A COMPARISON OF STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FOR FULL-TIME VERSUS PART-TIME FACULTY IN SELECTED FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

JERRY W. KANDZER

1977

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A Comparison of Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness for Full-Time Versus Part-Time Faculty in Selected Florida Community Colleges

presented by

Jerry W. Kandzer

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in **Administration and Higher Education**

Major professor

Date 5-20-77

O-7639

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FOR FULL-TIME VERSUS PART-TIME FACULTY IN SELECTED FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Jerry W. Kandzer

Statement of the Problem

The rapid growth of the nation's community college system in both the credit and noncredit programs has forced administrators to employ large numbers of part-time faculty. They have recruited them to maintain the adaptability of the community college, while operating within its existing economic constraints. Thus, part-time faculty members have become a critical component of the community college system.

In many instances the part-time faculty members are recruited from nonteaching professions. The problem, therefore, is that most of them lack the professional teacher preparation and/or teaching experience to complement their specialized knowledge.

The purpose of this study was to determine, through the use of a student rating instrument of teaching effectiveness, whether there was a significant

difference in the teaching effectiveness of full-time versus part-time faculty. Univariate and multivariate analysis of variance and Pearson's Correlation Coefficients tests were used to analyze the student ratings of full-time and part-time faculty. The comparison was made in four community colleges from Florida. A stratified sample of teachers was selected to control for experience. There were 759 student ratings comparing teachers. These students were enrolled in sophomore level general education courses leading to the Associate of Arts degree.

Major Findings of the Study

The major finding was that students perceive no significant difference in the level of teaching effectiveness presented by full-time and part-time faculty. Further, students perceive no significant difference in the dependent variables of: (1) personality characteristics, (2) student-faculty interaction, (3) teaching methods, (4) course organization, and (5) a comparison of the instructor being evaluated to all previous instructors.

Investigation of the independent variables of location, building, teacher status, teacher experience, and all possible combinations of interactions and nesting effects indicated that location was the only significant independent variable: that is, rural students perceived their instructors more positively than urban students.

A COMPARISON OF STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FOR FULL-TIME VERSUS PART-TIME FACULTY IN SELECTED FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Jerry W. Kandzer

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1977

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As with other candidates who are working toward or finishing a doctor's degree, I have learned much more than academics. I have renewed the pleasure of designing and perpetuating a project from creation to fruition. Long to be remembered are the humbling experiences learned through working for married housing emergency maintenance, the beautiful experiences derived from the M.S.U. farms, Rose Lake, the Fenner Arboretum, the flood, and Michigan's four seasons. But my family and I will remember longest the friends, acquaintances, and experience we derived from the international flavor of Spartan Village.

Education is not an individual achievement, as many experiences, many human influences, and many reflections are required to create an educated man.

This phase of my education is dedicated to Mrs. Frances Kandzer Brown and Dr. William Sweetland. They have both believed more than I in my abilities, have offered a word of encouragement when it was most needed, and have given greatly of their lives for my education.

Dr. Max Raines, my family--Joan, Brett, Korie, Blake--and my secretary, Maggie, also deserve a large measure of credit. They all encouraged me to take the giant step, were patient when I slowed, and were ready to proceed as I gained momentum.

Lastly, I wish to thank the Polk Community College administration, faculty and staff, the District Board of Trustees, and the Florida community colleges who participated in the study. Without their endorsement and support, none of this would have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Part-time faculty members are a critical component of the nation's community college system. They are used in every conceivable instructional program, both credit and noncredit. Their qualifications in both academics and experiences vary greatly. Their problems and needs are dissimilar from those of the full-time faculty member. Part-time faculty members have added flexibility and adaptability to the community college philosophy at a time when enrollments have increased faster than economic resources. Through their use, the community college has been able to maintain the levels of programming required to meet community needs. Yet the research literature is practically devoid of references to the problems, needs, policies, procedures, or instructional effectiveness of the part-time faculty member.

This study represents an attempt to assess the various uses, characteristics, preparedness, and instructional effectiveness of part-time faculty members. The

survey of the literature and the research study itself are indirectly and directly designed to reach this end.

The recruiting administrators of the various community college systems, knowing that the various state teacher certification agencies require of new full-time teachers a course in community college philosophy and often one in teaching methods, have requested through their university articulation committees that these courses be added to the teacher training program. In their recruiting practices, they also emphasize, where possible, work experience in the content area to be taught. It is their hope that this practical knowledge will be transmitted through the curriculum, thus making the instruction more relevant. While part-time faculty typically possess significant work experience and are engaged in full-time career pursuits, few of them possess either educational coursework in teaching methods or have an understanding of community college philosophy.

In the community college's effort to update itself, teacher orientation programs have developed a new profile. The more recent ones frequently contain segments on philosophy and teaching methods. Typically, the modern orientation program may last from one week to three months, in contrast to the historical two-hour "get acquainted" orientation program. Yet, part-time faculty, as a general rule, do not attend such programs.

This may be due to the time requirements of their full-time job, or because the orientation was designed exclusively for full-time faculty and presented at a time when it would be unlikely that a part-time teacher could attend even if he wished. There are a few examples of orientation programs offered by evening administrators specifically for their part-time faculty. These range from a one-night, two-hour explanation of institutional policy and the part-time faculty handbook, to a three-month, new part-time faculty training program. In studying part-time faculty practices in Illinois and Maryland, Gerald Kennedy states that

> New part-time faculty received a minimum of orientation upon appointment. Only two institutions in each state had any identifiable orientation program for new part-time instructors. At the other junior colleges, where some form of orientation was undertaken, it invariably consisted of a short discussion of administrative and academic regulations by a member of the administrative staff.[1]

Again, the major drawback in planning such a program is in scheduling a time which is not in conflict with the full-time occupational requirements of the part-time teacher.

A new emphasis upon faculty inservice programs has also developed. One area of great concern among such programs is the area of new teaching methods. These

---

[1]Gerald Kennedy, "Preparation, Orientation, Utilization, and Acceptance of Part-time Faculty," Junior College Journal 37 (April 1967): 15.

programs often include such topics as behavioral objectives for instruction, audiovisual aids to instruction, programmed methods of instruction, and criterion and/or norm referenced evaluation. They are typically offered as either in-house programs or as graduate courses presented on campus for the convenience of the local institution. However, these inservice training programs are generally developed for full-time faculty and it is a rarity for the part-time faculty to be invited to participate in these training programs.

Recently, instructional evaluation programs have assumed a greater level of importance in reaching accountability. The use of both student and faculty administration evaluation instruments has become more widespread. Institutions are both developing their own instruments, as well as utilizing nationally validated forms. However, such programs, in many instances, are not mandatory. In addition, the administrative procedures for administering such forms very frequently ignore proven research procedures. Probably the most flagrant violation is allowing the person being evaluated to administer and collect the instrument. In the cases where the student is evaluating the instructor, this has proven to result in a higher rating. Richard Miller, in speaking of developing programs for faculty, reported that Kirchner in 1969 found that "student ratings were significantly

higher when the instructor being rated was in the room than when he was absent."[2] The instrument is administered before grades have been issued, thus posing a threat to the student completing the form. The data resulting from the evaluation program are used primarily for ranking the effectiveness level of the institution's teachers. The results, by design, produce a numerical coefficient for each instructor based upon how he is viewed as an instructor by his students, peers, and the administration. These results have also been used recently to reward teaching excellence by tying them into a merit teaching program. One author reports that "for most institutions, a merit advancement procedure must be employed to allow faculty members to get ahead by developing excellence in teaching."[3] Yet, again, the evaluation program for the part-time faculty member is little more than formality. The results are usually placed in his personnel file without comment, the exception being when the instructor personally arranges to review the results, or when the results indicate a pending problem.

The part-time faculty members have not been slighted intentionally. They are a product of the rapid

---

[2]Richard I. Miller, Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974), p. 35.

[3]Jerry G. Gaff and Robert C. Wilson, "Faculty Values and Improving Teaching," Reprint, p. 4. (Source unknown.)

growth of the community college system. As evidenced by Table 1, enrollments increased so quickly that a corresponding rise in the instance of hiring part-time faculty was inevitable. The full-time faculty in many cases opted to fill their schedules with day classes, thus leaving night classes unmanned. Also, in many cases, night enrollments rose more rapidly than anticipated and additional part-time faculty were hired to staff the additional sections created for peak periods of enrollment. In many cases, the enrollment surplus, above the regular staffing ability of the full-time faculty of a given department, was not sufficient to warrant another full-time faculty member, nor was it constant enough to be considered a permanent level of enrollment. The part-time faculty then came to serve three purposes for the educational administrator. First, the part-time faculty member could be utilized until enrollments warranted an additional full-time faculty member. Second, the part-time faculty member could be used as a buffer zone whereby full-time faculty could assume their classes if enrollments fell for a short period of time. And, third, part-time faculty could be hired at a lower pay level than full-time faculty, thus reducing the per student costs of the institution.

TABLE 1

TOTAL FALL FTE CREDIT ENROLLMENTS COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES--1962, 1967, 1972, 1975

College	1962	1967	1972	1975
Brevard	1,094	2,953	5,340	7,620
Broward	1,268	3,467	5,730	7,210
Central Florida	840	1,373	1,780	1,910
Chipola	797	1,194	1,130	1,100
Daytona Beach	1,773	3,585	4,250	4,460
Edison	312	998	1,730	2,130
Florida J.C. at Jax.	--	4,708	8,400	11,080
Florida Keys	--	373	520	680
Gulf Coast	503	1,190	1,370	1,380
Hernando-Pasco	--	--	450	640
Hillsborough	--	--	5,540	9,400
Indian River	529	1,194	1,540	1,810
Lake City	320	1,078	1,330	1,490
Lake-Sumter	186	644	790	780
Manatee	1,104	2,084	2,260	2,440
Miami-Dade, North	4,588	11,901	13,840	14,920
Miami-Dade, South	--	5,053	7,300	9,250
North Florida	375	1,034	1,390	1,360
Okaloosa-Walton	--	1,200	2,050	2,670
Palm Beach	1,958	3,402	4,420	4,970
Pensacola	2,262	4,076	4,600	4,980
Polk	--	1,788	2,890	3,420
St. John's River	517	1,161	1,590	1,840
St. Petersburg, North	--	2,829	3,340	3,890
St. Petersburg, South	3,895	4,208	5,600	6,360
Santa Fe	--	2,014	2,310	2,610
Seminole	--	1,253	1,040	1,240
Tallahassee	--	956	2,400	2,600
Valencia	--	423	4,760	8,650
TOTAL	22,321	66,139	99,780	122,890

These instances of institutional neglect for its part-time faculty, resulting from the period of rapid growth, which the community college system has survived, must be resolved. Support services for the part-time faculty and evening students must be raised to a comparable level with day services. Additional evening administrators and staffs should be hired to elevate the efficiency level of the evening programs. It is the responsibility of community college administrators to guarantee the same level of instruction for both day and evening students.

Statement of the Problem

As a result of their rapid growth, the nation's community colleges appear to have neglected their part-time faculty and evening students. The instances of part-time faculty utilization--particularly by community colleges--is high, as shown in Table 2. They are recruited from business, industry health services, public services, and other institutions of secondary education. They may be homemakers or business people who have no teaching experience or a great deal of experience. All of these types are recruited to fill a vital role in the community education philosophy of the community college movement. In many instances, possessing only their academic skills, they are placed in the

TABLE 2

FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME POSITIONS BY COLLEGE AND POSITION TYPE--FALL, 1974

College	Instructional		Total Faculty	Percentage Part-time Faculty
	Full-Time	Part-Time		
Brevard	203	182	385	47.3
Broward	267	851	1,118	76.1
Central Florida	69	120	189	53.0
Chipola	65	5	70	7.1
Daytona Beach	151	390	541	72.1
Edison	60	44	104	42.3
Fla. J.C. at Jax.	319	1,175	1,598	73.5
Florida Keys	24	37	81	60.7
Gulf Coast	70	28	98	28.6
Hillsborough	148	237	385	61.6
Indian River	74	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lake City	65	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lake-Sumter	31	72	103	70.0
Manatee	66	134	200	67.0
Miami-Dade	784	N/A	N/A	N/A
North Florida	38	0	38	0.0
Okaloosa-Walton	72	66	138	47.8
Palm Beach	174	165	339	48.7
Pasco-Hernando	15	85	100	85.0
Pensacola	275	206	481	42.8
Polk	95	110	205	53.7
St. John's River	37	23	60	38.3
St. Petersburg	274	14	288	4.9
Santa Fe	219	91	310	29.4
Seminole	95	160	255	62.8
South Florida	26	48	74	64.9
Tallahassee	61	17	78	21.8
Valencia	123	124	247	50.2
TOTAL	3,900	4,384		

classroom or laboratory to perform at the same level as the professionally trained and competent teacher.

Part-time faculty members are ubiquitous. They are employed in the general education academic divisions, in the vocational education divisions, and in the community instructional services--continuing education division. The pedagogy in each of these divisions is different, thus adding to the complexity of the concept of the part-time faculty member. General education courses typically utilize the lecture method, and heavily emphasize philosophical concepts. Vocational education courses typically utilize the lecture method to prepare students for hands-on application of more practical concepts. The major difference is that general education instructors are teaching philosophically and vocational education instructors are teaching skills. The continuing education part-time faculty member quite often teaches both philosophy and a skill; but, again, the primary emphasis is the application of a concept toward developing a skill.

Many part-time faculty lack a thorough understanding of the philosophy of the community college movement and the special needs of the community college student. They must look to their previous educational and work experiences for models to organize course materials, methods of presentation, and evaluation of student

performance. Medsker says community college faculty have several reference points--that is,

> . . . the attitudes of junior college teachers may reflect the educational values or attitudes of teachers in four-year colleges and universities. Another possibility is that new and inexperienced teachers in junior colleges will retain a close identity with the graduate school or department from which he recently came and thus visualize the role of the junior college in terms of graduate standards and procedures. Another, is that those teachers who once taught in high schools may retain that perspective after they transfer to junior college teaching.[4]

Attempts at providing the additional training necessary to elevate them to a functional level of competence have been sporadic and for the most part unsuccessful as organized long-range programs. Since the part-time faculty member appears to be an indispensable part of the community college system, and his continued use is inherent, community college educators and administrators should take the essential steps necessary to guarantee their optimum quality and effectiveness as teachers. It seems somewhat ironic that these measures have not already been achieved, since the community college movement was founded upon its image as a "teaching" institution.

If we assume that these charges are true, the traditional academic divisions of the nation's community

---

[4]Leland L. Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect (New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1960), p. 173.

colleges are operating their programs at different levels of effectiveness and with diverse levels of instructor preparedness. This apparent dichotomy of qualifications concerns those administrators responsible for maintaining the quality and integrity of the community college instructional climate. And, due to the lack of research regarding part-time faculty teaching effectiveness, little has been done to correct the situation.

Since the uses of part-time faculty spread across all academic divisions, a general study of their teaching effectiveness level would be difficult. The instructional areas differ so greatly in both intent and method that the data from such a study would be subject to too many variables to be meaningful or defensible. For this reason, the study will deal only with those teachers teaching courses in the academic division which lead to the Associate of Arts degree.

Purpose of the Study

Although the use of part-time faculty has become a way of life for the community college movement, very little is known about their effectiveness as teachers. The purpose of this study, then, was to determine, through the use of comparative student ratings, whether there was a difference between the teaching effectiveness of part-time and full-time faculty in the traditional academic division. The sample was restricted to full-time and

part-time teachers teaching those academic courses which lead to the Associate of Arts or transfer degree program in selected Florida community colleges. This measure was taken to maintain the homogeneity of the student sample and the possibility of wide variance with respect to the types of courses being taught, i.e., faculty teaching vocational skills courses and noncredit courses were eliminated from the study to reduce extraneous variables. In addition, the study provides procedures and recommendations designed to assist educational administrators and part-time faculty in improving the level of teaching effectiveness.

Questions To Be Investigated in the Study

1. Will part-time faculty score at a comparable level with full-time faculty on a student evaluation of teacher effectiveness rating instrument?
2. Is the experience level and number of years of teaching experience of a full-time or part-time faculty member an indicator of teaching effectiveness?
3. Will there be any interaction between the experience level and full- or part-time teaching status?

General Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1:

Part-time faculty will score as well as full-time faculty on a student satisfaction rating instrument.

Hypothesis 2:

Experienced and inexperienced teachers will receive similar composite scores.

Hypothesis 3:

Teachers in rural and urban schools will receive similar composite scores.

Hypothesis 4:

The interactions between the teachers' status, experience level, location of the school, and building will have little effect on the composite scores.

Definition of Terms

Full-time Instructor--a full-time instructor is a person whose teaching assignment is considered by the local institution as full time.

Part-time Instructor--a part-time instructor is one who is teaching less than the minimum number of credit or contact hours recognized by the local institution as comprising a full-time teaching load.

Transfer Degree Program--a transfer degree program is one which leads toward transfer to a senior institution for the completion of the bachelor's degree.

Traditional Academic Division--a division whose courses are attended primarily by students in the transfer degree program.

Community College--a community college is a public, two-year, post-secondary institution which offers a two-year general education transfer program, and vocational technical programs leading to occupational entry or re-entry.

Accountability--the term "accountability" refers to both the responsibility of educational administrators to provide the highest possible level of educational experience for the student, and doing so through the most efficient expenditure of educational funds.

In-service Programs--an in-service program is a training program offered by the local institution or an outside agency, usually educational, which the local institution invited to present a specific topic or course. The intention of such programs is to provide an opportunity for the local faculty to update existing skills or acquire new knowledge, skills, or methods.

Orientation Program--an orientation program is one which is designed to acquaint new faculty with such topics as: institutional philosophy and policies, the special needs of community college students, modern teaching methods, learning theory, and evaluation of student performance.

Teaching Methods--teaching methods refers to different techniques of present course materials. Such techniques as lecture, informal group discussion, formal group discussion, debate, seminars, independent study, team teaching, and technological aids to the above are compared for advantages and disadvantages.

Teaching Effectiveness--teaching effectiveness is the degree to which an individual teacher is able to utilize all the characteristics and skills of teaching to attain the highest level of behavioral change for each student.

Location--location is the general service area of each school--i.e., whether the service area population is primarily urban or rural.

Status--status is the teacher's full-time or part-time employment responsibility.

Scope and Method of Study

Since the primary focus of this study was directed toward part-time faculty, institutions who were known to utilize a large number of part-time faculty were selected. Therefore, four such institutions in the Florida community college system with a full-time equivalent student enrollment of 3,000 to 8,000 were selected for the study. These four institutions were selected from the twenty-eight eligible institutions.

Instructors within participating institutions were partitioned into full-time experienced and inexperienced. A table of random numbers was used to select participant faculty from the list of eligible instructors.

The respondents for this study were students enrolled in evening sophomore level academic transfer courses being taught by the instructors included in the study. Each respondent completed the student evaluation of teacher effectiveness questionnaire developed for this study. The controlled survey method was used to administer the study.

The data were collected two weeks after the mid-term point of the term to insure that the respondents had ample time to learn the characteristics of their instructor. The quantitative analysis of the instructors' ratings by students involved machine scoring and calculation of the percentages, means, and standard deviations.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made as a basis for conducting the study:

(1) That community colleges will continue to employ large numbers of part-time faculty, and both community colleges and institutions offering teacher training programs need to develop preservice or inservice programs specifically for part-time faculty;

(2) That there is a distinct difference between academic versus vocational divisions regarding pedagogy;

(3) That a difference exists between the level of instruction provided by full-time teachers and part-time teachers in the classroom, and that the level of instruction currently offered by part-time faculty can be improved as a result of professional teacher education programs emphasizing community college philosophy, special needs of the community college student, and teaching and evaluation methods.

Uses of the Study

The study will:

(1) Provide community college administrators, university teacher training administrators, and

state departments of education with the data necessary to appraise policies regarding the use of part-time instructors;

(2) Demonstrate the need for well-formulated institutional evaluation programs of instructional effectiveness at all levels of education;

(3) Provide community college educators and administrators with data for policy decisions, practices, and the implications of employing part-time faculty to achieve community-based education.

Delimitations

The study was limited to the twenty-eight Florida community colleges. Further, the study was restricted to full-time instructors with four to six years teaching experience, part-time instructors with four to six years teaching experience, full-time teachers with customary formal teacher preparation, but only zero to two years teaching experience, and part-time teachers with neither formal teacher training and only zero to two years teaching experience. The respondents for the study were limited to sophomore level students enrolled in those general academic transfer courses being taught by the above-selected instructors during the spring term of 1975.

In the last half decade the United States has undergone both an economic recession and a reduction in student enrollments. These conditions have resulted in a reduction in the hiring of inexperienced full-time faculty. Since only those institutions who possessed such faculty were eligible to participate in the study, each institution, by design, had to be actively queried rather than randomly selected. Of the four categories comprising the instructor sample, the full-time with zero to two years of experience became the limiting category.

Weaknesses of the Study

The design of the study precludes the generalizability of the findings to instructors and administrations of other community colleges. Before generalizations can be made, each instructor or administrator must determine the degree to which the criteria of the instrument and the parameters of the institutions surveyed match those of his institution.

Significance of the Study

Research related to part-time faculty recruitment, orientation, inservice training, and special needs infers that part-time faculty are less prepared as teachers than full-time faculty. The research also implies that since they are less prepared through formal coursework

in community college philosophy and teaching methods, they are less effective as teachers. This researcher, however, could find no evidence to substantiate this claim. Therefore, this study may represent original information toward the study of the part-time faculty member.

It is, therefore, hoped that this study will provide data which will be beneficial to educational decisionmakers and long-range planners.

The first chapter has identified the problem and set the groundwork for completing the study.

Chapter II contains a review of the research and related literature.

Chapter III presents a detailed description of the design of the study.

The background information concerning the respondents in the study is presented in Chapter IV, and this chapter also presents the findings of the study.

Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The studies of literature and research reported in this chapter were selected from many sources as being applicable and relevant to the problem under investigation. For added credibility, the major portion of literature and research citings are from sources published after 1965. The major areas covered in this review are: (1) the part-time teacher, (2) characteristics of teaching effectiveness, and (3) student evaluation of faculty performance.

The first category describes the special characteristics of the part-time teacher, the preparation needs of the part-time faculty, and problems encountered by the part-time faculty. The second category highlights the characteristics of teacher effectiveness identified by educators, students, and evidence of pedagogical professionalism in teaching. The third area is an in-depth view of the need for evaluation, students as evaluators of faculty, what adequate student ratings should contain,

factors affecting the results of student rating scales, and the use of evaluation instruments in counseling teachers.

Part-Time Faculty

The rapid growth of the community college movement in the last decade resulted in a monumental demand for qualified full-time and part-time instructors. Prospective teachers were sought who were understanding of and sympathetic with the community college philosophy.

Characteristics of the Part-Time Teacher

While the part-time teacher has been used heavily to supplement the staffs of university and evening college programs, few studies have been done regarding his profile, needs, or effectiveness. In many colleges, the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty is almost one to one, and, typically, the majority of part-time faculty teach in the evening division, where they usually outnumber the full-time instructors.[5] The vast majority of part-time faculty are employed in full-time career pursuits and naturally, their first responsibility is to their full-time position.

The part-time teacher has traditionally been recruited from business, industry, health services, public

---

[5]Eileen P. Kuhns, "Part-Time Faculty," Junior College Journal 33 (January 1963): 9.

services, and other institutions of secondary education. That they are expected to perform at the same level of competence as the professionally trained teacher is illustrated by the fact that junior colleges require the same quality and standards for both day and night instruction.[6]

The technical qualifications and the adaptability of the part-time faculty make them a welcomed addition when qualified staff are unable to meet peak enrollments. Educational administrators utilize part-time faculty for three main purposes. First, they use the part-time faculty member until departmental enrollments warrant an additional full-time faculty member. Second, the part-time faculty member is used as a buffer zone, whereby full-time faculty can assume their classes if enrollments fall for a short period of time. And third, part-time faculty can be hired at a lower pay level than an experienced full-time faculty member, thus reducing the per student hour costs of the institution.

In his study of part-time faculty in community colleges of Maryland and Illinois, Gerald Kennedy highlights the profile of the part-time faculty member. His study of 935 part-time faculty illustrates that:

---

[6]Win Kelley and Leslie Wilbur, Teaching in the Community-Junior College (Des Moines: Meredity Corporation, 1970), p. 128.

1. In Illinois 54% and in Maryland 26% of the part-time faculty appointments came from secondary schools.
2. In Maryland 75% of the part-time faculty had master's degrees or advanced work; in Illinois 78%. In Maryland 18% of the part-time faculty held doctorates, but only 4% in Illinois.
3. Junior college administrators preferred to select applicants who had had some previous teaching experience, yet 28% of Illinois and 31% of Maryland's part-time teachers had no previous professional teaching experience, when initially appointed.
4. Typically, the part-time instructor conducted one course (75%), and had a 3 credit hour teaching program per semester (53%).
5. There was no instance in either state where a part-time teacher was teaching in a field in which he had not been academically prepared.[7]

Thus, the part-time teacher characteristically is employed full-time in a professional career, has a minimum of a master's degree, has some experience in teaching, and teaches one course in the technical or academic area for which he is educationally prepared.

Community College Teacher Preparation

The community college is an institution designed to serve the needs of its community. It fills a niche in the educational schema which before its inception, remained unattended. Namely, the community college is an accessible institution that serves young and old, capable and marginal, rich and poor, in a wide array

---

[7]Gerald Kennedy, "Preparation, Utilization, and Acceptance of Part-time Faculty," Junior College Journal 37 (April 1967): 14-15.

of programs. It is the first two years of a college degree, a vocational training center, a retraining center, a community action and cultural center, and a place to acquire knowledge in fields of special interest. Because of the diverse nature of its environment, special preparatory training is needed by the community college faculty.

Gleazer suggests that the community college offering a comprehensive curriculum does need special preparation of its faculty extending beyond academic competence or technical excellence. He further states that "the junior college teacher encounters a wider range of student abilities, motivation, interests, and achievement than is usually found in the lower division of senior colleges and universities with highly selective requirements."[8] For this reason, he suggests that the junior college teacher possess a strong guidance component, academic proficiency, and teaching proficiency.[9]

That academic or technical competence is essential can hardly be questioned, but this is the easiest criteria to measure, and it has long been the measuring stick for teacher selection. Academic prowess, however, is no guarantee of teaching effectiveness. Likewise, while

---

[8]Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "American Association of Junior Colleges Approach--Preparation of Junior College Instructors," Junior College Journal 35 (September 1964): 3.

[9]Ibid.

a prospective teacher can be required to take courses in guidance, there is no assurance that it will make him more sympathetic to students' needs and interests, or that it will help him be a better teacher. The complexity of the human personality makes it difficult to measure.

Probably the most ignored, poorly taught, and difficult to measure criterion of teacher preparation is teaching proficiency. Until recently, the majority of teachers in higher education have not been offered any courses on teaching methods, and those they now have are usually too brief to be really effective. While no one would argue that a teacher becomes more proficient with practice, he should also possess a thorough knowledge of teaching methods. Diekhoff said the following concerning the principles of teaching:

> If teaching is an art which requires no study, no deliberate planned practice, which is based on no principles, and comprises no skills that must be mastered, surely it is unique among the arts. But it is not unique. . . .
>
> We must assume that teachers are born to be made, that an inept teacher can improve his practice of his profession, that a good teacher can become a better teacher, and that the improvement of teaching may be fostered by study, thought, practice, criticism, practice, thought, and study.[10]

The need for improvement in teaching methods, by those within the profession and those now in training, has been voiced by others. Joseph Katz, in his

---

[10]John S. Diekhoff, "Untaught Teachers," Saturday Review, October 15, 1960, p. 90.

contributions to "College and Character," wrote that "the college teacher has probably never once systematically analyzed a single classroom hour to find out how effectively he communicated."[11] F. Robert Paulsen, Dean of the University of Connecticut, wrote "when it comes to different methods of teaching, how many professors really know the advantages of various instructional procedures?"[12] He goes on to comment that many who are most vehemently opposed to learning about techniques of teaching are those who have never bothered to study techniques as a skilled process.[13]

Gordon and Whitfield found in their study that community college staff members felt a sophisticated colleague cannot be prepared in an environment foreign to the kind of institution for which he is training. They proposed that:

> Prospective community college instructors should serve an internship on the scene; furthermore, the internship should be of such length and depth as to produce an understanding of the situation and afford a personal appraisal of whether the prospective instructor and the particular demands of the institution are truly compatible.[14]

---

[11]Charles E. Chapman, "Resharpening the Tools of Instruction," Junior College Journal 37 (October 1966): 34.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Shirley P. Gordon and Raymond P. Whitfield, "A Formula for Teacher Preparation," Junior College Journal 37 (May 1967): 27.

If such internship programs were coordinated with an institution's need to fill a vacancy, it would enable them to get an in-depth look at the human interaction side, the academic proficiency, and the level of teaching proficiency, exhibited by the candidate. A policy such as this would not only assist the student in gaining experience and an understanding of the community college environment, but it would also provide community colleges with a more qualified staff member.

If teaching is to become accountable for its products, it must be based upon a systematic plan which can be evaluated. A program for preparing junior college faculty, which can be accommodated by the existing university and college teacher training programs, was proposed by Arthur Cohen when he wrote the following:

> My rationale for junior college teacher preparation is based upon these premises:
> 1. Teaching is the prime function of the junior college.
> 2. Teaching is, itself, the process of influencing learning.
> 3. Learning is changed ability or tendency to act in particular ways.
> 4. Operationally, both teaching and learning may be assumed to have occurred only when observable changes are demonstrated by the learner.
> 5. Change may be observed only if there has been determination of students' abilities prior to instruction.
> 6. Specific measurable objectives must be set so that learning may be appropriately guided.[15]

---

[15]Arthur M. Cohen, "Teacher Preparation: Rationale and Practice," Junior College Journal 37 (May 1967): 21-25.

It becomes apparent that teacher preparation programs should emphasize the whole teacher. No longer is academic excellence and a course in community college philosophy sufficient. Future programs for teacher preparation should also weigh heavily the need for training in community college student personalities and needs, desirable teacher personalities, learning theory, teaching methods including the advantages of each method, a sophisticated practical course in developing behavioral objectives and evaluation techniques for instruction, community college philosophy, and an internship service to provide the prospective teacher with the opportunity to practice his skills. To expect less of a newly trained teacher is to perpetuate the shortcomings of the past, and to allow our resident faculties to continue without professional teacher training is less than professional.

Preparation Needs of Part-Time Faculty

The standards for hiring the part-time faculty member are similar to those for the full-time faculty. Like the full-time faculty, the main criteria for selection is the prospective faculty member's academic competence. Moreover, the standards against which his performance is judged are those established for the institution's full-time faculty. Thus, it is implied that he will be able to perform at the same level of

teaching competence as a professionally trained teacher with comparable teaching experience. Unfortunately, there is no research data to arrest this assumption. Educators must assume that the courses comprising college and university teacher training programs, preservice programs, and inservice programs have been developed through careful research, and that participation in such programs better prepares one for the responsibilities of teaching. While the research does not indicate what percentage of part-time teachers are certified in community college philosophy or teaching-learning methods, it does reflect a prominent lack of preparatory programs for the part-time faculty member.

Kennedy's study of nineteen Illinois and twelve Maryland public junior colleges revealed that only two institutions in each state had any identifiable orientation program for new part-time instructors. He further emphasized that of the remaining colleges, where some form of orientation was attempted, it invariably consisted of a short discussion of administrative and academic regulations by a member of the administrative staff.[16]

Gowin and Daigneault's study of the part-time college teacher perpetuates the lack of part-time faculty

---

[16]Kennedy, p. 15.

preparation. They reported that only eighteen of thirty-six institutions reported any kind of pre-service preparation for part-time faculty and that

> . . . the typical pattern of these 18 was a conference with the department head, or dean, or director of the evening division concerning college routines and student relations. Even fewer reported any kind of inservice program for part-time faculty, 12 of 36.[17]

The part-time faculty member is aware of his lack of teaching skills. In a study of Michigan community colleges, Messerschmidt found that part-time and full-time vocational-technical instructors, when asked to list their inservice needs, requested that teaching methodology, exam preparation, item writing, lesson plan preparation, and the philosophy of the community college be included in their inservice education program.[18]

Most colleges claim to have some form of orientation or inservice training programs, but the effectiveness of these programs is not known. Typically, says Monroe, inservice programs "include orientation sessions prior to the opening of a school term, weekend seminars, lectures by outstanding educators, and university

---

[17]D. B. Gowin and George H. Daigneault, The Part-Time College Teacher (Chicago: The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961), pp. 7-8.

[18]Dale Harvey Messerschmidt, "A Study of Part-Time Instructors in Vocational-Technical Education Among Community Colleges in Michigan" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967).

extension courses in the college campus."[19] Even when institutions have well-planned inservice programs, part-time faculty may not be invited to take part, or their regular employment may prevent them from taking part. In order to insure a high level of teaching competence in our evening colleges, community college administrators should design inclusive inservice programs either specifically for part-time faculty, or accessible to them.

Problems Encountered

While the part-time faculty are an essential part of the community college system, they are not without their problems, and the institution is not without its problems as a result of the part-time faculty.

Schmidt found in his study of "The Problems of Part-time Industrial and Technical Instructors," from interviews with twenty-one instructors in eleven Michigan community colleges, that their major problems were the following:

1. Lack of materials such as course outlines, plans, and faculty handbook, which should be furnished upon appointment.
2. Self-evaluation of one's effectiveness as a teacher.
3. Adapting instruction to individual differences.
4. Determining the various competencies required of graduates in one's subject area.

---

[19]Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972), p. 284.

5. Keeping abreast of current ideas and trends in one's occupational area.
6. Developing satisfactory tests and examinations.[20]

Siehr reported the problems of 2,783 new faculty members in 429 community colleges in 50 states.[21] While his study dealt with new full-time faculty, six of the nine most common problems appear to be applicable to part-time faculty and similar to Schmidt's findings. They are:

1. Lack of time for scholarly study.
2. Adapting instruction to individual differences.
3. Dealing with students who require special attention to overcome deficiencies.
4. Challenging superior students.
5. Obtaining needed instructional materials.
6. Grading and marking students' work.[22]

If these qualities are problems for new full-time faculty, who hopefully are professionally trained teachers, then it is difficult to imagine how severe a problem they must pose for new part-time faculty, who in many cases are not prepared professionally as a teacher.

Administrators of community colleges employing part-time faculty also have their problems. Kuhns says that "occasionally a part-time faculty member will feel

---

[20]Carlos R. Schmidt, "A Study of the Problems of Part-Time Industrial and Technical Instructors in Selected Michigan Community Colleges" (Ph.D. dissertation, 1971).

[21]Hugo Emil Siehr, "Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges" (Ph.D. dissertation, 1962).

[22]Ibid.

that administrative deadlines (for such things as mid-term or final grades) are meant for others, but not him, and by his tardiness will hold up the registrar's orderly process for hours or days."[23]

Robert E. Horton, Dean of Educational Services at Los Angeles City College, was quoted by Kuhns as saying that part-time teachers are not on campus frequently enough to become fully identified with the college, and, because of the full-time employment, communication with them is very difficult."[24]

Teachers lacking professional education courses in teaching methods and the community college student can cause other problems as well. Often they lack the required knowledge in the areas of techniques and the appraisal of student abilities and needs. Hiring professionals with graduate training may result in the level of instruction being pitched too high, ~~while high~~, while hiring part-time faculty from secondary education results in instruction being pitched too low.

Gowin and Daigneault wrote:

> It has been my experience that the average part-time person, when compared to the professional teacher, is not so skilled a teacher, not so devoted to his work, is not well informed regarding the workings of the university, is

---

[23]Ibid.

[24]Kuhns, p. 10.

> an easy grader, cannot spare much time, if any, working with students outside of class, etc. My point is that we cannot expect the average part-time faculty to perform as well as the full-time faculty.[25]

These findings suggest that community college administrators, even though they profess to offer equal levels of instruction for day and evening programs, are not living up to their responsibility. Many of these apparent problems could be resolved through joint planning of preservice and inservice programs by the administration and representatives of the part-time faculty. Such planning will both increase the guarantees of more effective classroom teaching and improve the educational climate of the institution. Vairo and many other educators believe that "since it is in the classroom, under the guidance and leadership of the teacher, that the minds of American students are developed, the qualifications of the teacher are of paramount importance."[26] Community college administrators, faced with the continued use of part-time faculty, shoulder the responsibility of clarifying to their public that the qualifications of their part-time faculty are the highest possible. And in addition, that their practices of recruiting,

---

[25]Gowin and Daigneault, p. 3.

[26]Philip D. Vairo, "Faculty Quality: A Challenge to the Community College," Journal of Higher Education 36 (April 1965): 217.

orienting, and training part-time faculty are consistent with demonstrated needs and methods.

A composite program for part-time faculty preparation, according to various articles of research, might include the following:

(1) Preparation of a part-time faculty handbook to be used as a supplement to the full-time faculty handbook;

(2) Creation of a part-time faculty-administrative planning committee;

(3) The administration of a needs-analysis study to determine the problems and deficiencies of new and returning part-time faculty;

(4) Joint planning of a part-time faculty orientation seminar;

(5) Joint planning of an inservice training program for part-time faculty;

(6) Scheduling of a number of department meetings at times when part-time faculty can attend.

While such a program might appear ideal in theory, one must face reality. The plight of the part-time faculty member is a result of both a lack of commitment by institutional administration and a lack of support services for the evening program. Before such a

program, as outlined above, could be initiated in full, both of these criteria would have to be secured.

A recent California study identified eight major areas where evening instructional programs received fewer support services than day instructional programs. They were:

1. general administrative services
2. office facilities
3. faculty orientation
4. curriculum and instructional support, i.e., supervision, evaluation, course outlines, etc.
5. counseling, guidance, and student testing
6. library services
7. teaching aids
8. compensation of instructors[27]

In defense of the evening administrations, who are normally responsible for the part-time faculty, the part-time faculty dilemma is not simply the problem of an administrative arm; it is an institutional problem. With the lack of institutional commitment and support services, it is commendable that evening administrators and the part-time faculty have accomplished so much.

Teaching Effectiveness

The thesis that the community college teacher should represent teaching excellence is not a new one. O'Banion notes that in 1931, Eells stated that "the community-junior college has little or no excuse for

---

[27]Kenneth R. Evans, "Evening Services of Junior Colleges," Junior College Research Review 4 (March 1970): 74-75.

existence if it does not place prime emphasis on superior teaching, superior instructors, and superior methods of instruction."[28] This idea was reinforced in 1960 by Thornton when he agreed that "either the community-junior college teaches excellently or it fails completely."[29] Other community college spokesmen, like Evans in 1970, have continued to stress the importance of qualified staff and teaching excellence, to build the curriculum, and to attract and retain good students.[30]

Teaching excellence is a very complex concept. Moreover, it is compounded because, in many respects, educators have not reached concensus as to a definition of teaching, whether it is an art or a science, what makes a teacher excellent, or the relative importance of various teaching methods. There does, however, appear to be agreement that teaching includes many variables and that teaching is much more than subject area competence.

James Laurits defines teaching as "the process by which changes in behavior are effected in an individual."[31] This definition was chosen both because of

---

[28]Terry O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community Junior College (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1972), p. 52.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid., p. 53.

[31]The Evaluation of Teaching, A Report of the Second Pi Lambda Theta Catena, Pi Lambda Theta (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 32.

its simplicity and its quasineutrality. It is assumed that, whether art or science, teaching is a process. A teacher in either case must organize, present, and evaluate. Also, it is further assumed that for both, the end product of teaching is to effect (through newly implanted knowledge) a change of behavior in the individual student. By comparing the explanations of teaching as an art and as a science, further common variables are revealed. Win Kelley and Leslie Wilbur maintain that superior teaching at any level of education is an art and go further by citing the following from Kegel:

> The teacher is both mirror and lamp. Knowledge of subject matter, of media and techniques is not enough. Art uses this knowledge as a means of creative communication, the creativity being the unique addition of the artists; the manner in which the artist uses the variety of materials and techniques that affect the behavior of his audience and establish his art form or style. His imagination and personality combine with the means of teaching to determine his effectiveness as a teacher.[32]

Speaking about the science of teaching, Diekhoff says "there is a theoretical base in philosophy, psychology, history, and sociology that may be learned by study. There is a body of skills that may be learned by practice."[33]

---

[32]Win Kelley and Leslie Wilbur, Teaching in the Community-Junior College (Des Moines: Meredith Corp., 1970), p. 136.

[33]John S. Diekhoff, "Untaught Teachers," Saturday Review 8 (October 15, 1960): 90.

Therefore, whether art or science, educators agree that certain variables such as knowledge of subject matter, communications skills, personality, materials, and techniques contribute to the level of teacher effectiveness. The argument, therefore, is not whether these variables are ingredients of teaching effectiveness, but whether they can be accurately measured, and to what degree is their importance.

Characteristics of Excellent Teachers

Probably one of the most extensively researches areas of education is the characteristics of teaching effectiveness. For the purpose of clarity, we are addressing ourselves to those characteristics which are believed to enhance student achievement. Listed below is a composite outline of those characteristics and skills recorded by seven writers as essential elements of teacher effectiveness:

(1) Personal characteristics

(2) Faculty-student interaction styles

(3) Professional knowledge (discipline competence)

(4) Organization of materials (objectives)

(5) Presentation of materials (techniques, methods)

(6) Evaluation of student outcomes

(7) Institutional teaching climate

It is interesting to note that no one writer included all seven categories in his remarks about teaching effectiveness. Also, a great amount of material deals with the personal attributes of the teacher. A topical outline by the author is presented in Appendix A, where the recurring tendency to illuminate the person as the teacher becomes apparent. National rating scales, on the other hand, manifest the need for judging the total makeup of the teacher, as indicated in Appendix B.

Attempts at predicting and measuring teacher effectiveness are in many instances the conveyance of opinions. There is little evidence of a research base which permits the prediction of those traits which are closely associated with teacher competence. One document which approaches the subject from a research orientation is the American Association of School Administrators report. It analyzes studies dealing with the traits of intelligence, age and experience, professional knowledge, cultural background, socio-economic background, teaching attitudes and interests, and voice and speech characteristics. Their findings were as follows:

1. Intelligence--there appears to be only a slight relationship between intelligence and the rated

success of the instructor, and that it is of little value as a single predicator.

2. Subject Matter--findings simply do not support this assumption.

3. Scholarship--not essential to teaching competence.

4. Professional Knowledge--there is some evidence that teachers who have more professional knowledge make better teachers, but the evidence is not as strong as might be expected.

5. Age and Experience--teacher's rated effectiveness at first increases rather rapidly with experience, then levels off at five years or beyond.

6. Cultural Background--no substantial evidence of differences in effectiveness.

7. Socio-economic Status--rated low by Sims Socio-Economic Scales.

8. Men and Women Teachers--no particular difference has been shown.

9. Marital Status--no evidence of a significant difference.

10. Aptitude for Teaching--data fails to establish the existence of any specified aptitude for teaching.

11. Attitude Toward Teachers and Teaching--the Yeager Scale seems to bear a small but positive relationship to teacher success measured in terms of pupil gain.

12. Voice Quality--not considered very important.[34]

The most revealing aspect of this study is that the major categories of subject matter, scholarship, professional knowledge, and age with experience were less than significant as contributors of teaching success. These are, after all, among the most highly acclaimed traits of the profession.

Since there are apparently no guarantees of what enhances teacher effectiveness, perhaps Richard Morton's comments regarding the improvement of teaching through improving the institutional climate for teaching can eliminate some of the complicating variables. Morton suggests that one of the best ways to improve teaching is to improve the campus, student-faculty, and faculty-administration relationships; let the teacher know he counts and that he is wanted; build an atmosphere of cooperation and "espre de corps." He continues to say that "if you want to increase the guarantees of more effective teaching, then increase the chances that the

---

[34]American Association of School Administrators, Department of Classroom Teachers of the N.E.A., National School Boards Association, Who's a Good Teacher (Washington: 1961), pp. 22-26.

instructor who goes into the classroom will be one whose personal, domestic, community, and classroom relationships are smooth and well defined, and who is given reason to be cheerful and hopeful, as well as inducements to make his subject as important as he possibly can."[35] This may be a big pill for administrators to swallow during a time when state monies are being guarded, enrollments are dropping, layoffs are imminent, and adversary relationships are mounting. Nevertheless, the rewards to our clientele, the student, are worth the effort.

Evaluation Programs

If educators wish to insure the best possible education for our students, the need for evaluation of teaching effectiveness is paramount. Further, educators must realize the positive merits of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness and take the initiative in the development of comprehensive evaluation programs.

> The need to evaluate teaching is imperative if we are to effectively change teaching and improve learning. . . . Also, as we move more and more into programs of team teaching and into developing instructional programs calling for staff differentiation, we must evaluate staff in order to

---

[35]Richard K. Morton, "Personal Backgrounds of Effective Teaching," Improving College and University Teaching 8 (Autumn 1960): 137.

> determine those persons suited for differentiated roles. Finally, we simply need a check on ourselves to see how well we are doing.[36]

Simply, evaluation is defined as "the process of ascertaining or judging the value of something by careful appraisal."[37] This appraisal may be informal, in which case it is based primarily upon supervisory opinion. Or, it may be formal, and include such stages as ratings by peers, students and administrators, observations by peers and supervisors, and conferences with supervisors which include written reports and recommendations. Sample criteria for classroom teaching effectiveness appraisals are often cited as student achievement, the level of student behavioral change, personality traits, and skills of teachers, and student, peer, supervisory, and administrative opinions of teaching effectiveness. Still another concept is that an even better indicator of effective teaching is to appraise the functioning level of the whole school.[38]

---

[36]Elmer G. Ellis and Lutian R. Wooton, "Valid Evaluation of Teaching Is Imperative," Kappa Delta Pi Record 7 (April 1970): 139.

[37]Delmer Goode, "The Centrality of Evaluation," Improving College and University Teaching 7 (Winter 1960): 16.

[38]The Evaluation of Teaching, A Report of the Second Pi Lambda Theta Cotena, Pi Lambda Theta (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. xi.

Even with a comprehensive evaluation program, the resulting data are, in the end, subject to human judgment. So many variables are associated with teaching effectiveness that the results in most cases are less than conclusive. Just as teachers teach in different ways and possess different skills, so do students learn in different ways and possess different abilities. Thus, through the complexity, and in the face of a diverse number of criteria and varying abilities of both student and teacher alike, educators must attempt to construct an evaluation system whose results indicate a number of factors which reflect successful teaching.

Teacher Opposition to Evaluation

Even under optimum conditions, teacher ratings have received open criticism. Student governments bargain for student evaluation programs while claiming that they, being the direct recipients of instruction, are the most qualified to judge teaching effectiveness. College administrations, often with a mandate from state officials or boards of trustees, have, with or without the support of their teaching faculties, developed appraisal systems to measure teaching effectiveness at their respective institutions. A minority among teaching faculties have themselves, in many cases, voiced the strongest opposition to teaching effectiveness appraisals. They ask what a student knows of the

complexities of teaching methods, of scholarly competencies, and of their degree of professional preparedness. They scorn their administration for their lack of involvement in the creation of appraisal systems, for the frequent linking of a merit system with the appraisal system, and for viewing the results of the total appraisal as a single neutralizing mathematical average. "After all," says Ernest House,

> . . . what does a teacher have to gain from having his work examined? As he sees it, absolutely nothing. He is exposing himself to administrators and parents. He risks damage to his ego by finding out he is not doing his job as well as he thinks he is. Perhaps worst of all, he risks discovering that his students do not really care for him--something a teacher would rather not know. Since there are no punishments for not exposing one's behavior and many dangers in so doing, the prudent teacher gives lip service to the idea and drags both feet.[39]

Variables Affecting the Results of Teacher Ratings by Students

Historically, a multitude of factors have been designated as variables which interfere with the validity of results arising from student rating plans. A number of studies in the past ten years have both refuted and endorsed findings of the past.

Richard Miller, in addressing a number of these variables in his book, Developing Programs for Faculty

---

[39]Ernest R. House, ed., School Evaluation: The Politics and Process (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973), p. 126.

Evaluation, stated that no significant relationship exists between course grades, achievement, gradepoint average; teachers cannot be differentiated on the basis of personality; no significant difference exists between the sex of the student rater or that of the teacher; and whether the course is required or elective is of little consequence. Miller felt that the data on the other variables, however, are more complicated and less conclusive. In speaking of the class level of the student rater as a complicating variable, Miller cited a number of related studies. Echert and Keller (1954) and Miller (1972) concluded that seniors and graduate students rated courses higher than undergraduates. Gage (1961) found that teachers of low-level courses were rated lower than teachers of upper-level courses. Bendig (1952) found that upperclassmen were more unfavorable in their opinions than lower classmen. However, Delchen (1940) and Hildebrand (1971) found little difference in student ratings at various grade levels. The effects of the teacher's rank, age and experience upon the student rater are also uncertain, according to Miller. Among the studies he used to illustrate this issue were Bowie (1952) who found no difference in student ratings between the under and over 40 age group, Guthrie (1954) found no relationship between experience and teaching effectiveness; and Centra (1972) who stated that the more

experienced teachers were rated no better than those in their first and second years of teaching. Results of the class size variable were also mixed. Guthrie (1954) found little relationship between the size of the class and the rating given. Goodhartz found that in classes with fewer than twenty students, the ratings were not always high. Gage (1961) and Miller (1972) agreed that the student's personal view about the effectiveness of small classes affected the results. Finally, Eckert and Keller (1954) found that ratings in early morning courses were lower than those for mid-day courses.[40]

Another variable which Miller isolates in his search is the procedure for administering the student rating form. He cites studies by Kirchner (1969) who found that student ratings were significantly higher when the instructor was in the room, and Colliver (1972) who found that students who do not sign the rating forms give significantly lower ratings.[41]

In contrast to Miller's "no significant difference" view on the students' sex as a complicating variable,

---

[40]Richard I. Miller, Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974), pp. 61-65.

[41]Ibid., p. 35.

Richard K. Morton provides a very convincing argument for the affirmative. Morton sees the

> . . . man as more strongly conscious of economic values and employment needs--he wants to get right to the business and have it over with; he wants clear and direct assignments. He wants an instructor who moves surely and vigorously. The woman, on the other hand, wants a neat and orderly presentation which is done in an enjoyable manner by a pleasing personality and by an individual who remembers the needs she has for relating what she learns to her daily life. She is more conscious of life goals than purely intellectual or vocational goals.[42]

The Need for Student Ratings in View of Faculty Opposition

The initiation of an evaluation program does not always carry the blessings of the faculty. There is usually a minority who oppose student ratings and the philosophy of evaluations, per se. They argue that evaluation programs are too complex to provide meaningful results, that the results are not used for the purpose for which they were created, and that the students are too immature to answer the highly technical questions appearing on most student rating forms.

Opposition or not, the instance of student ratings is on the increase. The decisions on recent court cases, the public, and the students demand that faculty be evaluated. Hoffman indicates why the evaluation programs

---

[42]Richard K. Morton, "Students' Views of Teaching," Improving College and University Teaching 13 (Summer 1965): 141.

are in such demand by referring to "The Editors Uneasy Chair," ICUT, Vol. 7, No. 1, Winter, 1959, from which he states that

> . . . professors cheat students too. They arrive at their classes without preparation, repeat or skip topics without realizing it, indulge in extended discourse on irrelevant matters, waste class time in incredible ways. Excessively involved in personal research or community interests, they teach without plan or schedule, run out of time each day and each term, ask test questions on things that have not really been taught, tolerate disorder, demoralize students by their inefficiency, and cancel classes without warning or without arranging makeup time.[43]

Although Hoffman's illustration represents the atypical faculty member or a minority of the faculty, it may more nearly reflect a minority public view of the college teacher. How do you explain to a prejudiced ear that your workload is nine hours a week while his is forty? One way educators can eliminate a measure of this unpopular public opinion is through evaluation itself. As Paul Dressel states, in addition to competence in one's discipline, we need

> . . . insight into the effect of one's instructional practices in promoting both the quantity and quality of student learning. Only by systematic study of student learning--by evaluation--

---

[43]Randall W. Hoffmann, "Students Portray the Excellent Teacher," Improving College and University Teaching 2 (Winter 1963): 21-24.

> can the teacher know his effectiveness and make such judgments as promise to increase it.[44]

As students have the opportunity to evaluate instructors and feel that their comments are used for the improvement of the educational system, their opinion of education will improve. Also, as faculty learn to use student feedback to improve their instruction, and not to view student evaluations as a threat, their relations with students should improve. Dressel states that two points should be kept in mind as an educator collects and uses student evaluations:

> First, student reactions are but indirect evidence of effectiveness, though they may point up factors which impede effectiveness. Second, students should be asked to evaluate a course or a teacher in such a way as to keep in evidence that the students share responsibility with the teacher for the effectiveness of the course.[45]

Just as there are varying opinions about the concept of evaluation, there are also varying opinions on the use of students as evaluators. J. T. Hastings feels that students are well qualified as evaluators. He states that "students can be an excellent source of data about perceptions of structure, relevance of material presented, adequacy of reference material, and tests." Hastings goes on to say that students' expectations for a given

---

[44]Paul L. Dressel, "Teaching, Learning, and Evaluation," Improving College and University Teaching 8 (Winter 1960): 11.

[45]Ibid., p. 15.

course or program are often revealed in the data.[46] As strongly as Hastings has praised the use of student evaluations, others have adamantly opposed them. The American Association of School Administrators suggests that "there is very little research evidence suggesting that student ratings contribute to instructor improvement or could be used to improve supervisory ratings."[47]

While the philosophy and worth of evaluation systems is far from decided, they are being used and will continue to be used. Since any evaluation results in a judgment, the question is, do we make that judgment with or without factual data to substantiate that judgment? Today's educators or administrators cannot risk intuitive judgment, for they are too often called to task.

---

[46]Ernest R. House, ed., School Evaluation: The Politics and Process (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973), p. 144.

[47]American Association of School Administrators, Department of Classroom Teachers of the N.E.A., National School Boards Association, Who's A Good Teacher (Washington: 1961), p. 33.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The present study was designed to determine the differences in teaching effectiveness among part-time and full-time faculty with reference to: (1) personality characteristics, (2) faculty-student interaction, (3) technical and professional skill, and (4) organization and evaluation. The determination of the levels of teaching effectiveness was made through the use of a self-designed and pilot-tested student rating instrument.

The procedures and methodology used to identify and analyze the problem will be presented in this chapter. Specifically, the procedures for selecting and identifying the sample, methods of collecting the data, the description of the instrument, and the treatment of the data will be discussed.

Sampling

Institution Sample

Since the primary focus of this study was directed toward part-time faculty, institutions who were most

likely to utilize a large number of part-time faculty were selected. Hence, those Florida Community Colleges with an opening fall 1975 enrollment by credit student headcount of 3,000 to 8,000 were selected for the study (Table 3). By design, this eliminates those institutions with both the least and the greatest numbers of students. It was assumed that those with the least number of full-time equivalent students would have a low instance of part-time faculty. And, those with the greatest number of full-time equivalent students, while they probably employ a large number of part-time faculty, may not represent the typical state institution. In addition, the study was further restricted to include those full-time and part-time faculty teaching only those academic courses which lead to the Associate of Arts or transfer degree. This limitation was prescribed in order to eliminate complicating factors such as dealing with academic, vocational, and noncredit faculty, and students enrolled in academic, vocational, and noncredit, occupational or avocational courses. With these restrictions established, the researcher utilized the 1975 Florida Public Community College table of opening fall enrollments to select those institutions with enrollments of 3,000 to 8,000. The enrollment statistics revealed that nine institutions were eligible to participate in the study (Table 3).

TABLE 3

OPENING FALL ENROLLMENTS--CREDIT HEADCOUNTS
FALL 1975

College	1975-76 Enrollment
Brevard	8,816
Broward	13,706
Central Florida	2,089
Chipola*	1,086
Daytona Beach*	3,952
Edison*	3,154
Florida J.C. at Jacksonville	13,110
Florida Keys	1,301
Gulf Coast	2,871
Hillsborough*	10,433
Indian River*	3,791
Lake City	2,410
Lake-Sumter	1,670
Manatee*	4,137
Miami-Dade	37,669
North Florida	885
Okaloosa-Walton	2,634
Palm Beach*	7,946
Pasco-Hernando	2,214
Pensacola	8,124
Polk*	4,305
St. John's River	1,388
St. Petersburg	12,492
Santa Fe*	5,922
Seminole*	3,423
South Florida	656
Tallahassee	2,884
Valencia*	6,721

*Institutions with 3,000 to 8,000 credit student headcount enrollment in the fall of 1975.

The researcher then calculated the time and cost necessary to administer the instrument and decided that four institutions would be the maximum number possible. The sampling procedure used to select the four institutions involved placing the individual names of the nine eligible institutions in a container and drawing them out, one at a time. Initially, five institutions acknowledged their willingness to participate, but one later withdrew because of an unusually large number of solicitations for research assistance. Administrative directors at the four identified institutions were then mailed a synopsis of the study, with an attached checklist. The checklist outlined those steps of the study which the participating institution would be asked to perform (Appendix C).

Teacher Sample

The four institutions which agreed to participate in the study were asked to categorize all eligible instructors into: (1) full-time with 4-6 years of teaching experience, (2) part-time with 4-6 years of teaching, (3) full-time with 0-2 years of teaching experience, and (4) part-time with 0-2 years of teaching experience. Initial eligibility of the teachers within the four categories was requested from the administrator(s) responsible for full-time and part-time credit faculty.

The assignment to categories was based upon the information contained in their personnel vitae.

The administrators were instructed to provide all eligible instructors with an introductory letter and synopsis of the study and asked if they were willing to participate. Those who indicated a willingness to participate were then, according to their status and experience, placed into one of the categories. Following the assignment to categories, an equal number of faculty representing each of the four cells were randomly chosen for each participating institution.

Student Sample

The respondents for this study were students enrolled in evening academic transfer courses being taught by the instructors included in the study. The students responded to the student evaluation of teacher effectiveness questionnaire designed for this study (Appendix D).

Methods of Collecting Data

After eligible instructors had been identified, schedules for the administration of the student evaluation form were prepared for each participating institution. The data were collected two weeks after the midterm point of the term to insure that the respondents had ample time to learn the characteristics of their instructors. Likewise, by administering the research

instrument prior to the end of the term, conflicts with existing institutional student rating of teaching effectiveness programs were eliminated.

Extreme care was taken to conform the program to the wishes of the participating instructors. The researcher entered the classroom at the time prearranged with the instructor. To eliminate anxiety on the part of the students, the instructor, as had been arranged previously, agreed to leave the room. Following the instructor's departure, the instruments were distributed to the respondents, and the instructions on the cover sheet were read. Each student was asked to participate and answer as honestly as possible. The class was further informed that the survey is not an institutional evaluation form, that it would not be traceable to the instructor or the institution, and since the results were for research purposes only, it in no way posed a threat to their instructor or themselves. Further, students were informed that they could elect not to participate. When all instruments had been completed and returned to the researcher, they were placed in a sealed envelope, coded for status and experience levels, and removed by the researcher.

Description of the Instrument

The instrument was developed according to (a) the ten criteria of teaching effectiveness most often mentioned by students (Appendix E), and (b) questions believed to

measure these criteria as derived from a number of nationally accepted and validated student evaluation forms (Appendix B). The students' response to the items of the instrument was on a seven-point scale. This scale represented a modification of the five-point scale, to include an absolute high and an absolute low. It was hoped that the addition of the absolute category would encourage the students to be more realistic in their responses. That is, if it is true that students would tend to respond either above or below the average, this modification would, by design, move their scores nearer the average.

The student instrument was developed according to six domains: instructional procedures, course objectives, course demands, evaluation procedures, personal characteristics, and the degree of student-faculty interaction. Related categories were combined to form the four categories which comprised the final student rating instrument of teaching effectiveness. The four final categories were: (1) Personality Characteristics, (2) Student-Faculty Interaction, (3) Technical and Professional Skills, and (4) Evaluation and Organization. These categories represent major areas of teaching effectiveness as voiced by both students and evaluation researchers.

Measures

Since the instrument was developed specifically for this study, the researcher felt it was imperative that the reliability of the instrument be established. To test the reliability of the instrument, a pilot group of students completed the rating form with a comments supplement added. Questions posing problems or comments illustrating ambiguity were rewritten to eliminate such errors. Since the reliabilities derived from the pilot study were acceptable, no questions on the student rating instrument were added, deleted or reordered. There were, however, several changes in the wording of items. These changes were made as a result of the pilot respondents' suggestions on the comment supplement for the pilot study instrument.

Reliability of Instrument

The reliabilities were determined through the use of Hoyt's analysis of variance procedure for estimating item homogeneity reliability. The reliabilities derived from the pilot study are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

RELIABILITIES, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS RESULTING FROM THE ANALYSIS OF THE PILOT STUDY DATA

Scale	Reliability	Mean	Std. Dev.
Personality Characteristics	.88	28.88	7.46
Faculty-Student Interaction	.77	37.50	7.59
Technical & Professional Skills	.89	40.95	8.73
Organization & Evaluation	.89	36.19	9.15

Since the pilot study was conducted in Michigan and the major study was conducted in Florida, it was felt that an additional test of reliability should be performed for the major study. The reliabilities resulting from the major study are presented in Table 5.

Even though both sets of reliabilities are within acceptable limits, the reliabilities for the major study are higher than those derived from the pilot study. This indicates that the Michigan students, the pilot sample, and the Florida students, the respondents for the major study, were responding to the questions in the same way. The higher reliabilities of the major study may, also, have resulted from the greater number of respondents.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficients illustrate a high degree of relationship in student response over the five dependent variables (Table 6).

A test of correlation across five scales which results in scales that intercorrelate the lowest at .91 indicates a general halo effect. That is, the scales are measuring the same thing; likewise, the respondents are not differentiating between the scales. These data can also be viewed as generalized consumer satisfaction with the teacher according to the five categories of teacher behaviors.

TABLE 5

RELIABILITIES RESULTING FROM MAJOR STUDY OF STUDENT RESPONSES

Status	Experience in Years: 0 - 2 Part-Time N = 159	0 - 2 Full-Time N = 195	4 - 6 Part-Time N = 198	4 - 6 Full-Time N = 207	All Students Combined N = 759
All 40 Items	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.98
Personality	0.95	0.95	0.91	0.89	0.93
Faculty-Stu. Interaction	0.95	0.95	0.93	0.92	0.94
Teaching Methods	0.95	0.96	0.93	0.92	0.94
Organiz./ Evaluation	0.96	0.95	0.94	0.93	0.94

TABLE 6

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN DEPENDENT VARIABLES

	Personality	Interaction	Skills	Organization	Total Qualities
Personality		.96	.96	.94	.94
Interaction			.96	.94	.92
Skills				.95	.95
Organization					.91

Treatment of the Data

Hypotheses Tested

Hypothesis 1:

There will be no significant difference between the level of teaching effectiveness as reflected by composite student ratings of full-time and part-time faculty.

Hypothesis 2:

There will be no significant difference between the composite student ratings of faculty with little teaching experience and those with considerable experience.

Hypothesis 3:

There will be no significant interaction between status (full-time or part-time) and experience.

Hypothesis 4:

The location of the school (urban vs. rural) will create no significant difference in the scores.

Hypothesis 5:

There will be no significant interaction between the teachers' experience level and the location of the school.

Hypothesis 6:

There will be no significant interaction between the teachers' status and the location of the school.

Hypothesis 7:

There will be no significant interaction between experience, status, and school location.

Method of Testing Hypotheses

The hypotheses were developed around groups of teacher behaviors and teacher-school conditions. Each of these groups provided item means and group means. Therefore, a method of testing differences among all the means at the same time was needed. Analysis of variance and the corresponding test of significance based upon the F distribution was chosen as the statistical method to accomplish these tests. This study used the .05 alpha level for acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses.

The response data contained in the student rating of teaching effectiveness instruments were transferred to key-punch cards at the Michigan State University Educational Research Consultation Office.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 6.0 was used to obtain reliabilities and Pearson's Product-Moment Correlations. The Fortran Program for Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Covariance (FINN) version 4 was used to test the major hypotheses. The data were processed by a CDC 6500 computer.

Summary and Overview

Through the use of a self-designed and pilot-tested student rating instrument, part-time and full-time instructors with experience levels of from zero to two years and four to six years were rated for

instructional effectiveness by their students. The instrument was designed to indicate where students felt instructors varied in the evidence and dispensation of: (1) personal characteristics, (2) faculty-student interaction, (3) technical and professional skills, and (4) organization and evaluation. The nine Florida community colleges with a 1975 opening fall headcount enrollment of between 3,000 and 8,000 were selected as representative of the typical community college in terms of size and employment practices. In addition, the study was further restricted to those full-time and part-time faculty teaching in the Associate of Arts or transfer degree program. The respondents for this study were students enrolled in the evening academic transfer courses being taught by the instructors included in the study.

The student rating scales were administered by the researcher at the times requested by the instructors. The instructors were not present during the ratings of teaching effectiveness; and to reduce the anxiety of the respondents, they were informed that this study was for research purposes only, and not a threat to their instructors or themselves. The data were collected two weeks after the midpoint of the term to insure that the respondents had ample time to learn the characteristics of their instructors. The data were analyzed

by the use of univariate and multivariate analysis of variance, and Pearson Product Moment correlation.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

Background Information Concerning the Respondents Who Participated in the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there was a significant difference in the levels of teaching effectiveness between full-time and part-time faculty. It was assumed that (1) a student rating instrument of teaching effectiveness would illustrate any such dichotomy, (2) that students are valid raters of teaching effectiveness, and (3) that students are in the most unbiased position to judge teaching effectiveness.

The 759 student respondents who participated in the study were enrolled in four Florida community colleges. The forty-four faculty members who participated were equally divided into the four cells of the study.

The study was further defined by segregating the participating institutions into rural or urban. This determination was made by examining both the location of each college and the community which it serves. It was determined that two of the participating institutions

were urban and two were rural. The matrix resulting from these independent variables is illustrated in Table 9 (Appendix F).

The forty-item instrument to which the students responded was composed of randomly ordered items dealing with the dependent variables of personality, student-faculty interaction, teaching methods, classroom organization, and Item 40, which was ranking this instructor according to all previous instructors the student had studied under.

Table 9 (Appendix F) shows a variable by variable listing by mean and standard deviation for each of the forty-four teachers. The total mean and standard deviation were derived by adding the means and standard deviations across the five independent variables.

Hypotheses Tested

This section is devoted to the presentation of the data resulting from the analysis in relation to the stated hypotheses. The data were analyzed by multivariate and univariate analysis of variance over four dependent variables. The analysis of the data is presented in the order in which the hypotheses appear in Chapter III.

In order to determine if a significant difference in the level of teaching effectiveness of full-time versus part-time faculty exists, it was hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1:

There will be no significant difference in the level of teaching effectiveness as reflected by composite student ratings of full-time and part-time faculty.

The overall multivariate test of this hypothesis indicates that there is no difference between the level of teaching effectiveness of full-time versus part-time faculty relative to a student rating instrument. The MANOVA for this analysis yielded an F-ratio of 1.46 with 4 and 25 degrees of freedom. These results are significant at the .25 level. Therefore, since this exceeds the .05 level of acceptance, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

The remaining hypotheses were developed from the independent variables of location, school, status, and experience. Each was tested independently and followed by tests of interactions with the others to determine which were significant. Table 7 displays the data resulting from these multivariate analyses for the remaining hypotheses.

Hypothesis 2:

There will be no significant difference between the composite student ratings of faculty with little teaching experience and those with considerable experience.

The multivariate test of this hypothesis yielded for Hypothesis 2 an F-ratio of .67 with 4 and 25 degrees

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

		F	d.f.	p	Decision
H_1	Status (Part-Time vs. Full-Time)	1.46	4 and 25	.25	Not rejected
H_2	Experienced vs. Inexperienced	.67	4 and 25	.62	Not rejected
H_3	Interaction between Status Experience	.56	4 and 25	.69	Not rejected
H_4	Location (Rural vs. Urban)	2.76	4 and 25	.05	Rejected
H_5	Interaction between Experience and Location	1.43	4 and 25	.25	Not rejected
H_6	Interaction between Status and Location	.3071	4 and 25	.87	Not rejected
H_7	Interaction between Experience, Status, and School Location	.41	4 and 25	.80	Not rejected

of freedom significant at the .62 level. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not rejected since p = .621 is greater than .05.

Hypothesis 3:

There will be no significant interaction between status and experience.

The multivariate test of this hypothesis indicates that the student respondents for this study did not score appreciably different for part-time experienced and inexperienced teachers, or full-time experienced and inexperienced teachers. The computed result for the multivariate analysis yielded an F-ratio of .559 with 4 and 25 degrees of freedom and a probability of .70. This F value does not obtain significance at the .05 level. Thus, the hypothesis of no interaction is supported and Hypothesis 3 was not rejected.

Hypothesis 4:

The location of the school will create no significant difference in the scores.

The multivariate test of this hypothesis reveals that the location of the respondents' school did have a significant effect upon how the students rated their instructor's level of teaching effectiveness. The computed result for the multivariate analysis of Hypothesis 4 provided an F-ratio of 2.76 with 4 and 25 degrees of

freedom. The probability of this F-ratio occurring by chance was less than .049. Thus, the null hypothesis is not supported by the results of the statistical analysis, and Hypothesis 4 is rejected.

When the multivariate null hypothesis was rejected, the univariate post hoc analysis of variance was reviewed to determine which of the dependent variables were most sensitive to the multivariate effect (Table 8).

TABLE 8

UNIVARIATE POST HOC ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE OF LOCATION

Dependent Variables	Univariate F	Univariate P
Personality	.67	.42
Interaction	.03	.87
Skills	.30	.59
Organization/ Evaluation	.19	.67

The univariate probabilities for each of the four dependent variables is greater than p = .05. Therefore, the significant p for the multivariate test was generalized over all dependent variables and did not show up in any one variable. This result is customary on instruments such as student rating instruments, where all the dependent variables are highly correlated.

Hypothesis 5:

There will be no significant interaction between the teacher's experience level and the location of the school.

The multivariate test for this hypothesis illustrates that the student respondents saw no difference between experienced and inexperienced teachers with respect to the rural or urban location of their school. The computed result for the multivariate test of Hypothesis 5 provided an F-ratio of 1.43 at a probability of .25 with 4 and 25 degrees of freedom. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was not rejected since p = .25 is greater than p .05.

Hypothesis 6:

There will be no significant interaction between the teacher's status and the location of the school.

The multivariate test for Hypothesis 6 provided an F-ratio of .31 with 4 and 25 degrees of freedom at a probability of .87. These data indicate that the student respondents scored full-time and part-time faculty no differently with respect to the location of the school. Therefore, since p = .87 is greater than p = .05, Hypothesis 6 was not rejected.

Hypothesis 7:

There will be no significant interaction between experience, status, and school location.

The multivariate test for this hypothesis illustrates that the student respondents' scores indicate no significant interaction between the teachers' number of years of experience, their full-time or part-time status, or the location of the school. The computed result for Hypothesis 7 was an F-ratio of .412 at a probability of .80 with 4 and 25 degrees of freedom. Therefore, Hypothesis 7 was not rejected since p = .80 is greater than p .05.

Summary

This chapter has presented the findings of the teaching effectiveness study of part-time versus full-time faculty as perceived by students. The analyses of the tests of significance yielded the following decisions:

Hypothesis 1--Students do not perceive a significant difference in the teaching of part-time and full-time faculty.

Hypothesis 2--Students do not perceive a significant difference in experienced and inexperienced teachers.

Hypothesis 3--Student scores did not indicate a significant interaction between full-time and part-time experienced and inexperienced teachers.

Hypothesis 4--Students of rural schools scored their teachers significantly higher than students of urban schools.

Hypothesis 5--Student scores did not reveal any interaction between experience and location.

Hypothesis 6--Student scores did not indicate any significant interaction between the teacher's full or part-time status and the location of the school.

Hypothesis 7--Student scores did not indicate any significant interaction between the experience, status, and location of the school.

A multivariate and univariate analysis of variance was used to determine if any student perceived differences existed between full-time and part-time faculty. Student responses were collected by means of a student rating instrument. This instrument contained items dealing with the dependent variables of personality characteristics, faculty-student interaction, technical and professional teaching skills, classroom organization, and teacher evaluation of student learning.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Within this chapter a general summary of conclusions relative to the findings and recommendations for further study are presented.

Summary

Over the past decade, the part-time faculty member has become a critical component of the nation's community college system. His emergence has resulted from a number of interrelated factors. Among these are: (1) the nation's economic state which has escalated all the costs of educational institutions; (2) the rapid and in many instances unpredictable growth of the nation's community college system; (3) the pledge of this system to keep its doors open, to remain adaptable and flexible to the needs of the community which it serves; and (4) to continue to serve primarily as an institution of teaching excellence.

Part-time faculty members are recruited from every conceivable segment of the community. Their purpose is to supplement the number of teaching staff, while maintaining the level of teaching excellence characteristic of the full-time faculty. This study was designed to determine if the level of teaching excellence provided by the part-time faculty was in fact comparable to that of the full-time teaching faculty. More specifically, students rated inexperienced and experienced part-time and full-time teachers on the variables of: (1) personality characteristics, (2) student-faculty interaction, (3) teaching methods, classroom organization, evaluation of student learning, and how this instructor rated in comparison to all their previous instructors. The reliabilities for the instrument were determined through the use of Hoyt's analysis of variance procedure for estimating item homogeneity reliability.

The review of the research and literature focused upon the characteristics and needs of the part-time faculty member, teaching effectiveness, and evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Very few studies have dealt with the part-time community college instructor, and the researcher could find no study which dealt with the teaching effectiveness of the part-time faculty member.

This study was conducted in four Florida community colleges, using eleven part-time instructors with

0-2 years of teaching experience, eleven full-time instructors with 0-2 years of teaching experience, eleven part-time teachers with 4-6 years of teaching experience, and eleven full-time teachers with 4-6 years of teaching experience. The respondents for the study were 759 community college students enrolled in the college credit Associate of Arts or transfer degree program. The students responded to a rating scale of teaching effectiveness designed and pilot tested for this study. Both the 44 participating faculty and the 759 students volunteered to participate in the study. Each teacher informed his students of the purpose of the study, asked only those who seriously wished to participate in the study to stay, and left the room while the instruments were being completed. Following the completion of the instruments, a designated student captain sealed the instruments in a return envelope and forwarded them to the institutional representative.

Data resulting from the student rating of teaching effectiveness instrument were computed by means of a univariate and multivariate analysis of variance and Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation. Instructors' mean scores and standard deviations were provided by the multivariate analysis of variance program. The Pearson's Correlation Coefficient provided the correlations between student responses to the five dependent variables of

personality, interaction, teaching skills, organization, and item 40. The data revealed a strong positive correlation between the student responses for each teacher for each dependent variable.

The original parameters of the study identified nine of the twenty-eight Florida community colleges as eligible to participate in the study. Three of the nine eligible institutions volunteered to participate. One of the institutions later withdrew from the study, stating that the unusually large number of research study demands during the year, and the complexity of this study, made it impossible for them to participate.

Additional problems of locating colleges with a sufficient number of beginning (0-2 years) teachers were also encountered and, therefore, limited the number of available choices. Eventually, four colleges which had at least two full-time teachers were identified and agreed to participate. With the N in this category finally established, a like number of participants was randomly selected from eligible faculty in the other three categories.

Note. The research packets completed by the respondents were originally coded for location, building, status, and experience using a 1, 2, 3, 4 sequence code. As the program for data analysis was being prepared, it was learned that the program selected required a 1, 2, 1, 2 sequence code. It was not discovered until the researcher had returned to Florida that an error had been made in recoding the data packets and subsequent

The reliabilities for the major study were computed after the coding error had been corrected.

Readers of this study will no doubt note that the design of the study, the instrument, and the survey of the research literature were predicated around this researcher's biased belief that there would be a marked difference in the level of teaching effectiveness of full-time and part-time faculty. However, since this researcher is responsible for hiring part-time community college faculty in an academic area other than that of the participants for this study, the researcher is gratified to discover that his biases may be unfounded. This, of course, is subject to the degree of generalization which the researcher chooses to exercise.

Since the research data derived from this study indicated a high level of performance on the part of the part-time faculty participant, the researcher interviewed the supervisors responsible for hiring part-time credit

---

keypunching of the data deck. The error consisted of assigning two full-time experienced teachers as full-time inexperienced teachers. Both instructors were within the same institution. The data tables used in the study represent the correct codes.

The data generated by variable listing as means and standard deviations were unique by teacher; therefore, the error had no effect upon their accuracy. Since these data were not suspect to error, it was used to create the tables related to mean scores, total mean scores by teacher, and rank orders by teachers and schools.

The multivariate and univariate analyses were suspect due to the coding error, however, since they were derived by aggregating teachers by location, building, status, and experience across the variables of

faculty at the four participating institutions. The purpose was to determine if these institutions provided any personnel training for its part-time faculty. All four institutions indicated that an annual part-time faculty orientation program was provided. The purpose of this session was to introduce each part-time faculty member to his peers, to the college administration, to familiarize them with institutional philosophy and resources, and to disseminate and review various pieces of literature. In two instances, this literature included a part-time faculty manual. In addition, the general procedure at the participating institutions was to follow the orientation session with a departmental session. The purpose of this session, which was either group or individually oriented, was to establish departmental philosophy, issue the text, course outlines, course objectives, view the facilities, and meet the staff. It appears

---

personality, interaction, skills, organization, and total teaching qualities. The area of suspicion was restricted to full-time inexperienced versus full-time experienced. This must be noted since the overall study is a comparison of ratings of part-time versus full-time teaching excellence. The variables of location and building were not affected by the coding error.

This researcher sought the assistance of a local research statistician in an effort to determine what effect the coding error would have on the multivariate and univariate F-ratios and probabilities. Using the unique teacher data with the coding error corrected, he performed a univariate analysis across the variables mentioned above. He concluded that the coding error had no significant effect upon the multivariate and univariate results (see Appendix G).

that this level of involvement of the part-time faculty member increases his tie with the institution and department for which he is teaching, encourages his level of participation, develops a more unified level of instruction, and results in a higher level of teaching excellence. It is, therefore, recommended that all institutions consider providing an increased number of personnel training activities for their part-time faculty.

Conclusions

A summary of the findings relative to the questions studied was presented in the previous section. These findings indicate a number of general conclusions which need to be addressed.

Results indicate that the students perceived the part-time instructor as performing at a teaching level comparable with the full-time faculty member. This indicates that students do not perceive part-time faculty as differing greatly from full-time faculty with respect to personality characteristics, faculty-student interaction, teaching methods, organization of curricular materials, and the evolution of instructional outcomes.

In view of the finding that experienced teachers did not score significantly higher than inexperienced teachers in either the part-time or full-time categories, it can be concluded that the number of years of teaching experience is only one of the many variables which

contribute to teaching excellence. Further, the beginning teachers' enthusiasm and desire to perform well adds to their successfulness as teachers.

The results indicate that the location of the school may be a shaper of student perceptions as a contributory factor toward the total value of their education and the level of teaching effectiveness they received. Students at rural institutions rated their teachers significantly higher than the students at urban institutions. The researcher, however, asks that any conclusion be drawn with caution. The variable of location carries with it many complicating variables which cannot be controlled. Examples of these complicating variables are the reading level of the students, the socio-economic background of the students, whether the students are test wise or test wary, the educational climate created by the facilities, etc. Because of these variables, the researcher can only conclude that in this study the rural-based students evaluate their teachers more favorably than urban-based students.

Finally, it may be concluded that the lengthy student rating of teaching effectiveness instrument may be unnecessary. Rather, a much shortened instrument written in the vernacular of the student may provide a more favorable student attitude toward evaluating instructional effectiveness. Such an instrument could

provide a greater level of student understanding regarding what they are attempting to measure.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of this study revealed several recommendations which may be beneficial to a greater understanding of the part-time faculty member and toward insuring that their contribution to instructional excellence is enhanced.

The results of this study indicate a level of student satisfaction with part-time faculty equal to that of full-time faculty. Follow-up discussions with the administrators responsible for hiring the part-time faculty who participated in this study revealed that several forms of part-time faculty inservice activities are used on a regular basis. It is, therefore, recommended that all institutions of higher education consider providing an increased number and mode of personnel training activities for their part-time faculty.

Many researchers have attempted to both establish the criteria of teaching effectiveness and develop a discriminating instrument for measuring these criteria. This study, whose instrument was patterned after nationally accepted student rating forms, failed to illustrate the desired degree of discrimination. It is, therefore, recommended that evaluation researchers

continue to explore the criteria of teaching effectiveness and the design of rating instruments which measure these criteria.

Recommendations for Further Study

During the course of this study, the researcher noted additional questions which indicate a need for further research. These items are as follows:

(1) An analysis of the current inservice training needs of part-time faculty, training activities available to part-time faculty, and training activities used by part-time faculty;

(2) An appraisal of the backgrounds of part-time faculty with reference to their full-time occupational pursuits, degree of teacher training, and types of previous teaching experiences;

(3) A study to determine if the students' perception of the items included in the student rating instruments of teaching effectiveness are the same as those intended by the researchers;

(4) A study of behavioral criteria and standard tests of competence characteristic of teaching effectiveness which when measured on the basis of consumer satisfaction will discriminate between full-time and part-time faculty.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS AS ILLUSTRATED BY PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS

APPENDIX A

TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS AS ILLUSTRATED BY PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS

Hamachek	McKeachie	Angers	Rapp	Kelley-Wilbur	Anderson	Trabue
Personal Characteristics	Objectives	Enthusiasm	Knows Students	Enthusiasm	Knowledge of Self	Class Size
Instructional Procedures	Enthusiasm	Initiative	Methods	Prepared	Enthusiasm	Organization of Materials
Interaction Styles	Student Involvement	Curiosity	Objectives	Organized	Initiative	Testing
Perception of Self	Subject Matter fits Method	Creativity	Institution's Attitude	Communicates	Curiosity	Personality
Perceptions of Others		Sees Intangible Rewards	Faculty Attitude	Changes pace	Creativity	Creativity
		High Morals	Techniques	Motivates	Communication	Techniques
		Disciplined	Evaluation	Emphasizes Instruction	Morals	
		Maturity		Personal Interest in Students	Disciplined	
				Personality Exciting	Mature	
				Character		

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLES OF NATIONALLY ACCEPTED STUDENT RATING FORMS

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLES OF NATIONALLY ACCEPTED STUDENT RATING FORMS

THE PURDUE RATING SCALE FOR INSTRUCTION

Note to Students: Following is a list of factors which are important to many courses but over which the instructor often has little control. You are asked to rate the course on each of the factors by selecting one of the letters and write in space at the right of each statement.

If the course is *extremely poor* with respect to the factor write E in space.

If the course is *below average* with respect to the factor write D in space.

If the course is *average* with respect to the factor write C in space.

If the course is *above average* with respect to the factor write B in space.

If the course is *excellent* with respect to the factor write A in space.

For example: If you feel that the course is not contributing very much to the attainment of your ultimate goal; but on the other hand, is not a complete waste of time you would probably respond to item number 20 by writing D in space.

11. Suitability of the method or methods by which subject matter of the course is presented (recitation, lecture, laboratory, etc.) ..... ____
12. Suitability of the size of the class (consider the subject matter and type of class—lecture, lab., etc.) ..... ____
13. The degree to which the objectives of the course were clarified and discussed ..... ____
14. The agreement between the announced objectives of the course and what was actually taught ..... ____
15. Suitability of the reference materials available for the course ..... ____
16. Suitability of the laboratory facilities available for the course ..... ____
17. Suitability of the assigned textbook ..... ____
18. The use made of tests as aids to learning ..... ____
19. Amount of freedom allowed students in the selection of the materials to be studied (considering the subject matter) .. ____
20. How the course is fulfilling your needs (consider your ultimate as well as your immediate goals) ..... ____
21. Range of ability in the class (are there too many extremely dull or extremely bright students?) ..... ____
22. Suitability of the amount and type of assigned outside work ..... ____
23. The weight given to tests in determining the final grade for the course ..... ____
24. Coordination of the tests with the major objectives of the course ..... ____
25. Frequency of tests ..... ____
26. The overall rating of the instructor ..... ____

COURSE EVALUATION

NOTE: The course evaluation questionnaire (which is copyrighted by Princeton University) is in the form of a booklet containing nine parts and a blank page for an essay response. The various parts cover the different kinds of courses at Princeton, and students fill out only those which are applicable. Three of the parts are reprinted here.

Part 1: LECTURES

1. Applicable_____ Inapplicable_____

	Excellent	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*	*Not Applicable*
2-11—*Rate the quality of the lectures in terms of the degree to which they:*					
2. Held your attention and interest	1	2	3	4	5	6	0
3. Covered the material at an appropriate intellectual level– neither too complicated nor too simple							
4. Clearly presented the relevant subject matter							
5. Covered diverse points of view and helped to expand your awareness of alternatives							
6. Emphasized principles and generalizations							
7. Stimulated your intellectual curiosity and provoked independent thinking							
8. Stimulated student discussion outside of class							
9. Were related to one another and followed a coherent sequence							
10. Were coordinated with other parts of the course							
11. Rate the general quality of the lectures as a whole							
12. In comparison to all other lecturers you have had at Princeton, how would you rate the lecturer in this course?							

13. About how many lectures did you miss?
    1) 1 or more
    2) 2-4
    3) 5-7
    4) 8 or more

14-22—*Often some very concrete characteristics of the lecturer reduce the value of a course or interfere with the achievement of its objectives. For each of the following characteristics indicate whether or not you felt that it applied to the lecturer:*						
14. Inaudible	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Writing illegible						
16. Too abstract						
17. Too superficial						
18. Covers too much material						
19. Speaks too fast						
20. Disorganized presentations						
21. Repetitious						
22. Distracting mannerisms						

(Specify: _____
_____)

Which lectures (or lectures on what subjects) did you find least valuable? Why?

Part 3: PRECEPTS OR CLASSES

31. Applicable_____ Inapplicable_____

	Excellent	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*	*Not Applicable*
35-11—*Rate the general quality of the precepts or classes on each of the following: (The word instructor is used to refer to the person responsible for your section regardless of whether it was a class or a precept.)*					
35. Interest of the instructor in the precept (class)					
36. Instructor's ability to raise challenging questions					
37. Instructor's ability to help clarify readings and lectures					
38. Instructor's ability to encourage broad student participation					
39. Instructor's ability to conduct discussions					
40. Instructor's responsiveness to students' comments and questions					
41. Integration with other parts of the course—relevant and supplementary					
42. General attitude and preparedness of fellow class members					
43. Your own interest, preparation and participation					

44. Value of the precepts or classes as a whole to this course — 1 2 3 4 5 6 0

45. How many precepts or classes did you miss?
   1) 1 or none
   2) 2-3
   3) 4-5
   4) 6 or more

Were there characteristics of the precepts (classes) which you found particularly valuable or not very useful? Please explain and, if possible, suggest modifications.

Name of Instructor: .....

Part 8: OVERALL RATINGS (Applicable To All Courses)

In relation to your own objectives in this course and compared to other courses you have taken at Princeton, how would you rate this course in terms of how much it contributed to each of the following:

	Excellent	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*	*Not Applicable*
91. Your mastery of the relevant content or subject matter					
92. Your mastery of the relevant skills or methods					
93. Your ability to see more alternatives and have more insight into the complexity of the relevant subject matter					
94. Your ability to formulate general principles in the relevant subject matter					
95. Your abilities for critical evaluation in the relevant subject matter					
96. An increase in your interest in the field so as to take further related courses or do reading on your own					
97. An impact upon your emotional sensitivity to the relevant phenomena or upon your values and attitudes towards parts of life or yourself					
98. Your total educational growth and development					

Please write in below any generally descriptive comments you would like to make about the course or specific points which were not brought out in the questionnaire.

SURVEY OF STUDENT OPINION OF TEACHING
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Instructor's Name _____

Course and Number _____

My major is _____

This course is required _____ elective _____ (check one)

My cumulative GPA is:

Below 2.5 _____ 2.5 to 3.0 _____ 3.0 to 3.5 _____ above 3.5 _____

This survey is made at the request of your instructor in this class. The information the instructor receives will not identify any student individually. He will receive a summary of class ratings and comments only after the quarter is over. At that time the individual instructor alone determines whether this information is to be destroyed or whether it is to be made available to any other person for reference.

Listed below are several qualities which describe aspects of instructor behavior. Rate your instructor on each of these items by drawing a circle around the number that best indicates his position in comparison with other teachers you have had. Rate each item as thoughtfully and carefully as possible. Do *not* omit items. Of course, it will be the very unusual case when the number you write in is the same for all items.

Legend: (1) *Outstanding.* (2) *Superior.* (3) *Competent.* (4) *Only Fair.* (5) *Of Less Value.*

1. Interprets abstract ideas and theories clearly	1	2	3	4	5
2. Gets me interested in his subject ..					
3. Has increased my skills in thinking					
4. Has helped broaden my interests ..					
5. Stresses important material					
6. Makes good use of examples and illustrations					
7. Has motivated me to do my best work					
8. Inspires class confidence in his knowledge of subject					
9. Has given me new viewpoints or appreciations					
10. Is clear and understandable in his explanations					

Your instructor would like to know if there is something you believe he has done especially well in the teaching of this course _____

_____

_____

Your instructor would also like to know what specific things you believe might be done to improve his teaching in this course _____

_____

_____

Thus far your judgments have been restricted to characteristics of the *teacher* himself. For the item below indicate your feeling for the *subject matter* of the course by checking the appropriate entry.

The subject matter or content of the course is:

Highly interesting ..... ____
Moderately interesting ..... ____
Not very interesting ..... ____

Circle the final grade you expect to receive in this course: A B C D E

Legend: (1) *Outstanding.* (2) *Superior.* (3) *Competent.* (4) *Only Fair.* (5) *Of Less Value.*

11. Lectures gave viewpoints and info text did not contain	1	2	3	4	5
12. Material enthusiastically presented in lectures					
13. Material presented in a well-organized fashion					
14. Helpful to individual students					
15. Integration of material into coherent whole was					
16. Text clear in presentation of concepts					
17. Text's overall rating					

18. How much was your interest in the subject changed by this course?
More interested 1 2 3 4 5 Less interested

19. What level of student sophistication was assumed in lectures?
Very high 1 2 3 4 5 Very low

20. Were students free to ask questions, disagree, express their ideas, etc.?
Encouraged 1 2 3 4 5 Discouraged

21. Has improved my problem-solving methods.
Very much 1 2 3 4 5 Not at all

22. Did test questions cover the material emphasized in the text and lectures?
Very well 1 2 3 4 5 Very poorly

23. Would you recommend this course by this instructor to majors in this dept.?
Very highly 1 2 3 4 5 Never

24. Would you recommend this course by this instructor to non-majors?
Very highly 1 2 3 4 5 Never

Additional questions will be on the chalkboard if the instructor wants to use them. ***Students were also asked to give class, age, sex, and expected grade in course.***

STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT

This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to express anonymously your views of this course and the way it has been taught. Indicate the response closest to your view by blackening the appropriate oval. Use a soft lead pencil (preferably No. 2) for all responses to the questionnaire. Do not use an ink or ball point pen.

SIR Report Number

SECTION I Items 1-20. Blacken one response number for each question.

NA (0) = Not Applicable or don't know. The statement does not apply to this course or instructor, or you simply are not able to give a knowledgeable response.
SA (4) = Strongly Agree. You strongly agree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
A (3) = Agree. You agree more than you disagree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
D (2) = Disagree. You disagree more than you agree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
SD (1) = Strongly Disagree. You strongly disagree with the statement as it applies to this course or instructor.

		NA	SA	A	D	SD
1.	The instructor's objectives for the course have been made clear					
2.	There was considerable agreement between the announced objectives of the course and what was actually taught					
3.	The instructor used class time well					
4.	The instructor was readily available for consultation with students					
5.	The instructor seemed to know when students didn't understand the material					
6.	Lectures were too repetitive of what was in the textbook(s)					
7.	The instructor encouraged students to think for themselves					
8.	The instructor seemed genuinely concerned with students' progress and was actively helpful					
9.	The instructor made helpful comments on papers or exams					
10.	The instructor raised challenging questions or problems for discussion					
11.	In this class I felt free to ask questions or express my opinions					
12.	The instructor was well-prepared for each class					
13.	The instructor told students how they would be evaluated in the course					
14.	The instructor summarized or emphasized major points in lectures or discussions					
15.	My interest in the subject area has been stimulated by this course					
16.	The scope of the course has been too limited; not enough material has been covered					
17.	Examinations reflected the important aspects of the course					
18.	I have been putting a good deal of effort into this course					
19.	The instructor was open to other viewpoints					
20.	In my opinion, the instructor has accomplished (is accomplishing) his or her objectives for the course					

SECTION II Items 21-31. Blacken one response number for each question.

21. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of this course was:
- Very elementary
- Somewhat elementary
- About right
- Somewhat difficult
- Very difficult

22. The work load for this course in relation to other courses of equal credit was:
- Much lighter
- Lighter
- About the same
- Heavier
- Much heavier

23. For me, the pace at which the instructor covered the material during the term was:
- Very slow
- Somewhat slow
- Just about right
- Somewhat fast
- Very fast

24. To what extent did the instructor use examples or illustrations to help clarify the material?
- Frequently
- Occasionally
- Seldom
- Never

Questionnaire continued on the other side

572MRC114P200X
283562

25. Was class size satisfactory for the method of conducting the class?

- Yes, most of the time
- No, class was too large
- No, class was too small
- It didn't make any difference one way or the other

26. Which one of the following best describes this course for you?

- Major requirement or elective within major field
- Minor requirement or required elective outside major field
- College requirement but not part of my major or minor field
- Elective not required in any way
- Other

27. Which one of the following was your most important reason for selecting this course?

- Friend(s) recommended it
- Faculty advisor's recommendation
- Teacher's excellent reputation
- Thought I could make a good grade
- Could use pass/no credit option
- It was required
- Subject was of interest
- Other

28. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?

- A
- B
- C
- D
- Fail
- Pass
- No credit
- Other

29. What is your approximate cumulative grade-point average?

- 3.50-4.00
- 3.00-3.49
- 2.50-2.99
- 2.00-2.49
- 1.50-1.99
- 1.00-1.49
- Less than 1.00
- None yet--freshman or transfer

30. What is your class level?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate
- Other

31. Sex:

- Female
- Male

SECTION III Items 32-39. Blacken one response number for each question.

	Not applicable, don't know, or there were none.	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
32. Overall, I would rate the textbook(s)						
33. Overall, I would rate the supplementary readings						
34. Overall, I would rate the quality of the exams						
35. I would rate the general quality of the lectures						
36. I would rate the overall value of class discussions						
37. Overall, I would rate the laboratories						
38. I would rate the overall value of this course to me as						

39. Compared to other instructors you have had (secondary school and college), how effective has the instructor been in this course? (Blacken one response number.)

One of the most effective (among the top 10%)	More effective than most (among the top 30%)	About average	Not as effective as most (in the lowest 30%)	One of the least effective (in the lowest 10%)

SECTION IV Items 40-49. If the instructor provided supplementary questions and response options, use this section for responding. Blacken only one response number for each question.

	NA										NA									
40.											45.									
41.											46.									
42.											47.									
43.											48.									
44.											49.									

If you would like to make additional comments about the course or instruction, use a separate sheet of paper. You might elaborate on the particular aspects you liked most as well as those you liked least. Also, how can the course or the way it was taught be improved? PLEASE GIVE THESE COMMENTS TO THE INSTRUCTOR.

If you have any comments or suggestions about this questionnaire (for example, the content or responses available), please send them to: Student Instructional Report, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

APPENDIX C

CHECKLIST FOR ADMINISTRATORS ASSISTING IN THE STUDY

APPENDIX C

CHECKLIST FOR ADMINISTRATORS ASSISTING IN THE STUDY

1. Yes No Our opening fall 1975 enrollment by credit student headcount was between 3,000 and 8,000 students.

2. Yes No We can prepare a list of those Advanced and Professional full-time faculty with 0 - 2 years teaching experience.

3. Yes No We can prepare a list of those Advanced and Professional part-time faculty with 0 - 2 years teaching experience.

4. Yes No We can prepare a list of those Advanced and Professional full-time faculty with 4 - 6 years teaching experience.

5. Yes No We can prepare a list of those Advanced and Professional part-time faculty with 4 - 6 years teaching experience.

6. Yes No An equal number of eligible Advanced and Professional can be drawn at random to represent each of the categories listed above. (Note: The full-time category with 0 - 2 years teaching experience will probably be the most critical. It, therefore, may be necessary to ask all such faculty if they are willing to participate in the study. Each instructor will be asked to administer the instrument to only one section or class).

7. Yes No Of all the faculty in each category who indicated a willingness to participate, an equal number in each category were selected at random to comprise the sample. (Note: An "N" of 4 per cell is an ideal minimum; however, less is acceptable, and the more the merrier).

8. Yes No The research will be notified of the "N" per cell and given a student section count from which to mail the appropriate number of instruments to you.

9. Yes No Each packet has been coded as full-time or part-time and 0 - 2 or 4 - 6 years of experience.

10. Yes No Each participating faculty member will be instructed to read the instructions, designate a student captain, leave the room during scoring, and instruct the student captain to return the completed packet to the evening office.

11. Yes No Upon completion of the study, the student ratings will be mailed in mass to:

    Jerry W. Kandzer
    Polk Community College
    999 Avenue H, NE
    Winter Haven, FL 33880

12. Yes No I would appreciate receiving a copy of the results of your study. (Please give name and address).

(All answers should be YES to meet with the controls of the study.)

APPENDIX D

STUDENT RATING INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX D

STUDENT RATING INSTRUMENT

A RESEARCH STUDY

A STUDY OF THE CRITERIA FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
AMONG FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY
OF SELECTED FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
AS JUDGED BY COMPARATIVE STUDENT RATINGS

STUDENT OPINION SURVEY OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to express anonymously your views of this course and the way it has been taught. This is an independent research study, and it is in no way connected with this institution. Your results will not be seen by your instructor, nor the administration of this institution, and there will be no numerical codes to tie the questionnaire to the institution or the instructor. We sincerely hope this confidentiality will allow you the freedom to voice your honest opinions. Following the completion of this questionnaire, it will be collected, sealed, and returned to the researcher.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

1. Ability to create an environment in which students learn.
2. Interprets ideas clearly.
3. The level of agreement between the announced course objectives and what was actually taught.
4. Use of effective communications (speech, volume, vocabulary, etc.)
5. The degree to which the instructor's personal appearance adds to or detracts from learning.
6. Classes were related and followed a coherent sequence.
7. Offers time and assistance equally to all students.
8. Self-confident and cheerful.
9. Motivates students to do their best work.
10. Disciplined and mature with respect to morals and outlook on life.
11. Makes course relevant to careers and/or life.
12. Presentation of the course was interesting.
13. Tests for understanding.
14. Emphasized principles and concepts.
15. Seems to enjoy teaching.
16. Uses a variety of instructional methods.
17. Senses when students do not understand attempts to help them understand.
18. Writes constructive comments on papers and/or tests.
19. Draws upon supplemental ideas and materials beyond text.
20. Enjoys a good laugh.
21. Periodically asks for student feedback as to how the course could be improved.
22. Generally pleasing personality.
23. Demonstrates a sincere interest in students.
24. Covers material at the appropirate intellectual level.
25. Course materials were well organized.
26. The degree to which you were informed of your progress and/or problems throughout the course.
27. Creates a democratic atmosphere for learning.
28. Demonstrates knowledge of his subject matter.
29. Fairness in grading system.
30. Demonstrates respect for student views.
31. Encourages independent thought.
32. Encourages class discussion.
33. Knowledgeable in giving students advice regarding employment and further education.
34. Uses class time effectively.
35. Paces the course well.
36. Dynamic and energetic.
37. Coordination of the tests with the major course objectives.
38. Course objectives were clarified and discussed.
39. Your own level of interest, preparation, and participation.
40. According to my previous college experience, I would rate this instructor as:

ANSWER SHEET
for
STUDENT EVALUATION of FACULTY TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

This instructor is:

1. the best in this particular characteristic of any I have ever had.
2. among the best in this particular characteristic of any I have ever had.
3. slightly higher in this particular characteristic of any I have ever had.
4. about equal in this particular characteristic of any I have ever had.
5. slightly lower in this particular characteristic of any I have ever had.
6. among the lowest in this particular characteristic of any I have ever had.
7. the lowest in this particular characteristic of any I have ever had.

* *

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.							
13.							
14.							
15.							
16.							
17.							
18.							
19.							
20.							
21.							
22.							
23.							
24.							
25.							
26.							
27.							
28.							
29.							
30.							
31.							
32.							
33.							
34.							
35.							
36.							
37.							
38.							
39.							
40.							

APPENDIX E

CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD TEACHING EMPHASIZED BY STUDENTS

APPENDIX E

CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD TEACHING EMPHASIZED BY STUDENTS

Bousfield[1]	Clinton[2]	Deshpande, et al[3]	French[4]	Gadzella[5]	Perry[6]	Pogue[7]	Hildebrand[8]
Fairness	Knowledge of subject matter	Motivation	Interprets ideas clearly	Knowledge of subject	Well-prepared for class	Knowledge of subject	Dynamic and energetic person
Mastery of subject	Pleasing personality	Rapport	Develops student interest	Interest in subject	Sincere interest in subject	Fair evaluator	Explains clearly
Interesting presentation of material	Neatness in appearance and work	Structure	Develops skills of thinking	Flexibility	Knowledge of subject	Explains clearly	Interesting presentation
Well-organized material	Fairness	Clarity	Broadens interests	Well-prepared	Effective teaching methods		Enjoys teaching
Clearness of exposition	Kind and sympathetic	Content mastery	Stresses important materials	Uses appropriate vocabulary	Tests for understanding		Interest in students
Interest in students	Keen sense of humor	Overload (too much work)	Good pedagogical methods		Fair in evaluation		Friendly toward students
Helpfulness	Interest in profession	Evaluation procedure	Motivates to do best work		Effective communication		Encourages class discussion
Ability to direct discussion	Interesting presentation	Use of teaching aids	Knowledge of subject		Encourages independent thought		Discusses other points of view
Sincerity	Alertness and broadmindedness	Instructional skills	Conveys new viewpoints		Course organized logically		
Keenness of intellect	Knowledge of methods	Teaching styles	Clear explanations		Motivates students		

1. Listed in order of importance by 61 undergraduates at University of Conn.
2. Listed in order of importance by 177 junior-year students at Oregon State Univ.
3. Listed in order of importance by 674 undergraduates who rated 32 engineering teachers.
4. Listed in order of importance by undergraduates at the Univ. of Washington.
5. Listed in order of importance by 443 undergraduates at Western Wash. State College.
6. Listed in order of importance by 1493 students, faculty, alumni at Univ. of Toledo.
7. Listed in order of importance by 307 students at Philander Smith College.
8. Listed in order of importance, by 338 undergraduate and graduate students at Univ. of Cal., Davis.

APPENDIX F

MATRIX OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

APPENDIX F

TABLE 9

MATRIX OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Design Over Subjects					Design Over Measures					
Location	Building	Status	Experience	Teacher Code	Personality	Interaction	Skills	Organization	Total Qualities	Total Mean Score
Rural N=24	Bldg. 1 N=16	Part-Time N=8	0 - 2 yrs.	1	24.00*	33.00	39.86	32.57	4.29	133.72
					9.78**	11.58	13.03	11.50	2.29	48.18
				2	21.88	28.65	28.71	27.24	1.94	108.42
					9.96	11.52	12.82	12.72	1.03	48.05
				3	14.55	17.00	20.27	19.27	1.64	72.73
					11.46	13.52	15.17	12.87	1.29	54.31
				4	17.44	23.22	26.78	25.22	1.78	94.44
					6.67	9.38	10.21	10.97	.83	38.06
			4 - 6 yrs.	5	15.71	20.29	21.14	19.43	1.86	78.43
					17.36	21.25	20.00	20.30	2.27	81.18
				6	23.31	29.77	33.08	29.00	2.92	118.08
					11.05	14.88	14.54	12.32	1.55	54.34
				7	23.38	30.75	34.63	31.88	2.63	123.27
					12.83	16.06	17.29	15.27	1.59	63.04
				8	25.25	35.56	37.89	35.50	3.50	139.68
					10.03	9.77	11.74	10.25	1.83	43.62
		Full-Time N=8	0 - 2 yrs.	9	18.29	22.00	25.43	26.43	2.00	94.15
					7.34	7.48	12.09	13.38	1.29	41.58
				10	24.07	33.66	35.07	27.48	2.52	122.80
					7.52	11.59	12.46	11.19	1.24	44.00
				11	25.00	34.70	32.50	33.90	3.30	129.40
					7.92	10.03	8.90	9.09	1.25	37.19
				12	24.69	30.65	38.81	36.58	3.81	134.54
					9.48	12.43	14.25	12.37	1.58	50.11
			4 - 6 yrs.	13	13.00	19.78	25.22	21.89	1.67	81.56
					2.87	4.58	6.10	7.51	.87	21.93
				14	15.66	25.86	26.03	22.83	1.86	92.24
					6.04	8.49	8.49	8.41	.88	32.31
				15	22.13	30.40	34.67	30.27	3.07	120.54
					9.98	12.35	13.03	11.97	1.79	49.12
				16	22.93	29.29	34.93	34.79	2.71	124.64
					9.66	12.83	10.29	9.01	1.33	43.12

TABLE 9--Continued

Design Over Subjects					Design Over Measures					
Location	Building	Status	Experience	Teacher Code	Personality	Interaction	Skills	Organization	Total Qualities	Total Mean Score
Rural N=24	Bldg. 2 N=8	Part-Time N=4	0 - 2 yrs.	17	39.50 2.43	48.67 4.03	55.33 5.05	45.33 3.39	5.50 .84	194.33 15.74
				18	20.73 8.05	26.82 10.08	29.73 11.44	26.91 10.87	2.50 1.26	106.69 41.70
			4 - 6 yrs.	19	18.00 6.27	22.90 8.97	25.81 9.34	23.72 8.19	2.00 .96	91.93 33.73
				20	20.77 7.61	28.36 9.16	34.41 10.01	29.73 8.74	3.05 1.25	116.32 36.77
		Full-Time N=4	0 - 2 yrs.	21	11.41 2.85	15.94 5.13	18.82 6.76	18.47 6.55	1.18 .39	65.82 21.68
				22	17.55 3.05	22.27 4.94	26.45 4.08	23.09 2.63	1.91 .70	91.27 15.40
			4 - 6 yrs.	23	16.39 7.11	23.04 11.21	24.30 11.14	25.43 13.36	1.96 1.30	91.12 44.12
				24	9.60 1.96	13.50 4.03	15.30 4.47	14.30 3.74	1.10 .32	53.80 14.52
Urban N=20	Bldg. 1 N=8	Part-Time N=4	0 - 2 yrs.	25	32.89 8.45	42.11 10.90	42.89 11.99	40.11 10.40	4.22 1.72	162.22 43.45
				26	21.23 8.75	32.00 12.20	32.77 12.64	30.46 11.87	2.92 1.75	119.38 47.21
			4 - 6 yrs.	27	17.05 6.35	21.58 9.06	25.95 10.15	24.42 9.21	2.42 1.26	91.42 46.03
				28	25.38 5.12	35.08 7.78	36.92 7.88	33.77 7.43	3.92 1.26	135.07 29.47
		Full-Time N=4	0 - 2 yrs.	29	14.50 5.99	22.67 9.19	24.50 10.01	26.33 11.96	1.67 .78	89.67 37.93
				30	28.11 7.23	38.17 9.69	41.22 8.68	37.44 7.91	4.00 1.28	148.94 34.79
			4 - 6 yrs.	31	19.00 7.89	27.38 10.60	25.38 9.98	30.43 10.52	2.19 1.44	104.38 40.43
				32	20.30 6.69	31.10 8.33	34.95 9.30	30.90 8.01	2.50 1.28	119.75 33.71

TABLE 9--Continued

Design Over Subjects					Design Over Measures					
Location	Building	Status	Experience	Teacher Code	Personality	Interaction	Skills	Organization	Total Qualities	Total Mean Score
				33	18.21 8.13	27.17 11.12	28.33 9.99	24.63 10.66	2.17 1.09	100.51 40.99
			0 - 2 yrs	34	16.04 6.44	28.48 10.66	27.78 9.18	26.65 10.13	1.96 1.11	100.91 37.52
		Part-Time N=6		35	13.61 5.36	17.83 6.75	21.67 7.07	16.67 7.15	1.46 .62	71.34 26.95
				36	12.81 10.36	19.14 13.38	19.43 14.06	19.52 13.57	1.67 1.35	72.57 52.72
			4 - 6 yrs.	37	14.94 7.68	21.53 9.63	24.24 11.56	22.41 10.46	2.00 1.17	85.12 40.50
Urban N=20	Bldg. 2 N=12			38	20.56 9.32	28.12 11.87	28.80 12.37	25.88 10.73	2.72 1.51	106.08 45.80
				39	16.42 7.15	25.84 8.25	27.13 9.18	24.00 8.85	2.13 1.20	95.52 34.63
			0 - 2 yrs.	40	11.42 3.82	17.08 5.20	18.00 5.70	14.50 4.81	1.17 .39	62.17 19.92
		Full-Time N=6		41	22.23 11.43	31.77 14.41	35.32 12.83	32.55 12.92	3.14 1.67	125.01 53.26
				42	20.64 6.32	27.68 8.96	30.32 9.01	25.52 7.70	2.56 1.19	106.72 33.18
			4 - 6 yrs.	43	18.08 6.47	27.04 11.20	27.92 10.60	25.25 12.24	2.25 1.03	100.54 41.54
				44	16.71 7.36	23.06 10.13	26.59 10.22	24.24 9.67	2.06 1.20	92.66 38.58

*First Row Scores = mean scores

**Second Row Scores = standard deviation scores

APPENDIX G

RESULTS OF UNIVARIATE TEST OF TOTAL MEAN SCORES FOR ORIGINAL DATA WITH CODING ERROR AND DATA WITH CODING ERROR CORRECTED

APPENDIX G

RESULTS OF UNIVARIATE TEST OF TOTAL MEAN SCORES FOR ORIGINAL DATA WITH CODING ERROR AND DATA WITH CODING ERROR CORRECTED

I. Univariate Test of Data with Coding Error

	n	$\bar{X}$	F	df	p
FT (0-2)	13	108.04	1.94	1 and 42	.83
FT (4-6)	9	93.64			

II. Univariate Test of Data with Coding Error Corrected

	n	$\bar{X}$	F	df	p
FT (0-2)	11	105.35	.38	1 and 42	.46
FT (4-6)	11	98.90			

Therefore, the coding error did not significantly effect the results of the multivariate test results.

Note: The univariate analysis of variance was run by Dr. Jon C. Allen, Assistant Professor, Systems Analysis and Mathematics Modeling, Agricultural Research and Education Center, Florida Agriculture Experiment Station, Lake Alfred, Florida.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of School Administrators. Department of Classroom Teachers of the N.E.A. National School Boards Association. Who's A Good Teacher. Washington: 1961.

Chapman, Charles E. "Resharpening the Tools of Instruction." Junior College Journal 37 (October 1966).

Cohen, Arthur M. "Teacher Preparation: Rationale and Practice." Junior College Journal 37 (May 1967).

Diekhoff, John S. "Untaught Teachers." Saturday Review 8 (October 1960).

Dressel, Paul L. "Teaching, Learning, and Evaluation." Improving College and University Teaching 8 (Winter 1960).

Ellis, Elmer G., and Wooton, Lutian R. "Valid Evaluation of Teaching is Imperative." Kappa Delta Pi Record 7 (April 1970).

Evans, Kenneth R. "Evening Services of Junior Colleges." Junior College Research Review 4 (March 1970).

Gaff, Jerry G., and Wilson, Robert C. "Faculty Values and Improving Teaching." Reprint ed., 1971.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "American Association of Junior Colleges Approach--Preparation of Junior College Instructors." Junior College Journal 35 (September 1964).

Goode, Delmer. "The Centrality of Evaluation." Improving College and University Teaching 7 (Winter 1960).

Gordon, Shirley P., and Whitfield, Raymond P. "A Formula for Teacher Preparation." Junior College Journal 37 (May 1967).

Gowin, D. B., and Daigneault, George H. The Part-Time College Teacher. Chicago: The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1961.

Hoffman, Randall W. "Students Portray the Excellent Teacher." Improving College and University Teaching 2 (Winter 1963).

House, Ernest R., ed. School Evaluation: The Politics and Process. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1973.

Kelley, Win, and Wilbur, Leslie. Teaching in the Community-Junior College. Des Moines: Meridith Corp., 1970.

Kennedy, Gerald. "Preparation, Orientation, Utilization, and Acceptance of Part-Time Faculty." Junior College Journal 37 (April 1967).

Kuhns, Eileen P. "Part-Time Faculty." Junior College Journal 33 (January 1963).

Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1960.

Messerschmidt, Dale Harvey. "A Study of Part-Time Instructors in Vocational-Technical Education Among Community Colleges in Michigan." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Miller, Richard I. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Morton, Richard K. "Personal Backgrounds of Effective Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching 8 (Autumn 1960).

_____. "Students' Views of Teaching." Improving College and University Teaching 13 (Summer 1965).

O'Banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community Junior College. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

Pi Lambda Theta. A Report of the Second Pi Lambda Theta Cotena. The Evaluation of Teaching. Washington, D.C., 1967.

Schmidt, Carlos R. "A Study of the Problems of Part-Time Industrial and Technical Instructors in Selected Michigan Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

Siehr, Hugo Emil. "Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962.

Vairo, Philip D. "Faculty Quality: A Challenge to the Community College." Journal of Higher Education 36 (April 1965).