be an understanding of the teaching behaviors that make a master teacher, then educators can not improve their teaching performance, there will be no understanding of how to train current and future teachers, and student's will become frustrated and as a consequence lower retention rates (Buskist et al., 2002). Student retention is very important for community colleges and universities. Faculty must model the appropriate teaching behaviors, otherwise, students may withdraw from the program, transfer to another school, or not go on to a four-year university due to a bad experience at the community college level (Somers et al., 2006). Community colleges are the first post-secondary experience that many of these students will have and so it is crucial to have educators and administrators to understand what the perceptions are for excellent teaching. Somers et al. (2006) pointed out, "Some students did not come with the

intention of transferring to a 4–year college. But now that they have experience success, they are motivated to earn a 4–year college degree" (p.59).

Statement of the Problem

Currently, studies involving effective teaching have been conducted at four–year universities (Keeley, Furr, & Buskist 2010; Liu, Kelley, & Buskist 2015; Stillgall & Lincoe, 2015; McConner, 2017; Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn, & Buskist (2003). However, as more students begin to choose community colleges as their entry point into higher education, it is important that faculty and administrators understand what perceptions are held by both faculty and students as to what behaviors determine excellent teaching (Somers et al., 2006). This understanding is important to aid in the recruitment and retention of students. Since the majority of studies have been focused on four–year colleges, there is a lack of literature and research at the community college level. Ford (2016) described a need to further research in the areas of faculty and student perceptions using the Teacher Behavior Checklist.

The relative lack of research concerning community colleges' perceptions makes it difficult for administrators and faculty to make appropriate decisions on how to proceed when it comes to promotions, teaching techniques, the hiring of successful faculty, and engagement of students. Identifying how faculty and students at the community colleges view the behaviors will enhance our understanding of what it means to be an excellent teacher. If there were additional research on these perceptions, community college administrators would be better able to understand who to hire, promote, and what training could be done with instructors to provide an environment conducive to learning.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate what faculty and students at community colleges perceive as the behaviors identifying excellent teaching. This study examined how the demographics of age, gender, ethnicity and student classification affect a student's perception on effective teaching behaviors. In addition, the study examined the demographics of age, gender, ethnicity, and teaching experience on the influence on faculty's perceptions of effective teaching behaviors. Lastly, the relationship between faculty and student's views of excellent teaching behaviors at the community college level was examined. By understanding, what behaviors are viewed as the most important in regards to excellent teaching, then community college faculty could make any necessary changes to their teaching style. This could lead to a more positive experience for both faculty and students as well as help in the community colleges retention of students.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are community college faculty's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

2. What are community college student's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

3. What is the relationship between faculty and student's perceptions of excellent teaching behaviors/attributes at community colleges?

Significance of the Study

This study aims to improve student retention rates at the community college level. The research from this study will assist educators in gaining a better understanding of what makes a master teacher. The study will help faculty see areas in which they can improve in an effort to become an excellent teacher. By understanding, the relationship between student and faculty perceptions of what behaviors constitute excellent teaching this may lead to progress in the areas of student success. This study sought to add to the limited literature concerning community colleges and the perceptions held by their faculty and students concerning teaching behaviors.

Limitations of the Study

Because this study was conducted with only two community colleges in the Alabama Community College System, caution should be taken when generalizing the study. Since this study contained survey research, self-reporting was a limitation. Research participants may try to answer the questions on the Teacher Behavior Checklist in a way that they feel the researcher wants them to, exaggerate answers, or not fully understand the questionnaire. The survey was administered anonymously online which should aid in controlling biases.

Definition of Terms

The following defines the terms used in this study to help aid in clarity of terminology.

1. Adjunct instructor: an instructor who teaches part-time and are often on a semester by semester teaching contract.
2. Chi-square of independence test: a non-parametric test used to determine if there is a significant relationship between two nominal/categorical variables.

3. Community College: a two–year postsecondary school where students receive vocational and/or basic collegiate coursework.

4. Excellent teaching: comes from teachers understanding the impact they make in student's lives in regards to retention of course material as well as student motivation (Kreber, 2002; Buskist et a. 2002; and Su et al. 2017).

5. Fisher's exact test: a statistical tests for determining nonrandom associations among two categorical values.

6. Master teacher: master teachers possess a great variety of teaching attributes but they all instill a desire for students to learn, have students learn the material being taught and keep the subject matter interesting (Buskist et al., 2002).

7. Teaching attributes/behaviors: "any observable teaching behavior or activity which might make the difference between success and failure in teaching" (Jensen, 1953)

8. Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC): a 28 item survey developed by Dr. William Buskist et al. (2002) to help identify teaching behaviors that are important in becoming an excellent teacher.

9. Teaching excellence: According to Baker, Franz, Glenn, Pauley, Snavely, and Von Dorpowski (2005), teaching excellence is considered,

> an academic process by which students are motivated to learn in ways that make a sustained, substantial, and positive influence on how they think, act, and feel; a process that elevates students to a level where they learn deeply and remarkably because of teacher attributes. (p. 1)

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Introduction

According to data from the U.S. Department of Education (2017), there are approximately 1,462 community colleges in the United States. Since there has been an increase in students attending community colleges, it is important that educators understand the community college system as well as what behaviors/attributes research has shown to be the most effective in becoming a master teacher. This chapter looks at the community college system nationally as well as in the state of Alabama. This chapter contains a literature review has been conducted on teaching strategies, adult education theories, student engagement, and teaching characteristics.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate what faculty and students at community colleges perceive as the behaviors that demonstrate excellent teaching. This study examined how demographics such as age, gender and student classification affect a student's perception on effective teaching behaviors. In addition, the study examined the demographics of age, gender, and teaching experience and the influence on faculty's perceptions of effective teaching behaviors. Lastly, the relationship between faculty and student's views of excellent teaching behaviors at the community college level was examined. By understanding, what behaviors are viewed as the most important in regards to excellent teaching, then community college faculty could make any necessary

changes to their teaching style. This could lead to a more positive experience for both faculty and students as well as help in the community colleges retention of students.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are community college faculty's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

2. What are community college student's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

3. What is the relationship between faculty and student's perceptions of excellent teaching behaviors/attributes at community colleges?

History of Community Colleges

Community colleges may be referred to as vocational schools, junior colleges, adult education centers, or two–year schools. As early as the 1850's, university educators began to think about not only have teaching obligations but research becomes a major focus as well. Educators, such as Henry Tappen in 1851, William Mitchell in 1859, and William Folwell in 1869, were huge proponents of making a division in the lower and upper-level classes (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

William Harper in 1892, who as President, actually changed the organization of the University of Chicago. He changed the organization into two distinct areas with freshman and sophomores being referred to as being in junior college and juniors and seniors being in senior college (Drury, 2003). William Harper is also credited with developing the term junior colleges.

The first community college in America was started in 1901 with William Rainey Harper being one of the driving forces. This took place at Central High School in Juliet, Illinois where fifth and sixth-year coursework was added to the existing high school (Jurgens, 2010). This is currently known as the Joliet Junior College. When the first community college was developed, the terminology of the time was junior college or two–year schools. It was based on the German high school system (Jurgens, 2010).

The growth of the community college system in the early 1900s grew out of an elitist movement where, universities at that time did not want the responsibility of teaching general education (Drury, 2003). According to Jurgens (2010), "The earliest community colleges generally focused on liberal arts education with an underlying goal of transferring students to 4–year institutions of higher education" (p. 253). Jurgens (2010) also pointed out that the earliest community colleges offered easy access to education for women and most women pursued community colleges as a way of preparing themselves to become grammar school teachers.

While community colleges were slow to grow from the elitist movement, a social movement began to educate society as a whole. This instigated growth in the number of students attending community colleges. According to Cohen and Brawer (2003), some of the reasons for this social movement were the acknowledgment that society benefits as a whole when people are educated, businesses needing an educated and trained workforce, and even community prestige. Cohen and Brawer (2003) pointed out that, "by 1930, there were 440 junior colleges, found in all but five states with a total enrollment around 70,000" (p. 14).

At the beginning of community college development, the United States had a substantial amount of private community colleges, with the majority of these being affiliated with religion. While these private institutions started out strong, over time privately owned community colleges have seen a steady decline (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Yet public institutions have seen a surge in growth.

Geller (2001) pointed out that in terms of growth there were two significant events that helped community colleges grow, the Great Depression and the return of Service members from World War II. One of the theories behind such growth in the student population for community colleges during the Great Depression was the lack of work available and students trying to gain valuable job skills to help them gain employment (Jurgens, 2010). Community colleges also saw a large increase in the number of students after World War II when service members returned due to a development in the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, more commonly known as the GI Bill, which gave veterans assistance in paying for higher education (Vaughan, 2006).

According to Tillery and Deegan (1985), the history of community colleges can be divided up into five generations of growth. Tillery and Deegan looked at the time periods from 1900 to the 1990s. The first generation being from the years 1900 to 1930, the community college years were considered a part of the public school system. In June of 1920, the first national conference for junior colleges was held by U.S. Bureau of Education, whereas, these attendees, later on, formed the American Association of Community Colleges (Geller, 2001). Other influential groups during this time were the Committee of Secondary School Studies also known as the Committee of Ten who

helped with the formulation of the Carnegie unit, leading to formulas for transfer credit (Kintzer, 1996).

The second generation, from 1930 to 1950, was considered as the start of the junior college system. There was major growth in terms of enrollment during this time period. In 1947, the Truman Commission Report or "Higher Education for an American Democracy" report came out and called for community colleges to be considered true academic institutions (Jurgens, 2010). Accrediting associations began to look at the credibility of the schools in the 1930s (Kintzer, 1996).

The third generation of community college's development was from 1950 to 1970, and this is when the terminology changed from junior colleges to favoring the term community colleges. In this time period, we see another large growth in community college enrollment numbers due to the Korean War. The GI Bill was extended to include the Korean War veterans as well which helped account for the rise in enrollment figures. In 1958, the Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges formed and worked to set transfer guidelines for students who wanted to transfer between the community college system and four-year institutions (Jurgens, 2010). In 1968, we see the first Tribal College and University (TCU), which was developed to address the needs of the Native Americans living in more isolated and rural conditions, with the start of Navajo Community College (Jurgens, 2010).

In the fourth generation or years 1970–1985, the term became comprehensive community colleges. In 1972, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) was developed to help support the TCU movement. The Native American movement for TCU's during the late 1960s and early 1970s led to increased legislature

and funding in support of the movement. In 1978, President Jimmy Carter signed into law the Controlled Community College Assistance Act, which allowed federal assistance to be given to community colleges controlled by Native Americans on their own reservations (Jurgens, 2010).

Lastly, the fifth generation that Tillery and Deegan (1985) referred to was not given a name but begins from the mid–1980s through the 1990s (Geller, 2001). In this time period, collaboration and partnerships developed between community colleges and the business industry. Raisman (1990) described a fast pace in growth for community colleges in the fifth generation as, "This faster pace is predicted to occur at a time when the demands on community colleges are also rapidly increasing" (p. 15). Some of the major issues being faced in the fifth generation involved remediation courses being increasingly pushed into the community college realm, trying to find a balance between the general education courses and vocation courses, and engaging the newer generation of students (Raisman, 1990).

History of Alabama Community Colleges

The first public community college in Alabama opened in 1925 and was state operated. In the 1800s, however, there were several community colleges in Alabama that were considered private institutions. In 1963, the Alabama Legislature linked the public community colleges into a single system. Currently, there are 25 community colleges and technical colleges in the state of Alabama and recently an addition of the Marion Military Institute rose the number to 26 schools (ACCS, 2019). The Alabama system has approximately 120,000 students enrolled in credited coursework (ACCS, 2019). Part of

the growth in enrollment for community colleges can be attributed to the open access/open door admissions policy.

Open Access/Open Door Admissions Policy

Brookfield (2002) stated, "Community College classrooms represent the ultimate in open–entry admissions in American higher education" (p. 31). An open door admissions policy means that the college will accept any student who has received their high school diploma or GED certificate. With most community colleges offering general education courses, there is great mobility, or access, for students to move from their adult education courses into community college courses within the same institution. Having an open door admissions policy has allowed students who would not have otherwise considered furthering their education to attend a community college. Goldrick-Rab (2010) pointed out that, "Community colleges are highly regarded for their open admissions policy, which expands opportunities to everyone, regardless of prior advantages or disadvantages" (p. 438). Cohen and Brawner (2003) indicated, "In general, this means that students may register with little advance commitment and enroll in classes without completing a plan of study" (p. 61). Open access is "not only beneficial to recent high school graduates but adult students who, because of outside commitments may have a hard time attending a full-time university" (Shannon & Smith, 2006, p. 16).

The open admissions policy at community colleges has helped the community college system to grow in numbers, as well as in diversity. According to Bragg (2009), "…open admissions policies are a fundamental reason for the increasing enrollment of diverse student groups in community colleges" (p. 97). More than one-half of Hispanics

and African Americans who attend college will choose a community college as their pathway to furthering their education (Bragg, 2009). Women also make up a large percentage of community college enrollees, however, this has been the case almost from the start of the community college system (Bragg, 2009).

There is no doubt that having an open admissions policy has helped with the diversity and number of students attending a community college. This policy has helped countless students who may not have obtained further education had this policy not been in place. That being said, there is a lot of debate currently about whether or not the open admissions policy should be more stringent. The open door admissions policy is also facing many challenges in the present day higher education climate (Cohen & Brawner, 2003).

Ingram and Morrissey (2009) indicated that there were ethical considerations that need to be taken into account. Some argue that having an open admissions policy could be setting students up for failure due to severely lacking basic study skills such as reading comprehension and mathematical skills. Some of the challenges to open access are being accessible geographically, fiscal issues, and the change of student demographics (Shannon & Smith, 2006; Hebel, 2010, Oliff, Palacios, Johnson, & Leachman, 2013; Deming & Walters, 2018). Ingram and Morrissey (2009) concluded that some of the major issues besides ethical ones are the capacity for the student to succeed and being able to use public funds appropriately and efficiently. According to Shannon and Smith (2006), "The deadly combination of shrinking state resources and increased tuition has played a heavy burden on those students whom the community colleges is designed to serve" (p. 19). This reduction in money allocated to community colleges by state budget

decreases hit the community college system harder than the cuts hurt four–year universities (Shannon & Smith, 2006).

There is also a disagreement on whether or not undocumented immigrants can make use of the open door admissions policy. Currently, the view is that undocumented immigrants can use the open door admissions policy; however, no financial aid will be given to those students (Ingram & Morrissey, 2009). Despite the challenges faced by the open door admissions policy it is important to recognize the importance of allowing people to have access to educational programs that will not only benefit them but the community as a whole. With the open door admissions policy, community colleges have seen an increase in enrollment.

National Community College Data

Enrollment Data

Higher education enrollment data for both community colleges and four–year universities fluctuates with the economy. In economic decline, higher education will see an increase in enrollment and as the economy improves, there will be a gradual decline in enrollment. In the Great Recession of 2007–2009, there was a dramatic increase in community college enrollment but since then there has been a steady decline in enrollment (Juszkiewicz, 2017). There has been a decline of approximately 3% for public community colleges for two consecutive years (Juszkiewicz, 2017). Enrollment at community colleges for students aged 24 or older had the highest rate of decline than other student cohorts (Juszkiewicz, 2017). The states with the highest community college enrollments are the states of Texas, Illinois, and California (Bragg, 2009). Enrollment

data for community colleges account for 45% of first-time college entrants and 37% of all undergraduates in American universities (Bragg, 2009).

Graduation Rates

Bailey, Jaggars, and Jenkins (2015) stated, "In the United States, 1,200 community colleges enroll over ten millions students each year—nearly half of the nation's undergraduates. Yet fewer than 40 percent of entrants complete an undergraduate degree within six years" (p. 1). For the year of 2013, the official graduation rate was 25.4%, which is an increase from the previous year; and the rate for women graduating from a community college was slightly higher than men at a 26.1% rate vs. men's 24.6% rate (Juszkiewicz, 2017). The 2014 cohort saw increases in graduation rages with men graduating at a rate of 31.1% and women at a 36.3% rate (Ginder, Kelley-Reid, & Mann, 2018). The National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) examines completion data by monitoring students across multiple institutions for a six–year time period, which is different from the U.S. Department of Education. According to the NSC's 2010 data, the overall six–year completion rate for students who started in the fall of 2010 at a public community college was a 27% (Juszkiewicz, 2017). This is in part due to the agency taking into consideration students who may have started at one community college and transferred to another community college as well as students who transferred to a four–year institution to finish their education (Juszkiewicz, 2017). Juszkiewicz (2017) stated, "All told, within 6 years, 39.3% of the community college students completed a program either at the starting institution or a different institution" (p. 5).

For full–time community college students, their completion rate at their starting institution was 42.1% and for part-time students, the completion rate was 20.4% with 18.4% completing at their starting institution according to the NSC's data (Juszkiewicz, 2017). According to NSC's six–year completion data, adult learners at community colleges who took classes part-time had a completion rate of 25.6% compared to full–time students who had a rate of 49.5%. (Juszkiewicz, 2017). The highest completion rate was full–time younger students with a rate of 59.7% (Juszkiewicz, 2017). Data from the U.S. Department of Education showed for the cohort years of 2009 and 2013 that 19.5% of students at a community college graduated within a 100% completion time, 32.6% within 150% completion time, and 37.4% complete within 200% of the program completion time (Grinder, Kelly-Reid, Mann, 2018). Juszkiewicz (2017) pointed out, "These findings belie the commonly held belief that most community college students don't graduate, because, in fact, most full-time students do complete a program and graduate" (p. 6).

Alabama Community College System Data

Currently, the State of Alabama has twenty-five comprehensive community and technical colleges, Marion Institute which is a junior military college, and the Alabama Technology Network (workforce development). The State of Alabama Community College system has served approximately 300,000 students in which 100,000 are enrolled in college credit classes (ACCS, 2018). "The Alabama Community College System's commitment to access is characterized by statewide geographical locations, open enrollment, and low-cost tuition, as well as a variety of programs and services that

remove barriers to college entrance, education pathways, and workforce training opportunities" (ACCS, 2018, para. 3).

ACCS data revealed that approximately 27,000 students were assisted in 2015 in their Adult Education programs. The Alabama Community College System in 2015 saw a 43% increase from the previous year in the awarding of 2,000 GED certificates with students passing the GED with a rate of 88% (ACCS, 2015). This rate surpasses the national pass rate for the GED exam. According to the data provided by the Alabama Community College System in 2014, 6,300 of their students transferred to a four–year college or university in 2010 where 89% of these students maintained a GPA greater than a 2.0 (ACCS, 2015). According to Smith (2019), “Nearly half of all postsecondary students today begin their college journey at a two–year institution (49.2 percent)” (p. 1).

The ACCS has also impacted industry through their job training programs. ACCS offers a Ready to Work training program that assists students with gaining knowledge that will make them more marketable in the work force. The programs are offered free of charge and upon completion students earn their Alabama Certified Worker (ACW) Certificate as well as the National Career Readiness Certificate (NCRC) (ACCS, 2019). Having programs such as this helps the business industry gain knowledgeable workers leading to a positive economic impact. Brand, Valent, and Browning (2013) stated, “In an economy that requires well-trained and highly skilled professionals, it is a proven method for endowing young people with the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful members of the workforce” (p. 13). Students in the ACCS has benefited from career readiness programs as well as the ease of moving from the adult education programs into college academic and/or career tech programs.

Adult Learning Theories

Community colleges offer a wealth of opportunities for adults in the local community. They offer adult education courses for those who could not finish high school. Community colleges offer general two–year studies courses for those who are seeking an Associate degree or planning to transfer to a four–year institution. Community colleges also offer vocational training programs. With the exception of dual enrollment courses, where students can gain college credits while currently in high school, community college programs teach adult students ages 18 and up. Due to the differences in student populations, it is important that instructors understand adult learning theories in an effort to understand the needs of their students and provide excellent teaching (Cercone, 2008). Adult learning theories such as Knowles andragogy and the self-directed learner, as well as, Mezirow's theory of transformative learning to produce permanent changes in the student can better equip instructors with a strong knowledge base. By understanding adult learning theories, a master teacher has teaching strategies that they can employ that will exhibit excellent teaching behaviors.

Andragogy

Malcolm Knowles is considered the American father of the adult learning theory andragogy. His work is a continuation of Eduard Lindeman's work in adult learning. John Henschke (1998) wrote, "Andragogy is the art and science of helping adults learn, and facilitating self-directed learning" (p. 3). Knowles' theory of andragogy was based on two central themes: (1) adult learners are autonomous and can use self-directed learning and (2) an emphasis on the learner having choices whereas; the teacher is more the facilitator (Jost Reischmann, 2004). St. Clair (2002) extended the notion by

describing andragogy as, "…andragogy is not all about learning –the assumptions demonstrate how the theory lays out a humanistic view of learners and their potential for growth, with implications for teaching, social philosophy, and human relationships" (p. 1).

According to Malcolm Knowles, there are six assumptions to andragogy. First, adults need to know why or the reason they need to know the material they are learning. Adult learners like to see the benefit of learning the material that is being presented to them. The second assumption is one of self–concept and the ability to use self-directed learning. Merriam (2001) stated, "And because adults manage other aspects of their lives, they are capable of directing, or at least assist in planning, their own learning" (p. 5). The third assumption is that adult learners can use their experiences to guide their learning. Ozuah (2005) acknowledged that "Adult learning practitioners believe that prior experiences are the richest resources available to adult learners" (p. 84).

Andragogy's fourth assumption is of an adult learner's readiness to learn. The adult learner's readiness to know is linked back to the first assumption of needing to know the value or benefit of knowing the material will bring to the adult learner's life (Ozuah, 2005). Fifth is an orientation to learning or how does this material relate to real-world problems and issues. The paradigm shifts from learning for the sake of knowledge to that of learning for the application. Lastly, the sixth assumption is that of motivation. In pedagogy, learning is based on extrinsic motivation; however, in andragogy there is a shift in adult learners to where motivation becomes intrinsic in nature. According to Blondy (2007), "Knowles believed that adults were best motivated to succeed with their educational goals when they were recognized and appreciated for their individual

contributions to the class" (p. 126). Leigh, Witted, and Hamilton (2015) stated, "…andragogical design elements need to be integrated into the curriculum for adult learners" (p.9). Andragogy can be found in the excellent teaching behaviors such as being creative and interesting, thus, allowing students to use their own experiences to guide their learning and keeping the material relevant to the learners.

Self-Directed Learning

Self–directed learning puts the focus back on the adult learner. The adult learner is the one with control. Self–directed learning comes from Malcolm Knowles first assumption of self–concept and the ability for the learner to use self–directed learning. Knowles believed that with self–directed learning learners need to be actively involved with their learning, responsible, and mature (Blondy, 2007). With self–directed learning, a learner may or may not need the assistance of an instructor (Cercone, 2008).

Some of the innovators in the field of self–directed study in adult education are Malcolm Knowles, Allen Tough, and Cyril Houle. Cyril Houle (1961) used the term learning oriented for a classifying a group of adult learners which helped to begin to further the interest in adult learners (Heimstra, 2003). Allen Tough has spearheaded numerous studies to further develop knowledge on how adults learn and the concept of self–directed learning. He is best known for his 1971 study entitled, The Learning Projects. Tough found that in 80% of learning projects the teacher was either the learner himself, a friend, and/or peer group (Tough, 1989).

It is important to remember that adult learners do not all come with the same degree of ability for self–directed learning and thus, some may need more help than

others in becoming self–directed learners. Cercone (2008) stated, "Some learners need varying degrees of direction and support, while others are ready to be self–directed" (p. 148). To help guide students who may not be at the self–directed phase, an instructor should make sure that their course whether formal or informal has clear objectives and activities that learners can tailor to their own needs (Blondy, 2007).

Transformative Learning

In 1978, Mezirow introduced his theory of transformative learning to the adult education realm. This type of learning is meant to produce a permanent change in the adult learner's way of thinking. According to Mezirow, transformative learning happens when an adult learner uses their experiences and knowledge or frames of reference to make their own interpretations instead of relying on other's ideas (Mezirow, 1997). Boucouvalas and Lawrence (2010) surmised that social change is a desirable effect of transformational learning but acknowledged that Mezirow did not feel that the change had to be immediate.

In transformative learning, adult learners or more self–reflective, responsible and autonomous in their decision making. Adult educators must help students become aware of their own thinking as well as others and become critical thinkers (Mezirow, 1997). New information gathered in transformative learning has to be put in a meaningful context using the adult learner's developed frame of reference (Mezirow, 1997). Some methods that are useful in helping adult learners through the process are methods such as role-playing, small group discussions or projects, and case studies. Activities such as these require students to interact with others and see different viewpoints.

Thus, helping them understand their own frames of reference, it is important to note that students may change their frames of reference after exposure to other's ideas and/or beliefs. Christie, Carey, Robertson, Grainger (2015) stated, "If students are given the motivation, the means and the knowledge necessary to critically assess, challenge and change their assumptions they will have the chance to become lifelong learners capable of acting for the best in a rapidly changing world" (p. 22). It is important for instructors to understand how to motivate and engage students in learning and model the appropriate teaching behaviors.

Student Engagement and Motivation

Student Engagement

Student engagement describes the time, energy, and effort a student puts into areas that will help him succeed in academics (Robinson & Hullinger, 2008). Student achievement has been linked highly to student engagement (Lei & Cui, 2018). The mere act of being engaged adds to a student's foundation, skill set, and dispositions that are essential even after the student leaves the college (Kuh, 2003). According to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), there are five benchmarks of education practice in regards to student learning and persistence (CCSSE, 2006b). Roman (2007) described the benchmarks as the following, "The benchmarks are: active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, student effort, academic challenge, and support for learners" (p. 21). Professors have an effect on each of these five benchmarks so it is important that professors understand their role in motivating and engaging their students.

Instructors play a huge part in motivating and engaging students. Student–faculty interactions are important for developing self–concept but also for motivation and achievement (Romsa, Bremer, & Lewis, 2017; Lundberg, Kim, Andrade, & Bahner 2018; Beckowski, Gebauer, Arminio, 2018; Groccia, 2018, Lancaster & Lundberg, 2019; Schudder, 2019). These interactions do not have to be formal as informal interactions also play an important part. Informal interactions outside the classroom have been shown to keep students involved, motivated, and engaged in the learning process (Woodside, Wong, & Weist, 1999; Romsa et al. 2017). When a student identifies with just one professor it has found that they are more likely to stay in college and are satisfied with their experience (Romsa et al., 2017). In a study conducted at two–year technical colleges, Chan and Wang (2015) found that students who positively interacted with their professors and peers were more likely to have a higher GPA than their counterparts.

Instructors must help students learn how to self–examine. Pardue and Morgan (2008) stated, "The extent to which students can accurately self-examine their skill sets may influence their motivation and engagement in learning" (p. 76). Hsieh (2014) found that students with more self-efficiency had higher GPAs. Other studies (Eden & Ravid, 1982; Griffith & Bakanauskas, 1983; Clifton & Simpson, 1992; Miller, 2001; Schilling & Schilling, 2005; Kohut, 2014) have found that if an instructor sets high expectations for students and shows support, most students will rise to the occasion basically, the self–fulfilling prophecy principle.

There are three known types of student engagement; behavioral, emotional, and cognitive. Behavioral engagement consists of activities such as active learning techniques and class discussion participation (Lei & Ciu, 2018). Emotional engagement is broken

down into a student's emotional reaction to the learning environment and its participants. Lastly, cognitive engagement is a learning strategy that the student uses during the learning process. Lei and Ciu (2018) found that out of the three known types of engagement; behavioral, emotional, and cognitive, behavioral engagement had the highest achievement rate. This helps to validate recommendations for professors to use more active learning techniques in their classroom. Since Millennial and Generation Z students prefer active learning and collaborative learning environments, professors who adapt their classroom settings to be conducive to active learning achieve more student engagement and motivation. This results in students achieving their goals.

Impact of Community College Instructors on Student Retention

Students have to stay engaged and motivated in order to learn; however, motivation and engagement are also important to colleges for retention purposes. According to Romsa, Bremer, and Lewis (2017) "Faculty have been found to play an important influence on many student outcomes, including both student retention and satisfaction" (p. 87). It is also important that faculty and administrators understand their student's characteristics and what motivates them (Hsieh, 2014). Master teacher's employ teaching behaviors that are conducive to student success which motivates the student to continue with their studies (Smittle, 2003).

Tinto's (1993) theory on student retention described the importance of faculty interactions, academic performance, and social interactions with a peer as crucial elements to retaining students. He also mentioned that these elements were most important in the student's first two years of college since this is when the shaping of the student occurs and influences whether or not they will persist. Since community colleges

normally focused on a student's first two years of college it is imperative that they focus on their students.

Hutto (2015) pointed out that there was a correlation between course retention and whether or not a student will complete their program. Hutto (2015) stated, "Recognizing that retaining students in courses contributes to overall student retention highlights the important role of faculty members in retention" (p. 6). Classroom experiences and professor interactions, as well as professor support, contributes to not only having the student to stay and finish his program at the institution he is currently enrolled in but in whether or not he will go on to further his education (Hutto, 2015; Pascarella, Seifert, & Whitt, 2008; Pascarella & Ternzini, 2005; Tinto, 2012). The student who is left alone and has become disengaged from the classroom will put very little effort into his studies and will be dissatisfied with his progress (Kuh, 2003).

Student success and motivation at the community college level can result in students further their education. Godrick-Rab (2010) described the purpose of education as, "…one function of education is to increase student's ambitions for further education, and therefore college attendance itself may enhance educational experiences" (p. 439). Cohen and Brawer (2003) pointed out, "The popularizing role was to have the effect of advertising higher education, showing what it could do for the individual and encouraging people to attend" (p. 21). Seventy percent of enrolled community college students say that they wish to further their education by earning a Bachelor's degree as a long-term goal (Bailey et. al, 2006; Godrick-Rab, 2010). Juszkiewicz (2017) stated, "Nearly half (49%) of those earning a bachelor's degree in the academic year 2015–16 had previously attended a public 2–year institution" (p. 8). Somers, Haines, Keene,

Bauer, Pfeiffer, McCluskey, Settle, and Sparks (2006) summed up the reason to transfer to a four-year institution in the following way, “Some students did not come with the intention to transfer to a 4–year college. But now they have experienced success, they are motivated to earn a 4–year degree” (p. 59).

In the community college system, you will find that the majority of professors are adjunct instructors due to budget constraints. Although full–time professors had the best student retention rates impact, Hutto’s 2015 study on student retention actually found that there was a small difference and that adjunct instructors actually had a higher student retention rate impact than full–time instructors. According to Hutto (2015), “The findings in this study indicate that inside the classroom is where the influence of faculty/student interaction on retention is most critical” (p. 14). At least short-term there seemed to be no negative effects on student retention by using adjunct faculty according to this study (Hutto, 2015).

It is important in terms of student engagement and motivation, to consider the generation(s) of the students' educators are teaching. Hampton and Keys (2016) argued that "Generational differences can influence the beliefs and expectations of college students, including how they approach learning and their perception of the roles of teacher and student” (p. 111). “Faculty should understand how their own generational biases, learning style and prejudices in order to understand and address the challenge of teaching the most recent generations” (Pardue & Morgan, 2008, p. 7). While there are many generations represented in a community college setting, there are two main generations that are affecting campus climates, the Millennial Student also known as Generation Y and the Generation Z students. Since the Millennial and Generation Z

students are now the majority on community college campuses, instructors must understand the characteristics of these students and what motivates them in the classroom.

Characteristics of Millennials and Generation Z Students

The Millennial Student

Millennial students were born in the year range of 1982 to 2002. Just as any of the other generations before, millennials have developed their own unique set of characteristics that present challenges to educators. One of their many good characteristics is that they are considered a hard-working generation and because they were raised by the Baby Boomer generation; they have been raised by parents who are not only supportive but want their children to be successful in life (Elam, Stratton, & Gibson, 2007). Because their parents have been so supportive, they are also considered sheltered. McAllister (2009) stated, "From birth, this generation has taken a place of priority in the world" (p. 14). Along with the millennial student influx into higher education, educators have seen an influx of helicopter parents as well. This is a challenge because this can hinder a student's ability to think for themselves and make independent actions (Much, Wagener, Breitkreutz, & Hellenbrand, 2014). This also can lead to students not being able to handle criticism well and are very sensitive especially when it deals with being corrected in a public setting (Roehling, Kooi, Dykema, Quisenberry, & Vandlen, 2011). Although this may be considered a challenge for educators, it has a positive side as this has led to the student having greater trust in not only their parents but those who are in authority positions as well (McAllister, 2009).

Romsa, Bremer, and Lewis (2017) concluded that "Millennials have come both to trust authority and depend on authority" (p. 87).

The Millennial student is a multitasker. Because Millennials are such great multi-taskers, they are able to juggle a lot of different information sources. This can be both a positive and a negative skill. Pardue and Morgan (2008) described the Millennial student's multitasking skill as follows, "Their propensity for multitasking makes it difficult for them to focus on one activity, and the volumes of information available to them create unique challenges for sorting through and evaluating critical data" (p. 74). This multitasking skill and the constant barrage of entertainment and sources has created students who have a shorter attention span than previous generations. They become bored quicker which is a challenge especially for professors who prefer only to utilize the traditional lecture format. While millennial students may have a great ability to multi-task this does not necessarily equate to greater retention of the learning material. McAlister (2009) found that "Several studies gauging the effectiveness of multitasking and learning have shown that learning does suffer when one is attempting to process several layers of unrelated information at once" (p. 15).

While this generation is sometimes considered the me generation, they actually prefer a collaborative learning environment. They have grown up in a technical world thus, it is imperative that instructors are tech savvy to keep students interested and involved in the classroom. Elam, Stratton, and Gibson (2007) stated, "Some researchers also fear that millennial students, being over-reliant on communications technology, will have stunted interpersonal (face-to-face) skills" (p. 22). This research indicates it is

important to use this generation's team-player characteristic with their tech-savvy skills to help them develop more communication skills.

Turner and Thompson (2014) indicated that this generation has a larger more diverse population than those before it. This leads to a classroom that is full of diverse learners and learning styles with differing expectations. This generation is also considered one of the most pressured generations and they are achievement oriented both inside and outside of the classroom. This has led to an increase in health concerns and stress issues for the millennials (Wagener, Breitkreutz, & Hellenbrand, 2014). Both the health issues and the diverse student population means a instructor will need to adapt their teaching style to accommodate students.

Generation Z Students

Generation Z students are students who were born in the year 2000 and will extend approximately until the year 2020. Some researchers say that Generation Z actually began in 1995. This newest generation of students is beginning to show up on college campuses. Currently, they are one of the biggest generations and will outnumber the millennial generation. Generation Z students have been shaped by the constant bombardment of technology, natural disaster events such as Hurricane Sandy and Katrina, and born into a world that has had to deal with terrorism (Rothman, 2016).

There are many similarities with Millennials and Generation Z students. Both groups are tech savvy, great at multi-tasking, have a lower attention span than previous generations, and prefer team-oriented activities. While these students are similar in some

ways to millennial students, they are also different in some of their characteristics (Rothman, 2016; Cilliers 2017).

According to Mohr and Mohr (2017), “Interestingly, rather than the 'me-centric' spirit attributed by some to Millennials, the Z Generation is considered ‘we–centric’” (p. 86). Generation Z students are more open-minded about ethnic diversity and are themselves a very diverse generation (Hampton & Keys, 2016). They are the first generation to be born in a fully digital world and are often referred to as Digital Natives. Cilliers (2017) stated, "Some research illustrated that the brains of Generation Z are structurally different from those of earlier generations, not as a result of genetics, but as a result of the external environment and how our brains respond to such” (p. 190). The challenge for instructors is how to create conducive learning environments that are suitable for Generation Z students and keep them entertained.

This generation is accustomed to getting constant and immediate feedback due to the digital world they grew up in. This can be a challenge and cause friction between a instructor and the student when it may take a while for the instructor to give feedback and/or answer an email instantly. Even though students prefer instant feedback, it is important to note that in a survey by Cilliers (2017), Generation Z students still preferred to take written exams over electronic exams although the researcher did observe electronic exams were gaining in popularity.

Generation Z students have been described as wanting to change the world and are considered socially responsible (Rothman, 2016). This can be used to a instructor’s advantage if they use current events for student engagement. Generation Z has been raised in an environment that is fully digital, they have developed a preference for visual

learning as opposed to auditory (Chun, Dudoit, Fujihara, Gerschenson, Kennedy, Koanui, Ogata, & Sterns, 2017). This change in learning preference needs to be considered so that we can begin to prepare/train faculty as these students begin to enter the higher education system. Because Millennial and Generation Z students are dominate on community college campuses now, it is important that instructors understand the teaching strategies necessary for teaching these newer generations. There must be an understanding of the appropriate teaching behaviors that Millennial and Generation Z students prefer.

Teaching Strategies for Millennial and Generation Z Students

Millennial students are described as team-oriented, high–achieving, multi-taskers, pressured, sheltered, diverse, and tech-savvy. Generation Z students are considered fast decision makers, tech-savvy, team-oriented, multi-taskers, and want instant information/communication. Because both of these generations have some characteristics that are similar, the strategies covered will work for both of the Millennial and Generation Z students. Unlike faculty who usually prefer the traditional lecture, Millennials and Generation Z students prefer active learning environments with group work and hands-on activities that engage the student including using multimedia and active questioning (Pardue & Morgan, 2008).

Both of these generations have a shorter attention span than previous generations. This can be a challenge to faculty as they develop their classroom learning environment. Wilson (2004) stated, “Rather than faculty being primarily lecturers, they are designers of learning methods and environments” (p. 59). This could not be more accurate than for these two generations as they have come to classrooms with high expectations. Because their attention spans are shorter, faculty will need to develop a classroom in which

information is given in short bursts since this is how these students are used to receiving their information from their technology sources. It is important to use technology in the classroom through a variety of media sources to keep students motivated and engaged throughout the learning process. Jo and Martin (2007) described the technology in the classroom in the following way, "It is meant to act as an enhancement to help provide adequate stimulation, interaction, and motivation for students" (p. 4).

These tech-savvy generations appreciate working with a variety of media as it helps with multi-sensory engagement (McAlister, 2009). Montenery, Walker, Sorensen, Thompson, Kirklin, White, and Ross (2013) found that these students not only preferred using technology in the classroom but also enjoyed audience response systems such as the iclicker. Students of these generations have actually come to expect that faculty use some form of technology in the classroom (Romsa, Bremer, & Lewis, 2017). Not only are students wanting technology to be used in the classroom but they are also using it to conduct their research outside of the classroom (Romsa, Bremer & Lewis, 2017). Cillers (2017) stated, “The teacher however, needs to think critically and creatively and establish a classroom environment that is conducive to thinking and creating” (p. 195). Wilson (2004) stated, “technology should not be used for its own sake but rather only if it enhances teaching and learning” (p. 67).

The hallmark for both the Millennial and Generation Z students is that of high expectations not only of themselves but faculty as well. Because of how structured their lives have been growing up they enjoy clear expectations, well–structured assignments and syllabi, and prefer guidelines for completing assignments; all of which can present a challenge since the faculty's role is to help with growth and development which requires

for students to develop those critical thinking and autonomy skills (Wilson, 2004). Since these students have grown up as being more as friends with their parents, professors may need to have clear guidelines on how they would like to be addressed and how communication is conducted.

Instructors should take into account that these students tend to be team-oriented. Having a learning environment that makes use of collaborative discussions and peer mentoring/tutoring is a great way to help engage students in the learning material. Wilson (2004) suggested that faculty can create these learning environments through study groups. This not only helps with their need to be team oriented but helps in developing their communication skills which may be lacking due to so much computer time. Cilliers (2017) believed, that instructors need to be prepared to use software programs and get creative with their classroom setup, understand how to incorporate the internet into the classroom to facilitate communications within groups, move away from traditional teaching to a more learner-focused classroom, and move away from a traditional to a transformational learning model. This coincides with Mezirow's Transformational Learning Theory in working with adults.

By instructors moving to the transformational learning approach, instructors are able to help the Millennial and Generation Z students with some of their biggest challenges such as lack of critical thinking skills, lack of autonomy, and help with better decision making. This can only take place if the professor understands that student's frame of reference and an understanding of generational differences between the professor and the student.

It is very important for community colleges to understand the appropriate teaching behaviors needed to motivate and engage students in the learning process. If instructors understand that there can be generational shifts in the needs of students then they can begin to understand what teaching behaviors are appropriate for the generations they are teaching. Students need to be engaged and motivated if they are to learn. Cy Houle said that the learning environment for adult learners must be goal oriented, activity oriented, and learner oriented (Bullock, 2017).

Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) Instrument

The Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) is a 28-item behavioral based survey developed in 2002 by Buskist, Buckley, Sikorski, and Saville as a way of evaluating the behaviors related to a master teacher. The checklist looks at both teacher competency constructs and interpersonal constructs. The Teacher Behavioral Checklist (TBC) has been given in numerous traditional educational settings but has shown great promise in areas outside the traditional two and four–year settings. The TBC has been found to have solid validity and reliability ratings (Stigall & Blincoe, 2015). Since the development of this instrument, there have been numerous studies addressing not only what makes a great instructor, but also in how to provide intervention strategies for instructors who may need improvement in their teaching area.

One such study, conducted by Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn, and Buskist (2003), looked at the perspectives from faculty and students at the community college level in regards to effective teaching. This study was conducted at a mid-western community college and was given to 99 faculty members and 231 students. This study was a direct replication of the original study by Buskist, Buckley, Sikorski, and Saville in 2002, but administered at

the community college level. The top ten behavior qualities selected by both faculty and students were as follows: approachable, creative and interesting, encouraging and caring, enthusiastic, flexible and open-minded, knowledgeable, realistic expectations and fair, and respectful (Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn, & Buskist, 2003). What the researchers found were results that were similar to the original study. The faculty still focused more on teaching technique behaviors such as teaching critical thinking and keeping current in their field whereas, students seemed to focus on the teacher-student relationship type behaviors.

In 2017, McConner used the Teacher Behavior Checklist at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. McConner (2017) stated, that the study examined the teaching qualities and behaviors that U.S. educated and foreign educated faculty who teach at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) deem necessary for teaching. There were 543 faculty members from HBCUs in the study. The study looked at not only whether or not there were differences in the U.S. educated and foreign educated faculty perceptions, but also, if there was a difference depending on those faculty members years of teaching experience. In this study, the top 10 qualities for effective teaching were: knowledgeable, enthusiastic, approachable, creative, effective communicator, encouraging, promoting critical thinking, accessible, confident and prepared (McConner, 2017). Both groups agreed on the top 10 qualities for teaching; however, their order of the ranking was different. The U.S. educated faculty ranked being approachable higher than their foreign educated counterparts. The foreign educated faculty member ranked caring higher. As far as teaching experience when compared to other studies that looked at U.S. education and foreign educated faculty members, there was again an agreement

on eight of the qualities but still there showed a difference in there ranking (McConner, 2017). Faculty in general at HBCUs seem to favor more interpersonal behaviors than predominately white institutions (McConner, 2017).

The Teacher Behavior Checklist was used in O'Meara's dissertation (2007) in which he showed that the checklist has merit even outside the traditional college realm. This study used the Teacher Behavior Checklist to identify effective teaching behaviors according to students at an Air Force Officer School. It examined whether or not the instructors at the Air Force Officer School felt "possess the characteristics of effective teachers" (O'Meara, 2007). The study compared differences between faculty and student's perceptions and was given to 447 students and 37 instructors at the Squadron Office School. From this study, there were no gender differences in the perceptions of characteristics of effective teachers. However, there seemed to be a difference in student's and instructor's perceptions of what behaviors/attributes make an effective teacher. Instructors gave lower scores on the characteristics than students (O'Meara, 2007). O'Meara (2007) stated, "…this study has demonstrated that students and teachers, regardlesss of the nature of the student, perceive that the characteristics of effective teachers should be present in ideal teachers to a high degree…" (p.89).

Stigall and Lincoe (2015) used the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) to evaluate the faculty's self-ratings and student ratings to see if these had any impact on student evaluations. The researchers looked at three areas using the TBC: student and course qualities affect student ratings on the TBC, do evaluation sources reflect the same as the TBC, and do the course and instructor qualities affect self-ratings on the instrument (Stigall & Lincoe, 2015). A variety of techniques were used such as having a research

assistant videotape three minutes of lecture and subsequent rating, administering the TBC to the students, and then administering the TBC to the instructor of the course. One interesting development from this study was that years of experience had no impact on a higher or lower rating on the TBC. Stigall and Lincoe (2015) stated, "Instructor sex, student sex, expected grades, student effort, course level, class size, and instructor speaking time were all associated significantly with student usage of the TBC" (p. 304). Students tended to rate instructors higher if the instructor was female, expected to get a high grade, was in an upper level course, and in a smaller classroom (Stigall & Lincoe, 2015). Another topic that came from this study is that in a smaller classroom, instructors were assessed more positively and consistently given high markings on the caring attribute. These researchers found that using the TBC is a positive instructor self-assessment tool for self-reflection and promotion preparation.

There have been numerous studies conducted on a southeastern university campus using the Teacher Behavior Checklist. One study was conducted in 2010 by Keeley, Furr, and Buskist where undergraduate students at from two different southeastern institutions were used in a sample using the TBC. Students were asked to complete the checklist three times. They were to rate their best professor, their worst professor, and the professor with whom they had just left their course. The results from the study showed that even though the types of universities used in the sample were very different in many aspects, students had almost identical ratings. The study also showed that the TBC can detect "strong differences among types of teachers" (Keeley et al., 2010, p.19). Strong differences were found in regards to whether or not student's ranked an instructor

as their best, worst, or most recent instructor accounting for 45% of the variance in ratings (Keeley et al., 2010).

The Teacher Behavior Checklist has also been used in the vocational education setting. One hundred and thirty seven students and 6 instructors were surveyed at a community college in the Southeast by Anuar in 2016. As in previous studies, students and instructors were given the Teacher Behavior Checklist and asked to identify out of the 28 characteristics what they felt was the most important characteristics for an effective instructor. For the most part, there was a consensus on seven of the characteristics. The characteristics that both groups found important were accessible, confident, good at listening, punctual and management of class time, and strives to be a better teacher and technology competent (Anuar, 2016). This is a change from the other studies in which it seemed that more students placed a higher value on the interrelationship values. Here, however, they are more focused on whether or not the teacher is actually competent in teaching and his subject area. The faculty at this two–year college also echoed the student's perceptions in that teacher competency and fairness were the most important characteristics when it comes to being an effective teacher. It was noted that in this study, both students and instructors viewed having a happy/positive/humorous attitude the least important (Anuar, 2016).

Chinese college student's perceptions of the characteristics of excellent teachers were also examined in a study by Liu, Keeley, and Buskist in 2015. From a large university in Eastern China, 115 students participated in this study. The data were then compared to American and Japanese students who had taken the TBC at another time period. One difference in the comparison between the three nationalities was that

Chinese student's placed more value on their instructor being technologically competent. According to Liu, Keeley, Buskist (2015), Chinese students' valued the traditional role of teachers in an authoritative and respectful role. The Chinese students, when compared to the Japanese and American students, seemed to place a lower value on the relationship behaviors on the TBC. American students ranked the interpersonal relationship behaviors higher than the other two nationalities. The researchers found that while there was a difference in perspectives of an excellent teacher between the three nationalities, there were even differences in the ranking of the items between the two Asian cultures. The authors believed this was due to Japan adopting more of the Western culture (Liu, Keeley, & Buskist, 2015). This could have implications for student evaluations at the end of the semester. So a faculty member who has a large Asian population in his/her classroom might want to focus more on their teaching strategies and behaviors since they view these TBC qualities more favorably.

In a similar international study using the TBC, researchers Keeley, Christopher, and Buskist (2012) compared students at a small liberal four-year college and students at a small liberal arts college in Japan. Two hundred and thirty one students from the American college participated and 111 students from a Japanese college participated in this study. The surveys for the American students were given online while the Japanese students were given paper copies of the instrument. The students in both universities agreed on the following seven qualities: knowledgeable, confident, approachable/personal, enthusiastic, effective communicator, prepared, and a good listener (Keeley, Christopher, & Buskist, 2012). The difference lies in the last three qualities. American students other three choices were accessibility, respectfulness, and

intellectually. Japanese students chose humbleness, striving to be better, and creative/interesting as their other three choices (Keeley et al., 2012). Their study showed that there may be cultural differences as well as differences in types of institutions as well when looking at what qualities make an effective teacher.

These studies established a fairly consistent rating range from both students and faculty alike in what they view as important behavioral qualities for an expert or master instructor. From these studies, we can see that researchers have a proven instrument to study teacher's behaviors. Not only is the Teacher Behavior Checklist a sound instrument for studies, but it can be used in a multitude of ways to explore different teaching environments.

Effective Teaching Characteristics for Teaching Excellence

In order for a instructor to succeed in becoming a master teacher, it is important to understand what characteristics are actually effective for teaching at the higher education level. This may be true for instructors at community colleges since a good percentage of their students may need remedial coursework. The National Center for Education Statistics (1999–2000) reported that 32% for 4–year colleges and 41% of community college students needed remedial coursework. Teacher effectiveness has been defined in many ways. It may be defined in terms of student achievement, performance ratings by supervisors or student evaluations to name a few (Stronge, 2018). Teacher effectiveness has been shown to be one of the most important factors in a student's achievement (Hande, Kamath, & D'Souza, 2014).

Shaw and Young (1999) described an effective teacher as one who has mastered the skills of communication, creating learning environments that are comfortable, caring for their students, motivating their students and course organization. Shaw and Young (1999) also showed that professors do not have to be good in all these areas but truly effective professors have learned how to compensate in the areas they may be weak in. The research has shown that Millennial and Generation Z students prefer clear instructions and active learning strategies; this means that more than ever it is important for professors to develop course instruction strategies that have clear goals/instructions as well as active learning activities. Hande et al. (2014) stated, "…majority of the students liked their teacher to give a clear and easy understanding of the subject as well as to make the topic fun to learn" (p. 65).

Porter and Brophy (1998) described the characteristics of an effective teacher as the following: knowledge of content as well as their students, clear and easy to understand, teach and give practice for students to develop metacognition skills, knowledgeable in teaching strategies, reflective in their practice, and feel responsible for their student outcomes. Smittle (2003) stated,

> Teachers can use and apply the principles of commitment; command of subject matter and ability to teach diverse students; integration of affective skill development; provision of connected, open learning environments; high-performance expectations and ongoing evaluation and professional development to offer their best to student. (p. 7)

Hande et al. (2014) showed that effective teaching requires a instructor to constantly reflect and use feedback and proactively refine courses as necessary. Smittle

(2003) stated, “Effective teachers are constantly embracing change in their quest for improvement and also applying findings from evaluation outcomes to enhance teaching effectiveness and student success” (p. 6). This research is similar to Stephen Brookfield’s (1995) concept of being a critically reflective teacher, which stated that teachers need to reflect back on who they are as a teacher and where they want to go. A instructor will need to continually reflect on their teaching practice as experience changes their views on their teaching practice and as generational changes happen with their students. Without this continual growth, the professor will not be effective.

Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education

Chickering and Gamson developed what is known as the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education in 1987. These principles came about from research that was accomplished in the higher education setting in regards to good teaching and learning practices. The principles when employed can lead to effective teaching. According to Chickering and Gamson (1987), the seven principles for good practice were: (1) encourages contact between students and faculty, (2) develops reciprocity and cooperation among students, (3) encourages active learning, (4) give prompt feedback, (5) emphasizes time on task, (6) communicates high expectations, (7) respects diverse talents and ways of learning. These seven principles work well because they promote some of the most powerful driving forces in teaching at the higher education level. “These driving forces are: (1) activity, (2) cooperation, (3) diversity, (4) expectations, (5) interaction, and (6) responsibility” (Chickering & Gamson, 1987, p. 3)

Contact between students and faculty should be frequent and consistent, both inside and outside, the classroom in order to effectively engage and motivate students.

By using the second principle of cooperation of students the professor is helping students learn by sharing their ideas thus; deepening their understanding of the material (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). The active learning principle is crucial in keeping students engaged in the lesson; and as previously mentioned, it is essential in keeping the Millennial and Generation Z student interested in learning the material. Chickering and Gamson (1987) suggested that students be given prompt feedback so that students are better able to focus on their learning and progress. Providing constructive and prompt feedback as it leads to enhanced student learning outcomes (Soomere, Lepp, Groccia, Mansour, 2018). Another principle that is very useful for the Millennials and Generation Z students is time on task and teaching students valuable time management skills. According to Chickering and Gamson (1987), "Allocating realistic amounts of time means effective learning for students and effective teaching for faculty" (p. 4). The sixth principle of setting clear expectations is still being echoed throughout studies. Clear expectations are valued by the newer generations as they like to have clear set rules and expectations. When Millennials and Generation Z students know what is expected of them, they will normally rise to the occasion. Lastly, professors should respect and acknowledge diverse learning styles. As mentioned earlier, the Millennial and Generation Z cohorts are the most diverse generations that have come through classrooms. In order to be effective and achieve teaching excellence professors will need to develop teaching strategies that can reach the diverse learner.

Master Teacher

There are many different qualities and effective teaching characteristics that are required to attain the title of Master Teacher. There is not a definite clear cut definition

of what makes an instructor a master teacher; however, there are some guidelines from the research pertaining to master teacher status. Master teachers come from combinations and blends of different qualities and there is not a one size fits all method of defining who or what makes a master teacher (Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, & Saville, 2002; Buskist & Keeley, 2018). While there are many qualities that instructors must get right, a master teacher also recognizes the importance of the sum of the parts as well. Baiocco and DeWaters (1998) wrote,

> A professor who has been recognized for distinguished teaching is like a symphonic conductor, responsible for paying attention to each instrument in the orchestra individually while attending to the whole. The conductor demands a standard of excellence and makes clear what is necessary from each performer, and the outcomes are evaluated by both the conductor and the audience following each piece and at the end of the season. (p. 93)

There are three qualities that keep reoccurring throughout the literature in regards to the main qualities that are essential to becoming a master teacher. These three qualities are knowledgeable about subject matter, personality and/or rapport, and classroom management (Kelley et al., 2016, Buskist & Keeley, 2018; Ford, 2016). A master teacher must have knowledge of the content that they are teaching. They must have the ability and knowledge of how to teach this content in a way that diverse student populations can understand and retain. Lai, Yeung, and Hu (2016) stated, " Teachers, as significant social agents who shape students' intellectual and social experiences, have a critical role to play (p. 703). Another important aspect of knowledge is helping students make a connection from the material being learned in their course to other courses. Ford

(2016) pointed out that, “While sharing new knowledge is important, master teachers should also model critical thinking skills to ensure students are trained to think critically” (p. 45).

While there is not necessarily a certain personality type that makes for a master teacher, the master teacher has the ability to understand their own strengths and how to use those strengths to teach students as well as being flexible to change up their styles as needed (Buskist et al., & Eble, 1983; Keeley et al., 2016; Trammell & Aldrich 2016) and have a caring and approachable personality. A master teacher is enthusiastic about what they teach and are easy to relate to. Humor has also been found to be a beneficial teaching quality and has been shown in numerous studies to have a positive and motivating effect on the teacher/student relationship. In a study conducted by Gardner in 2006, the results supported that the use of humor in the college classroom resulted in better content retention. Humor, caring, enthusiastic, and approachability are all important personality characteristics for developing rapport and trust which are necessary for students to feel that the professor is approachable (Buskist et al., 2005; Adams, 2019; Demir, Burton & Dunbar, 2019).

Master teachers have developed excellent classroom management skills. This achieves good rapport and the development of trust in the classroom. Classroom management skills not only refer to dealing with problems that arise in the classroom but also in how an instructor structures classroom time. Buskist et al. (2005) described classroom management skills in the following manner, “Master teachers often control their classrooms through active learning techniques that help motivate students to become more personally invested in their own learning” (p. 29). By creating an environment that

employs active learning strategies, encourages participation, and sharing; the master teacher has developed a classroom that is conducive to not only the learning but retaining the material. As teachers strive to become master teachers, they can begin by reflecting on their own teaching style. Brookfield developed the four lenses of being a critically reflective teacher and by using this practice an instructor can address the parts of the equation that may need improvement in for them to become a master teacher. Brookfield's Four Lenses of Reflective Practice is an important framework when using this study in understanding how to use the TBC in an effort to improve their teaching practice.

Four Lenses of Reflective Practice

Brookfield developed the Theory of Reflection in 1995. This theory is based on the idea that teachers/professors should use critical reflection as a mean of improving teaching skills. Brookfield (2017) stated, "Critical reflection, is, quite simply, the sustained and intentional process of identifying and checking the accuracy and validity of our teaching assumptions" (p. 3). According to Brookfield (2002), "A critically reflective stance toward the practice of community college teaching can help teachers feel more confident that their judgments are informed and leave them with energy and intent to do good work" (p. 31). The four lenses that are part of being a critically reflective teacher are as follows: autobiographical, students, peers, and scholarship.

The first lens is the autobiographical lens. When instructors look through the self or their own eyes, they are taking into account their past learning experiences. Instructors may think that they are teaching in new ways or tackling new strategies but in reality after reflection, they may find that they are actually teaching in a way they preferred as a

learner. By understanding their own ways of learning, instructors can understand why they choose the methods of teaching that they choose (Brookfield, 2017).

A critically reflective teacher should look through the eyes of their students. Making us look more at how our words and actions can impact a student (Brookfield, 2017). A good way is by using student evaluations throughout the semester to try and accurately gauge how you are impacting students. By doing this throughout, the semester, the instructor is able to adjust his actions accordingly. According to Brookfield (2002), "Seeing their practice through learners' eyes helps teachers teach more responsively" (p. 34). Brookfield (2002) points out that it is important that professors not only understand the methods in which they teach but gain insight from their students in order to teach well.

The third lens is a professor's colleagues or peer perceptions. It is beneficial to the professor to have a peer come to their classroom and observe a class. This peer can then give constructive feedback to help further develop the skills of the professor being observed and opening our eyes to perspectives they might have missed (Brookfield, 2017). Having this dialogue with peers can lead to a supportive mentoring type environment for professors. Working with peers can help a professor to gain new insight and develop more skills in teaching that they might not have had if they did not reach out to their peers.

The fourth and last lens is scholarship. Reading and studying theories and new research that is available is imperative in keeping up with what is new in the area of education and teaching. According to Brookfield (2017), "Theoretical and research literature can provide unexpected and illuminating interpretations of familiar as well as

newly complex situations" (p. 8). Scholarship should be acknowledged as an important step in professional development whether it is reading up on research literature already completed or the researcher conducting the research themselves.

Brookfield's theory of a reflective practice, encourages instructors to use critical reflection as a means of improvement. Information from the TBC can be used to address the four lenses of Brookfield's theory: autobiographical, looking through the eyes of the learner, peer perceptions, and scholarship. Once an instructor understands their own teaching behaviors/attributes, then instructors can improve their teaching performance.

Chapter 3

Methods

Introduction

This chapter discusses the research design and survey instrument used in this study. Details concerning the participants, data collection, and data analysis methods are addressed as well. Chapter 3 also describes the TBC in more detail.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate what faculty and students at community colleges perceive as the behaviors identifying excellent teaching. This study examined how demographics such as age, gender and student classification affect a student's perception on effective teaching behaviors. In addition, the study examined the demographics of age, gender, and teaching experience and the influence on faculty's perceptions of effective teaching behaviors. Lastly, the relationship between faculty and student's views of excellent teaching behaviors at the community college level was examined. By understanding, what behaviors are viewed as the most important in regards to excellent teaching, then community college faculty could make any necessary changes to their teaching style. This could lead to a more positive experience for both faculty and students as well as help in the community colleges retention of students.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are community college faculty's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

2. What are community college student's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

3. What is the relationship between faculty and student's perceptions of excellent teaching behaviors/attributes at community colleges?

Research Design

This study focused on identifying perceptions of teaching excellence among faculty and students at community colleges. Survey research was conducted at two local community colleges. Research approval was given by the IRB Office (See Appendix D). Survey research was utilized for this study as it allowed the researcher to target a larger sample of students and professors. Rossi, Wright, and Anderson (2014) stated, "Sample surveys are currently one of the more important basic research methods of the social sciences and an important tool for applied purposes in both the public and private sectors" (p. 1). Survey research has the benefits of low cost with web surveys being more cost effective, ease of use, and with paper surveys a greater participation rate (Porter, 2004). All participants were asked to identify their top 10 qualities/behaviors they viewed as being necessary for teaching excellence from the 28–item Teacher Behavior Checklist. Participants were also asked demographic questions to aid in gathering data needed for answering research questions. Faculty were administered the survey using Qualtrics survey software program.

Instrument

For this study, the Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) was used because of it's ability to measure teaching behaviors. Gurung, Richmond, and Boysen (2018) stated, "Research indicates that the TBC provides a reliable and valid measure of master teaching" (p. 16). The TBC is a 28–item survey tool that was developed to identify behaviors/attributes that are important for excellent teaching (Buskist et al., 2002). There are two subscales within the TBC: caring and supportive identified by items (1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 28) and professional competency and communication skills identified by items (2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 21, 24, and 27) [Appendix A].

The TBC has been shown to be psychometrically sound with solid validity and reliability ratings (Stigall & Blincoe, 2015). Numerous studies (Stigall & Blincoe, 2015; Keeley et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2015; Schaeffer et al., 2003 and Keeley, Ismail, and Buskist, 2016) have consistently shown the TBC to be high in internal reliability and with a strong test-retest reliability (Keeley et al., 2006). According to Keeley et al. (2006), r values for the 28 items on the TBC were between .24 to .64 ($p<.001$ for 19 items). For the subscales, there was a reliability score of .72 ($p<.001$) for the professional competency and communication and .68 ($p<.001$) for the caring and supportive subscale (Keeley et al., 2006).

Survey Instrument

Two survey instruments were used in this study; one for faculty and one for students. The faculty survey instrument consisted of five questions. The first four questions asked demographic questions: years of teaching experience, age, ethnicity, and

gender. For the demographic questions for both faculty and students it is important to remember according to Connelly, Gayloe, and Lambert (2016), "In the case of measures of ethnicity, there are strong correlations between ethnic categories and other socio-demographic differences, so particular care is needed in order to avoid drawing spurious conclusions about ethnic differences" (p. 5). The researcher used the mutually exclusive category approach in regards to ethnicity this is the most often used method in social surveys (Connelly et al., 2016). The fifth question asked faculty to identify the 10 qualities/behaviors that they viewed as important determinants to excellent teaching [Appendix B]. The TBC checklist was used as originally designed by Buskist et al. (2002), which included the behaviors/attributes and the descriptors.

The second survey was for student participants. This survey consisted of five questions. The demographic questions asked participants to identify their age, gender, ethnicity, and student classification. The fifth question asked students to identify their top 10 behaviors/attributes that they believed faculty needed to exhibit for excellent teaching.

Participants

This study took place at two local community colleges in the state of Alabama. At Site 1 the faculty and students were both asked via email to participate in the online Qualtrics survey. The email was sent out by their Dean of Instruction. Site 1 is a community college with approximately 1,536 students. For Site 2, email addresses were obtained through their website for active faculty members and a direct email asked them to complete the online Qualtrics survey. At Site 2, students were recruited via willing instructors who volunteered class time for the completion of the survey. Students at this

community college were given a paper version of the survey. Site 2 has an enrollment of approximately 3,888 students. In regards to student classification, there were some juniors and seniors who were a part of the study. These students identified as a junior or senior based on credit hours they had earned. There are numerous reasons a community college would have juniors/seniors attending such as completing core as a transient student, accumulation of credit hours, and even the possibility of earning a second degree. All data and participation in the surveys were anonymous and voluntary.

Data Collection and Procedures

At one Site 1, the Dean of Instruction at that institution distributed the email containing both the information letter and survey link to all faculty and students at their institution. Different links were given for the faculty and student surveys. Once a participant accessed the link it took them to the Qualtrics platform where the information letter appeared once again asking them for consent. Participants could exit the survey at any time. The surveys were sent out at the end of the Fall 2018 semester and then once again at the beginning of Spring 2018 semester.

For Site 2, an email was distributed to faculty members containing the information letter as well as a survey link to the faculty survey by the researcher. The link took them to the Qualtrics platform where they were shown the information letter asking for consent. Faculty participants had the ability to exit the survey at any time. A reminder email was sent out to faculty participants a week after the original request. For the students, the researcher gained permission by individual faculty to come into their classrooms to administer the survey. The researcher went at times that were the most convenient to the individual faculty members to minimize disruption to their classroom

instruction time. The researcher explained to students that all data would be kept confidential and anonymous. Once these details were covered, the researcher then explained the instructions for the survey. Completion of the paper survey took around 10 to 15 minutes. Once students completed the survey, they dropped the surveys into a box located at the back of the room. For student surveys, the information letter was given as the front page as an attachment and they were informed to keep the letter for their records. All research at the second institution took place during the Spring 2018 semester. There were no incentives offered to faculty or students at either institution for participation in the study. Also, all research and research documents were approved by the Auburn University IRB Board [See Appendix C].

Data Analysis

To answer Research Question One of what are community college faculty's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes, community college faculty were asked to identify 10 qualities/behaviors from the 28–item TBC that were considered ideal for excellent teaching. Participants were not asked to rank but to only identify the 10 items they felt were essential. Faculty members responses were used to determine similarities and differences across the demographic variables of gender, age, ethnicity, and number of years of teaching experience. Data were analyzed using the SPSS software program where descriptive statistics were used to determine frequencies. Pearson's Chi-square of independence test was the test chosen to identify any, if there were any, differences among the groups. Chi-square of independence test is a non-parametric test used to identify significant differences among two categorical variables (McHugh, 2013). For analysis where the cells had an expected value less than five, a

Fisher's Exact Test was utilized. The Fisher's Exact Test is a statistical tests that is used in trying to determine if there are nonrandom associations between two categorical variables (Weisstein, 2019).

Research Question Two asked what are community college student's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes. This was answered by having community college students identify the 10 qualities/behaviors that they viewed as ideal for excellent teaching from the 28–item TBC. Descriptive statistics were used to determine frequencies of responses and a Pearson Chi-square of Independence test was used to identify any differences among groups.

To answer the Research Question Three which examined the relationship between faculty and students' perceptions of excellent teaching behaviors/attributes, a Chi–square test of independence was conducted to determine the relationship between faculty and students' views of excellent teaching behaviors. The Chi-square test is a non-parametric test and was chosen to analyze categorical data. Survey data was inputted into SPSS and the Chi-square tests were used to determine if there were any relationships between the two groups of respondent's views on teaching.

Summary

This chapter outlined the design and data collection procedures. The participants used for this study consisted of faculty and students from community colleges. The Teacher Behavior Checklist was used as originally designed with added demographic questions. The added demographic questions were necessary for answering the research questions posed.

Chapter 4

Findings

Introduction

Chapter 4 discusses the research findings from this study. The chapter examines the sample populations and their demographics that were used in this study. This chapter also contains the data analysis used for answering the research questions posed as well as the summary of the findings.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate what faculty and students at community colleges perceive as the behaviors identifying excellent teaching. This study examined how demographics such as age, gender and student classification affect a student's perception on effective teaching behaviors. In addition, the study examined the demographics of age, gender, and teaching experience and the influence on faculty's perceptions of effective teaching behaviors. Lastly, the relationship between faculty and student's views of excellent teaching behaviors at the community college level was examined. By understanding, what behaviors are viewed as the most important in regards to excellent teaching, then community college faculty could make any necessary changes to their teaching style. This could lead to a more positive experience for both faculty and students as well as help in the community colleges retention of students.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are community college faculty's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

2. What are community college student's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

3. What is the relationship between faculty and student's perceptions of excellent teaching behaviors/attributes at community colleges?

Participants

Faculty Participants

Faculty were administered the survey via Qualtrics software program. At one community college, faculty were sent an email requesting their participation through their Dean of Instruction. The researcher contacted faculty members at the other community college soliciting their participation by email. The response rate for faculty members was 22.5%. Of the respondents 63.2% were women and 36.4% were men. The majority of respondents had between 11 and 15 years for teaching experience (21.1%). Faculty respondents had an average age of 47.5 for age and an average of 15.5 years of teaching experience (See Table 1). See Table 2 for faculty results based on the Teacher Behavior Checklist.

Table 1:
Faculty Demographics

Faculty Demographics	Total (η=76)	Percentage
Gender		
Men	48	63.6
Women	28	36.8
Age		
20-29	4	5.3
30-39	16	21.1
40-49	27	35.5
50-59	12	15.8
60-69	13	17.1
70+	4	5.3
Teaching Experience(Years)		
1-5	11	14.5
6-10	15	19.7
11-15	16	21.1
16-20	14	18.4
21-25	11	14.5
26-30	4	5.3
31+	5	6.6
Ethnicity		
Black	8	9.2
Alaskan/American Indian	1	1.3
Asian	0	0
White	65	85.5
Latinx	3	3.9

Table 2:
Faculty Results Based on the Teacher Behavior Checklist

Teaching Behavior/Attribute	Total	Percentage
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	64	83.1
Approachable/Personable	58	75.3
Encourages and Cares for Students	45	58.4
Respectful	38	49.4
Accessible	36	46.8
Creative and Interesting	34	44.2
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	34	44.2
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and Grading	32	41.6
Effective Communicator	33	42.9
Strives to be a Better Teacher	30	39
Confident	26	33.8
Flexible/Open-minded	24	31.2
Humble	24	31.2
Provides Constructive Feedback	24	31.2
Promotes Class Discussion	20	26
Understanding	20	26
Authoritative	19	24.7
Good Listener	18	23.4
Prepared	18	23.4
Presents Current Information	17	22.1
Rapport	17	22.1
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	16	20.8
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	16	20.8
Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals	14	18.2
Professional	13	16.9
Sensitive and Persistent	11	14.3
Technologically Competent	10	13

Student Participants

Students at one community college were asked to participate in an online survey via Qualtrics. To help protect anonymity, the Dean of Instruction at that college emailed the survey requesting student participation. Data collection at the other community college was conducted using a paper survey. The researcher received permission by instructors to visit their classrooms to administer the survey. There were a total of 300 student responses. The average age for the students was 23 years of age. The largest category for ethnicity was the White ethnicity with 71.3%. For student classifications, freshman was the largest group of participants with 51.3% (See Table 3). TBC student results for the Teacher Behavior Checklist can be found in Table 4.

Table 3:
Student Demographics

Student Demographics	Total (η=300)	Percentage
Gender		
Men	103	34.3
Women	197	65.7
Age		
19-29	257	85.7
30-39	25	8.3
40-49	13	4.3
50-59	5	1.7
Student Classification		
Freshman	154	51.3
Sophomore	112	37.3
Junior	20	6.7
Senior	14	4.7
Ethnicity		
Black	64	21.3
Alaskan/American Indian	4	1.3
Asian	6	2.0
White	214	71.3
Latinx	12	4.0

Table 4:
TBC Student Results

Teaching Behavior/Attribute	Number of	Percentages
Approachable	229	76.3
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	193	64.3
Encourages and Cares for Students	177	59
Understanding	170	56.7
Knowledgeable about Subject Matter	165	55
Respectful	159	53
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and	152	50.7
Accessible	151	50.3
Flexible/Open-minded	149	49.7
Creative and Interesting	142	47.3
Enthusiastic about Teaching and Topic	133	44.3
Effective Communicator	126	42.0
Confident	124	41.3
Good Listener	101	33.7
Constructive Feedback	93	31.0
Rapport	88	29.3
Strives to be a Better Teacher	70	23.3
Sensitive and Persistent	69	23.0
Humble	68	22.7
Prepared	64	21.3
Promotes Class Discussion	57	19.0
Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals	54	18.0
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually	51	17.0
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	50	16.7
Presents Current Information	49	16.3
Authoritative	43	14.3
Professional	42	14.0
Technologically Competent	30	10.0

Data Analysis

Findings for Research Question 1

For research question 1 which was what are community college faculty's perceptions on what behaviors/attributes makes for excellent teaching? To determine if there were any significant differences in the teaching behaviors/attributes and faculty demographics, a Chi-square of independence test was utilized using the SPSS software program. For behaviors/attributes where cells were violated a Fisher's Exact Test was used.

Faculty Age

A Chi–square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between faculty's age and the ten teaching behaviors. The data was found to be significantly different in regards to age and the teaching quality of being a good listener, as the p value was <.05, $\chi^2(5)$, 18.045, p<.003 and the teaching quality of being humble as well, $\chi^2(5)$, 11.122, p=<.031. There was a significant difference in faculty's age and being an effective communicator, $\chi^2(5)$, 16.703, p=<.005. Faculty in the 30-39 age range chose being an effective communicator as an important teaching behavior/attribute with the age group 20-29 years of age not choosing this behavior at all. Being a good listener was chosen the most by faculty in the 30-39 age group with the 20-29 age group following second. The teaching behavior/attribute, humble was ranked the highest among the 40-49 age group and lowest with both the 50-59 and 60-69 age group. The rest of the teaching behaviors did not have a statistical difference (See Table 5).

Table 5:
Chi-Square Tests for Faculty's Age and Teaching Behaviors

Behavior	Total Responses	20-29 (η=4)	30-39 (η=16)	40-49 (η=27)	50-59 (η=12)	60-69 (η=13)	70+ (η=4)	χ^2	*p*-Value
Accessible	36	1	6	11	9	6	3	6.811	0.235
Approachable/Personable	58	3	11	21	11	9	3	2.472	0.781
Authoritative	18	0	2	10	1	3	2	8.112	0.150
Confident	26	1	3	10	7	3	2	6.207	0.287
Creative & Interesting	34	2	6	13	7	5	1	2.245	0.814
Effective Communicator	33	0	10	5	7	8	3	16.703	**0.001***
Encourages & Cares for Students	45	2	10	15	9	6	3	2.931	0.711
Enthusiastic about Teaching Topic	58	2	12	22	10	9	3	2.638	0.756
Establishes Daily Academic & Academic Term Goals	13	0	5	3	2	3	0	4.921	0.426
Flexible/Open Minded	24	1	5	7	3	5	3	4.496	0.480
Good Listener	18	4	5	2	2	4	1	18.045	**0.003***
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	16	2	4	5	1	3	1	3.509	0.622
Humble	24	2	5	13	1	1	2	11.122	**0.031***
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	63	3	12	24	9	11	4	2.943	0.674*
Prepared	17	2	3	7	2	3	0	3.457	0.630*
Presents Current Information	16	1	4	4	3	3	1	1.002	0.962
Professional	13	0	2	5	2	4	0	3.642	0.543*
Promotes Class Discussion	19	1	6	4	4	3	1	3.297	0.570*
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	33	1	8	10	6	8	0	6.300	0.309*
Provides Constructive Feedback	23	2	5	6	4	6	0	4.918	0.444*
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	16	2	2	6	2	3	1	2.951	0.707
Rapport	17	0	4	9	2	1	1	4.939	0.462*
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing & Grading	31	3	5	11	6	5	1	3.405	0.687*
Respectful	38	3	10	15	3	6	1	6.410	0.285*
Sensitive/Persistent	11	0	3	1	2	4	1	6.637	0.161*
Strives to be a Better Teacher	29	1	5	15	3	4	1	5.555	0.386*
Technologically Competent	10	1	0	7	0	2	0	9.248	0.074*
Understanding	20	0	7	9	1	2	1	7.428	0.218*

*Represents Fisher's Exact Test

Faculty Gender

A Chi–square of independence test was used to test the correlation between faculty's gender and the 28 teaching qualities listed on the TBC. For men and women faculty, there was a significant difference in the teaching quality of being happy/positive attitude/humorous was, $\chi^2(1)$, 8.868, p=.003. Men faculty member's chose having a happy/positive attitude/humorous as being a very important teaching behavior/attribute over women faculty. The definition given for the happy/positive attitude/humorous teaching attribute was an instructor who tells jokes and funny stories as well as laughing with students. The use of humor in the classroom can help make an instructor seem more approachable, helps to build rapport with the instructor, and actively engages the students in the learning process (McCabe, Sprute, Underdown, 2017). The rest of the teaching behaviors did not show a statistical difference in regards to faculty's gender (See Table 6).

Table 6:

Chi-Square Tests for Faculty's Gender and Teaching Behavior

Behavior	Total Responses	Men (η=28)	Women (η=48)	χ^2	*p*-Value
Accessible	36	13	23	0.016	0.900
Approachable	58	19	39	1.755	0.185
Authoritative	18	8	10	0.586	0.444
Confident	26	12	14	1.473	0.225
Creative/Interesting	34	12	22	0.063	0.801
Effective Communicator	33	13	20	0.163	0.686
Encourages/Cares for Students	45	14	31	1.557	0.212
Enthusiastic about Teaching Topic	58	20	38	0.586	0.444
Establishes Daily/Academic Term Goals	13	3	10	1.277	0.258
Flexible/Open-Minded	24	6	18	2.114	0.146
Good Listener	18	8	10	0.586	0.444
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	16	11	5	8.868	**0.003**
Humble	24	9	15	0.007	0.936
Knowledgeable about Subject Matter	63	24	39	0.249	0.618
Prepared	17	5	12	0.520	0.471
Presents Current Information	16	9	7	3.281	0.070
Professional	13	5	8	0.018	0.565*
Promotes Class Discussion	19	10	9	2.714	0.099
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	33	11	22	0.309	0.579
Provides Constructive Feedback	23	6	17	1.640	0.200
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	16	6	10	0.004	0.951
Rapport	17	8	9	0.982	0.322
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and Grading	31	11	20	0.042	0.839
Respectful	38	16	22	0.905	0.342
Sensitive and Persistent	11	1	10	4.257	0.047*
Strives to be a Better Teacher	29	9	20	0.680	0.410
Technologically Competent	10	4	6	0.049	0.824
Understanding	20	7	13	0.040	0.842

*Represents Fisher's Exact Test

Faculty Ethnicity

The relationship between ethnicity and teaching qualities/behaviors preferred by faculty was analyzed using the Chi-square of independence test. No Asian faculty members participated in the study. There was a significant difference in regards to the teaching behavior rapport, $\chi^2(3)$, 11.173, p=.0231. In regards to ethnicity the following ethnicity groups ranked the teaching behavior rapport as important in order of highest to lowest: Latinx (100%), White (33%), Black (14%), and then American Indian or Alaska Native (0%). According to Brookfield (2017), it is also important that an instructor use the autobiographical lens to understand why they choose the methods of teaching they choose. Using the autobiographical lens an instructor can begin to see how their culture plays a part in the TBC teaching behavior/attribute they have chosen. The rest of the teaching behaviors did not show a statistical difference in regards to faculty's ethnicity (See Table 7).

Table 7:
Chi-Square Tests for Faculty's Ethnicity and Teaching Behaviors

Behavior	Total Responses	American Indian/ Alaska Native (η=1)	Asian (η=0)	Black (η=7)	White (η=65)	Latinx (η=3)	χ^2	*p*-Value
Accessible	36	1	0	3	31	1	1.408	0.939*
Approachable/Personable	58	1	0	6	48	3	1.803	0.783*
Authoritative	18	0	0	4	13	1	5.289	0.099*
Confident	26	1	0	4	21	0	5.223	0.144*
Creative & Interesting	34	0	0	5	28	1	3.057	0.422*
Effective Communicator	33	1	0	3	29	0	3.644	0.368*
Encourages & Cares for Students	45	1	0	5	37	2	1.331	0.921*
Enthusiastic about Teaching Topic	58	1	0	5	49	3	1.365	0.714
Establishes Daily Academic & Academic Term Goals	13	0	0	0	13	0	2.654	0.569*
Flexible/Open Minded	24	1	0	2	20	1	2.220	0.628*
Good Listener	18	1	0	3	14	0	5.742	0.179*
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	16	1	0	2	12	1	4.523	0.190*
Humble	24	0	0	2	22	0	2.030	0.819*
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	63	1	0	5	55	2	1.548	0.383*
Prepared	17	0	0	1	14	2	3.967	0.314*
Presents Current Information	16	0	0	2	14	0	1.314	0.866*
Professional	13	0	0	1	12	0	0.949	0.814
Promotes Class Discussion	19	0	0	2	17	0	1.427	0.893*
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	33	0	0	1	31	1	3.793	0.320*
Provides Constructive Feedback	23	0	0	1	22	0	2.978	0.612*
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	16	0	0	2	12	2	4.523	0.190*
Rapport	17	0	0	1	13	3	11.173	**0.231***
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing & Grading	31	0	0	2	28	1	1.331	0.921*
Respectful	38	0	0	3	33	2	1.492	0.684
Sensitive/Persistent	11	0	0	0	11	0	2.177	0.781*
Strives to be a Better Teacher	29	0	0	3	24	2	1.758	0.840*
Technologically Competent	10	0	0	1	9	0	0.641	0.887
Understanding	20	0	0	0	18	2	5.440	0.122*

*Represents Fisher's Exact Test

Faculty Years of Teaching Experience

A Chi–square of independence test was used to examine the relationship between the number of years of teaching experience and the 28 teaching behaviors/attributes on the TBC. A significant difference was found with the teaching behaviors/attributes of sensitive and persistent, $\chi^2(3)$, 15.685, $p<.016$. Faculty who had 16-20 years of teaching experience believed that being sensitive/persistent was an important teaching behavior/attribute compared to the other teaching experience groups. The rest of the teaching behaviors did not show a statistical difference in regards to a faculty member's years of teaching experience (See Table 8).

Table 8:
Chi-Square Tests for Faculty's Teaching Experience and Teaching Behaviors

Behavior	Total Responses	1-5 (η=11)	6-10 (η=15)	11-15 (η=16)	16-20 (η=14)	21-25 (η=11)	26-30 (η=4)	31+ (η=5)	χ^2	*p*-Value
Accessible	36	3	9	5	7	4	4	4	11.562	0.78*
Approachable/Personable	58	9	12	12	9	8	4	4	2.790	0.913*
Authoritative	18	4	2	3	5	2	1	1	3.430	0.755*
Confident	26	2	4	5	5	4	4	2	9.501	0.174*
Creative & Interesting	34	6	8	6	4	5	3	2	4.225	0.664*
Effective Communicator	33	5	7	5	3	6	3	4	8.705	0.198*
Encourages & Cares for Students	45	7	7	9	10	8	3	1	6.418	0.423*
Enthusiastic about Teaching Topic	58	7	12	12	11	9	3	4	1.371	0.976*
Establishes Daily Academic & Academic Term Goals	13	1	3	4	1	0	2	2	9.441	0.117*
Flexible/Open Minded	24	5	3	5	4	5	1	1	3.341	0.791*
Good Listener	18	5	5	1	2	3	0	2	9.088	0.153*
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	16	5	2	2	3	2	0	2	7.385	0.337*
Humble	24	4	3	8	6	2	0	1	7.454	0.336*
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	63	10	12	13	12	9	3	4	0.910	0.990*
Prepared	17	2	3	3	5	2	0	2	3.875	0.774*
Presents Current Information	16	3	5	4	1	3	0	0	6.053	0.491*
Professional	13	1	1	1	5	2	1	2	8.433	0.169*
Promotes Class Discussion	19	6	4	2	4	3	0	0	9.602	0.197*
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	33	3	6	10	7	6	0	1	8.597	0.227*
Provides Constructive Feedback	23	2	5	5	3	4	1	3	3.694	0.746*
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	16	2	4	3	4	2	0	1	1.991	0.973*
Rapport	17	1	5	4	3	3	1	0	3.835	0.746*
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing & Grading	31	6	3	7	5	5	3	2	5.792	0.449*
Respectful	38	5	8	11	6	6	0	2	6.984	0.345*
Sensitive/Persistent	11	0	0	2	4	1	1	3	15.685	**0.016***
Strives to be a Better Teacher	29	3	6	9	6	4	1	0	6.318	0.424*
Technologically Competent	10	2	5	2	0	1	0	0	9.237	0.217*
Understanding	20	1	6	7	5	1	0	0	11.175	0.105*

*Represents Fisher's Exact Test

Findings for Research Question 2

For research questions 2 which was what are community college student's perceptions on what behaviors/attributes makes for excellent teaching? A Chi-square test of independence was ran in SPSS to determine if there were any significant differences in the teaching behaviors/attributes and student demographics. For behaviors/attributes where cells were violated a Fisher's Exact Test was used.

Student Classification

A Chi–square of independence test was used to analyze the relationship between a student's classification in school and perceptions of the teaching behaviors/attributes necessary for excellent teaching. The student's classification was as follows: freshman 0-30 credit hours, sophomore 31-60 credit hours, junior 61-90 credit hours and seniors 91+ credit hours. There was a significant difference in the teaching qualities of a faculty member being approachable/personable, $\chi^2(3)$, 8.640, p=.034, creative and interesting $\chi^2(3)$, 8.253, p=.41, and being flexible**,** $\chi^2(3)$, 10.394, p=.015. The Chi–square test also determined that the teaching quality knowledgeable about subject matter, $\chi^2(3)$, 10.562, p=.014, showed a significant difference in regards to a student's classification. In the teaching behaviors/attributes of being approachable/personable, creative & interesting, flexible, and knowledgeable about subject matter, most freshman chose these attributes more so than the other student classifications believing that they are important to an excellent teaching. The rest of the teaching behaviors did not show a statistical difference in regards to student's classification (See Table 9).

Table 9:
Chi-Square Tests for Student's Classification and Teaching Behaviors

Behavior	Total Responses	Freshman (η=154)	Sophomore (η=112)	Junior (η=20)	Senior (η=14)	χ^2	*p*-Value
Accessible	151	79	56	9	7	0.291	0.962
Approachable/Personable	229	126	81	11	11	0.860	**0.035***
Authoritative	43	23	15	4	1	1.239	0.758*
Confident	124	68	45	8	3	2.870	0.412
Creative & Interesting	142	76	57	7	2	8.253	**0.041**
Effective Communicator	126	63	43	13	7	5.384	0.146
Encourages & Cares for Students	177	101	58	10	8	5.859	0.119
Enthusiastic about Teaching Topic	133	68	50	10	5	0.688	0.876
Establishes Daily Academic & Academic Term Goals	54	29	21	3	1	1.355	0.840*
Flexible/Open Minded	149	88	51	7	3	10.394	**0.015**
Good Listener	101	55	39	5	2	3.383	0.367*
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	193	97	74	14	8	0.864	0.837*
Humble	68	36	21	6	5	2.998	0.350*
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	165	72	71	11	11	10.562	**0.014**
Prepared	64	32	20	5	7	7.850	0.063*
Presents Current Information	49	24	20	3	2	0.322	0.973*
Professional	42	23	12	4	3	2.356	0.398*
Promotes Class Discussion	57	29	24	4	0	3.729	0.260*
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	51	19	25	2	5	8.790	**0.031***
Provides Constructive Feedback	93	50	37	3	3	3.365	0.369*
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	50	22	18	5	5	5.314	0.319*
Rapport	88	43	36	6	3	1.001	0.825*
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing & Grading	152	79	51	11	11	5.716	0.126
Respectful	159	80	61	10	8	0.334	0.954
Sensitive/Persistent	69	27	34	5	3	6.087	0.098*
Strives to be a Better Teacher	70	34	26	7	3	1.687	0.633*
Technologically Competent	30	13	11	3	3	3.077	0.286*
Understanding	170	87	60	14	9	3.175	0.652*

*Represents Fisher's Exact Test

Student Gender

The Chi–square of independence test was used to examine the relationship between gender and the views of students on what teaching behaviors/attributes make for excellent teaching. A significant difference in regards to gender on the teaching behaviors/attributes of being confident, $\chi^2(1)$, 4.329, p=.037, encourages and cares for students, $\chi^2(1)$, 6.396, p=.011, punctuality/manages class time, $\chi^2(1)$, 4.048, p=.044, and the teaching behavior sensitive and persistent, $\chi^2(1)$, 6.304, p=.012. Women chose being confident as an important teaching behavior/attribute when compared to men. Men were split in their opinion on whether or not confidence was necessary for teaching excellence with 52 selecting *no* and 51 selecting *yes*. More women than men chose the teaching behavior/attribute encourages and cares for students (53.8%) as well as the teaching behavior/attribute being sensitive and persistent (27.4%). Using the framework from Brookfield's theory of a critically reflective teacher, an instructor can use the information from his student's TBC results to understand how gender effects the interpersonal teaching attributes listed above. If an instructor has a course where the majority of the students are women, they may want to consider employing more of the teaching attributes of being confident, encouraging, and sensitivity for better teaching results. The rest of the teaching behaviors did not show a statistical difference in regards to a student's gender (See Table 10).

Table 10:

Chi-Square Tests for Student's Gender and Teaching Behavior

Behavior	Total Responses	Men (η=103)	Women (η=197)	χ^2	*p*-Value
Accessible	151	52	99	0.001	0.970
Approachable	229	80	149	0.155	0.694
Authoritative	43	10	33	2.732	0.098
Confident	124	51	73	4.329	**0.037**
Creative/Interesting	142	46	96	0.505	0.477
Effective Communicator	126	46	80	0.456	0.500
Encourages/Cares for Students	177	71	106	6.396	**0.011**
Enthusiastic about Teaching Topic	133	40	93	1.921	0.166
Establishes Daily/Academic Term Goals	54	18	36	0.029	0.864
Flexible/Open-Minded	149	56	93	1.387	0.239
Good Listener	101	35	66	0.007	0.934
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	193	71	122	1.446	0.229
Humble	68	27	41	1.126	0.289
Knowledgeable about Subject Matter	165	55	110	0.163	0.687
Prepared	64	20	44	0.343	0.558
Presents Current Information	49	13	36	1.582	0.209
Professional	42	17	25	0.817	0.366
Promotes Class Discussion	57	20	37	0.018	0.894
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	51	18	33	0.025	0.874
Provides Constructive Feedback	93	31	62	0.060	0.807
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	50	11	39	4.048	**0.044**
Rapport	88	35	53	1.634	0.201
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and Grading	152	56	96	0.860	0.354
Respectful	159	48	111	2.578	0.108
Sensitive and Persistent	69	15	54	6.304	**0.012**
Strives to be a Better Teacher	70	18	52	3.008	0.083
Technologically Competent	30	11	19	0.080	0.777
Understanding	170	60	110	0.650	0.723

*Represents Fisher's Exact Test

Student Age

A Chi–square test of independence test was performed to examine the relationship between age and the views of students on what teaching behaviors make for excellent teaching. A significant difference was found in the interaction of age and the teaching behaviors: creative and interesting, $\chi^2(3)$, 10.143, p=.017, knowledgeable about subject matter, $\chi^2(3)$, 6.346, p=.045, punctuality/manages class time, $\chi^2(3)$, 8.106, p=.044 and rapport, $\chi^2(3)$, 12.830, p=.005. The student's in the age group of 19-29 preferred these teaching behaviors/attributes more so, than the other age groups. The rest of the teaching behaviors did not show a statistical difference in regards to student's age group (See Table 11).

Table 11:
Chi-Square Tests for Student's Age and Teaching Behaviors

Behavior	Total Responses	19-29 (η=257)	30-39 (η=25)	40-49 (η=13)	50-59 (η=5)	χ^2	*p*-Value
Accessible	151	128	113	7	3	0.307	0.959
Approachable/Personable	229	196	18	11	4	0.791	0.852
Authoritative	43	35	5	3	0	2.407	0.492
Confident	124	106	9	8	1	3.421	0.368*
Creative & Interesting	142	131	6	3	2	10.143	**0.012***
Effective Communicator	126	106	9	8	3	3.132	0.368*
Encourages & Cares for Students	177	154	16	5	2	3.362	0.358*
Enthusiastic about Teaching Topic	133	111	10	9	3	4.089	0.255*
Establishes Daily Academic & Academic Term Goals	54	45	7	1	1	2.685	0.395*
Flexible/Open Minded	149	132	11	4	2	2.661	0.441*
Good Listener	101	84	9	6	2	1.169	0.702*
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	193	171	14	6	2	4.463	0.191*
Humble	68	61	4	1	2	3.321	0.334*
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	165	133	19	9	4	7.877	**0.045***
Prepared	64	50	7	4	3	6.346	0.083*
Presents Current Information	49	44	1	2	2	4.957	0.135*
Professional	42	33	6	2	1	2.534	0.316*
Promotes Class Discussion	57	52	1	3	1	4.053	0.179*
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	51	40	5	4	2	4.156	0.162*
Provides Constructive Feedback	93	80	8	5	0	2.598	0.523*
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	50	37	9	3	1	8.106	**0.033***
Rapport	88	85	3	0	0	12.830	**0.003***
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing & Grading	152	128	15	6	3	1.228	0.747*
Respectful	159	137	12	8	2	0.980	0.813*
Sensitive/Persistent	69	60	6	2	1	0.483	0.959*
Strives to be a Better Teacher	70	58	8	2	2	2.369	0.433*
Technologically Competent	30	24	4	2	0	2.099	0.457*
Understanding	170	149	15	5	1	5.035	0.314*

*Represents Fisher's Exact Test

Student Ethnicity

A Chi–square test of independence test was performed to examine the relationship between ethnicity and student's perceptions of excellent teaching qualities/behaviors. A significant difference was found in regards to ethnicity and the teaching qualities authoritative, $\chi^2(4)$, 10.785, p=.029, creative and interesting**,** $\chi^2(4)$, 10.013, p=.040, being a good listener, $\chi^2(4)$, 11.829, p=.019 and striving to be a better teacher, $\chi^2(4)$, 12.989, p=.011. In regards to the teaching behaviors of being an effective communicator, the Black ethnic group, was almost equally split with 33 selecting *no* and 31 selecting *yes* to the behavior being important in teaching excellence. The teaching behavior of authoritative was chosen by the ethnicity group Black, with American Indian or Alaskan Native group saying that authoritative was not a factor in teaching excellence. Choosing the authoritative teaching behavior/attribute shows that for African American students having an instructor that gives them clear course rules, maintains class order, and speaks in a loud, strong voice is important to them. Creativity and interesting was most valued by the White ethnic group however, Asian ethnicities disagreed with no student in the Asian ethnicity choosing this teaching behavior. This means that for students from the White ethnic group they value teaching behaviors such as using different teaching methods, using technology in the classroom, and using interesting and relevant examples. A significant difference was also found in the teaching behavior of promoting critical thinking/intellectually stimulating. This teaching behavior was not chosen at all by the America Indian or Alaska Native ethnicity group. However, the ethnicity of White students ranked it as very important to teaching excellence. The teaching attribute of critically thinking/intellectually stimulating indicates that this ethnic group prefers an

instructor who asks thoughtful questions of their students, assigns homework, uses group discussions, and the use of essays on quizzes. An instructor can use the TBC student results to understand the importance ethnicity plays in the teaching behaviors/attributes students chose for being necessary for excellent teaching and plan classroom activities appropriately. The rest of the teaching behaviors did not show a statistical difference in regards to student's ethnicity (See Table 12).

Table 12:
Chi-Square Tests for Student's Ethnicity and Teaching Behaviors

Behavior	Total Responses	American Indian/ Alaska Native (η=4)	Asian (η=6)	Black (η=64)	White (η=214)	Latinx (η=12)	χ^2	*p*-Value
Accessible	151	1	2	40	104	4	7.155	0.125*
Approachable/Personable	229	3	4	49	163	10	0.645	0.943*
Authoritative	43	0	1	15	23	4	10.785	**0.025***
Confident	124	3	4	32	79	6	7.534	0.096*
Creative & Interesting	142	1	0	36	102	3	10.013	**0.031***
Effective Communicator	126	1	1	31	88	5	3.212	0.574*
Encourages & Cares for Students	177	2	3	44	123	5	4.546	0.302*
Enthusiastic about Teaching Topic	133	3	5	23	96	6	7.230	0.120*
Establishes Daily Academic & Academic Term Goals	54	0	1	11	38	4	2.834	0.600*
Flexible/Open Minded	149	3	3	33	107	3	4.049	0.421*
Good Listener	101	1	4	31	62	3	11.829	**0.015***
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	193	3	3	42	136	9	1.434	0.863*
Humble	68	0	0	16	49	3	3.174	**0.696***
Knowledgeable About Subject Matter	165	2	4	28	125	6	4.770	0.297*
Prepared	64	2	2	14	44	2	2.717	0.508*
Presents Current Information	49	0	0	11	37	1	2.692	0.882*
Professional	42	0	1	13	25	3	4.966	0.222*
Promotes Class Discussion	57	1	2	12	39	3	1.261	0.674*
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	51	0	4	8	37	2	12.241	**0.043***
Provides Constructive Feedback	93	1	1	14	74	3	4.619	0.344*
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	50	1	2	7	36	4	5.316	0.142*
Rapport	88	1	2	11	71	3	6.272	0.126*
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing & Grading	152	3	1	26	116	6	7.379	0.116*
Respectful	159	3	4	32	116	4	3.466	0.518*
Sensitive/Persistent	69	1	0	16	49	3	1.974	0.787*
Strives to be a Better Teacher	70	0	2	5	59	4	12.989	**0.004***
Technologically Competent	30	1	0	4	21	4	9.934	0.057*
Understanding	170	3	2	35	125	5	3.846	0.633*

*Represents Fisher's Exact Test

Findings for Research Question 3

To answer whether or not there was a relationship between faculty and student views of teaching behaviors, the nonparametric Pearson's Chi-Square for Independence test was ran. This test was chosen for this variable because of the test robustness in analyzing categorical data among groups. For behaviors/attributes where cells had less than a count of five a Fisher's Exact Test was used. There were significant differences found in seven of the teaching behaviors/attributes. The teaching behaviors/attributes enthusiastic about teaching and topic ($\chi^2(1, N=377) = 25.563$, $p=.001$), flexible/open-minded ($\chi^2(1, N=377) = 7.293$, $p=.007$), and happy/positive attitude/humorous ($\chi^2(1, N=377) = 44.339$, $p=.001$) showed a significant difference in regards to teaching behaviors across the student and faculty views. These behaviors were valued more by students more than faculty members. The data showed that knowledgeable about subject matter ($\chi^2(1, N=377) = 20.314$, $p=.001$) had a significant difference between the two categories with students deeming the teaching behavior/attribute of knowledgeable about subject matter more beneficial to teaching excellence than faculty. According to the Chi-square test there was a significant difference in the teaching quality promotes critical thinking/intellectually stimulating ($\chi^2(1, N=377) = 23.657$, $p=.001$), strives to be a better teacher ($\chi^2(1, N=377) = 6.497$, $p=.011$), and understanding ($\chi^2(1, N=377) = 23.665$, $p=.001$) in regards to faculty and student views of teaching excellence. The rest of the teaching behaviors did not show a statistical difference in regards to the relationship between faculty and student views of teaching behaviors (See Table 13).

Table 13:
Chi-Square Tests for Faculty's & Student's Perceptions on Teaching Behaviors

Behavior	Total Responses	Faculty (η=76)	Student (η=300)	χ^2	*p*-Value
Accessible	187	36	151	0.314	0.575
Approachable	288	59	229	0.003	0.957
Authoritative	61	18	43	3.695	0.055
Confident	150	26	124	1.465	0.226
Creative/Interesting	176	34	142	0.274	0.601
Effective Communicator	159	33	126	0.018	0.892
Encourages/Cares for Students	223	46	177	0.014	0.906
Enthusiastic about Teaching Topic	192	59	133	25.563	**0.001**
Establishes Daily/Academic Term Goals	67	13	54	0.052	0.819
Flexible/Open-Minded	174	25	149	7.293	**0.007**
Good Listener	120	19	101	2.283	0.131
Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous	210	17	193	44.339	**0.001**
Humble	93	25	68	3.167	0.075
Knowledgeable about Subject Matter	229	64	165	20.314	**0.001**
Prepared	81	17	64	0.020	0.887
Presents Current Information	66	17	49	1.400	0.237
Professional	55	13	42	0.409	0.523
Promotes Class Discussion	76	19	57	1.226	0.268
Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating	84	33	51	23.657	**0.001**
Provides Constructive Feedback	115	23	92	0.281	0.869
Punctuality/Manages Class Time	66	16	50	0.718	0.397
Rapport	105	17	88	1.645	0.200
Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and Grading	184	32	152	2.034	0.154
Respectful	197	38	159	0.327	0.567
Sensitive and Persistent	80	11	69	2.783	0.095
Strives to be a Better Teacher	99	70	29	6.497	**0.011**
Technologically Competent	40	10	30	0.576	0.448
Understanding	190	20	170	23.665	**0.001**

*Represents Fisher's Exact Test

Summary of Results

Faculty respondents chose the following 10 teaching qualities/behaviors for what they felt were essential in excellent teaching. The top ten teaching behaviors/attributes that were chosen by instructors and students from highest to lowest ranking were: (1) knowledgeable about subject matter, (2) approachable, (3) encourages and cares for students, (4) respectful, (5) accessible, (6) creative and interesting, (7) promotes critical thinking/intellectually stimulating, (8) realistic expectations of students/fair testing and grading, (9) effective communicator, and (10) strives to be a better teacher. To answer Research Question 1in regards to what teaching behaviors/attributes that instructors deem necessary for excellent teaching, a Chi–square for independence was used to analyze if there were significant difference in regards to faculty's age, gender, ethnicity, and years of teaching experience in regards to the teaching behaviors/attributes identified on the TBC. The areas where there were significant differences for faculty were in age and the teaching qualities good listener and humble; gender and the teaching quality happy/positive attitude/humorous; ethnicity and the teaching quality of rapport; and years of teaching experience and the teaching quality of sensitive and persistence.

Overall, student respondents chose the following 10 teaching behaviors/attributes that they considered were essential in excellent teaching. They chose in order of highest responses: (1) approachable, (2) happy/positive attitude/humorous, (3) encourages and cares for students, (4) understanding, (5) knowledgeable about subject matter, (6) respectful, (7) realistic expectations of students/fair testing and grading, (8) accessible, (9) flexibility/open-minded, and (10) creative and interesting. To answer Research

Question 2 to find out which teaching behaviors/attributes students felt was necessary for excellent teaching, a Chi–square for independence test was used to analyze if there were any significant differences in regards to students' classification, age, gender, and ethnicity, and the TBC teaching behaviors/attributes. Significant differences were found in classification, age, gender, and ethnicity on multiple teaching behaviors. Student classification showed significant differences in the qualities of approachable/personable, creative and interesting, flexible, and knowledgeable about subject area. Within the age groups, there were significant differences in the areas of creative and interesting, punctuality/manages class time, and rapport. Gender showed significant differences in the qualities of encourages and cares for students, and sensitive and persistent. Lastly, there were significant differences between ethnicity and students' and significant differences in the authoritative, creative and interesting, good listener, striving to be a better teacher, and technologically competent. For Research Question 3 which was to find the relationship between faculty and student's views of excellent teaching behaviors at community colleges, the significant differences when comparing faculty and student's views on excellent teaching were as follows: enthusiastic about teaching and topic, flexible/open-minded, happy/positive attitude/humorous, knowledgeable about subject matter, critical thinking/intellectually stimulating, strives to be a better teacher, and understanding. Faculty and student respondents agreed on the following seven teaching qualities: a) knowledgeable about subject matter, b) approachable/personable, c) encourages and cares for students, d) respectful, e) realistic, accessible, and f) creative.

Chapter 5

Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations for Further Research

Introduction

Chapter 1 presented an overview of the study. In chapter 1, the purpose of the study, research questions, and a brief overview of the importance of understanding excellent teaching.

Chapter 2 provided a literature review on the TBC,and studies that have used the instrument as well as the instrument itself. Literature was introduced on Millennial and Generation Z students. The importance of adult education and adult learning theories were also presented in the literature review. Chapter 3 discussed the data analysis conducted in the study. Discussion of the survey instrument, as well as student/faculty demographics, was described. Chapter 4 went into detail as to the findings of the study. Chi-square of independence was utilized in these findings. Chapter 5 provides a summary of results, discussion, implications of the study, and recommendations for further research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate what faculty and students at community colleges perceive as the behaviors identifying excellent teaching. This study examined how demographics such as age, gender and student classification affect a student's perception on effective teaching behaviors. In addition, the study examined the demographics of age, gender, and teaching experience and the influence on faculty's

perceptions of effective teaching behaviors. Lastly, the relationship between faculty and student's views of excellent teaching behaviors at the community college level was examined. By understanding, what behaviors are viewed as the most important in regards to excellent teaching, then community college faculty could make any necessary changes to their teaching style. This could lead to a more positive experience for both faculty and students as well as help in the community colleges retention of students.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used in this study:

1. What are community college faculty's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

2. What are community college student's perceptions related to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes?

3. What is the relationship between faculty and student's perceptions of excellent teaching behaviors/attributes at community colleges?

Discussion

Learning takes place in a multitude of arenas and no one teaching strategy will fit all. As the literature review shows it is important that faculty and administrators grasp the complexity of teaching multiple generations of students. Each generation is different from the last and because of this, their needs are ever changing. By using tools such as the TBC to analyze what teaching behaviors/attributes both students and faculty value as the most essential to teaching excellence, educators can begin to bridge the gaps. This study shows that for 7 out of 10 teaching behaviors/attributes, students and faculty members agree on what teaching behaviors/attributes are essential for excellent teaching.

Creative and interesting was a teaching behavior/attribute that both faculty and students identified in this study as important to excellent teaching; this is in agreement with the literature review (McConner, 2017). Keeping material creative by using student's own experiences and making the material relevant to learners is an example of Knowles' concept of andragogy. From the literature review, students who are disengaged in the classroom with become dissatisfied with his students and could drop from their programs (Kuh, 2003). From the data, students have chosen teaching behaviors/attributes that pertain to active engagement in the classroom such as encouraging, humorous, and creative/interesting.

Instructors and students do agree on the top seven teaching behaviors/attributes. So there is some agreement to what behaviors both sides believe are important. Previous research studies (Ford, 2016; O'Meara, 2016; and Anur 2016) also demonstrated that both instructor and students agreed on the top seven teaching behaviors/attributes. Although Noll's (2016) study using the TBC showed an agreement between faculty and students on only five of the teaching behaviors/attributes. Another difference between previous research and this study is that the teaching behavior/attribute of being creative was ranked in the top seven behaviors/attributes that students and faculty were in agreement on. While this study showed agreement in seven teaching behaviors/attributes there were areas of significant differences between instructor and student views. Students want to learn. Voss (2006) stated, "Students predominantly want to encounter valuable teaching experiences to be able to pass tests and to be prepared for their profession" (p. 234).

Faculty can use the data from the Teacher Behavior in a multitude of ways. First, faculty members who take the TBC can look at their own results to understand the behaviors they believe make for excellent teaching. In Brookfield's four lenses of being a critically reflected teacher, his first lens, the autobiographical lens, could be used to understand their beliefs as an instructor. The TBC can help an instructor discover his own belief system and then utilize professional development to strengthen their weaknesses. Brookfield's second lens is the student view lens. Instructors can use the results from their students taking the TBC to see what teaching behaviors/attributes their students feel are the most important. When instructors understand the behaviors that their students prefer in excellent teaching, they can use this information to motivate their students to learn. Malcolm Knowles and Cyril Houle believed that in understanding what motivates adult learners, instructors can then move them onto a patch of self-directed learning (Nasri, 2017; Parker & Roessger, 2019). Knowles' theory believed that adult learners are internally motivated and that learners should have choices in their learning. Cyril Houle said the adult learning environment should be goal oriented, activity oriented, and learner oriented (Nasri, 2017). If we look at the behaviors chosen by students of managing class time, being creative, and flexible/open-minded then we can use Knowles and Houle's theories to create a conducive learning environment. Instructors can use the work done by Allen Tough on self-directed and lifelong learning to use processes such as mentoring to evolve their teaching practice to better meet the needs of their students especially, in the areas they are weak in. The information gathered in this study can start the process of identifying ways to reach both faculty members and students to better serve the community. Community colleges can take the

data and evaluate the services they offer both students and faculty so that it better aligns with the areas that are valued for excellent teaching.

Implications

One implication that comes from the research is in faculty training in regards to the development of teaching behaviors/attributes to help instructors excel in the classroom. It has not been the norm for college instructors to receive special training on how to teach with the exception of the occasional workshop. However, more official professional development such as the University/College Teaching certificate are being offered on campuses such as Auburn University, Duke University, University of Alabama and Vanderbilt University. The information gained through this study can be used to help identify training areas for faculty members or students who are in these official training programs. Knowledge gained from this study could also give program/course developers a strong foundation on building coursework needed to complete the program. Inventories could be developed using the TBC to help instructors find the areas they are weak in so that they may further develop their teaching abilities. Keeley, Smith, and Buskist (2006) stated, "This instrument clearly identifies specific target teaching behaviors that instructors can alter to attempt to improve their teaching effectiveness" (p. 84).

A second implication that comes from this study is in student retention. Retention rates are instrumental in numerous decisions that are made at a university/college setting. Knowledge of student's views in regards to excellent teaching behaviors/attributes can lead to higher retention rates. This makes it imperative for both administrative decisions and in producing a conducive learning environment for student success/retention. If a

community college understands the teaching behaviors/attributes that their students prefer, then they are better able to provide support for students and faculty. According to Keeley, Smith, and Buskist (2006) the TBC could be used as a formative assessment. This could aid administration in the development of supplemental training and workshops for instructors. Attending supplemental training/workshops for instructors in teaching behaviors/attributes that students prefer according to the TBC, then instructors would be able to develop their teaching skills further, creating a more effective learning environment.

Lastly, the third implication is to use information from this study to produce a conducive learning environment for students. Understanding the areas that are important to students, can help faculty members develop a productive classroom. The information from this study could be used to help faculty members facilitate classroom learning. Using this study as well as, taking the TBC survey instructors can identify areas in which their teaching strategies are not aligning with their students. Instructors can then take that knowledge and change their teaching strategy in an attempt to engage students in the learning process thus, then creating a learning environment that is conducive to learning.

Recommendations for Further Research

While this study used the TBC to examine faculty and student's views of what teaching behaviors/attributes is necessary for excellent teaching at the community college level, the TBC can be used to further the research in education.

1) Further research into if taking a course aimed at improving instructor teaching skills actually changes the behaviors/attributes instructors feel are essential for excellent teaching. A survey could be administered to students before and after the instructor took

the development course to see if the instructors actually improved their teaching behaviors/attributes after taking the development course.

2) The TBC has shown to be an asset in multiple settings such as community colleges, four-year universities, and the Air Force's Squadron Office College. Further research could be accomplished to see what additional usages outside of the traditional classroom there are for the instrument. Areas such as graduate students, human resource training sessions for the workforce, adult education centers, and high school education classes would be areas that using the TBC could prove useful in determining student's needs.

3) The TBC has been used mainly with university students. Further research into using the TBC with adult education students would be beneficial. Since most community colleges offer adult education courses and then students matriculate into college coursework, it would be interesting to see if their views of excellent teaching changes once they transition.

4) Further research of the TBC using a longitudinal study to examine if a student's views of what makes an excellent teacher changes over the course of their college career.

5) Retention studies (Hutto, 2017; & Bennett, 2017) have shown that there is a link between student retention and instructor teaching patterns. So, research could be conducted on whether or not there is a relationship between teaching behaviors/attributes and student retention.

6) To further explore the juniors and seniors who attend community colleges, a recommendation to add additional questions to explore just who they are and their

reasons for classifying themselves as a junior or senior. This could help in refining the two-year college categories.

7) Additional research concerning the authoritative teaching behavior variable of the TBC to clarify its implied meaning.

References

Adams, S. K. (2019). Empowering and motivating undergraduate students through the process of developing publishable research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 1007.

Alabama Community College System. (2015). 2015 annual report of the Alabama Community College System. Retrieved from https://www.accs.cc/default/assets/File/DPE_Stat/annualreport_2015.pdf.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2016). *Trends in Community College Enrollment and Completion Data 2016.* Washington, DC: Jolanta Juszkiewicz.

Anuar, A. (2016). *Effective teaching characteristics in vocational education* (Doctoral Dissertation). Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Bailey, T. R., Jaggars, S. S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges*. Harvard University, Press, 2015.

Baker, W., Franz, G., Glenn, A., Herron, N., Pauley, L., Pierce, G., Snavely, L., Von Dorpowski, H., (2005). Definition of Teaching Excellence. Teaching Excellence Committee. Teaching and Learning Consortium, Penn State. Retrieved from: http://www.schreyerinstitute.psy.edu/definition.

Baiocco, S. A., & DeWaters, J. N. (1998). *Successful college teaching: Problem-solving strategies of distinguished professors*. Old Tappan, NJ: Allyn and Bacon.

Beckowski, C. P., Gebaer, R., & Arminio, J. (2018). Cultivating deeper life interactions: Faculty-student relationships in a nonresidential learning community. *Journal of College Student Development 59*(6), 752-755.

Bennett, E. (2017). *The relationship between first-year student retention and type of faculty at a four-year public research university: A profile of three academic colleges* (Doctoral Dissertation). Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

Bickerstaff, S. (2018). Supporting adjunct faculty to advance student success in community colleges. Community College Research Center. Retrieved from: https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/easyblog/supporting-adjunct-faculty-advance-student-success.html.

Brand, B., Valent, A., & Browning, A. (2013). How career and technical education can help students be college and career ready: A primer. *College and Career Readiness and Success. Center.*

Brookfield, S. D. (2017). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Brookfield, S. D. (2002). Using the lenses of critically reflective teaching in the community college classroom. *New directions for community colleges*, *2002*(118), 31-38.

Bullock, K. T. (2017). A qualitative study examining the learning orientations of adult doctoral students in a college of education using Houle's typology as a framework. (Doctoral dissertation). University of South Florida, Tampa, FL.

Buskist, W., Keeley, J.W. (2018). Searching for universal principles of excellence in college and university teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2018*(156), 95-105.

Buskist, W., Benson, T., & Sikorski, J. F. (2005). The call to teach. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *24*(1), 111-122.

Buskist, W., Sikorski, J., Buckley, T., & Saville, B. K. (2002). Elements of master teaching. *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer, 1*, 27-39.

Cameron, E. A., & Pagnattaro, M. A. (2017). Beyond millennials: engaging generation Z in business law classes. *Journal of Legal Studies Education*, *34*(2), 317-324.Chan, H. Y., & Wang, X. (2016). Interact for what? The relationship between interpersonal interaction based on motivation and educational outcomes among students in manufacturing programs at two-year technical colleges. *Community College Review*, *44*(1), 26-48.

Cilliers, E. J. (2017). The challenge of teaching generation Z. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*(1).

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, *3*, 7.

Connelly, R., Gayle, V., & Lambert, P. S. (2016). Ethnicity and ethnic group measures in social survey research. *Methodological Innovations, 9*, 2059799116652885.

Deegan, W. L. & Tillery, D. (1985). Renewing the American community college: Priorities and strategies for effective leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Deming, D., & Walteres, C. (2018). The impact of state budget cuts on US postsecondary attainment. *draft,* Harvard University, Februrary.

Demir, M., Burton, S., & Dunbar, N. (2019). Professor-student rapport and perceived autonomy support as predictors of course and student outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology, 46*(1), 22-33.

Dudoit, K., Center, M. I. E., Koanui, B., & Oahu, W. Teaching Generation Z at the University of Hawai ‘i.

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

Edemt. D., & Ravid, G., (1982). Pygmalion versus self-expectancy: Effects of instructor- and self-expectancy on trainee performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 30*(3), 351-364.

Elam, C., Stratton, T., & Gibson, D. D. (2007). Welcoming a new generation to college: The millennial students. *Journal of College Admission*, *195*, 20-25.

Ford, C. (2016). *Identifying effective teaching behaviors of pharmacy faculty master teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Fowler Jr, F. (2014). Survey research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Garner, R. L. (2006). Humor in pedagogy: How ha-ha can lead to aha!. *College Teaching*, *54*(1), 177-180.

Geller, H. A. (2001). A brief history of community colleges and a personal view of some issues. (Open Admissions, Occupational Training and Leadership).

Giner, S. A., Kelly-Reid, J. E., & Mann, F. B. (2018). Graduation rates for selected cohorts, 2009-14; Outcome measures for cohort year 2009-10; student financial aid, academic year 2016-17; and admissions in postsecondary institutions, Fall 2017. First Look (provisional data). NCES 2018-151. *National Center for Education Satsistics.*

Glynn, J. (2019). Persistence: The Success of Students Who Transfer from Community Colleges to Selective Four-Year Institutions. *Jack Kent Cooke Foundation*.

Groccia, J. E. (2018). What is student engagement?. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2018*(154), 11-20.

Gruung, R. A., Richmond, A., & Boysen, G. A. (2018). Studying excellence in teaching: The story so far. *New Directors for Teaching and Learning, 2018*(156), 11-19.

Hampton, D. C., & Keys, Y. (2016). Generation Z students: Will they change our nursing classrooms?. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, *7*(4), 111.

Hebel, S. (2010). State cuts are pushing public colleges into peril. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 56*(27), A1-A22.

Hsieh, T. L. (2014). Motivation matters? The relationship among different types of learning motivation, engagement behaviors and learning outcomes of undergraduate students in Taiwan. *Higher Education*, *68*(3), 417-433.

Hutto, P. N. (2017). The relationship between student retention in community college courses and faculty status. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 41*(1), pp. 4-17.

Jensen, A. C. (1953). Definition of Teacher Behavior Encompasses Many Traits. *Educational Horizons*, *32*(2), 125-128.

Jones, V., Jo, J., & Martin, P. (2007, February). Future Schools and How Technology can be used to support Millennial and Generation-Z Students. In *ICUT 2007 (Proc. B), 1st Int. Conf. Ubiquitous Information Technology* (pp. 12-14).

Jurgens, J. C. (2010). The evolution of community colleges. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *28*(2), 251.

Juszkiewicz, J. (2016). *Trends in community college enrollment and completion data, 2016.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Keeley, J., Furr, R. M., & Buskist, W. (2010). Differentiating psychology students' perceptions of teachers using the teacher behavior checklist. *Teaching of Psycholgoy 37*(1), 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*(2), 84.91.

Kintzer, F. C. (1996). A historical and futuristic perspective of articulation and transfer in the United States. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *1996*(96), 3-13.

Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in higher education*, *38*(5), 758-773.

Kohut, L. (2014). The impact of teacher expectations on student achievement. *Theses and Dissertations* (All). 441. Retrieved from: http://knowlege.library.iup.edu/etd/441.

Kreber, C. (2002). Teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 27*(1), 5-23.

Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE: Benchmarks for effective educational practices. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *35*(2), 24-32.

Lai, C., Yeung, Y., & Hu, J. (2016). University student and teacher perceptions of teacher roles in promoting autonomous language learning with technology outside the classroom. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 29*(4), 703-723.

Lancaster, J. & Lundberg, C. (2019). The influence of classroom engagement on community college student learning: A quantitative analysis of effective faculty practices. *Community College Review, 47*(2), 136-158.

Lei, H., Cui, Y., & Zhou, W. (2018). Relationships between student engagement and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *46*(3), 517-528.

Leigh, K., Whitted, K., & Hamilton, B. (2015). Integration of andragogy into preceptorship. *Journal of Adult Education, 44*(1), 9-17.

Lundberg, C., Kim, Y., Andrade, L., & Bahner, D. (2018). High expectations, strong support: Faculty behaviors predicting Latina/o community college student learning. *Journal of College Student Development 59*(1), 55-70.

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

Marti, C. N. (2008). Dimensions of student engagement in American community colleges: Using the Community College Student Report in research and practice. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *33*(1), 1-24.

McAlister, A. (2009). Teaching the millennial generation. *American Music Teacher*, *59*(1), 13-15.

McCabe, C., Sprute, K., & Underdown, K. (2017). Laughter to learning: How humor can build relationships and increase learning in the online classroom. *Journal of Instructional Research, 6*, 4-7.

McGlynn, A. P. (2008). Millennials in college: How do we motivate them?. *The Education Digest*, *73*(6), 19.

McHugh, M. L. (2013). The chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia medica: Biochemia Meidca, 23*(2), 143-149.

Mohr, K. A. (2017). Understanding generation Z students to promote a contemporary learning environment. *Journal on Empowering Teaching Excellence*, *1*(1), 9.

Montenery, S. M., Walker, M., Sorensen, E., Thompson, R., Kirklin, D., White, R., & Ross, C. (2013). Millennial generation student nurses' perceptions of the impact of multiple technologies on learning. *Nursing education perspectives*, *34*(6), 405-409.

Much, K., Wagener, A. M., Breitkreutz, H. L., & Hellenbrand, M. (2014). Working with the millennial generation: Challenges facing 21st-century students from the perspective of university staff. *Journal of College Counseling*, *17*(1), 37-47.

Nasri, N. M. (2017). Self-directed learning through the eyes of teacher educators. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences.*

Noll, K. (2016). *Baccalaureate Nursing Stduent and Faculty Views of Effective Teaching.* (Doctoral dissertation). Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Oliff, P., Palacios, V., Johnson, I., & Leachman, M. (2013). Recent deep state higher education cuts may harm students and the economy for years to come. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*, 1-21.

O'Meara. K. (2008). *Characteristics of Effective Teachers in the Air Force's Squadron Office College.* (Doctoral dissertation). Auburn University, Auburn, AL.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. (2005). *How college affects students (Vol.* 2): A third decade of research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., Seifert, T. A., & Whitt, E. J., (2008). Effective instructions and college student persistence: Some new evidence. In J. M. Braxton (Ed.), *Special issue: The role of the classroom in college student persistence*. *New Directions for Community Colleges* (Vol, 115, p. 55-70). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pardue, K. T., & Morgan, P. (2008). Millennials considered: A new generation, new approaches, and implications for nursing education. *Nursing education perspectives*, *29*(2), 74-79.

Parker, D. A., & Roessger, K. M. (2019). Retrievel practices as process in self-directed learning: New philosophical directions for self-directed learning. Retrieved from: https://newprairiepress.org/aerc/2019/papers/10/.

Pinder-Grover, T., & Groscurth, C. R. (2009). Principles for teaching the millennial generation: Innovative practices of UM faculty. *Center for Research on Learning and Teaching*, *26*, 1-8.

Porter, S. R. (2004). Pros and cons of paper and electronic surveys. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2004*(121), 91-97.

Raisman, N. (1990). Moving into the fifth generation. *Community College Review, 18*(2), 15-22.

Robinson, C. C., & Hullinger, H. (2008). New benchmarks in higher education: Student engagement in online learning. *Journal of Education for Business*, *84*(2), 101-109.

Roehling, P. V., Kooi, T. L. V., Dykema, S., Quisenberry, B., & Vandlen, C. (2010). Engaging the millennial generation in class discussions. *College Teaching*, *59*(1), 1-6.

Roman, M. A. (2007). Community College Admission and Student Retention. *Journal of College Admission*, *194*, 18-23.

Romsa, K., Bremer, K. L., & Lewis, J. (2017). The Evolution of Student-Faculty Interactions: What Matters to Millennial College Students?. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *35*(2), 85-99.

Rothman, D. (2016). A Tsunami of learners called Generation Z. *URL: http://www. mdle. net/JoumaFA_Tsunami_of_Learners_Called_Generation_Z. pdf*.

Schilling K.M., & Schilling, K. L.Expectations and performance. *Challenging and Supporting the First-Year Student: A Handbook for Improving the Frist Year of College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schudde, L. (2019). Short-and long-term impacts of engagement experiences with faculty and peers at community colleges. *The Review of Higher Education, 42*(2), 385-426.

Somers, P., Haines, K., Keene, B., Bauer, J., Pfeiffer, M., McCluskey, J., & Sparks, B. (2006). Towards a theory of choice for community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *30*(1), 53-67.

Smith, A. (2018). Why part-time success matters. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/04/30/success-part-time-students-key-closing-achievement-gap.

Smittle, P. (2003). Principles for effective teaching. *Journal of Developmental Education*, *26*(3), 10-16.

Soomere, T., Lepp, L., Groccia, J., & Mansour, E. (2018). Characteristics and behaviors of excellent teaching: Perceptions of military educators. In *INTED2018 Conference* (pp. 6736-6744).

Stanley, P. (2007). Importance of community colleges. *Issues in Science and Technology, 24*(1), 10-11.

Stigall, L., & Blincoe, S. (2015). Student and instructor use of the teacher behavior checklist. *Teaching of Psychology*, *42*(4), 299-306.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (2012). *Completing college: Rethinking institutional action.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Turner, P., & Thompson, E. (2014). College retention initiatives meeting the needs of millennial freshman students. *College student journal*, *48*(1), 94-104.

Vaughan, G. B. (2006). *The community college story*. American Association of Community College.

Voss, R., & Gruber, T. (2006). The desired teaching qualities of lecturers in higher education: a means end analysis. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *14*(3), 217-242.

Weisstein, E. (2019). Fischer's Exact Test from MathWorld. Retrieved from: http://mathworld.wolfram.com/FishersExactTest.html.

Wilson, M. E. (2004). Teaching, learning, and millennial students. *New directions for student services*, *2004*(106), 59-71.

Wood, M. & Su, F. (2017). What makes an excellent lecturer? Academics' perspectives on the discourse of 'teaching excellence' in higher education. *Teaching in higher education, 22*(4), 451-466.

Woodside, B. M., Wont, E. H., & Weist, D. J. (1999). The effect of student-faculty interaction on college students' academic achievement. *Education 119*(4), 730-733.

Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010). Improving student engagement: Ten proposals for action. *Active learning in higher education*, *11*(3), 167-177.

Appendix A: Paper Student Survey

Section 1: Demographics

1. I am……

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

2. My age in years is _____.

3. I identify my race/ethnicity as….

- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ Caucasian or White
- ☐ Hispanic/Latino
- ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

4. Currently my student classification is……

- ☐ Freshman, 0-30 credit hours
- ☐ Sophomore, 31-60 credit hours
- ☐ Junior, 61-90 credit hours
- ☐ Senior, 91+ credit hours

Section II: Teacher Behavior Checklist

Listed below are 28 teacher qualities and the behaviors that define them. Please indicate the top 10 qualities and behaviors you feel are essential in quality teaching by checking the box beside your choice.

- ☐ Accessible (Posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-email information)
- ☐ Approachable/Personable (Smiles, greets students, initiates conversations, invites questions, responds respectfully to student comments)
- ☐ Authoritative (Establishes clear course rules; maintains classroom order; speaks in a loud, strong voice)
- ☐ Confident (Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly)
- ☐ Creative and Interesting (Experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting relevant, and personal examples; not monotone)
- ☐ Effective Communicator (Speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples)
- ☐ Encourages and Cares for Students (Provides praise for good student work, helps students who need it, offers bonus points and extra credit, and knows students names)
- ☐ 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)
- ☐ Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals (Prepares/follows the syllabus and has goals for each class)

- 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)
- Good Listener (Doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making)
- Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous (Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students)
- Humble (Admits mistakes, never brags, and doesn't take credit for others' successes)
- Knowledgeable About Subject Matter (Easily answers students' questions, does not read straight from the book or notes, and uses clear and understandable examples)
- Prepared (Brings necessary materials to class, is never late for class, provides outlines of class discussion)
- 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)
- Professional (Dresses nicely [neat and clean shoes, slacks, blouses, dresses, shirts, ties] and no profanity)
- Promotes Class Discussion (Asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class)
- Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating (Asks thoughtful questions during class, uses essay questions on tests and quizzes, assigns homework, and holds group discussions/activities)
- Provides Constructive Feedback (Writes comments on returned work, answers students' questions, and gives advice on test-taking)
- 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 manner)
- Rapport (Makes class laugh through jokes and funny stories, initiates and maintains class discussions, knows student names, interacts with students before and after class)
- Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and Grading (Covers materials 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)
- 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)
- Sensitive and Persistent (Makes sure students understand the materials before moving to new material, holds extra study sessions, repeats information when necessary, asks questions to check student understanding)
- 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)
- 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)

- 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)

Appendix B: Online Survey Students

Welcome to the research study!

INFORMATION LETTER
for a Research Study entitled
A Community College's Student's and Faculty's Perceptions of Excellent Teaching

You are invited to participate in a research study to assess the preferred teaching behaviors of community college's student and faculty members. The study is being conducted by Jennifer C. Hillis, Coordinator II in the Cooperative Education Program under the direction of Dr. James Witte, Professor in the Auburn University Department of Education. You are invited to participate because you are a student or faculty member at Chattahoochee Valley Community College and are age 19 years or older.

What will be involved if you participate? Your participation is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to identify the top 10 teaching qualities and behaviors from a list of 28. There will also be a short list of demographic questions to answer as well. Your total time commitment will be approximately 10 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? The risks associated with participating in this study are minor. To minimize these risks, we will de-identify all data for analysis and provide all reported data in aggregate form.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time during the study. Your participation is completely voluntary. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Cooperative Education or School of Education.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. We will protect your privacy and the data you provide by presenting only aggregate data. . Information collected through your participation may be published in a dissertation, professional journal, or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Jennifer Hillis at 334.844.5414 or jcc0051@auburn.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL SERVE AS YOUR AGREEMENT TO DO SO. THIS LETTER IS YOURS TO KEEP.

IRB Protocol #18-474 EX 1810, Approved on 11/19/2018

_____
Investigator's signature Date

_____
Print Name

By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 19 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device.

- ○ I consent, begin the study
- ○ I do not consent, I do not wish to participate

I am....

- ○ Female
- ○ Male

My age in years is .....

I identify my race/ethnicity as...

- ○ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ○ Asian
- ○ Black or African American
- ○ Caucasian or White
- ○ Hispanic/Latino
- ○ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Currently my student classification is....

- ○ Freshman, 0-30 credit hours

- Sophomore, 31-60 credit hours
- Junior, 61-90 credit hours
- Senior, 91+ credit hours

Listed below are 28 teacher qualities and the behaviors that define them. Please indicate the top 10 qualities and behaviors you feel are essential in quality teaching by clicking next to the quality you find important.

- Accessible (Posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-mail information)
- Approachable/Personable (Smiles, greets students, initiates conversations, invites questions, responds respectfully to student comments)
- Authoritative (Establishes clear course rules; maintains classroom order; speaks in a loud, strong voice)
- Confident (Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly)
- Creative and Interesting (Experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone)
- Effective Communicator (Speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples)
- 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)
- 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)
- Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals (Prepares/follows the syllabus and has goals for each class)
- 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 for others, and allows students to do make-up work when appropriate)
- Good Listener (Doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making)
- Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous (Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students)
- Humble (Admits mistakes, never brags, and doesn't take credit for others' successes)

- ☐ Knowledgeable About Subject Matter (Easily answers students' questions, does not read straight from the book or notes, and uses clear and understandable examples)
- ☐ Prepared (Brings necessary materials to class, is never late for class, provides outlines of class discussion)
- ☐ 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)
- ☐ Professional (Dresses nicely [neat and clean shoes, slacks, blouses, dresses, shirts, ties] and no profanity)
- ☐ Promotes Class Discussion (Asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class)
- ☐ Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating (Asks thoughtful questions during class, uses essay questions on tests and quizzes, assigns homework, and holds group discussions/activities)
- ☐ Provides Constructive Feedback (Writes comments on returned work, answers student's questions, and gives advice on test-taking)
- ☐ Punctuality/Manages Class Time (Arrives to class on time/early, dismisses class on time, presents relevant matierals in class, leaves time for questions, keeps appointments, returns work in a timely manner)
- ☐ Rapport (Makes class laugh through jokes and funny stories, initiates and maintains class discussions, knows students names, interacts with students before and after class)
- ☐ Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and Grading (Covers materials 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)
- ☐ 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)
- ☐ Sensitive and Persistent (Makes sure students understand material before moving to new materials, holds extra study sessions, repeats information when necessary, ask questions to check student understanding)

- ☐ Strive 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)
- ☐ Technologically Competent (knows now 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
- ☐ 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)

Appendix C: Faculty Survey

Welcome to the research study!

INFORMATION LETTER
for a Research Study entitled
A Community College's Student's and Faculty's Perceptions of Excellent Teaching

You are invited to participate in a research study to assess the preferred teaching behaviors of community college's student and faculty members. The study is being conducted by Jennifer C. Hillis, Coordinator II in the Cooperative Education Program under the direction of Dr. James Witte, Professor in the Auburn University Department of Education. You are invited to participate because you are a student or faculty member at a community College and are age 19 years or older.

What will be involved if you participate? Your participation is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to identify the top 10 teaching qualities and behaviors from a list of 28. There will also be a short list of demographic questions to answer as well. Your total time commitment will be approximately 10 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? The risks associated with participating in this study are minor. To minimize these risks, we will de-identify all data for analysis and provide all reported data in aggregate form.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time during the study. Your participation is completely voluntary. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Cooperative Education or School of Education.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. We will protect your privacy and the data you provide by presenting only aggregate data. . Information collected through your participation may be published in a dissertation, professional journal, or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Jennifer Hillis at 334.844.5414 or jcc0051@auburn.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL SERVE AS YOUR AGREEMENT TO DO SO. THIS LETTER IS YOURS TO KEEP.

IRB Protocol # 18-474 EX 1811, Approved 11/19/2018

_____
Investigator's signature Date

_____
Print Name

By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 19 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device.

- I consent, begin the study
- I do not consent, I do not wish to participate

I have _____total years of teaching experience.

My age in years is .....

I am...

- Female
- Male

Q8

I identify my race/ethnicity as...

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Caucasian or White
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Listed below are 28 teacher qualities and the behaviors that define them. Please indicate the top 10 qualities and behaviors you feel are essential in quality teaching by clicking in the box next to the quality you deem important to excellent/quality teaching.

- ☐ Accessible (Posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-mail information)
- ☐ Approachable/Personable (Smiles, greets students, initiates conversations, invites questions, responds respectfully to student comments)
- ☐ Authoritative (Establishes clear course rules; maintains classroom order; speaks in a loud, strong voice)
- ☐ Confident (Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly)
- ☐ Creative and Interesting (Experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone)
- ☐ Effective Communicator (Speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples)
- ☐ 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)
- ☐ 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)
- ☐ Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals (Prepares/follows the syllabus and has goals for each class)
- ☐ 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 for others, and allows students to do make-up work when appropriate)
- ☐ Good Listener (Doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making)
- ☐ Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous (Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students)
- ☐ Humble (Admits mistakes, never brags, and doesn't take credit for others' successes)
- ☐ Knowledgeable About Subject Matter (Easily answers students' questions, does not read straight from the book or notes, and uses clear and understandable examples)
- ☐ Prepared (Brings necessary materials to class, is never late for class, provides outlines of class discussion)

- ☐ 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)
- ☐ Professional (Dresses nicely [neat and clean shoes, slacks, blouses, dresses, shirts, ties] and no profanity)
- ☐ Promotes Class Discussion (Asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class)
- ☐ Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating (Asks thoughtful questions during class, uses essay questions on tests and quizzes, assigns homework, and holds group discussions/activities)
- ☐ Provides Constructive Feedback (Writes comments on returned work, answers student's questions, and gives advice on test-taking)
- ☐ Punctuality/Manages Class Time (Arrives to class on time/early, dismisses class on time, presents relevant matierals in class, leaves time for questions, keeps appointments, returns work in a timely manner)
- ☐ Rapport (Makes class laugh through jokes and funny stories, initiates and maintains class discussions, knows students names, interacts with students before and after class)
- ☐ Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and Grading (Covers materials 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)
- ☐ 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)
- ☐ Sensitive and Persistent (Makes sure students understand material before moving to new materials, holds extra study sessions, repeats information when necessary, ask questions to check student understanding)
- ☐ Strive 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)
- ☐ Technologically Competent (knows now 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

- 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)

Appendix D: IRB Approval

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 Jennifer C. Hillis Title Coordinator II Dept./School Cooperative Education

Address 1075 Birch Circle Auburn, AL 36830 AU Email jcc0051@auburn.edu

Phone 334.844.5414 Dept. Head Dr. Sherida Downer

FACULTY ADVISOR (if applicable):

Name Dr. James Witte Title Professor Dept./School Educational FLT

Address 3006 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

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: A Community College's Student's and Faculty's Perceptions of Excellent Teaching

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 _____ **APPROV**

DATE OF IRB REVIEW: _____ by _____ **APPROV**

DATE OF ORC REVIEW: _____ by _____ **INTERVA**

DATE OF APPROVAL: _____ by _____

COMMENTS:

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this Document for use from 11/19/2018 to ----------
Protocol # 18-474 EX 1811

Appendix E: IRB Modification(s)

AUBURN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD for RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

REQUEST for MODIFICATION

For help, contact: **THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE (ORC)**, 115 Ramsay Hall, Auburn University
Phone: 334-844-5966 **e-mail:** IRBAdmin@auburn.edu **Web Address:** http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs

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.

1. **Protocol Number:** 18-474 EX 1810
2. **Current IRB Approval Dates: From:** 11/19/2018 **To:** _____
3. **Project Title:** A Community College's Student's and Faculty's Perception of Excellent Teaching

4.

Jennifer Hillis	Coordinator II	Cooperative	334.844.5414	jcc0051@auburn.edu
Principal Investigator	**Title**	**Department**	**Phone**	**AU E-Mail** (primary)
Jennifer Hillis	1075 Birch Circle Auburn AL 36830			
PI Signature	**Mailing Address**			**Alternate E-Mail**
Dr. James Witte		Ed. FLT	334.844.3054	witteje@auburn.edu
Faculty Advisor	**FA Signature**	**Department**	**Phone**	**AU E-Mail**

Name of Current Department Head: Dr. Sherida Downder **AU E-Mail:** downesh@auburn.edu

5. **Current External Funding Agency and Grant number:** N/A

6. **a. List any contractors, sub-contractors, other entities associated with this project:**

N/A

b. List any other IRBs associated with this project: _____

7. **Nature of change in protocol: (Mark all that apply)**

- ☐ **Change in Key Personnel** (attach CITI forms for new personnel)
- ☑ **Change in Sites** (attach permission forms for new sites)
- ☑ **Change in methods for data storage/protection or location of data/consent documents**
- ☐ **Change in project purpose or questions**
- ☑ **Change in population or recruitment** (attach new or revised recruitment materials as needed)
- ☐ **Change in consent procedures** (attach new or revised consent documents as needed)
- ☑ **Change in data collection methods or procedures** (attach new data collection forms as needed)
- ☐ **Other (explain):** _____

FOR ORC OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE RECEIVED IN ORC: _____ by _____
DATE OF IRB REVIEW: _____ by _____
DATE OF IRB APPROVAL: _____ by _____
COMMENTS:

MODIFICA
PROTOCO
MODIFICA
INTERVA

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this Document for use from 03/18/19 to ----------
Protocol # 18-249 EX 1806

AUBURN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD for RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

REQUEST for MODIFICATION

For help, contact: **THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE (ORC)**, 115 Ramsay Hall, Auburn University
Phone: 334-844-5966 **e-mail:** IRBAdmin@auburn.edu **Web Address:** http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs

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.

1. **Protocol Number:** 18-474 EX 1810
2. **Current IRB Approval Dates: From:** 11/19/2018 **To:** _____
3. **Project Title:** A Community College's Student's and Faculty's Perception of Excellent Teaching

4.

Jennifer Hillis	Cooridatior II	Cooperative	334.844.5414	jcc0051@auburn.edu
Principal Investigator	**Title**	**Department**	**Phone**	**AU E-Mail** (primary)

Jennifer Hillis — 1075 Birch Circle Auburn AL 36830 — _____
PI Signature — **Mailing Address** — **Alternate E-Mail**

Dr. James Witte		Ed. FLT	334.844.3054	witteje@auburn.edu
Faculty Advisor	**FA Signature**	**Department**	**Phone**	**AU E-Mail**

Name of Current Department Head: Dr. Sherida Downder **AU E-Mail:** downesh@auburn.edu

5. **Current External Funding Agency and Grant number:** _____

6. **a. List any contractors, sub-contractors, other entities associated with this project:**

_____

b. List any other IRBs associated with this project: _____

7. **Nature of change in protocol: (Mark all that apply)**

- ☐ **Change in Key Personnel** (attach CITI forms for new personnel)
- ☐ **Change in Sites** (attach permission forms for new sites)
- ☐ **Change in methods for data storage/protection or location of data/consent documents**
- ☐ **Change in project purpose or questions**
- ☐ **Change in population or recruitment** (attach new or revised recruitment materials as needed)
- ☐ **Change in consent procedures** (attach new or revised consent documents as needed)
- ☐ **Change in data collection methods or procedures** (attach new data collection forms as needed)
- ☑ **Other (explain):** Approval granted by Chattahoochee Valley Community College to include Spring 2019 research.

_____

FOR ORC OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE RECEIVED IN ORC: _____ by _____
DATE OF IRB REVIEW: _____ by _____
DATE OF IRB APPROVAL: _____ by _____
COMMENTS:

MODIF
PROTC
MODIF
INTERV

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this Document for use from 1/10/2019 to ----------
Protocol # 18-474 EX 1810