2012

Using Student Evaluations at a Cambodian University to Improve Teaching Effectiveness

John Lysne Nash
Lehigh University

Using Student Evaluations at a Cambodian University to Improve Teaching Effectiveness

by

John Lysne Nash

Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee
of Lehigh University
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership

Lehigh University
November 22, 2011

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

Date

Dissertation Director

Accepted Date

Committee Members:

Roland K. Yoshida
Professor of Education
& Provost Emeritus

Daphne P. Hobson
Executive Director
Office of International Programs

Jill Sperandio
Associate Professor of Education

Karen E. Stout
Research Associate at University of Minnesota

Acknowledgements

To Dr. Roland K. Yoshida, the Chair of my dissertation committee…Thank you for your unflagging support and your willingness to read, thoughtfully respond, and quickly return countless versions of this document. Also, thank you for your persistent optimism. You have contributed more than you know to helping me complete this journey.

To Dr. Daphne P. Hobson, Dr. Jill Sperandio, and Dr. Karen E. Stout, my dissertation committee…Thank you for the sharing of yourselves in the courses that you have taught, guidance you have offered, and friendship you have given.

To Jean Johnson and the LTS team…No matter how obscure the journal, you found the article for me…thank you, you helped make the difference.

To Dr. Kelly Mekdici, Dr. Karen Hendershot, and Cohort 4…Thank you for inspiring me to try, and to try again.

To Dr. Luise Ahrens…The doors you opened for me made this study possible. Thank you for your friendship, support, encouragement, and guidance. You are inspirational.

To the students, faculty and staff at the English Language Support Unit of the Royal University of Phnom Penh…Thank you for participating in this study and for sharing your thoughts, feelings, and ideas.

To Dr. Akoto Osei and Hou Kroeun…Thank you for being so patient in showing me the languages that let this study sing.

To Dr. Herbert W. Marsh…Thank you for developing the SEEQ and for allowing me to use it in this study. Your work has helped teachers and students around the world.

To my sisters and brother…You have made my life fuller than you know. Thank you for the love and respect that you have showed me throughout my life and the faith you had in me while I was on this journey.

To my mother and father…Thank you both for providing us with a home in which kindness was expected, books valued, and ideas listened to. Our family travels taught us to appreciate the human condition and the gift of each other's company.

To Nancy Jean Haselow…Your love and companionship have made my life an exciting adventure. Your faith, encouragement, and support are what allowed me to both begin and complete this doctoral program. Thank you for being my partner in life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER 4

REFERENCES

TABLES

FIGURES

APPENDICES

CURRICULUM VITAE

ABSTRACT

This is the first study done in Cambodia wherein students used the Student Evaluations of Educational Quality (SEEQ) evaluation tool to evaluate the teaching quality of their instructors. Respondents were instructors and students from the English Language Support Unit at the Royal University of Phnom Penh. This study generated data from mid- and end-of-semester administrations of the SEEQ, mid-semester consultations with teachers in the experimental group, and end-of-semester debriefings with teachers and students. The data generated in this study provides an early understanding of what instructors and students in a Cambodian university setting think about students evaluating instructors' teaching and the impact of gender on teaching quality.

Overall, data indicated that both instructors and students believed that students were sufficiently observant and ethical to provide useful feedback to instructors. Respondents believed that instructors would use this feedback, self-evaluations using the SEEQ, and consultations, to improve their teaching. Most instructors and students indicated they believed that student evaluations of teachers (a) did not cause instructors' to lose Face, (b) were culturally acceptable for students to do, and (c) should occur every semester. Most respondents indicated they believed women to be as competent teachers as men. Further, that teaching ability, not gender, was the most appropriate metric to use when evaluating instructors. Lastly, respondents noted that as female instructors were primarily responsible for the domestic chores in their homes, they had to balance the demands of their jobs with childcare, housework, and other family responsibilities.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

This study investigated whether a method commonly used in Western institutions of higher education (IHEs) to improve teaching effectiveness would produce similar results at a Cambodian IHE. The method examined in this study involved providing instructors randomly assigned to an experimental condition with mid-semester feedback consisting of data from student evaluations of teachers (SETs) and a consultation. This study used data from end-of-semester SETs to assess changes in teaching. In addition to collecting quantitative data about SETs, the study's mixed-method design collected qualitative data regarding participants' (a) reactions to students evaluating instructors and (b) the impact gender had on participants' evaluation of teachers.

History of Education in Cambodia

From the beginning of independence from France in 1953 until 1970, successive national governments spent up to 20% of annual national budgets establishing the country's elementary through university public education programs (Ayres, 2000a). By 1972, hyperinflation, civil war, and U.S. bombing of the entire country had virtually ended public and private education throughout most of Cambodia (de Walque, 2004; Duggan, 1996). Khmer Rouge troops entered Phnom Penh in April of 1975 and began a nearly four-year long reign of terror resulting in the death of approximately one out of every five Cambodians (CIA, 2007). The Khmer Rouge regime's targeting of educated people resulted in the deaths of 75% to 90% of teachers, 96% of university students, and nearly 70% of secondary and upper elementary students (CIA, 2007; Clayton, 1998). During the Khmer Rouge's regime, schools throughout the country remained closed. The only education taking place in Cambodia consisted of a very

few elementary students being taught basic literacy and numeracy skills in non-school settings such as stables or outdoors under trees. Classes were typically half-day and instructors often illiterate. For most Cambodians however, no education took place until after the Khmer Rouge fled Phnom Penh in January of 1979. The longing for education was apparent from the beginning of the post-Khmer Rouge chapter of Cambodian history as nearly one million students attended school in the 1979-1980 school year (Ayres, 2000a; MoEYS, 2005b). Cambodia ratified its present constitution in 1993 – Article 65 guaranteeing all Cambodians the right to a quality education (Cambodia, n.d.). Only in 1999 did the last of the Khmer Rouge surrender, providing Cambodians with their first year of peace in the previous 30 years (CIA, 2007).

Cambodian Institutions of Higher Education

Cambodia's first IHE, the Royal Khmer University, opened in 1960. In 1975, the Khmer Rouge closed all IHEs and other educational institutions throughout the country. IHEs reopened in 1980 after the Khmer Rouge were removed from power. During the decade of Vietnamese occupation, 1978-1988, IHE instructors were Vietnamese, Russian, and Cambodian. The former conducted classes in Vietnamese and Russian – neither of which students understood well. Although students understood the Cambodian instructors, these instructors had been high school teachers prior to the Khmer Rouge regime and were not qualified to teach at the post-secondary level (King, 2003).

Until 1997, successive Cambodian governments allowed only publicly-funded, non-tuition charging IHEs to operate in the country. In 1997, the government began allowing (a)

privately-funded IHEs to open, and (b) both privately- and publicly-funded IHEs to charge tuition (Chealy, 2006). By 2006, Cambodian IHEs had a total enrollment of 97,524 students. In 2007, 40 of the 62 IHEs operating within Cambodia were private, tuition-charging IHEs (Chealy, 2009).

Royal University of Phnom Penh

Established in 1960 as the Royal Khmer University, the Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP) is the oldest and largest university in Cambodia (RUPP, 2008a). RUPP is a tuition charging publicly-funded IHE located on three campuses within Phnom Penh. RUPP confers bachelor's (RUPP, 2008e) and master's (RUPP, 2008c) degrees. RUPPs school year consists of two 19-week semesters with start dates in September and February respectively (RUPP, 2008b). All of RUPPs approximately 300 academic staff hold university degrees including 132 masters degrees and 15 doctorates. Almost one-third of RUPPs approximately 8,900 undergraduate and 250 graduate students were women (RUPP, 2008d). RUPP is the only IHE in Cambodia to be a member of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations' University Network (ASEAN, 2007). In its Vision, Mission, and Objectives statements, RUPP aspires to (a) create knowledge, (b) encourage teaching competence and confidence, and (c) promote research for academic advancement (RUPP, 2008a). RUPP groups its academic and vocational programs under three faculties that are synonymous with the U.S. nomenclature of schools and colleges. RUPPs faculties are the (a) Faculty of Science, (b) Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, and (c) the Institute of Foreign Languages (RUPP, 2008a). Within these faculties are 24 departments similar to those found in U.S. IHEs. The Department of Foundation supervises the mandatory first year general education program required of all students (See

Table 1). RUPP also operates seven research centers and institutes including the (a) Cambodia-Japan Cooperation Center, (b) Center for Population Studies, (c) Continuing Education Center, (d) English Language Support Unit, (e) IT Center, (d) Library Services, and (f) Quality Assurance Unit (RUPP, 2008f).

Table 1

Faculties and Departments within the Royal University of Phnom Penh

Faculty	Departments
Faculty of Science	Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Environmental Science, Mathematics, Physics
Faculty of Social Science and Humanities	Geography, History, Khmer Literature, Social Work, Linguistics, Media and Communication, Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, Tourism
Institute of Foreign Languages	English, French, Japanese, Korean, Khmer for Foreigners, Language Courses (Thai, Chinese)
Department of Foundation Studies	Foundation

The faculty and students volunteering for the this study came from RUPPs English Language Support Unit (ELSU). The ELSU served approximately 1,400 students and ELSU classes averaged 30 students each. Participating students were undergraduates in their first three years at RUPP. RUPP required undergraduate students to complete six semesters of English from the ELSU. This graduation requirement existed because (a) English was the

language of instruction in many RUPP courses, (b) RUPP courses commonly used English language textbooks and research materials, and (c) English speaking ability was believed to be critical for RUPP students to be competitive in the job market upon graduation (N. Tao, personal communication, September 30, 2009). The ELSUs 35 member faculty consists of 28 Cambodians and seven expatriates of which eleven of the 28 Cambodians are women. The entire ELSU Cambodian faculty possesses bachelor's degrees and 12 hold master degrees from IHEs outside of Cambodia.

Problem: Lack of Individual Teacher Evaluations at RUPP

RUPP had incorporated many of the structures, processes, and policies found in Western IHEs. However, a major difference between RUPP and Western IHEs is that RUPP had yet to implement a university-wide system of evaluating the teaching effectiveness of individual instructors' (L. Ahrens, personal communication, September 23, 2009). Instead, students completed a 10-question survey near the end of the academic year. The survey asked students to evaluate their overall experience at the university for that academic year. The RUPP Quality Assurance office released these survey results to Faculties and departments several months after survey completion. In contrast, students in the ELSU department evaluated their instructors in one course once a year. Instructors received simple mean scores for each item and a summary of students' comments prior to the start of the following semester. Instructors did not receive a consultation with the evaluation results. ELSUs management team constructed the surveys with input from ELSU faculty. Surveys were unique to individual courses.

The lack of a university-wide program of SETs was not surprising given four aspects of Cambodian history and culture discussed below: (a) the 30 years of civil disruption that ended only recently, (b) the hierarchical view of relationships, (c) the importance given to *Face*, and (d) the prescribed Buddhist ideal of student-teacher relationships.

Thirty years of pain. Cambodia's 30 years of civil war, genocide, occupation, and civil unrest ended in 1999. The tragedy of the Khmer Rouge experience alone resulted in nearly all of RUPPs students, instructors, and administrators being tortured, murdered, or worked to death. Under the Khmer Rouge, it was common to execute individuals found to be at fault for a variety of minor offenses. The widespread murdering of people with a higher education may have contributed to RUPP administrators being hesitant to implement a university-wide system of students evaluating instructors.

Hierarchy counts. Cambodian families teach children that age and gender determine the amount of respect appropriately accorded to individuals and that authority is to be revered (Hinton, 1996). This hierarchical world view and attitude towards authority extends to relationships outside of the family and permeates Cambodian culture (Kelley, 1996). Traditionally, individuals with lower status have not had the right to question or evaluate those of higher status (Ayres, 2000b). These beliefs about hierarchy and attitudes towards authority are key components of the Cambodian concept of Face.

Face is very important. Face is of the greatest social importance and is similar to the Western concept of status. How others (a) respond to one's performance – positively or negatively, (b) display obedience and respect, and/or (c) perceive one's level of wealth (Hinton, 1996), determines one's level of Face. An example of the importance of Face were the warnings I received from two expatriates who had had worked within Cambodia's higher

educational system for more than five years. These individuals noted that a study which caused an instructor to publicly lose Face could be fatal to the study's author (confidential personal communications, October 1, 2008). The current study's design and implementation was such that instructors did not lose Face whether or not they participated in the study.

Buddhist view of teachers. Cambodian adherence to Buddhism may also have contributed to the absence of a university-wide program of students evaluating instructors at RUPP. At least ninety-five percent of Cambodians are Buddhist (CIA, 2007). The Buddhist cosmology accords teachers very high status - second only to parents. Further, Buddhist doctrine explicitly describes the ideal student-teacher relationship. It is one in which students revere teachers and teachers protect students and educate them well. No mention is made of students evaluating teachers (Kaw, 1999). With this Buddhist perspective on student / teacher relationships being part of Cambodian culture for more than eight hundred years, it is difficult to overstate the impact of its teachings on expectations regarding student-teacher relationships. Thus, given that RUPP administrators, instructors, and students have grown up within a culture that supports respect for hierarchy, reverence for authority, importance of Face, and the Buddhist student-teacher relationship ideal, it is understandable that a university-wide program of SETs were not common at RUPP.

Adoption of SETs

Three factors appear to have mitigated these traditional cultural and religious influences such that university-wide SETs now have an opportunity to become a part of RUPPs academic environment. The factors are the (a) diminished status held by Cambodian teachers and IHE instructors, (b) SETs taking place at IHEs in other Asian countries, and (c) student access to

information not controlled by instructors. At the time of the current study, the social status of teachers in Cambodia was lower than it was prior to the early 1970's. This diminished social status began when the Khmer Rouge killed more than 90% of Cambodia's IHE instructors (CIA, 2007; Clayton, 1998). Research indicates that Cambodia's IHE instructors generally lacked expertise in their subjects and had poor teaching skills (Ahrens & Kemmerer, 2002). Two Cambodian graduate students anecdotally commented to me that the pedagogical repertoire of some of their undergraduate instructors' consisted of only reading aloud verbatim from textbooks. Education in these courses involved students writing down what their instructors' read aloud, memorizing their notes, and reproducing the information on exams (confidential personal communications, September 5, 2008). Also contributing to the diminished status of IHE instructors were the unofficial education fees Cambodians paid to teachers and administrators throughout their primary and secondary educational careers. To insure that they received these fees, teachers commonly provided needed exam material only during after-hours tutoring sessions (MoEYS, 2005a). These fees ranged from one to almost three U.S. dollars (USD) per month per student. With approximately 35% of working Cambodians earning less than two USD a day (ADB, 2006, p. 2, Table 1), these fees were a significant financial burden on many families and contributed to the negative reputation of teachers. Although IHE instructors did not usually charge such fees, the damage to the reputations of instructors already taken place by the time students entered university. Finally, another practice that reduced the social status of IHE instructors is that at the time of the current study, IHE instructors at publicly funded universities, such as RUPP, were earning approximately $100 a month - less than a living wage. This reduced amount of Face accorded

to IHE instructors provided an opportunity to modify the interactions between students and teachers to include SETs.

The second factor contributing towards Cambodian IHE instructors accepting SETs are the SET studies successfully taking place in other Asian cultures. As in Cambodia, teachers in these other cultures have traditionally enjoyed elevated social status and have not been subject to student evaluations. For example, in Hindu cultures, the relationship between students and IHE instructors has historically been that of disciples and gurus. However, Watkins and Thomas (1991) and Watkins and Regmi (1992) found that 111 Indian and 297 Nepalese graduate students, respectively, overcame their disciple roles and were able to formally evaluate their IHE instructors. Further, these students were able to discern between what they perceived to be good and poor instructors. Similarly, Marsh, Hau, Chung, and Siu's (1997) study of 844 Chinese undergraduate students in Hong Kong and Tsai's (2005) study involving 626 students at four universities in northern Taiwan found that these students were able to overcome Chinese cultural prohibitions against criticizing teachers and complete evaluations on their instructors. In all four of these studies (Marsh et al., 1997; Tsai, 2005; Watkins & Regmi, 1992; Watkins & Thomas, 1991) students from different Asian cultures evaluated teachers even though their cultures did not provide cultural or historical support for them to do so.

The third factor contributing towards the acceptance of SETs at Cambodian IHEs is the powerful effect of the Internet on the roles of instructors and students. The quantity of information readily available through the Internet has resulted in IHE instructors no longer being students' primary sources of information. Indeed, instructors' traditional role of dispensers of officially sanctioned knowledge is changing to that of facilitators of learning

(Nguyen & McInnis, 2002). In response, students' roles are changing from receivers of official knowledge to consumers of education. Examples of RUPP students acting as consumers of education include choosing to attend RUPP from the more than 60 IHEs in the country and choosing among RUPPs three faculties and many majors.

In sum, RUPP students were willing to complete SETs on their instructors because (a) of the diminished status of their instructors, and (b) the students self-identification as consumers of post-secondary education. Ten ELSU instructors were willing to accept SET-based feedback given their (a) reduced amount of Face as compared to their pre-Khmer Rouge predecessors, (b) desire to improve their teaching skills, and (c) change in role from distributors of officially sanctioned knowledge to learning facilitators.

Student Evaluations of Teachers

General Design and Findings

Student evaluations of Teachers (SETs) involve students evaluating instructors' teaching effectiveness, often by completing surveys. The seminal work on SETs began in 1927 when Remmers (Remmers & Brandenburg, 1927) co-authored the first in a series of studies that examined whether a variety of factors influenced students' ratings of instructors. These factors included class size (Remmers, 1933), the halo effect (Remmers, 1934), students' grades (Remmers, Martin, & Elliott, 1949), and ratings of alumni versus current students (Drucker & Remmers, 1951). By 2007, researchers had completed more than 2,000 SET-related studies (Shao, Anderson, & Newsome, 2007). Research indicates that well designed SETs are (a) valid and reliable in evaluating university-level teaching (Aleamoni, 1999; Wachtel, 1998), (b) relatively unaffected by potential biases such as the grades received by students or course

difficulty (Marsh, 2001; Murray, 1997), and (c) multi-dimensional in that they measure different components of effective teaching (Marsh & Hocevar, 1990).

The common design of SET studies typically involves students completing SETs about their instructors at about five weeks after the start of the term. Shortly afterwards, instructors in experimental groups usually receive (a) feedback consisting of aggregated mid-term SET data, (b) sometimes data from other sources, and (c) possibly consultation. Instructors in control groups do not receive this feedback. Near the end-of-term, students once again evaluate their instructors. Investigators then compare mid-term and end-of-term SET data and try to determine how providing instructors with mid-term feedback affected their teaching effectiveness. The current study's design also (a) randomly assigned instructors to experimental and control groups, (b) provided feedback to instructors at mid-term, and (c) measured changes in teaching effectiveness using end-of-term SETs.

Duration of SET Studies

SET studies done within one semester are as successful at measuring changes in teaching effectiveness as studies taking longer than one semester (Cohen, 1980). In Cohen's (1980) meta-analysis of 17 studies, he conducted 22 comparisons - 19 of which were one semester long and three of which were longer than one semester. The correlation of the duration of the studies and total effect size was very small, only .09. This small effect size indicates little impact on student ratings of teachers whether studies were one semester long or longer. Data generated by this meta-analysis was useful in designing the current study. The current study also collected data during one semester and collected data on primary instructors

teaching regular university classes. The current study did not involve instructors who were graduate students or teaching in learning laboratories.

Consultation

The mid-term feedback provided to instructors in the current study included SET data augmented with consultation. Consultation is a teaching improvement activity that uses graduate students, peers, or teaching specialists as instructional consultants (Piccinin, Cristi, & McCoy, 1999). Consultation is a commonly found component of IHE teaching improvement programs in North America and Europe (Centra, 1978; Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Marsh, 2001). Instructors receiving mid-term feedback consisting of SET data and consultation typically receive higher student ratings of their teaching effectiveness as compared to instructors who receive SET data only (McKeachie et al., 1980; Overall & Marsh, 1979). Overall and Marsh (1979) and McKeachie et al (1980) conducted multi-section SET studies which included 30 sections of a computer science course and 40 sections of an introductory psychology course respectively. Both studies used different SET surveys, different examinations to measure student achievement, and different instruments to measure student affective outcomes. Yet data from both studies indicated that students rated instructors as being more effective if instructors had received set data augmented with consultation, less effective if they received set data only, and least effective if they received neither consultation nor SET data. Of particular interest in Overall and Marsh's (1979) study was that end-of-semester SET scores significantly favored the feedback group (n =12 instructors and 295 students) over the no-feedback group (n = 18 instructors and 456 students).

Data from meta-analyses (Cohen, 1980; Menges & Brinko, 1986) also supports augmenting mid-semester SET data with consultation. In Cohen's (1980) meta-analysis of 17 studies, the average effect size of feedback consisting of augmented SET data and consultation was .64 compared to .20 for SET data alone. The use of augmented SET data and consultation was the only variable significantly related to effect size. In Menges and Brinko's (1986) meta-analysis, five of the 30 studies also focused on the effects of providing instructors with mid-semester feedback that included augmented SET data. In four of the five studies, significant differences were found favoring feedback groups receiving augmented SET data versus the no feedback groups. Although the effect sizes of the five studies were highly variable, ranging from 0 to 2.50 with a standard deviation of 1.14, the reasons for this variability in effect sizes were unclear. Data from the remaining 25 studies indicated significant positive differences in end-of-semester SET scores favoring feedback over no-feedback groups. In summary, data indicated that providing instructors with mid-semester SET data augmented with consultation was more likely than not to improve teaching effectiveness as measured by end-of-semester SETs, student achievement, and affective measures (Cohen, 1980; McKeachie et al., 1980; Menges & Brinko, 1986; Overall & Marsh, 1979).

If augmented consultation is more helpful than merely providing SET data, what should be the form of consultation given to instructors? Penny and Coe's (2004) meta-analysis of 11 SET studies identified three models of consultation: advisory, diagnostic, and educational. In the advisory model of consultation, consultants (a) spent one to two hours with instructors, (b) engaged instructors in a collaborative, problem-solving form of discussion, and (c) used several sources of information about the effectiveness of instructors' teaching. The advisory model of consultation produced moderate-to-large positive effects on teaching effectiveness (*d*

= 0.78). Further, the sample size of studies analyzed as part of the meta-analysis (n = 6) was large enough to indicate that the effect size was reliable. The diagnostic model differs from the advisory model in that consultants' (a) spend less time with instructors, (b) engage in a more didactic style of interaction, and (c) use fewer sources of information about the instructors' teaching effectiveness. The diagnostic model showed only a modest effect on teaching effectiveness (d = 0.41, n = 2). In contrast to the diagnostic model, the educational model is similar to the advisory model. Although the educational model realized the greatest effect size of the three models (d = 0.83), Penny and Coe (2004) argued that the small sample size of studies using the educational model (n = 3) rendered the effect size unreliable. Further, studies using the educational model provided activities such as seminars and workshops given to whole faculty groups. These activities added considerable costs in terms of time and effort that may not be warranted given a difference of only an effect size of .05 between this and the advisory model. The current study used the advisory model because this model was the most cost effective given its moderate-to-large and reliable effect size.

SEEQ Questionnaire

SEEQs Development

Data from a variety of studies provided significant support for using the Students' Evaluations of Educational Effectiveness (SEEQ) (Marsh, 1982) survey to measure teaching effectiveness. The SEEQ is multi-dimensional in design, measuring nine Factors related to teaching effectiveness: (a) Learning / Value, (b) Instructor Enthusiasm, (c) Organization / Clarity, (d) Group Interaction, (e) Individual Rapport, (f) Breadth of Coverage, (g) Examinations / Grading, (h) Assignments / Readings, and (i) Workload / Difficulty.

Additionally, the SEEQ used in this study included a 10th Factor, Student Evaluations of Teachers, used to measure participants' reaction to students evaluating teachers.

In developing the SEEQ and conducting early SEEQ-based studies, Marsh (1982) used exceptionally large and diverse samples of courses, instructors, and students. From 1976 through 1982, students at the University of California–Los Angeles completed over 500,000 SEEQs in more than 20,000 courses representing more than 50 academic departments. Concurrently, from 1978 through 1982, students at the University of Southern California completed over 250,000 SEEQs in over 24,000 courses (Marsh & Hocevar, 1990). Data from these studies indicated that students in both feedback and no-feedback groups were similar on pre-test achievement scores and mid-term evaluations of their instructors. Instructors receiving mid-term feedback consisting of SEEQ data earned higher end-of-term SEEQ scores as compared to instructors who did not receive the mid-term SEEQ data. Also, students earned higher scores on standardized final exams and scored higher on affective outcome scales if their instructors received mid-term SEEQ data. It is appropriate to analyze SEEQ data by comparing class-average scores for the SEEQs factors based upon the total group and those based on each separate group (Marsh & Hocevar, 1990). The current study compares class-average scores of the SEEQs factors based upon the total sample of students and upon individual classes of students.

Using the SEEQ in Western and Asian Cultures

Researchers have used the SEEQ to measure teaching effectiveness in both Western and Asian cultures. Researchers have also used the SEEQ to evaluate two different groups of instructors. The first group consisted of instructors whose classes students were attending at the

time the studies took place. The second group consisted of students asked to rate the 'best' and 'worst' instructors from throughout their entire IHE experience. Table 2 presents a list of SEEQ-based studies conducted in Western and Asian countries divided between current instructors and instructors from throughout students' entire IHE careers. The language of the SEEQ instrument for three out of four studies done in Asia was English. In the fourth study, Marsh, Hau, Chung, and Siu (1997), done in Hong Kong, used a SEEQ instrument translated into Chinese.

Data from all four studies done in Asian cultures (Clarkson, 1984; Marsh et al., 1997; Watkins & Regmi, 1992; Watkins & Thomas, 1991) indicated that students within those cultures were able to differentiate between be good, average, and poor teachers on SEEQ items and scales. Students in non-Asian cultures were also able to differentiate between instructors' different levels of teaching effectiveness. The only exception to this result was the Workload/Difficulty scale. In six out of the seven studies in which students rated the best and worst teachers from throughout their IHE careers, students tended to rate good and poor instructors similarly on Workload/Difficulty items. Only the students in Hong Kong (Marsh et al., 1997) differentiated between instructors on their Workload / Difficulty scale.

In the seven studies listed in Table 2 in which students rated the best and worst teachers from throughout their IHE careers, students also identified SEEQ items that they thought were inappropriate. In all seven studies, 10% or more of students listed items relating to examinations and assignments as being inappropriate. The studies suggested this result might have occurred because many instructors gave only final examinations and often did not return graded exams to students. Also, some courses had no examinations and some did not require much reading outside of class. In four of the studies (Clarkson, 1984; Marsh, 1981; Marsh et

al., 1997; Marsh, Touron, & Wheeler, 1985), 10% or more of students found items related to interpersonal rapport or class interaction / class discussion to be inappropriate. In these studies, instructors tended to be part-time employees and most likely did not have time for students outside of class. In studies in which students found class interaction and discussion

Table 2

Categories of SEEQ Studies by Culture, Instructor Type, and Country of Study

Culture	Instructor Type	
	Current[a]	Best and Worst in IHE Experience
Western	Marsh (1982) (U.S.)	Marsh (1981) (Australia)
	Marsh and Roche (1993) (Australia)	Marsh, Touron, and Wheeler (1985) (Spain)
	Marsh and Hocevar (1990) (U.S.)	Watkins, Marsh, and Young (1987) (New Zealand)
	Coffey and Gibbs (2001) (UK and Other European Countries)	
Asian	None	Clarkson (1984) (Papua New Guinea)
		Watkins and Thomas (1991) (India)
		Watkins and Regmi (1992) (Nepal)
		Marsh, Hau, Chung, Siu, (1997) (Hong Kong)

[a]Only studies explicitly stating that students evaluated current instructors were included in the Current Instructor column of Table 2.

items to be inappropriate, the investigators of some of theses studies suggested that students were probably unwilling to engage in discussions within class. These findings may also reflect classes in which teachers may consider student input undesirable. Other than these few items,

students from both Western and Asian cultures evaluated almost all of the SEEQs items as being acceptable for use in evaluating classroom instruction. Further, student evaluators appeared to discriminate a range of teacher behaviors from good to poor.

Educational Transfer

Examining the adoption of educational policies and programs from other countries has been an area of study in comparative literature since the nineteenth century (Beech, 2006). Terms commonly used to describe this process are *educational borrowing and lending* (Perry & Tor, 2009). However, the current study used the term *educational transfer* because I believed this term to better reflect the complexity of educational entities at national, local, and school levels attempting to address challenges by adopting "…ideas, structures, and practices from [different] time[s] and place[s]" (Perry & Tor, 2009, p. 510).

The earliest well documented case of educational transfer occurred during the early 1900's at Achimota College in Ghana (Steiner-Khamsi & Quist, 2000). The colonial ministry of British Tropical Africa, included what is now Ghana, established Achimota College and created its curriculum using the Hampton-Tuskegee model of industrial-vocational education. Now known as adapted education, this curriculum originated at Hampton College and Tuskegee Institute in the U.S. Because of the perceived success of adapted education at Achimota College, educational institutions in British colonies around the world continued to adopt adapted education up through the 1950's (Steiner-Khamsi & Quist, 2000).

Often, comparative education research focuses on issues related to macro-level policy transfer (Sperandio, Hobson, Douglas, & Pruitt, 2009). In contrast, the current study investigates a micro-level example of educational transfer. That is, the use at a Cambodian IHE

of a SET program developed in the U.S. and used in both the U.S. and Western countries such as the United Kingdom, other European countries, and Australia.

Four aspects of educational transfer reflected in the current study were: (a) *agents of transfer*, (b) *cross-national attraction*, (c) *externalization*, and (d) *imposition*. Agents of transfer are "official policy makers, bureaucrats and politicians, … individuals, organizations and networks" (Perry & Tor, 2009, p. 516) who play significant roles in the adoption of foreign policies and programs. To a significant degree, the British Tropical Africa colonial education ministry selected the Hampton-Tuskegee model for Achimota College because of the high esteem in which the British authorities held three men who were advocates of adapted education. Similarly, RUPPs administration held in high regard a person who had been significantly involved in the post-Khmer Rouge reestablishment of the university. This person suggested that SETs might help improve teaching at RUPP and RUPPs administrators agreed to allow the current study to take place in the form of a voluntary professional development activity for instructors.

Cross-national attraction and externalization. Both cross-national attraction (Phillips & Ochs, 2004) and externalization (Schriewer, 2003) are commonly found in educational transfer and are apparent in RUPPs acceptance of the current study's activities. Cross-national attraction refers to policy makers being more successful in promoting the adoption of policies and programs from foreign countries than similar policies and programs found locally. Externalization recognizes that officials reference authorities' external to local environments in order to imbue foreign policies and programs with seemingly objective proofs of efficacy. Some RUPP administrators may have recognized that SETs might help improve teaching effectiveness, but concerns including instructors' losing Face may have prevented the adoption

of SETs. In order to address that issue, administrators have attempted to reduce threats to instructors' Face by offering the current study's SET experience as a voluntary staff-development activity. Further, administrators have 'talked up' the current study's SET activity by touting that the concept and process comes from the U.S. (cross-national attraction) and that an American researcher from a U.S. university was to conduct the program (externalization).

Imposition. Imposition denotes educational transfer forced upon the receivers of policies and programs by entities with greater political and/or monetary resources. This activity may be done using positive sounding "…apolitical, technical and neutral terms such as 'diffusion', 'knowledge sharing', [or] 'best practice'…" (Perry & Tor, 2009, p. 519). In the example of Achimota College, the British colonial authorities had the power to determine which curriculum the College was to use. Perry and Tor (2009) note that coerced educational transfer tends not to endure and, by the early 1950's, adapted education was no longer found in the curriculum of Achimota College. To ensure that the current study was not coercive in design or implementation, all participants received complete information about the project. I told all participants that their choice to participate was voluntary and that only those giving informed consent would participate. The RUPP administrators affirmed the voluntary nature of the activity by telling instructors that their participation in the study was an optional professional development activity. The cash stipends used in the current study were not coercive in nature because non-participating instructors did not lose any money – their paychecks were the same as in any other month. Participation in the activity required instructors to expend time and effort beyond normal staff-development activities. Therefore, the cash stipends and Letters of Professional Development received by participating instructors were no different in character from additional salary received for teaching extra classes.

Research Questions

Using a mixed-method model, I collected quantitative data to better understand how useful the SEEQ was in measuring the teaching effectiveness of ELSU instructors. Qualitative data gathered during the study provided a better understanding of how instructors and students reacted to commonly-used Western methods of evaluating instructors. Mixed-method studies have the potential to gather data in ways that the results of the study are actually two parallel sub-studies (Yin, 2006). The current study addressed this issue by designing some of the quantitative and qualitative measures to overlap, thereby strengthening the connections between data from the two sources. Specifically, some of the closed-ended questions on the SEEQ survey and some of the open-ended questions asked during consultations and debriefings, addressed one of the central qualitative questions. That question asked what instructors and students thought and how they felt about participating in a semester-long teaching evaluation program using the SEEQ survey.

The current study was the first in a South East Asian country in which students evaluated their current instructors using the SEEQ survey. I used SEEQ data generated at mid-semester to inform the consultation used during the treatment condition (X). The goal was to discover if providing instructors with SEEQ data and consultation would result in instructors improving their teaching effectiveness. During the end-of-semester debriefings, I used data generated from throughout the study to help instructors determine how they could improve their teaching quality during upcoming semesters. Debriefing sessions also addressed issues that instructors or students had concerning their participation in the study.

Quantitative research questions:

1. Were the means of the nine Factor scores from the SEEQ the same for instructors who received mid-semester feedback as for those instructors who do not receive such feedback?
2. What items from the SEEQ did 10% or more of instructor and student participants believe to be inappropriate in the study's setting?
3. Did students and instructors believe that providing instructors with mid-semester feedback helped instructors improve their teaching effectiveness?
4. Did students and instructors believe that students evaluated instructors' fairly at the mid-semester and end-of-semester administrations of the SEEQ?
5. Did students and instructors believe it was acceptable for students to evaluate instructors' teaching effectiveness using the SEEQ or other methods of evaluation?
6. Did students and instructors believe that instructors lose Face when students evaluate them?

The current study had two primary qualitative research questions. The first addressed how participants reacted to students evaluating their instructors. The second primary qualitative research question gathered data on the impact of students' and instructors' gender on students' perception of teachers. I collected qualitative data during structured orientations, observations, consultations, debriefings, and unplanned and unstructured interactions. I recorded comments regarding the study made by students and instructors. (See Appendix A. Sources of Data for Research Questions.)

Qualitative research questions:

1. What did participants think and how did they feel about students evaluating teachers using the SEEQ survey?
2. How did the gender of students and instructors influence their perception of teachers?

Sub-questions:

1. Which aspects of Cambodian culture were identified as being likely to modify the way the program operates and how were they addressed?
2. Which aspects of Cambodian culture changed expected outcomes and how were they addressed?
3. What did students and instructors think about the SEEQ as an evaluation tool?
4. How did students and instructors feel about participating in the study?
5. What did students and instructors think about students evaluating instructors?
6. How did instructors feel about students evaluating them?
7. What did students and instructors think about having SETs in upcoming semesters?
8. What were students' and instructors' perspectives on female teachers?

CHAPTER II

Method

Participants

Faculty participants. Using purposeful sampling, I recruited 10 Cambodian faculty volunteers, four women and six men, from RUPP's English Language Support Unit (ELSU). Faculty participated in this study as part of a voluntary, stipend-compensated, professional development activity. Participating faculty received assurances from RUPP administrators that their involvement or non-involvement in the study would not affect their employment, promotion, or tenure status. Participating faculty met four criteria: One, they were teaching at least one ELSU class of 10 or more students during the second semester of school year 2009-2010. Two, I believed these participants would be "information rich" (Patton, 2002, p. 46). That is, these individuals would be able to provide unique and important insights from a Cambodian perspective when answering the study's research questions. Three, the participating ELSU instructors were willing to allow me to recruit students from their classes to participate in the study. Four, I did not understand Khmer, Cambodia's national language, and the ELSU instructors were sufficiently fluent in English to communicate with me.

The average age of the seven out of ten participating ELSU instructors who chose to disclose their age was 33. However, as this group included the two oldest instructors, ages 42 and 43 respectively; I believe the actual average age would have been closer to 29. The average number of years teaching at the university level for the seven out of the nine instructors who reported their years of teaching was 3.6. In contrast, the two oldest instructors had taught for twelve and eight and a-half years respectfully. Seven of the ELSU instructors held bachelor degrees that they had earned since 2005 at RUPP's Institute of Foreign Languages (IFL). An

eighth instructor had also earned his bachelor's degree from IFL in 2002 and was in the process of earning a master's degree from a university in Canada. The oldest male instructor had earned his bachelor's degree from RUPP in 1998 and a master's degree in Thailand in 2003. The oldest female instructor had earned had earned two master's degree – one in Russia in 1993 and one in Thailand in 2003.

When was founded in 1960, most instructors at RUPP were French nationals, not Cambodians. However, RUPP employed perhaps five Cambodian women instructors before the Pol Pot regime closed the university 1975. One woman taught biology; one taught French; two taught physics; and one taught within the Faculty of Medicine. After the fall of Pol Pot, records indicate four Cambodian women instructors were on the faculty (L. Ahrens, personal communication, November 28, 2011). These women taught biology, physics, and chemistry. In addition, some of RUPP's instructors were Vietnamese women who may have taught Marxist-Leninist philosophy and other courses. As of November, 2011, RUPP's female instructors were mostly represented in the biological and social sciences. Women headed the physics, psychology, and social work departments and RUPP had two female Vice-Rectors (L. Ahrens, personal communication, November 27, 2011).

I randomly assigned half of the participating instructors to an experimental condition and half to a control condition. Instructors teaching more than one class with an enrollment of 10 or more students had one of her or his classes randomly selected to participate in the study. I conducted the study within the guidelines of Lehigh University's Office of Research and Sponsored Programs' Institutional Review Board and RUPPs regulations regarding the use of human participants in research. I told instructors that their participation was completely voluntary and obtained instructors' informed consent prior to their participation. To encourage

instructor participation, participating faculty received Letters of Professional Development noting their involvement in the study. Participating instructors also received $50 from a RUPP staff-development fund to compensate them for doing the extra work that participation in the study required.

Student participants. I recruited student volunteers to participate in the current study from the randomly selected classes of participating instructors. I told all potential student participants that their participation or non-participation in the study was completely voluntary and would have no effect on their grades. Further, I told students that the study's design attempted to reduce students' stress about providing potentially embarrassing feedback about their instructors that might cause instructors to lose Face and / or retribution to the students. Key to this effort was not assigning identification numbers to student volunteers, ensuring that the student surveys were anonymous. Students gave their informed consent prior to participating in the study. To encourage student participation, I entered students into random drawings for cash prizes of $10 U.S. dollars. The drawings took place in each class after students completed the mid-semester SEEQ and again after completing end-of-semester SEEQ.

RUPP segregates into different classes students attending on scholarships from and students who pay for their tuition. Some instructors noted that they preferred working with students on scholarship because they were often more motivated and more academically skilled than fee-paying students. All of the student participants in this study were attending RUPP on scholarships. Students earned their scholarships (a) by earning high scores on their high school graduation tests, (b) being female, (c) being from very poor families, or (d) belonging to ethnic minorities. The majority of students' came from the provinces and their families were poor. Although the scholarships covered tuition fees for the students whose families lived outside out

of Phnom Penh, the cost of room, board, books, and incidentals often caused great hardship. Some students had to withdraw from RUPP because they could not afford these non-tuition costs.

Instrument

SEEQ Validity and Reliability. The SEEQ instrument used in the current study presented 33 items that measured student ratings of classroom teaching effectiveness. For 29 of the items, students' rated instructor's teaching characteristics from one (strongly disagree) to nine (strongly agree). For two of the items, students rated an instructor's behavior from one (very easy) to nine (very hard). One item asked students to rate an instructor's behavior from one (too slow) to nine (too fast). One item asked the number of hours per week that students spent on class work. All of these items were then assigned to nine factors based upon previous studies: (a) learning / value, (b) instructor enthusiasm, (c) organization / clarity, (d) group interaction, (e) individual rapport, (f) breadth of coverage, (g) examinations / grading, (h) assignments / readings, and (i) workload / difficulty (Marsh & Hocevar, 1990). Marsh and Hocevar (1990) examined the SEEQs construct validity by conducting factor analyses of SEEQs completed by students in more than 24,000 courses at the University of Southern California. The authors' divided the responses into 21 sub-groups based upon instructor level, course level, and academic discipline. In both the total group and in each of the 21 sub-groups, factor analyses consistently identified the SEEQs nine factors. Additionally, the SEEQ used in this study included a 10^{th} Factor, Student Evaluations of Teachers (SETs), used to measure participants' reaction to students evaluating teachers. The Factor SET consists of four survey items that address the current study's qualitative questions three through six. See Table 3.

I used Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient to assess the internal consistency among responses to the items designed to measure the same component of teaching effectiveness. The reliability of the class-average response for the SEEQ, based upon responses of all the students in a class who complete the SEEQ, increases with the number of students in the class. Marsh (1982) found that the alpha reliability coefficient of all items in classes of 10 students was 0.74; in classes of 25 students, 0.90; and in classes of 50 students, 0.95.

Results indicated the SEEQ to be reliable and valid in studies done in the U.S. (Marsh, 1982; Marsh & Hocevar, 1990) and other Western cultures including Australia (Marsh, 1981), New Zealand (Watkins et al., 1987), Spain (Marsh et al., 1985), and the United Kingdom (Coffey & Gibbs, 2001). Results also indicated the SEEQ is reliable and valid in studies done in Asian cultures including Hong Kong (Marsh et al., 1997), India (Watkins & Thomas, 1991), Nepal (Watkins & Regmi, 1992), and Papua New Guinea (Clarkson, 1984). However, results from the four SEEQ–based studies done in Asian cultures indicate that the SEEQ displayed different levels of validity with the different samples of students. The study done in Hong Kong (Marsh et al., 1997) used a Chinese language version of the SEEQ. This study was the only one of the four Asian-based studies that used a non-English version of the SEEQ. Students in the Hong Kong study differentiated between the SEEQs nine factors of teaching effectiveness similarly to students using English language versions of the SEEQ used in studies done in Australia and the U.S. Data from the studies done in India (Watkins & Thomas, 1991), Nepal (Watkins & Regmi, 1992), and Papua New Guinea (Clarkson, 1984) indicated less validity than data from the study done in Hong Kong. In the former three studies, item factor analysis indicated that when evaluating teaching effectiveness, students tended to group items from different factors together more often than did students from Hong Kong, Australia, and

Table 3

SEEQ Survey Items 36 – 39 and Corresponding Quantitative Research Questions 3 – 6

SEEQ Survey Items	Quantitative Questions
36. Receiving student feedback at mid-semester helps instructors improve their teaching effectiveness	3. Do students and instructors believe that providing instructors with mid-semester feedback helps instructors improve their teaching effectiveness?
37. Students evaluate instructors fairly	4. Do students and instructors believe that students evaluated instructors' fairly at the mid-semester and final administrations of the SEEQ?
38. It is acceptable for students to evaluate instructors' teaching	5. Do students and instructors believe it is acceptable for students to evaluate instructors' teaching effectiveness using the SEEQ or other methods of evaluation?
39. Instructors lose Face when evaluated by students	6. Do students and instructors believe that instructors lose Face when students evaluate them?

the U.S. Specifically, the three studies recognized a stronger than expected factor consisting of items that addressed teaching skill, teacher enthusiasm, and student-teacher rapport that was not evident in the studies done in Hong Kong, Australia, and the U.S.

Although Clarkson's (1984) study in Papua New Guinea had a small sample size (n = 51) of second year mathematics students, 10% or more of the students found 27 of the 33 survey items to be inappropriate to their school setting. Clarkson's study found significantly more than the 1 to 5 items deemed inappropriate by students in the remaining six studies in Table 2 in which students evaluated the best and worst instructors in their IHE experience.

Clarkson (1984) suggested that the high number of items reflected two things. First, students' did not value mathematics because it was a requirement to earn degrees in other fields, not a separate major. Second, although students most frequently listed items under Group Interaction as being inappropriate, the author indicates that faculty did not encourage student participation in class. I was interested in discovering how many survey items RUPP students would decide were inappropriate. This data helped me better understand how useful RUPP students found the SEEQ survey to be in evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Paper-Based Instrument Format. The current study used a paper-based instrument rather than a web-based instrument for two reasons. First, previous research indicated that IHE students were more likely to complete to paper-based, rather than web-based, instruments (Penny & Coe, 2004). Second, as Cambodia has one the highest Internet access costs in Southeast Asia (MoEYS, 2005c), participating in a web-based survey would be an onerous financial burden for many students.

Instrument Language. Although RUPP often conducts classes in English, Khmer is students' first language. Thus, the current study used a Khmer language version of the SEEQ (SEEQ-KL). Three Cambodians fluent in both Khmer and English, two of whom are earning Masters Degrees in public health, reviewed the SEEQ-KL and ensured its accurate translation and content integrity with the English version of the SEEQ.

Pilot Study. I conducted a pilot study using the SEEQ-KL with a small group of RUPP undergraduate students who did not participate in the study. I met with the students and obtained their informed consent to participate in the pilot study using a Khmer language version of the Student Informed Consent Form. I administered the SEEQ-KL surveys to the students in the absence of instructors or other RUPP personnel. I then conducted a group

interview with the students and asked them to comment on their understanding of the SEEQ-KL items and any issues they had concerning the instrument or its administration. I modified the SEEQ-KL based upon the feedback received. See Appendix C for a copy of the English language version of the questionnaire used in the current study. See Appendix B for the Khmer language version of the questionnaire (SEEQ-KL) used in the current study.

Reliability of SEEQ-KL. In the current study, as shown in Table 4, class sizes ranged from 19 to 30 students with a mean class size of 24 students. The reliability of the class-average response for the SEEQ-KL, based upon responses of all the students in a class who completed the SEEQ-KL, ranged from 0.34 to 0.87. Using George and Mallery's (2003, as cited in Gliem and Gliem, 2003) interpretation of Cronbach alpha reliability results, the coefficients in the current study was Good (> 0.8) or Acceptable (> 0.7) for nine classes, Questionable (> 0.6) or Poor (> 0.5) for six classes, and Unacceptable (< 0.5) for 5 classes.

Table 4

Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Classes at O_1 and O_2

O_1		O_2	
Cronbach Alpha	Class Size	Cronbach Alpha	Class Size
0.84	20	0.87	19
0.70	22	0.81	29
0.69	23	0.80	23
0.63	20	0.74	20
0.63	26	0.71	29
0.55	25	0.71	22
0.52	30	0.70	22
0.41	29	0.69	26
0.29	23	0.40	26
0.22	22	0.34	28

Note: Reliability coefficients from the Khmer language version of the SEEQ (SEEQ-KL).

Research Design and Procedure

In stage one of this study's two-stage mixed-method model, instructors randomly assigned to the experimental condition received feedback at mid-semester consisting of data from student evaluations of teachers (SETs) and a consultation with me. Instructors randomly assigned to the control group did not receive this feedback at mid-semester. In stage two, I used data from end-of-semester SETs to assess changes in teaching effectiveness. I also collected and analyzed instructor and student comments about their experiences with the evaluation program. These comments were from the first meetings in which I requested participants' involvement in the study through the final debriefing sessions. This second stage helped me to better understand the causes for the SET results gathered in first stage.

General Description. Figure 1 presents the modified version of the *pretest-posttest control group* design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) used in this study. The current study added an orientation (P_1) for instructors that occurred prior to the random assignment of instructors to the experimental and control conditions.

Figure 1. Current Study's Enhanced Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design

P_1	R	O_1	X	O_2 P_2	P_2
Orientation	Random Assignment	Pre-Test Observation	Treatment	Post-Test Observation & Debriefing	Debriefing
(Week 2)	(Week 3)	(Week 6)	(Week 8)	(Week 17)	(Week 22)
	Experimental Group	Student Orientation Mid-Semester SEEQ Instructor Self-Evaluation	SEEQ Data & Consult	End-of-Semester SEEQ, & Student Debriefing	Instructor Debriefing
Instructor Orientation	R				
	Control Group	Student Orientation Mid-Semester SEEQ Instructor Self-Evaluation		End-of-Semester SEEQ, & Student Debriefing	Instructor Debriefing

The current study's design also added a debriefing (P_2) for both students and instructors that occurred after students completed the SEEQ-KL at the end-of-semester (O_2). The debriefing for instructors took place after they submitted final grades for their students who participated in the current study.

Orientation (P_1). Approximately two weeks after the start of the semester, I conducted an orientation for instructor participants. See Appendix D *Interview Guide: Instructor Orientation* for a description of the orientation's structure and the topics addressed. During the orientation, I described (a) the purpose of the study, (b) the voluntary nature of the study, and (c) the study's design. I described the purpose of the study as consisting of two components. The first component was to discover how mid-semester student feedback affected teaching effectiveness as assessed by end-of-semester SETs. The second component was to learn what instructors and students thought and how they felt about SETs in general, the SEEQ in particular, and participating in the study. I described that participating faculty would be randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Instructors learned that those assigned to the experimental group would receive aggregated SEEQ-KL data and consultations with me at mid-semester (X). Instructors also learned that both those assigned to the experimental group and control group would receive aggregated SEEQ-KL data and consultations with me at the end-of-semester debriefing. I explained that participation in the study was completely voluntary and how the study's design protected the confidentiality of instructors and students. Instructors received two copies of Appendix F. *Instructor Consent to Participate in Research – Khmer language version* (See Appendix F). (To view an English language version, see Appendix E. *Instructor Consent to Participate in Research – English language version*.) During the orientation, I answered instructors' questions. I collected signed copies of the

Instructor Consent to Participate in Research – Khmer language version consent form from instructors who chose to participate in the study. Instructors retained a copy of the form for their records.

Random Assignment (R). At approximately the third week of the semester, I obtained instructor class schedule and student enrollment information from RUPPs administration. I randomly assigned Cambodian ELSU instructors to the experimental and control groups. Each of these instructors had volunteered to participate in the study and were teaching at least one class of 10 or more students. For instructors who were teaching more than one class of 10 or more students, I randomly selected one of their classes with 10 or more students to participate in the current study.

Pre-Test Observation (O_1). Approximately six weeks after the start of the semester, I conducted an orientation and pre-test observation (O_1) with individual classes of students of all participating instructors. Upon me entering the classrooms to conduct orientations and pre-test observations, I handed instructors copies of the SEEQ and asked them to complete them elsewhere. Instructors then left the classrooms and were not present during orientations or while students were completing the surveys. See Appendix G. *Interview Guide: Student Orientation* for a description of the orientations' structure and the topics addressed. During orientations, I described (a) the purpose of the study, (b) the voluntary nature of the study, and (c) the study's design. I described the purpose of the study as consisting of two components. The first component was to discover what how student feedback affected teaching effectiveness. The second component was to learn what students thought and how they felt about SETs in general, the SEEQ in particular, and participating in the study.

Students learned (a) that participation in the study was completely voluntary, and (b) how the study's design protected their confidentiality and that of their instructors. Students received two copies of Appendix H. *Student Consent to Participate in Research – Khmer language version*. (To view an English language version of the student consent form, see Appendix I. *Student Consent to Participate in Research –English language version*.) I answered students' questions about the study, their consent to participate in it, and the consent form. Students learned that the SEEQ form was anonymous and that it would be impossible for me to be able to tell anyone, including their instructors, how individual students completed the SEEQ. Further, that their instructors would only receive data aggregated by class. Students also learned that instructors would not receive aggregated end-of-semester SEEQ data (O_2) until after instructors had turned in final grades. I collected signed copies of the *Student Consent to Participate in Research – Khmer language version* from students who choose to participate in the study. I gave students a copy of the form for their records.

Student participants then completed SEEQ-KL surveys on their current ELSU instructors. See Appendix B. *SEEQ Questionnaire – Khmer language version* (referred to in this study as SEEQ-KL) to view the form students' completed. (To view an English language version of the form, see Appendix C. *SEEQ Questionnaire –English language version*.) I reminded students not to identify themselves in any way on the SEEQ-KL form. I conducted cash raffles for students upon each class's completion of the survey.

Treatment (X). At approximately the eighth week of the semester, instructors in the experimental group received the treatment (X) condition. Based upon the *advisory model* (Penny & Coe, 2004) of providing feedback to instructors, I provided each instructor in the experimental group with one individual consultation session that lasted from one to two hours.

Following the protocol articulated in Appendix J. *Interview Guide: Instructor Consultation*, I worked in a collaborative fashion with instructors to accomplish three goals. The first goal was to help instructors assess their teaching effectiveness. The second goal was to help instructors' identify one area in which they wish to improve their teaching effectiveness. The third goal was to assist instructors in developing plans for improving their teaching effectiveness in the area they identified. To accomplish the first goal of helping instructors accurately assess their teaching effectiveness, instructors evaluated their own teaching effectiveness by reviewing the SEEQ survey they completed earlier on themselves. Completing the SEEQ survey allowed instructors to evaluate their teaching effectiveness using the same survey items as used by their students. Six out of the eleven studies in Penny and Coe's (2004) meta-analysis used data from instructors' self-assessments during consultation. In all six studies, instructors completed the same assessment forms as their students. During the current study's consultation session, I provided instructors with aggregated SEEQ-KL data from their classes. The data consisted of item means grouped into the SEEQs factors (Marsh & Hocevar, 1990). With my help, the faculty assessed areas of incongruence between theirs and their students' responses to the SEEQ survey items. The second goal of the consultation was to help instructors identify one area of their teaching that they believed they could significantly improve during the current semester. Working with me, instructors used the SET data and their self-evaluation to identify one area in which they wished to improve during the current instructor. I then worked with instructors to achieve the third goal of devising specific, practical methods to help instructors improve their teaching effectiveness in the self-identified area. Also, I worked with instructors to develop criteria to measure the level of instructors' success in addressing their area of improvement.

The protocol ensured consistency in how I engaged with different instructors. The protocol also provided a description of what occurs during consultation sessions. This level of specificity addressed a significant shortcoming found in many SET studies, namely the lack of a detailed account of what actually happened in consultation sessions (Menges & Brinko, 1986; Penny & Coe, 2004).

Post-Test (O_2). At about 15 weeks after the start of the semester, I asked the students of all participating instructors to complete end-of-semester SEEQ-KL surveys (O_2). I reminded students that their participation was voluntary, that their SEEQ-KL responses were anonymous, and that instructors would receive data aggregated by class only after instructor had turned in final grades. After students completed the surveys, I debriefed students (P_2).

Debriefing (P_2). The debriefings (P_2) provided student and instructor participants in both the experimental and control groups with forums to share their thoughts and feelings about SETs, the SEEQ instrument, and participating in the study. For students, the debriefings occurred with students en masse in each classroom immediately after they completed the end-of-semester SEEQ-KLs (O_2). Instructors were not present. The goal of the student debriefings was to provide students with the opportunity to meet with me and discuss what they thought and how they felt about participating in the study. Because few students spoke English fluently, an interpreter asked students questions in Khmer. When students responded in Khmer, the interpreter repeated their responses in English for me and subsequently interpreted my responses to students in Khmer. In this way, the interpreter facilitated brief conversations between me and students. I also acquired other student-generated qualitative data from students' written comments on the mid-semester and end-of-semester SEEQ surveys. The interpreter translated comments written in Khmer into English. See Appendix K. *Interview*

Guide: Student Debriefing to review the protocol I used during the student debriefings. I conducted cash raffles as each class completed the debriefings.

For instructors, debriefings occurred after instructors posted their students' final semester grades. See Appendix L. *Interview Guide: Instructor Debriefing* to review the protocol I used during the instructor debriefings. The instructor debriefings had three goals. The first goal was to afford instructors a safe setting in which they could discuss their thoughts and feelings about participating in the study. The second goal was to provide instructors with anonymous student-generated feedback from the end-of-semester SEEQ-KLs (O_2). The third goal was to help instructors use feedback from throughout the semester to improve their teaching effectiveness in upcoming semesters. To accomplish the latter, I helped instructors (a) reflect upon the data from their self-assessment and the mid- and end-of-semester SEEQ-KL surveys, (b) set a goal for improving in one area of teaching during the following semester, and (c) develop strategies for attaining that goal. I provided each instructors with a $50 cash stipend during the debriefings.

Anonymity and Confidentiality. I assured students that their responses to survey questions would remain anonymous. I administered SEEQs to students in the absence of their instructors. The SEEQ had no place indicated on the form for a name and I told students not to write their names on the forms. Further, I told students that he would not divulge their individual written or verbal comments to instructors or RUPP administrators. Lastly, I told students that their instructors would only receive SEEQ data aggregated by class.

I assured instructors that data from SEEQs, consultations, and debriefings that identified individual instructors would remain confidential. I did not share this instructor-identifying information with students, colleagues, or administrators. I conducted consultations

and debriefings with instructors individually and out of the hearing of other people. I told instructors that he would report data generated from this study only in aggregate form in order to ensure instructors' confidentiality.

Collecting Qualitative Data Generated Throughout the Study. I gathered qualitative data using the *general interview guide* approach during the study's planned interactions - orientations, consultations, debriefings. This approach delimits the topics explored with participants, yet allows leeway as to the timing and specificity of individual questions (Patton, 2002). (See Appendix G: *Interview Guide: Student Orientation,* Appendix D: *Interview Guide: Instructor Orientation,* Appendix J: *Interview Guide: Instructor Consultation,* Appendix K: *Interview Guide: Student Debriefing,* and Appendix L: *Interview Guide: Instructor Debriefing*.) Additional qualitative data came from participant's written comments on the SEEQ surveys they completed.

During scheduled interactions, I gathered data using both fixed-response and open-ended questions. I used fixed-response questions to ensure participants understood the study's (a) purpose, (b) design, and (c) participant anonymity and confidentiality features. I used open-ended questions to discover what participants thought and how they felt about students evaluating instructors and participating in the study. Open-ended questions were neutral in construction and encouraged individual insights. I treated data generated from interviews with individual instructors as micro-case studies nested within the larger case of the participating ELSU faculty. During unplanned verbal interactions, I gathered data using the *informal conversational interview* approach during which I spontaneously generated open-ended questions resulting from the interaction. I noted unplanned interactions after the interactions took place.

Recordings and Transcriptions

With participants' permission, I made sound recordings during consultations and debriefings of instructors and students' comments. These recordings were used to make speech-focused (Schilling, 2006) verbatim transcriptions. Speech-focused verbatim transcriptions include audible behavior such as laughing that provide a better understanding of interviewees' responses. The transcriptions also included descriptions of the context in which the interviews took place, including: (a) when and where the interviews occurred, (b) descriptions of the physical environments in which interviews took place, and (c) descriptions of the teacher or student participants. I ensured participant anonymity in the transcriptions by substituting unique codes for the names of persons and institutions.

Data Analysis: Analysis of SEEQ-KL Data

The study used students as the unit of analysis. Using a 2 (experimental group and control group) X 2 (pre-test and post-test) analysis of variance (ANOVA) for independent groups I tested (a) whether means were the same at pre-test and post-test and (b) the interaction between the two factors. The analysis used an alpha level of .05 for all tests of the hypotheses.

Data Analysis: Analysis of Qualitative Data

The current study followed an analytical framework approach and organized qualitative data using cross-case analysis. Using cross-case analysis involved grouping together responses from planned interactions such as those generated from open-ended questions from the consultation and debriefing interview guides (Patton, 2002). The study also generated qualitative data during unplanned face-to-face interactions between participants and me.

Whether gathered from planned or unplanned interactions, written or verbal data, I strove to create thick, rich, accurate descriptions of participants' comments.

I recognized that each type of data gathered and each theoretical framework used to understand that data provided only a partial understanding of participants' understanding of and experience within the world. To develop a more in-depth and rich understanding of how participants' felt and what they thought about being involved in the study, SETs in general and the SEEQ in particular, the current study used data and theory triangulation. I gathered different types of data from multiple sources and interpreted the data using multiple theories. I used *grounded theory* (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) to discern the embedded meanings and relationships in the participants' responses. Grounded theory calls for using data to generate theories, as opposed to using data to modify established theories. Grounded theory facilitated my discovering patterns, themes, and categories from the data and offering informed hypotheses (theories) about relationships between these concepts. The qualitative units of analysis used in the current study were pieces of text that contained a single, "comprehensible…idea, episode, or piece of information" (Tesch, 1990, p. 116, as cited in Schilling, 2006, p. 31). These pieces of text were individual words, parts of sentences or paragraphs, or entire sentences or paragraphs (Mayring, 1994, as cited in Schilling, 2006). I used these pieces of text to develop *indicators*, *concepts*, and *variables*. I developed indicators from this study by selecting and grouping participants' statements that focused on specific, "events / actions / interactions (Strauss and Corbin, 1998)." Although concepts may consist of a single indicator, more typically concepts subsume numerous indicators - being what LaRossa (2005) refers to as saturated. In this study, I considered concepts saturated when additional indicators failed to add new perspectives or no additional indicators existed. Lastly, variables

subsumed at least two concepts. As the questions put to instructors and students in this study were overlapping, I used a cross-question (Mayring, 1994, as cited in Schilling, 2006) sequence of analysis. That is, I initially examined individual interviews in their entirety and then compared different participants' responses by question.

Although I attempted to reduce my *voice* to a minimum, I was aware that completely objective, "value-free inquiry is impossible" (Patton, 2002, p. 93). To reduce the amount of investigator bias, I engaged in *reflexive* interviewing. That is, I accepted that he was not an observer standing apart from participants recording observations in a completely objective manner. Rather, he was affecting and being affected by his interactions with participants in relation to a variety of issues including culture, values, class, race, gender, beliefs, and emotions (Hsiung, 2008, p. 212; Patton, 2002, p. 66). These points of contact with participants affected how I designed the study, where it took place, with whom he spoke, the questions he asked and did not ask, and how he interpreted participants' responses (Willig, 2001). By attempting to be reflexively self-aware in his interactions with participants, I attempted to be conscious of his own voice and perspectives when analyzing qualitative data (Patton, 2002). In this vein of reflexivity, I noted that at the time he interacted with the current study's participants he was a 54-year-old English speaking American Caucasian married man. He was a full-time doctoral student living in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. I had already earned graduate and undergraduate degrees in social work in New York City and Long Beach, California, respectively. For the decade prior to conducting the current study, I lived Africa and Asia, working in a variety of roles with students from five to 20 years of age. For the five years prior to that, I was an instructor and program director at a small, tribally controlled, community college in northeast Wisconsin. I was aware that my belief in the efficacy of using SETs to

evaluate and improve instructors' teaching skills influenced the study's design, implementation, and my interpretation of the data. Indeed, I may have been what Dolowitz and Marsh (1996, p. 345, as cited in Stone, 2000, p. 21) refer to as a "policy transfer entrepreneur." By being an American doctoral student from a prestigious American university, I may have helped provide, "the rhetoric…to give substance and legitimacy" (Stone, 2000, p. 21) to my belief that is possible to use SETs to improve teaching quality. The study's design combined with my stated belief in the usefulness of SETs may have influenced instructors' and students' perspective about SETs and the SEEQ.

CHAPTER III

Results

Quantitative Data

Quantitative Question 1: Do instructors receiving mid-semester feedback that includes data from student evaluations and a consultation receive higher mean scores compared to instructors who do not receive the mid-semester feedback?

To examine the effect of student feedback (experimental group, control group) and timing of SEEQ administration (mid-semester [O_1] and end-of-semester [O_2]) on student ratings of instructors, the study used a 2 X 2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) for independent groups. Table 5 presents the significant main effect of the student feedback condition found for four SEEQ Factors. The Factors are Organization - $F(1, 485) = 4.71$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$; Group Interaction - $F(1, 487) = 4.73$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$; Individual Rapport - $F(1, 487) = 12.49$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$; and Workload / Difficulty - $F(1, 485) = 5.21$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. A significant main effect of the timing of SEEQ administration condition was found for the SEEQ Factor Breadth - $F(1, 483) = 6.60$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. Table 6 presents the significant interaction effect of student feedback and timing of SEEQ administration for two SEEQ Factors. The two significant factors are Learning - $F(1, 487) = 8.06$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$; and Enthusiasm - $F(1, 487) = 9.63$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$.

The Factor Learning's control group O_1 total mean score was significantly higher than the experimental group's O_1 total mean score. At O_2, this difference was no longer significant. The Factor Enthusiasm's experimental and control groups' total mean scores at O_1 were not significantly different, but were so at O_2. At O_2, the experimental group's total mean score was significantly higher than the total mean score of the corresponding control group.

Quantitative Question 2: What items from the SEEQ did 10% or more of instructor and student participants believe to be inappropriate in the study's setting?

In the present study, SEEQ survey item 38 provided respondents the space to list up to five survey items respondents believed to be inappropriate. Respondents used their own criteria to determine a survey item's inappropriateness. Both instructor and student participants found most survey items to be appropriate. Instructor participants completed the SEEQ at O_1 only. Out of the 37 survey items related to teaching quality and students' evaluations of teachers, six out of ten instructors deemed 14 items inappropriate. Table 7 lists the 10 survey items found to be inappropriate by two instructors at one time.

Student participants completed the SEEQ survey at O_1 and O_2. At O_1, 10.2% of students, and at O_2, 14.2% of students, deemed as inappropriate survey item number 37, *Instructors lose face when evaluated by students*, of SEEQ Factor - Student Evaluations of Teachers. Item 37 was the only one that more than 10% of students found to be inappropriate at both O_1 and O_2. However, at O_1, 9.8% of students found survey item number 22, *Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories*, of the Factor - Breadth, to be inappropriate. At O_2, 10.2% of students deemed as inappropriate survey item number 21, *Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas / concepts developed in class*, also subsumed under the Factor Breadth.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance for SEEQ Survey Factors: Effect of Student Feedback (A), Timing of SEEQ Administration (B)

	Effect of Student Feedback (A)								Timing of SEEQ Administration (B)							
	Exp. Group			Control Group					Pre-Test (O_1)			Post-Test (O_2)				
SEEQ Factor	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	F-Test	η^{2b}	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	F-Test	η^2
Factor 1 - Learning	27.7	4.1	248	27.9	4.2	243	0.33	0.00	27.6	4.1	245	27.9	4.1	246	0.56	0.00
Factor 2 - Enthusiasm	28.1	4.2	248	27.9	4.8	243	0.16	0.00	27.9	4.7	245	28.1	4.3	246	0.25	0.00
Factor 3 - Organization	28.6	4.2	247	27.7	5.0	242	**4.71***	0.01	27.8	4.5	243	28.5	4.7	246	3.04	0.01
Factor 4 - Group Interaction	29.4	4.3	248	28.4	5.2	243	**4.73***	0.01	29.0	4.6	245	28.8	5.0	246	0.16	0.00
Factor 5 - Individual Rapport	26.8	4.7	248	25.1	5.9	243	**12.49***	0.02	25.6	5.5	245	26.4	5.3	246	2.25	0.01
Factor 6 - Breadth	24.2	5.3	246	23.5	5.3	241	2.29	0.01	23.2	5.6	242	24.5	5.0	245	**6.60***	0.01
Factor 7 - Exams	22.8	3.1	247	22.3	3.4	243	3.58	0.01	22.4	3.5	244	22.7	3.0	246	1.62	0.00
Factor 8 - Assignments	15.6	2.1	247	15.6	2.1	243	0.11	0.00	15.6	2.2	244	15.6	2.0	246	0.01	0.00
Factor 9 - Workload / Difficulty	21.4	3.6	247	22.2	3.9	242	**5.22***	0.01	21.7	4.0	243	21.9	3.5	246	0.56	0.00
Factor 10 - SETs	26.9	4.4	247	26.7	3.8	241	0.13	0.00	26.6	4.2	242	27.0	4.0	246	1.15	0.00

Note. SEEQ = Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality. SETs = Student Evaluations of Teachers.
[b]η^2 = Partial Eta Squared.
*$p < .05$.

Table 6

Analysis of Variance for SEEQ Survey Factors: Interaction (A X B)

	Experimental						Control							
		O_1			O_2			O_1			O_2			
Factor	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	F-Score	η^{2b}
1. Learning	**27.0***[a]	4.2	121	28.3	3.8	127	**28.2**	3.9	124	27.5	4.4	119	**8.06***	0.02
2. Enthusiasm	27.3	4.4	121	**28.8***[b]	4.0	127	28.4	4.9	124	**27.2**	4.4	96	**9.63***	0.02
3. Organization/Clarity	27.9	4.1	120	29.3	4.2	127	27.7	4.8	123	27.7	5.2	119	2.46	0.01
4. Group Interaction	29.1	4.1	121	29.6	4.6	127	28.8	5.1	124	28.0	5.3	119	2.18	0.00
5. Individual Rapport	26.0	4.9	121	27.6	4.3	127	25.2	6.0	124	25.1	5.9	119	3.06	0.01
6. Breadth of Coverage	23.4	5.2	120	24.9	5.4	126	23.0	5.9	122	23.9	4.6	119	0.31	0.00
7. Exams	22.4	3.4	120	23.2	2.8	127	22.3	3.6	124	22.2	3.2	119	2.47	0.01
8. Assignments	15.5	2.3	120	15.7	2.0	127	15.7	2.1	124	15.4	2.1	119	1.84	0.00
9. Workload / Difficulty	21.3	3.6	120	21.5	3.5	127	22.1	4.3	123	22.3	3.5	119	0.00	0.00
10. Student Eval of Teachers	26.3	4.9	120	27.4	3.9	127	26.9	3.5	122	26.6	4.1	119	3.34	0.01

Note. SEEQ = Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality.
M = Total mean scores obtained by first summing all responses for individual questions and then finding the mean of the total responses.
[a]Experimental group's O_1 total mean score significantly different than corresponding control group's O_1 total mean score.
[b]Experimental group's O_2 total mean score significantly different than corresponding control group's O_2 total mean score.
[b]η^2 = Partial Eta Squared.
**p* < .05.

Table 7

Survey Items Identified as Inappropriate by Two Instructors

No.	Survey Item
11	Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught so I knew where the course was going.
17	Instructor was friendly towards individual students.
21	Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas / concepts developed in class.
22	Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories.
24	Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field.
29	Readings, homework, laboratories contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject.
30	Class difficulty, relative to other classes, was ….
31	Class workload, relative to other classes, was ….
32	Class pace was ….
37	Instructors lose face when evaluated by students.

Note. Respondents rated survey items using a 1 to 9 Likert scale. For items 1 through 29 and 34 through 37, the descriptors corresponding to a Likert scale were: *Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree*. For items 30 and 31, the corresponding descriptors were: *Very Easy – Medium – Very Hard*. For item 32, the corresponding descriptors were: *Too Slow – About Right – Too Fast*.

Quantitative Questions 3 – 6:

3. *Did students and instructors believe that providing instructors with mid-semester feedback helped instructors improve their teaching effectiveness?*
4. *Did students and instructors believe that students evaluated instructors' fairly at the mid-semester and end-of-semester administrations of the SEEQ?*
5. *Did students and instructors believe it was acceptable for students to evaluate instructors' teaching effectiveness using the SEEQ or other methods of evaluation?*
6. *Did students and instructors believe that instructors lose Face when students evaluate them?*

This study discusses the results of quantitative questions three through six together because the results for these questions came from the data generated by survey items numbers

34 through 37 (see Appendix C). Survey items 34 – 37 are from the Factor, Student Evaluations of Teachers (SET). As shown in Table 8, a significant main effect of the student feedback condition was found for survey item 34, *Feedback improves teaching*, $F(1, 480) = 8.92$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. The mean score of the experimental group was significantly higher than that of the control group, 7.41 and 7.04 respectively. Also of note is that the mean scores for survey items 34, 35, and 36, ranged from 7.0 to 7.8 on the 9-point Likert scale used in the current study. These scores indicate that students were more likely to agree than disagree with these survey items, all of which supported student evaluations of instructors. Interestingly, the mean ratings for item 37, *Evaluated instructors lose face*, ranged from 4.6 to 4.9 - lower mean scores than any other survey items in the SET Factor. As reflected in Table 9, there was not a significant interaction effect for student feedback and timing of SEEQ administration for survey items 34 – 37.

Table 8

Analysis of Variance for SEEQ Survey Factor 10 – Student Evaluations of Teachers: Effect of Student Feedback (A), Timing of SEEQ Administration (B)

	Effect of Student Feedback (A)								Timing of SEEQ Administration (B)							
	Exp. Group			Control Group					Pre-Test (O_1)			Post-Test (O_2)				
Survey Items	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	F-Test	η^{2b}	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	F-Test	η^2
34. Feedback improves teaching	7.41	1.4	243	7.04	1.4	241	**8.92***	0.02	7.18	1.4	239	726	1.5	245	0.25	0.00
35. Students evaluate fairly	7.50	1.4	246	7.37	1.5	240	1.01	0.00	7.43	1.4	240	7.45	1.5	246	1.03	0.00
36. Student evals acceptable	7.70	1.5	244	7.67	1.6	238	0.06	0.00	7.65	1.6	238	7.73	1.5	244	0.28	0.00
37. Evaluated instrctr's lose face	4.65	2.3	240	4.82	2.1	240	0.67	0.00	4.73	2.1	237	4.74	2.3	243	0.00	0.00
--- Total mean score	26.9	4.4	247	26.7	3.8	241	0.13	0.00	26.6	4.2	242	27.0	4.0	246	3.34	0.00

Note. SEEQ = Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality. SETs = Student Evaluations of Teachers.
[b]η^2 = Partial Eta Squared.
*$p < .05$.

Table 9

Analysis of Variance for SEEQ Survey Factor 10 – Student Evaluations of Teachers: Interaction (A x B)

	Experimental						Control							
	O_1			O_2			O_1			O_2				
Survey Item	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	F-Score	η^{2b}
34. Feedback improves teaching	7.3	1.4	117	7.5	1.3	126	7.1	1.3	122	7.0	1.5	119	1.80	0.00
35. Students evaluate fairly	7.4	1.4	119	7.6	1.3	127	7.4	1.4	121	7.3	1.6	119	1.03	0.00
36. Student evals acceptable	7.6	1.6	118	7.8	1.4	126	7.7	1.6	120	7.7	1.6	118	0.39	0.00
37. Evaluated instrctr's lose face	4.6	2.2	115	4.7	2.4	125	4.9	2.0	122	4.8	2.2	118	0.42	0.00
--- Total mean score	26.3	4.9	120	27.4	3.9	127	26.9	3.5	122	26.6	4.1	119	3.34	0.01

Note. SEEQ = Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality.
[b]η^2 = Partial Eta Squared.
*$p < .05$.

Qualitative Data

I collected qualitative data from instructors and students in classrooms located in three different buildings on RUPP's campus. All the classrooms were rectangular, with east and west facing walls covered with white dry erase boards and north and south facing walls having louvered windows. Even with ceiling fans and breezes coming through the open windows, the warm temperatures and high humidity often resulted in the papers I was holding becoming mushy. Immediately to the east of one of the buildings was a construction site on which a new multi-story classroom building was being built. To the north of this same building was a chain-link fence separating RUPP's campus from an illegal settlement of tiny ramshackle houses knocked together from scrap lumber, tin sheeting, and brick. The homes were resting on both sides of a railroad track's right-of-way about 75 feet from the building. The sound from the construction site, of rooster's crowing, and of children playing could be heard in the classrooms during the consultations and debriefings.

All five instructors in the experimental group reported that the students who evaluated them showed more improvement during the semester than students in similar classes they had taught in the past. Instructors said students' improvement was due in part to the changes instructors made resulting from the consultations earlier in the semester. Instructors also ascribed the student's improvement to other factors such as the students arriving on the first day of class with a higher level of English skill. Subsequent to the consultations, instructors made changes to their teaching including using small groups more frequently and talking with students more often during the semester than they had in the past. As one instructor noted, "(I)…talk(ed) with the student(s)…one by one about their writing, like (in) student

conferences." Instructors then obtained the materials that students needed to address these needs. One instructor encouraged students to tell him if there was something they wanted him to change. Subsequently, students were more likely than in previous classes to tell the instructor about areas of teaching in which they wanted the instructor to change. Interestingly, students did this with instructors using SMS text messages, not speaking face-to-face.

Qualitative Question 1: What do participants think and how do they feel about students evaluating teachers using the SEEQ survey?

Instructor Responses

I developed two variables from instructors' responses to the first five qualitative sub-questions: (a) *Instructors' Positive Attitudes towards the SEEQ and Participation in the Study* and (b) *Instructors' Concerns about the SEEQ and Participation in the Study*. Table 10 presents the frequency by which the 10 instructors mentioned 14 specific concepts contained in these two variables. Eleven of the concepts expressed instructors' positive attitudes and feelings about participating in the study, student evaluations of teachers (SETs), and the SEEQ survey.

Nine out of the 10 participating instructors described how participating in the survey helped them to identify areas in which they could improve their teaching skills. Instructors commented that, "…I just want to know about my weaknesses and then I can try to improve to find more strategy or change style teaching or something like that." "I think (getting feedback) is a good idea that because we want to see that what is the weak point and … the good point – and we keep that one. But the weak point we just want to improve that to be better and better."

Another instructor described feedback from students as, "…very important. …teachers must receive feedback from students so that (teachers)…will have some kind like ideas to improve his or her students' weaknesses …and also…the teacher's weakness…." Several instructors made the point students as, "…very important. …teachers must receive feedback from students so that (teachers)…will have some kind like ideas to improve his or her students' weaknesses …and also…the teacher's weakness…." Several instructors made the point that with student feedback teachers could help students learn better. "I guess it a good idea that student can evaluate and then we can see what is the weak point (of the student), what is a good point…ok? If you can see the weak point, maybe you can…we can improve them..."

Six instructors expressed positive feelings about participating in the study and having students evaluate them. One instructor was not only in favor of student evaluations, but also made the point that students can provide instructors with insights that instructors cannot get from self-reflection, "…without this (student evaluations)…you yourself cannot see your back, but the students can see." Another instructor described feeling, "…happy (about receiving student evaluations). They (students) are my mirror that they give me to see my mistake. They want me to do better, for Cambodia and for themselves." Yet another said, "Yeah, I think … this (the SEEQ survey) will help me and also will help students." For many of the instructors, it was a matter of professional pride that they would use student feedback to improve their teaching skills. As one noted, "This is my career. I want to improve my career also…in teaching…. And if something I see that, a weak point, I mean change that, yeah." Another instructor put it differently, "I am happy because this is the way that we have to open up….When student evaluate, you can see…our self also….I read to my student the evaluation and I try to improve." One instructor put it like this, (the SEEQ) "benefit…me, also school,

Table 10

Instructor Responses to Qualitative Research Question One

Variable Concept	Frequency *n* = 10
Instructors' Positive Statement towards the SEEQ and the Study	
(The SEEQ) Helps instructors identify areas to improve	9
Positive feelings about participation	6
Instructors feel good about being evaluated	6
Positive feelings about recurring SEEQ	5
Structure is appropriate	5
Instructors' want to participate	3
Ok to want positive evaluation	3
(SEEQ is) Helpful to instructors and students	3
SETS are good	3
Survey items are relevant	3
Maintains student confidentiality	3
Instructors' Concerns about the SEEQ and the Study	
Some SEEQ items not relevant	6
Translation issues (concerns about SEEQs' translation into Khmer)	3
Students misunderstand questions	3

Note: SEEQ: Student Evaluations of Educational Quality. SETs: Student Evaluations of Teachers.

also students and I think it is the kind of thing that really helps us …. Another said, "not only the teacher, but also the student can …positively participate in the survey. And we both…can learn something more."

Five instructors approved of the idea of having their students evaluate them on a recurring basis using the SEEQ. Some wanted to demonstrate that their teaching materials and skills would improve because of the student feedback. "I really want…I really want…(the SEEQ) again next semester…I want you to see that uh…improving material and closer to the student (more in tune with the student) how different with the result came out. Another said, "I

will be happy to have that survey again….because I have some new and improving points...I'm going to try it for my (students) next year …and (would like to) see …how well it happen." Other instructors mentioned how having students evaluate them helped to motivate them to be better teachers. "…Couldn't be happier (with having the SEEQ)…not only next semester, but every year…Even I taught the same level, but …because you have a survey, that's why also I have to prepare (so it actually causes you to be a better teacher)…." Another instructor described how the SEEQ preserved the Face of students and instructors, "…(students) want to save their Face, …they want to save their teacher Face, and they want to save institution's Face as well … they cannot talk very …talk badly …very bad about uh…their teacher, their own teacher. (However, on this survey)…most of the time they can truly answer the question. They can honestly answer the question."

Five of the instructors also believed the structure of the study was appropriate. Instructors defined appropriate in different ways. Two put it succinctly, "I think this is a doable survey" and "I think eh…it fair enough and I think it's good." Another instructor thought having the SEEQ at mid- and end-of-semester was valuable. "So, what I think is that the style of evaluating (using the survey twice) is really helpful." Another agreed, "…I can learn something in advance and (I) will be ready for the whole semester on." Another instructor also expressed approval with the twice-a-semester evaluation. "I don't like it when some people come only one time for a workshop and drop out. You come and try to keep all the record. You remind me also. …I don't want only as a certificate and put on the wall." The SEEQ also faired well when compared to a previous researcher's instrument, "(The SEEQ is) better than one done by a Japanese researcher last year – (the) SEEQ is shorter and its questions less complex."

The three remaining concepts captured instructors' concerns about the SEEQ and their participation in the study. Six instructors noted that not all of the items on the SEEQ survey were relevant to the instructors' task of teaching students to speak English. Several instructors concurred with their colleague who suggested I, "…change some questions that are not so relevant because …it is hard for you to get very accurate results and it is not so fair (to instructors). Or, as another instructor proposed, "just reword some question(s) and skip over some question that are not so relevant."

Three instructors expressed concerns that the translation of some of the survey items from English into Khmer was imperfect. As one instructor said, "Students did not understand some questions" (due to translation into Khmer). Another suggested, "maybe we can add some more explanation to make them clearer about the question that you ask." Perhaps the most succinct response was, "sometime interpretation could be better."

Three instructors also believed that not all students' responses were well thought out, "Sometime (students) just answer the question without looking at the question … whether they understand it or not." Some attributed this behavior to student fatigue, "If you keep asking them more than 20 or 30 minutes, the students will feel sleepier… the last question they feel a bit lazy so they just answer without critically thinking." Another instructor thought that students felt, "…some kind of pressure (to) provide some kind of fake result…(and that most of the time the results were) more positive to the teachers." Other instructors also spoke to the length of time it took students to complete the SEEQ. "Just bring out the useful, the most important question. But 30 minute is ok for the student….45 minutes is a bit long." A different instructor described the time concern from a different angle, "Doing SEEQ takes too long to do every semester." The concern expressed in this statement is attributed to the situation in which

instructors have too much to accomplish to comfortably relinquish the necessary class time for students to complete SEEQ surveys every semester.

Student Responses

After students completed the end-of-semester SEEQ (O_2), I used an interpreter to conduct debriefings (P_2) with the 19 – 29 students present in each class. In total, 246 students were present in the 10 participating classes. During these debriefings, I asked students to respond to the qualitative sub-questions. In seven classes, the interpreter was able to ask students all six questions. However, in three of the classes, students took longer to complete the SEEQ than the students in the other seven classes. As a result, in these three classes insufficient time was available to ask the students to respond to all six questions. The interpreter asked students to respond to three qualitative sub-questions in two of the three classes and to five qualitative sub-questions in the third class. Of the 246 students present during the debriefings, the percentage of students from the experimental and control groups was 52% (127) and 48% (119) respectively. Similarly, out of the 123 students who made responses during the debriefings, 49% (59) were from the experimental group and 51% (64) were from the control group. The ratio of female to male students was also similar between the total number of student participants and those who responded to the qualitative sub-questions. Out of the 246 students present during the debriefing sessions, 243 responded to the O_2 SEEQ survey item asking them to indicate whether they were male or female. Fifty percent (123) of students indicated they were female. Of the 123 students responding to the qualitative sub-questions, 47% (58) were female.

Students made 128 verbal and 20 written responses that addressed the study's first qualitative research question. The three largest percentages of students' verbal responses addressed students' (a) desire to complete the SEEQ on instructors in upcoming semesters, (b) belief that the SEEQ helped them to identify areas of need in instructors' teaching ability and that teaching would subsequently improve, and (c) belief that they were capable to evaluate their instructors. I asked students to raise their hands if they wanted to complete the SEEQ about their instructors in the following semester. More than 90% of students in four classes and 100% of students in five classes responded positively. Approximately 38% of students said they believed that completing the SEEQ helped them to identify instructors' teaching strengths and weaknesses. These students also believed that instructors' teaching quality would improve because of instructors having received this student input. Students described it this way, "I think the evaluating on instructors is good because when we evaluate them they can fill in the gaps and develop themselves"; "…evaluating of instructors…is good because we can change the bad points and improve the instructor's teaching"; and ". . . if I don't tell him his bad points, he will continue to use them." Another student spoke about helping the teacher keep pedagogically current, "…we try to get it (instructors' teaching) out of the out-date teaching method and doing it like this we can seek out modern …new teaching methods for instruction."

Further, 12% of the students said that they believed that they knew their instructors' teaching abilities well enough to offer accurate observations. As one student said, "I think it (SETs) is very good because the students stay with the teachers, so they know what teachers do….when they (teachers) have something wrong – the students will know." Another student concurred, "…each instructor does not know their weaknesses or shortcomings…only students

who are studying with them…can help improve the teaching methodologies and to make it better."

In addition to the more than 90% of students who raised their hands indicating they wanted to evaluate their instructors in upcoming semesters, five percent of students described aloud why they thought evaluating instructors' teaching was appropriate for students to do. These students said that they believed that SETs helped instructors to better teach students, describing SETs as a "good" activity. A common sentiment among students was reflected in one student's comment, "I think as a student standing with (the instructor), I think it's not so wrong to evaluate … because we want … (the instructor) to be good, be better." Another common refrain among students was that students and instructors were part of a joint venture in which improved teaching would result in better learning. In contrast, only 1% of students said they found SETs to be inappropriate. As one student put it, "…I think (it) is like a wrong doing. Because first (it is) our tradition (that) teacher is a something we should be grateful (for and) we should not criticize them."

Students used the opportunity to write open-ended comments on the mid- (O_1) and end-of-semester (O_2) SEEQ surveys to write 26 comments, 25 (96%) of which addressed the first qualitative research question. The written responses were similar to the majority of students' verbal comments in that students noted they believed that completing the SEEQ (a) helped students learn about good teaching practices, (b) helped students identify instructors' strengths, and (c) resulted in instructors' improving their teaching quality. Six of the comments noted students' preference for the SEEQs' administration to be on a regular, recurring basis – not just as a component of a study.

Qualitative Question 2 : How does the gender of the students and instructors influence their perceptions of female teachers?

Instructor Responses

Table 11 presents the results of two variables: (a) Instructors' Beliefs and Attitudes about Female and Male Instructors and (b) Instructors' Beliefs about Students' Instructor Preferences. These two variables subsume seven concepts. Five of the seven concepts expressed positive attitudes and beliefs about female instructors. Nine of the ten participating instructors said that female instructors had teaching abilities that were at least equal to that of male instructors. Interestingly, four of the six participating male instructors said they believed that students preferred female instructors. At the same time, half of the male instructors and half of the female instructors said they believed that students did not prefer instructors of one

Table 11

Instructor Responses to Qualitative Research Question Two

Variable	Participant Frequency	
Concept	Female	Male
	n = 4	*n* = 6
Instructors' Beliefs and Attitudes about Female and Male Instructors		
Positive attitudes about female instructors	4	6
Female and male instructors' are similar in teaching ability	4	5
Negative attitudes about female instructors	1	3
Changes in Khmer culture support females' career upward mobility	2	1
Instructors' Beliefs about Students' Instructor Preferences		
Student's prefer female instructors	1	4
Student's prefer female and male instructors equally	2	3
Student's prefer male instructors	0	3

sex to another. Two instructors proposed variations on this theme. One male instructor expressed his belief that students preferred instructors of their own sex. A female instructor modified this statement further by observing that when the academic skills of female students in a class were lower than their male peers, female students preferred male instructors. Conversely, when the female students' academic skills were equal to or higher than that of their male peers, the female students preferred female instructors.

Student Responses

Table 12 presents the results of four variables, which subsume nine concepts, generated from the 60 verbal comments made by students during the debriefings (P_2). The four variables are (a) Students' Valuation of Teaching Skill versus Instructor Gender, (b) Students' Beliefs and Attitudes about Female Instructors, (c) Students' Beliefs and Attitudes about Male Instructors, and (d) Students' Beliefs about Students' Instructor Preferences. The concept generated by the most number of comments was that instructors' teaching skills, not their gender, was most important to students when evaluating instructors.

Two concepts, generated from 20% of students' comments, indicated students' preference for female instructors (*Female instructors are: better teachers*, 13%; *more understanding, softer, and can get closer to students than male teachers*, 7%). Contradictorily, two concepts, generated from 10% of students' comments, indicated students' preference for male instructors (*Male teachers are: better…*, 7%; and *softer, less strict, more open*, 3%). Interestingly, 13% of students believed that students' preferred instructors of a particular gender depending upon students' gender (10%) or the subject the instructor was teaching (3%).

Table 12

Students' Beliefs and Attitudes about Female and Male Instructors

Variable	Verbal Comments (n = 60)	
Concept	Number	Percent*
Students' Valuation of Teaching Skill versus Instructor Gender		
Teaching skill, not instructors' sex, most important	25	42%
Students' Beliefs and Attitudes about Female Instructors		
Female instructors are better teachers	8	13%
Female instructors are more understanding, softer, and can get closer to students than male teachers	4	7%
Female instructors more strict	3	5%
Female instructors are under more pressure	3	5%
Students' Beliefs and Attitudes about Male Instructors		
Male teachers are better, of higher quality	4	7%
Male instructors are softer, less strict, more open	2	3%
Male instructors are more strict	1	2%
Students' Beliefs about Students' Instructor Preferences		
Students feel closer to instructors of their own sex	6	10%
Students prefer male or female instructors depending upon subject being taught	3	5%
Better looking Instructors inspire students' to do better	1	2%

*Percent total greater than 100% due to rounding error.

Impact of Cambodian Culture on Current Study's Structure and Outcomes

The study investigated three aspects of Cambodian culture and their likely impact on the current study's design and outcomes: (a) hierarchical view of relationships, (b) importance given to *Face*, and (c) Buddhist ideal of student-teacher relationships. All three aspects are reflected in the traditional relationship between Cambodian instructors and students. Traditionally, students could not (a) remain seated when instructors entered the classroom, (b) look instructors in the eye, or (c) engage instructors in the type of give and take discussion

common to university classes in north America (confidential personal communications, July 1, 2010).

Instructor Responses

I tried to address instructors' concerns about hierarchy and Face by not sharing instructors' SEEQ survey scores or comments with colleagues, supervisors, or other university personnel. I also addressed the concern that students evaluating instructors would violate the Buddhist ideal of student-teacher relationships by describing the study to instructors and students as being a respectful and mutually beneficial learning experience. It appears the study successfully addressed these three culturally based concerns. As one instructor put it, "I guess I feel safe. I don't feel I lose any face because it's kind of like, as I told you, it is some kind of like confidential… and anonymous." Instructors learned how their students perceived their teaching skills. One instructor said, "I don't feel something like embarrassed…scared…no, never (hurt feelings?)… no, never, never." Another expressed the same feelings more succinctly, "…its no problem for me… so when they evaluate me, it is ok." Instructors also noted how participating in the SEEQ was of benefit to both students and instructors – addressing the concern of respectful student-teacher relationships. As one said, "…it benefit…me, also school, also students and I think it is the kind of thing that really helps us …." Another instructor commented, "because…not only the teacher, but also the student can…positively participate in the survey. And we both…can learn something more."

Student Responses

I addressed the issues of hierarchy and Face for students by (a) ensuring instructors were absent while students completed the SEEQ, (b) instructing students not to make self-identifying marks or comments on SEEQ surveys, and (c) reminding students during the debriefings that other students in the room might share their comments with instructors and others outside of class. Student comments during the debriefings indicated that the current study's design and implementation successfully addressed the issues of hierarchy and Face. One student said, "I think that the survey is very good because sometimes we dare not say in front of the teachers (what we think about their teaching)…." Another noted, "… I think (the instructor) does not feel angry with us because we are doing it (evaluating instructors) confidentially…." And a third put it clearly, "…the mistakes of the teachers…I saw them but I couldn't tell them. Only this time I can do it, I can share it."

Out of the 123 students who made verbal responses during the debriefings, only two students said they felt that evaluating instructors was not appropriate. As one student described his feelings, "My own feeling when evaluated (evaluating) my teacher I think is like a wrong doing. Because first our tradition teacher is a something we should be grateful, we should not criticize them. Because they are human beings usually make mistakes. We have bad and good points. But this is education we should not evaluate the instructor. This is what my feeling (is)." The other student was more succinct, "I think it is a little wrong." Other student comments indicate that students felt that evaluating instructors did not violate the Buddhist ideal of a student / teacher relationship, that in fact it was a good, not bad, behavior. As one student noted, "I think the evaluating on instructors is good because when we evaluate them they can fill in the gaps and develop themselves." Another agreed, "…evaluating of instructors

it is good because we can change the bad points and improve the instructor's teaching." Yet another student said, "…the evaluation on instructors…can improve the teaching method and the reception of the knowledge by the students…."

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

Evaluating the teaching quality of university instructors by using student evaluations is common practice in the United States. In cultures that require students to show respect for instructors by not questioning them, using SETs is less common. This study is the first done in Cambodia wherein students used the SEEQ to evaluate the teaching quality of their instructors. This study generated results from mid- and end-of-semester administrations of the SEEQ, mid-semester consultations with teachers in the experimental group, and end-of-semester debriefings with teachers and students. The results provided an early understanding of what instructors and students in a Cambodian university setting think about (a) students evaluating instructors' teaching and (b) the impact of gender on teaching quality.

Quantitative Data

Addressing the first quantitative research question, the results indicated that instructors who had received consultation were more likely than not to be rated higher by students on two of the SEEQs ten factors, Learning and Enthusiasm. However, the interaction effect of student feedback and timing of SEEQ administration was weak. The ANOVA results also showed a weak but significant relationship between instructors who received student feedback and consultation and student ratings describing instructors as: (a) more organized, (b) more effective at working with students, and (c) better at designing courses with appropriate levels of workload and difficulty. Unfortunately, with only 10 instructors in the study, five for each condition, the resulting effect sizes were very small for those tests found to be significant.

Addressing the second quantitative question, the results indicated that instructors and students found most survey items to be appropriate for use in this context. No more than two instructors found any single survey item to be inappropriate. The two key findings from student generated results had to do with survey items related to examinations / assignments and instructors' Face. The first key finding was that 10% or more of students did not identify as inappropriate survey items related to examinations and assignments. This finding contrasts with students in seven previous SEEQ-based studies (Marsh 1981; Clarkson 1984; Marsh, Touron et al. 1985; Watkins, Marsh et al. 1987; Watkins and Thomas 1991; Watkins and Regmi 1992; Marsh, Hau et al. 1997) who did find such survey items to be notably inappropriate. Researchers conducting these earlier studies noted that many courses had only end-of-semester exams or no exams at all thus providing students with no feedback from exams. Instructors participating in the current study provided students with feedback from mid- and end-of-semester exams. Furthermore, these earlier studies occurred 10 to 20 years before the current study. Consequently, the Cambodian culture may have changed during this period, because of its unique experiences, to such an extent that instructors and students alike believe such assignments to be acceptable.

The second key finding was that more than 10% or more of the responding students deemed survey Item 37 to be inappropriate. Item 37, *Instructors lose Face when evaluated by students*, directly addresses quantitative question six. The significance of students choosing this item is two-fold. First, this was the only survey item deemed inappropriate by more than 10% of students on both the mid- and end-of-semester SEEQ surveys. Further, although the means of item 37 ranged from 4.6 to 4.9, which the survey instrument categorizes as neutral, these were the lowest mean scores of any of the 37 survey items measuring teaching quality [see

Appendix M. *SEEQ Survey Items and Total Mean Scores at Mid-Semester (O_1) and End-of-Semester (O_2)*]. Although 89.8% of students at O_1 and 85.8% of students at O_2 found Item 37 to be appropriate, these low mean scores indicate that a substantial portion of students were less likely to agree with the survey item's assertion as compared to the assertions in other survey items.

Second, Item 37 addresses the importance of Face, a pervasive and significant feature of Cambodian culture. Face is so valued in Cambodian society that it is an imprisonable offense to defame the reputation of public officials, the monarchy, and laws (CCHR, 2010). Perhaps for these reasons, conclusions about how to address Face in the context of SETs are complex. As noted above, although Item 37 was the only survey item that more than 10% of students' deemed inappropriate at both O_1 and O_2, the large majority of students still indicated on the SEEQ that they felt neutrally or strongly that they agreed with the item's assertion. At the same time, students supported using the SETs as they stated during debriefings. The majority of students also supported administering SETs in upcoming semesters and only 1% of students' verbal comments during debriefings disagreed with using SETs. These results present a picture of students who viewed SETs as a practice that should continue but with a strong caution that any future users of SETs must be particularly sensitive to preserving the Face of instructors.

Addressing quantitative research questions three through five, the results did not show significance. However, during the consultations and debriefings, respondents made statements indicating their agreement with the queries posed in each question. Instructors and students indicated they believed that (a) SETs improved teaching effectiveness, (b) most students evaluated instructors fairly, and (c) it was acceptable for students to evaluate instructors.

Qualitative Data

The results generated during consultations and debriefings offer an initial understanding of what participants thought about SETs, the SEEQ instrument, and female instructors. Instructors and students believed that students were able to provide instructors with feedback that helped instructors improve their teaching. These findings are consistent with data generated from SEEQ-based studies conducted in other Asian / Pacific countries (Watkins and Thomas 1991), Nepal (Watkins and Regmi 1992), Hong Kong (Marsh, Hau et al. 1997), Taiwan (Tsai 2005), and Papua New Guinea (Clarkson 1984).

Regarding the first primary qualitative research question, instructors and students described student evaluations as being (a) helpful to instructors, (b) a positive experience, and (c) Face saving. Instructors and students indicated SETs were useful because students could identify areas in which instructors needed to improve their teaching. Nine out of ten instructors reported that completing the SEEQ on themselves also helped them to identify areas in which they could improve their teaching. More than half of the participating instructors reported positive feelings about having students evaluate them. Students concurred, describing SETs as a joint activity in which students and instructors could work together to improve instructors' teaching. Both instructors and students believed that students should complete the SEEQ on their instructors in the future. None of the instructors indicated that student evaluations caused them to lose Face. Most student participants also indicated that they could evaluate their instructors without violating cultural prohibitions against showing disrespect for teachers. Only one percent of students expressed concern that SETs were not respectful to instructors.

Regarding the second primary qualitative research question, two key findings emerged. The first key finding was that most instructors and students indicated they believed women to

be at least as competent teachers as men. All ten participating instructors made positive comments about female instructors' teaching. Nine out of the ten instructors said they believed female and male instructors were similar in teaching ability. Interestingly, 13% of student comments indicated students thought female instructors were better teachers than were male instructors. Only 7% of student comments asserted the opposite view. Similarly, 7% of student comments suggested students found female instructors to be more understanding and better able to develop closer relationships with students than male instructors. Only 3% of student comments suggested male instructors were better in these areas.

Some instructors and students noted that cultural and family expectations were changing for Cambodian women. For example, respondents noted that parents were more likely than in the past to support their daughters completing high school and attending university. Others noted that husbands of professional working women were more likely to help with household chores and childcare than in the past. However, instructors and students uniformly described women as still being the individuals with the primary responsibility for homemaking and childrearing. Regardless of the cultural changes underway, respondents observed that women instructors struggled to balance the demands of their jobs with childcare, housework, and other family responsibilities.

The second key finding is that both instructors and students commented that ability, not gender, was the best measure of instructors' teaching. No instructor suggested evaluating female instructors on any other attribute than teaching skill. Students concurred with 42% of students making verbal comments saying that it was teaching skill and not gender that was the most important criteria by which to evaluate instructors.

Summary of Findings

Overall, the quantitative and qualitative results generated in the present study indicated that instructors and students believed students were sufficiently observant and capable to provide useful feedback to instructors. Respondents also believed that instructors would use this feedback, along with the consultation, to improve their teaching. Most instructors and students indicated that they believed SETs (a) did not harm instructors' Face although administrators should be sensitive to this issue, (b) were culturally acceptable for students to do, and (c) should occur every semester. Most respondents indicated that they believed women to be as competent teachers as men. Further, respondents considered teaching ability, not gender, to be the most appropriate metric to use when evaluating instructors. Finally, respondents agreed that, although female instructors had high-status professional careers, they were still responsible for most of the domestic responsibilities in their homes.

Limitations and Recommendations for Researchers

Future researchers and practitioners must use care when generalizing this study's findings to the larger population of instructors at the Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP) or instructors at other institutions within or outside of Cambodia. This study's results provide an initial understanding of how instructors and undergraduate students in the English Language Support Unit at RUPP react to SETs, the SEEQ, and female instructors. However, the instructors were atypical for RUPP because they all spoke English, all taught English language speaking courses, and all volunteered to participate in the study's SET activities. Perhaps teaching in English subtly influences students to be accepting of SETs because the English-language context may also communicate cultural values associated with English or Western

cultures in which SETs are commonly practiced. One instructor noted that students in ELSU classes have the freedom to question instructors:

> We don't care whether you are the teacher or...and you are the student...we have the same right, and we can…compare, we can copy…we can come back with each other….I think the English classes…the relationship…the freedom the students [have] in the English classes…[is more than many instructors in non-ELSU courses allow their students]….[W]e try to be sure that everyone (has a) …vote, …(has a) equal right (to say)….(confidential personal communication, July 1, 2010).

It also is likely that participating instructors in the experimental and control groups spoke to one another about their study-related experiences during the course of the study. This behavior may have resulted in treatment contamination and compensatory rivalry. Treatment contamination may have occurred when (a) instructors discussed their reactions, and that of their students, to completing the SEEQ; and (b) instructors in the experimental group described their consultation experiences to instructors in the control group. These discussions may also have resulted in compensatory rivalry. This threat occurs when participants in control groups respond to their exclusion from the experimental treatment by putting forth extra-ordinary efforts that skews data. Future researchers may wish to include questions in the P_2 instructor debriefing that addresses whether these conversations took place and, if so, what the instructors believe were their reactions to the discussions.

During the end-of-semester P_2 student debriefing, some students described how completing the SEEQ made them more aware of what they perceived to be modern teaching techniques. The sensitization of students to aspects of their instructors' teaching performance may be an example of the reactive effect of testing. It is possible that O_2 end-of-semester

SEEQ scores may reflect some students' perceptions of instructors' efforts, or perceived lack thereof, to improve teaching as students' had suggested on the O_1 mid-semester SEEQ. Future researchers could attempt to address this issue by encouraging students to try not to do so – just prior to administering the end-of-semester SEEQ.

A broader sample of instructors will help address the issue of representativeness of samples to the population of instructors usually found at the university level. Samples drawn from other faculties should include instructors that (a) speak and teach in languages other than English; (b) teach mathematics, history, or other non-English language speaking courses; and (c) teach graduate students in addition to undergraduate students. These instructors may or may not use pedagogy similar to instructors in the current study. Also, the sample size of ten instructors was small. By increasing the number of instructors, future research designs will also have increased power to test hypotheses.

Another methodological change to be considered is to secure permission from student respondents to keep a unique identifying code of each of them. The code can then use used to match their responses throughout a study. Doing so will allow the use of more powerful statistical procedures that will help in detecting significant mean differences. Finally, student respondents were undergraduate students in one of six course levels learning to speak English. Often students in the lower levels were in their first year of university and students in the higher levels were in their second, third, or fourth years of university. It would be useful for future samples to include students from multiple sections of the same course thereby controlling for students' experience with university level teaching.

Recommendations for Practitioners

Future practitioners may consider several different applications based upon the experiences from this initial study. First, they may wish to have instructors complete end-of-semester SEEQ surveys in addition to those collected during the semester. At least one instructor felt it was, "not fair for me," that students completed the SEEQ twice, but instructors only once. This instructor wanted the opportunity to complete a second self-evaluation and write comments at the end-of-semester on the SEEQ. This source of additional data may provide new insights about changes in instructors' perceptions about SETs that occur during the course of a semester. These data may also provide clues as to what impact these changes have on instructors' teaching behavior.

Second, the mixed results from Item 37 and the end-of-semester debriefings with students about the issue of Face suggest that administrators should consider students as valuable partners in improving instruction. As instruction develops and improves, the university will enhance its reputation. In order to develop a learning community in which instructors view students as respected and trustworthy associates, administrators should visit classes of students prior to administering the SEEQ, introduce themselves, and describe how confidential SETs benefit both instructors and students. Further, administrators should work with instructors so that they become committed to the purpose of SETs. They can then talk with their students and (a) describe SET activities in a positive manner, (b) convey their acceptance of and comfort with SETs, and (c) describe how students' responses on the SEEQ are not accessible by instructors. In short, administrators and instructors together work towards reducing students' concerns about SETs causing harm to instructors' Face or harm to students resulting in honest feedback that will improve instructors' skills in the classroom.

Third, interview protocols used in future evaluation studies should include questions to elicit participants' perceptions of the structure and content of the consultations, debriefings, and protocol forms themselves. Identifying the discrete components of the consultations and debriefings will help instructors and students determine how useful participants found these components to be. Practioners will be able to use these data to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the consultations and debriefings. These data may suggest new ways to help improve instructors' teaching quality and students' learning experiences especially within the specific context in which SETs are used. If instructors had been given such questions during the present study, I believe instructors would have asked to be given their self-evaluation and student SEEQ data prior to consultations and debriefings. Having these data and a description of how they were to use these data prior to the consultations and debriefings, would have given instructors more time to reflect on the areas in which they wanted to improve and their strategies for meeting those goals. Without being given that time in the current study, I observed instructors feeling pressed for time to quickly evaluate and use new data presented to them in an unfamiliar format. I attempted to allay any potential threat to instructors' Face by identifying the problem to instructors and asking instructors to take as much time as they need to evaluate the data.

Fourth, some instructors and students expressed concern that the English to Khmer translation of a few of the SEEQ-KL's survey items was less than adequate. The Cronbach alpha coefficients of responses from the various class administrations ranged considerably from acceptable to very low. Although the current study translated the SEEQ items along with a back translation, the exact wording of the SEEQ-KL from English to Khmer may not have had the best equivalent for some words or phrases in Khmer. Practitioners should conduct a

further psychometric review of the SEEQ-KL to improve the validity and reliability of this version of the SEEQ. It also may be possible that even this review may not yield a high reliability version because given the Khmer culture no functional concepts or words may exist for what the SEEQ attempts to measure.

Fifth, scoring the SEEQ and verifying that the scoring was accurate was and will be a logistical challenge for any university who will want to use the SEEQ as a school-wide instrument for consultation and evaluation. I manually recorded students' 21,000+ responses to the SEEQ instrument (43 questions X 491 surveys). Universities in the U.S. that have teaching evaluations in place have offices or employees dedicated to surveying members of their communities on an on-going basis. They have developed infrastructures that have some type of automated data tracking hardware or software. Given the priorities of starting up universities, allocating employees and funds for this particular task may not be high. However, having an evaluation system, if done a widespread basis, will give administrators and instructors alike, critical information on how well they are offering their curriculum and what in which areas they must improve. Instructors could then more quickly adjust their teaching to meet students' needs. Students would experience more quickly how their feedback affected instructors' teaching.

Finally, once practitioners address instrumentation and administrative issues, the focus should turn to the best uses of the SEEQ results. This study attempted to test whether a consultation session during the semester would have helped the instructors. With the small samples available, it was not possible to conduct a definitive test. From the experiences of this study, practitioners should consider the following issues when designing an evaluation program that includes consultation. Instructors could have used more time to reflect upon the

feedback from self-evaluations and from the students prior to participating in consultation and debriefings. This dedicated time will allow instructors to be more reflective when (a) choosing the areas in which to improve their teaching, (b) determining how they would accomplish the changes, and (c) deciding how to measure the results of their efforts. Studies could include multiple consultations provided by professionals chosen for this task or by a peer coaching approach in which instructors choose colleagues to be their consultants. In order to gain an acceptance of and commitment to consultation, administrators must recognize instructors' participation in evaluations and consultations with letters of commendation and the use of evaluation information during appraisal cycles for immediate one-time awards or more permanent increases in instructors' salaries.

Conclusion

The results generated by this study contribute to the literature on student evaluations of teachers, in particular, the development of protocols used during planned interactions with instructors and students. The results of this study provide future practitioners with some guideposts to consider when developing and implementing SET programs within Cambodian IHEs and IHEs in other Face conscious cultures. The most important lesson learned is that in order for participants to provide accurate data, the design of the program needs to protect the Face of instructors, students, and institution. Administrators must participate with instructors and SET program staff to reassure students that evaluating instructors is safe, culturally appropriate, and of value to students as well as instructors. Functional SET programs also need administrative support in terms of office space, personnel, technical resources, and instructor time. Well designed and effectively implemented SET programs result in students and

instructors working together to improve instructors' teaching so students receive a higher quality university education.

References

Ahrens, L., & Kemmerer, F. (2002). Higher education development [Electronic Version]. *Cambodia Development Review, 6*, 8-11 from http://www.cdri.org.kh/webdata/cdr /2002/cdr03-1.pdf.

Aleamoni, L. M. (1999). Student rating myths versus research facts from 1924 to 1998 [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13*, 153-166. Retrieved March 5, 2008 from http://www.springerlink.com.ezproxy.lib .lehigh.edu/content/p8x03ku047401745/fulltext.pdf.

Asian Development Bank (ADB). (2006).Key indicators of Asian and Pacific countries: Part 1, special chapter [Electronic Version], 1-75. Retrieved April 15, 2007 from http://www.adb.org/Documents/Books/Key_Indicators/2006 /pdf/Special -Chapter-2006.pdf.

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). (2007). Association of Southeast Asian Nations university network: Cambodia. Retrieved October 1, 2009, from http://www.ecap-project.org/ip_education_and_networking/asean_university _network_aun/cambodia.html

Ayres, D. M. (2000a). *Anatomy of a crisis: Education, development, and the state in Cambodia, 1953-1998*. Honolulu: HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ayres, D. M. (2000b). Tradition, modernity, and the development of education in Cambodia. *Comparative Education Review, 44*, 440-463. doi: 410.1086/447629.

Beech, J. (2006). The theme of educational transfer in comparative education: A view over time. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 1, 2-13. doi: 10.2304/rcie.2 006.2301.2301.2302.

Cambodia Center for Human Rights (CCHR). (2010). Cambodia gagged: Democracy at risk? Report on freedom. Retrieved November 2, 2011 from http://www.ifex.org/Cambodia/2010/10/04/cambodia-gagged-democracy-at-risk.pdf

Cambodia, Kingdom of (Cambodia). (n.d.). Organization: Constitution. Retrieved March 16, 2008, from http://www.cambodia.gov.kh/unisql1/egov/english/organ.constitution.html

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Centra, J. A. (1978). Types of faculty development programs [Electronic Version]. *The Journal of Higher Education, 49,* 151-162 Retrieved February 13, 2009 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1979280

Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). (2007). *The world factbook*: Cambodia. Retrieved May 7, 2007, from https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/print/cb.html

Chealy, C. (2006). *Higher education in SE Asia: Cambodia*. from United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: http://unesdoc.unesco.org /images/0014/001465/146541e.pdf.

Chealy, C. (2009). The political economy of educational reforms and capacity development in Southeast Asia: Cases of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. *Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects, 13,* 153-165. doi: 110.1007/1978-1001-4020-9377-1007.

Clarkson, P. C. (1984). Papua New Guinea students' perceptions of mathematics lecturers [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76,* 1386-1395. Retrieved October 8, 2008 from http://psycnet.apa.org.ezproxy.lib.lehigh .edu/journals/edu/76/6/1386.pdf.

Clayton, T. (1998). Building the new Cambodia: Educational destruction and construction under the Khmer Rouge, 1975-1979 [Electronic Version]. *History Educational Quarterly, 38,* 1-16. Retrieved May 11, 2007 from http://links.jstor .org/sici?sici=0018-2680%28199821%2938%3A1%3C1%3ABTNCED%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6.

Coffey, M., & Gibbs, G. (2001). The evaluation of the student evaluation of educational quality questionnaire (SEEQ) in UK higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 26,* 89-93. doi: 10.1080/02602 930020022318.

Cohen, P. A. (1980). Feedback for improving college instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. *Research in Higher Education, 13,* 321-341. doi: 310.1007/BF00976252.

de Walque, D. (2004). The long-term legacy of the Khmer Rouge period in Cambodia [Electronic Version]. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* 43. Retrieved August 7, 2008 from http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/defaul t/WDS ContentServer/WDSP/IB/2004/12/10/000012009_20041210135851/Rendered/PDF/wp s3446.pdf.

Drucker, A. J., & Remmers, H. H. (1951). Do alumni and students differ in their attitudes toward instructors? *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, *42*, 129-143. doi: 110.1037 /h0055547.

Duggan, S. J. (1996). Education, teacher training and prospects for economic recovery in Cambodia. *Comparative Education, 32,* 361-375. doi: 310.1 080/03050069628768.

Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 5,* 87-100. doi: 110.1177/1469787404040463.

Gliem, J., & Gliem, R. (2003, October). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. Refereed paper presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH (Electronic Version]. Retrieved October 22, 2011 from *https://scholarworks. iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/344/Gliem+&+Gliem.pdf?sequence=1*

Hinton, A. L. (1996). Agents of death: Explaining the Cambodian genocide in terms of psychosocial dissonance [Electronic Version]. *American Anthropologist, 98*, 818-831. Retrieved July 11, 2008 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/681888.

Hsiung, P.-C. (2008). Teaching reflexivity in qualitative interviewing [Electronic Version]. *Teaching Sociology, 36*, 211-226. Retrieved December 19, 2009 from http://www.ingentaconnect.com.ezproxy.lib.lehigh.edu/content/asoca/ts/2008/00000036/00000003/art00002?token=00401bd14877c159a3267232d45237b597a73385e573a465d3e283568263c7b1.

Kaw, E. (1999). Theravada Buddhism: Strategies of knowledge and authority: Buddhist doctrine of non-violence in Burma: Differing pedagogies, diverse effects. *Abstracts of the 1999 AAS Annual Meeting.* Retrieved February 13, 2008, from http://www.aasianst.org/absts/1999abst/SE/se-206.htm

Kelley, B. R. (1996). Cultural considerations in Cambodian childrearing [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care*, *10*, 2-9. Retrieved August 15, 2008 from http://www.jpedhc.org/issues/contents?issue_key=S0891-5245(00)X0032-6.

King, E. F. (2003). *To what extent does culture affect teacher education and practice in Cambodia?* Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of London, London, Author's personal copy.

LaRossa, R. (2005). Grounded theory methods and qualitative family research. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67* (4), 837-857. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00179.x

Marsh, H. W. (1981). Students' evaluations of tertiary instruction: Testing the applicability of American surveys in an Australian setting [Electronic Version]. *The Australian Journal of Education, 25,* 177-193. Retrieved February 22, 2008 from http://www.acer.edu.au /index.html.

Marsh, H. W. (1982). SEEQ: A reliable, valid, and useful instrument for collecting students' evaluations of university teaching [Electronic Version]. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 52,* 77-95. Retrieved February 21, 2008 from https://illiad.lib.lehigh.edu /PDF/157499.pdf.

Marsh, H. W. (2001). *Students' evaluations of university teaching* from http://66.102.1.104/scholar?hl=en&lr=&q=cache:T0h8s1mBfbEJ:apps.uws.edu.au/uws/edc/seeq/SETs_HerbMarsh_presentation_2001.pdf+.

Marsh, H. W., Hau, K.-T., Chung, C.-M., & Siu, T. L. P. (1997). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Chinese version of the students' evaluations of educational quality instrument [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89,* 568-572. Retrieved February 19 2008 from https://illiad.lib.lehigh.edu/PDF/15714 5.pdf.

Marsh, H. W., & Hocevar, D. (1990). The multidimensionality of students' evaluations on teaching effectiveness: The generality of factor structures across academic discipline, instructor level, and course level (Report No. ED 319 788.) [Electronic Version]. *Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)* from http://eric.ed .gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/20/67/5c.pdf.

Marsh, H.W., & Roche, L. (1993). The use of students' evaluations and an individually structured intervention to enhance university teaching effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal, 30* (1), 217-251. doi: 10.3102/00028312030001217

Marsh, H. W., Touron, J., & Wheeler, B. (1985). Students' evaluations of university instructors: The applicability of American instruments in a Spanish setting [Electronic Version]. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 1,* 123-138. Retrieved April 30, 2008 from https://illiad.lib.lehigh.edu/PDF/165486.pdf.

McKeachie, W. J., Lin, Y.-G., Daugherty, M., Moffett, M. M., Neigler, C., Nork, J., Walz, M., & Baldwin R. (1980). Using student ratings and consultation to improve instruction [Electronic Version]. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 50*, 168-174 from http://www.bps.org.uk/publications/journals /bjep/bjep_home.cfm?&redirectCount=0.

Menges, R. J., & Brinko, K. T. (1986). *Effects of student evaluation feedback: A meta-analysis of higher education research*. Paper presented at the 70th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Retrieved February 22, 2008 from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01 /0000019b/80/2f/49 /ea.pdf.

Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport (MoEYS). (2005a). Education: Addressing the education/poverty trap [Electronic Version]. Retrieved April 20, 2007 from http://www.moeys.gov.kh/en/education/efa /addressing_education.htm.

Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport (MoEYS). (2005b). Education: MoEYS statistics: Table 1: Schools, classes, students and staff. Retrieved May 18, 2007, from http://www .moeys.gov.kh/en/about_moeys/statistic.htm

Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport (MoEYS). (2005c). Education: Policy and strategies on ICT. Retrieved May 17, 2007, from http://www.moeys.gov.kh /en/education/ict/sit uation_analysis.htm

Murray, H. G. (1997). Does evaluation of teaching lead to improvement of teaching?. *International Journal for Academic Development, 2,* 8-23. doi: 10.1080/13601449700 20102.

Nguyen, K. D., & McInnis, C. (2002). The possibility of using student evaluations in Vietnamese higher education. *Quality in Higher Education, 8,* 151-158. doi: 110.1080 /1353832022000004340.

Overall, J. U., & Marsh, H. W. (1979). Midterm feedback from students: Its relationship to instructional improvement and student's cognitive and affective outcomes [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71,* 856-865 from http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=search.displayRecord&uid=1980-06279-001.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Penny, A. R., & Coe, R. (2004). Effectiveness of consultation on student feedback: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 74*, 215-253. doi: 210.3102/003465430740 02215.

Perry, L. B., & Tor, G.-H. (2009). Understanding educational transfer: Theoretical perspectives and conceptual frameworks. *Prospects*, *38*, 509-526. doi: 510.1007/s11125-11009-190 92-11123.

Phillips, D., & Ochs, K. (2004). Researching policy borrowing: Some methodological challenges in comparative education [Electronic Version]. *British Educational Research Journal*, *30*, 773-784. Retrieved November 24, 2009 from http://www.jstor .org/stable/1502241.

Piccinin, S., Cristi, C., & McCoy, M. (1999). The impact of individual consultation on student rating of teaching [Electronic Version]. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, *4*, 75-88. Retrieved March 1, 2008 from https://illiad.lib .lehigh.edu/PDF/158588.pdf.

Remmers, H. H. (1933). Class-size: A reply to Mr. Charters' criticism of class-size experiments [Electronic Version]. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *4*, 468-470. Retrieved January 31, 2009 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1976994.

Remmers, H. H. (1934). Reliability and halo effect of high school and college students' judgments of their teachers [Electronic Version]. *The Journal of Educational Psychology*, *18*, 619-630. doi: 610.1037/h0074783

Remmers, H. H., & Brandenburg, G. C. (1927). Experimental data on the Purdue Rating Scale for Instructors [Electronic Version]. *Educational Administration and Supervision, 13,* 519-527. Retrieved February 9, 2009 from https://illiad.lib.lehigh .edu/illiad/illiad.dll ?SessionID=R030124160D&Action=10&Form=75&Value=191047.

Remmers, H. H., Martin, F. D., & Elliott, D. N. (1949). Are students' ratings of instructors related to their grades? [Electronic Version]. *Purdue University Studies in Higher Education, 66,* 17-26. Retrieved February 9, 2009 from https://illiad.lib.lehigh.edu /illiad/illiad.dll?SessionID=R030124160D&Action=10&Form=75&Value=191046.

Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP). (2008a). Royal University of Phnom Penh: About RUPP: Introduction, vision, mission, objectives, history. Retrieved October 1, 2009, 2009, from http://www.rupp.edu.kh/about_rupp.php

Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP). (2008b). Royal University of Phnom Penh: Home: Academic program and staff: Academic calendar. Retrieved September 17, 2009, 2009, from http://www.rupp.edu.kh/academic_calendar.php

Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP). (2008c). Royal University of Phnom Penh: Home: Academic program and staff: Postgraduate degrees. Retrieved September 17, 2009, 2009, from www.rupp.edu.kh/postgraduate.php

Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP). (2008d). Royal University of Phnom Penh: Home: Academic program and staff: Student statistic. Retrieved September 18, 2009, 2009, from http://www.rupp.edu.kh/stu_statistic.php

Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP). (2008e). Royal University of Phnom Penh: Home: Academic program and staff: Undergraduate degrees. Retrieved October 1, 2009, from http://www.rupp.edu.kh/undergraduate.php

Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP). (2008f). Royal University of Phnom Penh: Home: Research centers and institutes. Retrieved October 1, 2009, 2009, from http://www.rupp.edu.kh/center/research_center.php

Schilling, J. (2006). On the pragmatics of qualitative assessment: Designing the process for content analysis. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 22* (1), 28-37. doi: 10.1027/1015-5759.22.1.28

Schriewer, J. (2003). Globalisation in education: Process and Discourse. *Policy Futures in Education, 1*, 271-283. doi: 210.2304/pfie.2003.2301.2302.2306.

Shao, L. P., Anderson, L. P., & Newsome, M. (2007). Evaluating teaching effectiveness: Where we are and where we should be. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 32*, 355-371. doi: 310.1080/02602930600801886.

Sperandio, J., Hobson, D., Douglas, R., & Pruitt, R. (2009). Does context matter? Importing US educational progams to schools overseas. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative & International Education, 39*(6), 707-721. doi:710.1080/03057920802483359.

Steiner-Khamsi, G., & Quist, H. O. (2000). The politics of educational borrowing: Reopening the case of Achimota in British Ghana [Electronic Version]. *Comparative Education Review, 44*, 272-299. . Retrieved November 17, 2009 from http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0010-4086%28200008%2944%3A3%3C272%3ATPOEBR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. 2 ed. Retrieved December 4, 2009, from http://www.li.suu.edu/library/circulation/Stein/Comm%206020ksStraussCorbinBasicsQualitativeFall07.pdf

Stone, D. (2001). Learning lessons, policy transfer and the international diffusion of policy ideas (Working Paper No. 69/01). Retrieved November 27, 2011, from University of Warwick, Centre for the Study of Globalization and Regionalization website: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/csgr/research/workingpapers/2001/ wp6901.pdf

Tsai, S.-H. (2005). The objectivity of student ratings of instructors among Taiwanese students [Electronic Version]. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66,* 1675. Retrieved February 28, 2008 from http://ezproxy.lib.lehigh.edu/login?url=http ://proquest.umi .com.ezproxy.lib.lehigh.edu/pqdweb?did=920926301&sid=3&Fmt=2&clientId=8243& RQT=309&VName=PQD.

Wachtel, H. K. (1998). Student evaluation of college teaching effectiveness: A brief review. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 23,* 191-211. doi: 110.1080/0260293 980230207.

Watkins, D., Marsh, H. W., & Young, D. (1987). Evaluating tertiary teaching: A New Zealand perspective [Electronic Version]. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 3,* 41-53. Retrieved October 10, 2008 from https://illiad.lib.lehigh.edu/illiad/illiad.dll ?SessionID=W00273 5059Q&Action=10&Form=75&Value=179741.

Watkins, D., & Regmi, M. (1992). Student evaluations of tertiary teaching: A Nepalese investigation. *Educational Psychology, 12,* 131-143. doi: 110.1080/0144341920120 204.

Watkins, D., & Thomas, B. (1991). Assessing teaching effectiveness: An Indian perspective [Electronic Version]. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 16,* 185-198. Retrieved October 16, 2008 from https://illiad.lib.lehigh .edu/illiad/illiad.dll?SessionID =Q015007020V&Action=10&Form=75&Value=180234.

Willig, C. (2001). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method*. Retrieved December 20, 2009, from http://www.mcgraw-hill.co.uk/openup /chapters/0335205356.pdf.

Yin, R. K. (2006). Mixed methods research: Are the methods genuinely integrated or merely parallel? [Electronic Version]. *Research in The Schools*, *13*, 41-47. Retrieved December 21, 2009 from http://www.msera.org/Rits_131/Yin_131.pdf.

Research Questions	Data Sources 1. SEEQ data 2. Orientations 3. Observations	4. Consultations 5. Debriefings 6. Unplanned Interactions
1. If the program of student evaluations of individual teachers designed for use in one cultural setting is adaptable in Cambodia, how are aspects of the culture identified as being likely to modify or change the way the program operates being overcome?	2. Orientations 3. Observations 4. Consultations 5. Debriefings 6. Unplanned Interactions	
2. If the program of student evaluations of individual teachers designed for use in one cultural setting is not adaptable in Cambodia, how are aspects of the culture changing expected outcomes?	2. Orientations 3. Observations 4. Consultations 5. Debriefings 6. Unplanned Interactions	
3. Are the means of the ten Factor scores from the SEEQ the same for instructors who receive advisory mid-semester feedback as those for the instructors who do not receive such feedback?	1. SEEQ data	
4. Do students and instructors believe that providing instructors with mid-semester feedback helps instructors improve their teaching effectiveness?	1. SEEQ data 2. Orientations 4. Consultations 5. Debriefings 6. Unplanned Interactions	
5. Do students and instructors believe that students evaluated instructors' fairly at the mid-semester and final administrations of the SEEQ?	1. SEEQ data 4. Consultations 5. Debriefings 6. Unplanned Interactions	
6. Do students and instructors believe it is acceptable for students to evaluate instructors' teaching effectiveness using the SEEQ or other methods of evaluation?	1. SEEQ data 4. Consultations 5. Debriefings 6. Unplanned Interactions	
7. Do students and instructors believe that instructors lose Face when students evaluate them?	1. SEEQ data 4. Consultations 5. Debriefings 6. Unplanned Interactions	

8. Did any other issues surface about the use of the SEEQ?	1. SEEQ data 2. Orientations 3. Observations 4. Consultations 5. Debriefings 6. Unplanned Interactions
9. What items from the SEEQ do 10% or more of instructor and student participants believe to be inappropriate in the study setting?	1. SEEQ data 4. Consultations 5. Debriefings 6. Unplanned Interactions

ការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រលប់របស់និសិត្សទៅលើការបង្រៀន 1 / 7

ថ្នាក់:									
គ្រូ:						**កាលបរិច្ឆេទ:**			
សេចក្តីណែនាំ *សូមបញ្ជាក់អំពី ចំណាត់ថ្នាក់នៃការយល់ព្រម/មិនយល់ព្រមរបស់អ្នក ចំពោះប្រយោគនានា ខាងក្រោម ដែលពិពណ៌នាអំពីថ្នាក់រៀននេះ ដោយប្រើប្រាស់នូវអង្កាស់ទាំងនេះ:*									
មិនយល់ស្រប យ៉ាងខ្លាំង		មិនយល់ស្រប		អព្យាក្រឹត		យល់ស្រប		យល់ស្រប យ៉ាងខ្លាំង	
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	
កំណត់សំគាល់: សូមទុកចោលចំពោះសំណួរណាដែលមិនទាក់ទងការបង្រៀនរបស់បុគ្គលិកនេះទេ									
សូមគូសសញ្ញាដូចរបៀបនេះ:				*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	5	*6* *7* *8* *9*

ការសិក្សា - *LEARNING*									
1. ខ្ញុំយល់ថាវគ្គសិក្សានេះមានការប្រណាំងប្រជែង ដោយភាពវៃឆ្លាត និងការលើកទឹកចិត្ត	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. ខ្ញុំបានរៀនអំពីអ្វី ដែលខ្ញុំគិតថាមានតំលៃ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. ចំណាប់អារម្មណ៏របស់ខ្ញុំចំពោះមុខវិជ្ជានេះ មានការកើនឡើង ទៅតាមដំណើរនៃវគ្គ សិក្សានេះ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. ខ្ញុំបានរៀន និងយល់ដឹងច្បាស់អំពីឯកសារមេរៀននៃ វគ្គសិក្សានេះ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ចំណង់នៃការបង្រៀន - *ENTHUSIASM*									
5. គ្រូមានការស្រលាញ់ការបង្រៀន និង ចង់បង្រៀន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

ការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រលប់របស់និសិត្សទៅលើការបង្រៀន 2 / 7

មិនយល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង		មិនយល់ស្រប		អព្យាក្រឹត		យល់ស្រប		យល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*
កំណត់សំគាល់: សូមទុកចោលចំពោះសំណួរណាដែលមិនទាក់ទងការបង្រៀនរបស់បុគ្គលិកនេះទេ								
សូមគូសសញ្ញាដូចរបៀបនេះ				5				
6. គ្រូមានភាពស្វាហាប់ និង ពោរពេញទៅដោយថាមពល ក្នុងការបង្រៀន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. គ្រូធ្វើអោយការបង្រៀនប្រសើរឡើងដោយមានការប្រើពាក្យកំប្លែង	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. របៀបបង្រៀនរបស់គ្រូនៅក្នុងថ្នាក់ធ្វើអោយខ្ញុំចាប់អារម្មណ៍	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ការរៀបចំ – *ORGANIZATION*									
9. ការពន្យល់របស់គ្រូ គឺមានភាពច្បាស់លាស់	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. ឯកសារសម្ភារៈរបស់គ្រូមានការរៀបចំបានល្អ និងពន្យល់ដោយប្រុងប្រយត្ន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. គ្រូបង្រៀនបានធ្វើតាមអ្វីដែលបានកំណត់ក្នុងគោលបំណងនៃកិច្ចតែងការរបស់គាត់ដែលធ្វើឱ្យខ្ញុំដឹងថា វគ្គដើរដល់ណា	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. គ្រូបានបង្រៀនតាមវិធីដែលអាចអោយនិស្សិតធ្វើការកត់ត្រាបាន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

ការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រលប់របស់និស្សិតទៅលើការបង្រៀន 3 / 7

មិនយល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង		មិនយល់ស្រប		អព្យាក្រឹត		យល់ស្រប		យល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

កំណត់សំគាល់: សូមទុកចោលចំពោះសំណួរណាដែលមិនទាក់ទងការបង្រៀនរបស់បុគ្គលិកនេះទេ

សូមគូសសញ្ញាដូចរបៀបនេះ	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	5	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

ការចំនាក់ចំនងជាក្រុម - *GROUP INTERACTION*									
13. និស្សិតត្រូវបានលើកទឹកចិត្ត អោយចូលរួមក្នុងការពិភាក្សាក្នុងថ្នាក់រៀន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14. និស្សិតត្រូវបានអញ្ជើញអោយចែករំលែកនូវគំនិតនិងចំណេះដឹង	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15. និស្សិតត្រូវបានលើកទឹកចិត្តអោយសួរសំណួរដល់គ្រូ ហើយគ្រូផ្តល់ចំឡើយដែលមានន័យគ្រប់គ្រាន់	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16. និស្សិតត្រូវបានលើកទឹកចិត្តអោយបញ្ចេញយោបល់ផ្ទាល់ខ្លួន និង/ឬសួរសំណួរទៅកាន់គ្រូ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ចំនាក់ចំនងបុគ្គល - *INDIVIDUAL RAPPORT*									
17. គ្រូមានភាពរួសរាយជាមួយនិស្សិតគ្រប់រូប	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18. គ្រូធ្វើអោយនិស្សិតយល់ថា ខ្លួនត្រូវបាន ស្វាគមន៍ក្នុងការសុំអោយជួយ/ផ្តល់ដំបូន្មាន ទាំងនៅក្នុងឬក្រៅថ្នាក់រៀន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

ការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រលប់របស់និស្សិតទៅលើការបង្រៀន 4 / 7

មិនយល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង		មិនយល់ស្រប		អព្យាក្រឹត		យល់ស្រប		យល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

កំណត់សំគាល់: សូមទុកចោលចំពោះសំណួរណាដែលមិនទាក់ទងការបង្រៀនរបស់បុគ្គលិកនេះទេ

សូមគូសសញ្ញាដូចរបៀបនេះ	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	5	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*
19. គ្រូពិតជាមានការយកចិត្តទុកដាក់ចំពោះនិស្សិតម្នាក់ៗ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
20. និស្សិតមានពេលគ្រប់គ្រាន់ ក្នុងការជួបគ្រូទាំងនៅក្នុងអំឡុងម៉ោងធ្វើការ ឬក្រោយពេលចេញពីរៀន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

ការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រលប់របស់និស្សិតទៅលើការបង្រៀន 5 / 7

ភាពទូលំទូលាយ - BREADTH

21. គ្រូពិភាក្សានិងប្រៀបធៀបទំនាក់ទំនងរវាងទ្រឹស្តីខុសៗគ្នា (ចំណុចមេរៀនខុសៗគ្នា)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
22. គ្រូបង្ហាញនូវសារវាតា ឬដើមកំណើត នៃគំនិត និងទស្សនាទានដែលបានលើកឡើងនៅក្នុងថ្នាក់រៀន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
23. គ្រូបង្ហាញនូវទស្សន: ច្រើនជាងការគិតផ្តាល់ខ្លួន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
24. គ្រូពិភាក្សាគ្រប់គ្រាន់អំពីការវិឌ្ឍន៍បច្ចុប្បន្ននៅក្នុងប្រធានបទនៃការសិក្សា	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

ការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រលប់របស់និសិត្សទៅលើការបង្រៀន 5 / 7

មិនយល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង		មិនយល់ស្រប		អព្យាក្រឹត		យល់ស្រប		យល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

កំណត់សំគាល់: សូមទុកចោលចំពោះសំណួរណាដែលមិនទាក់ទងការបង្រៀនរបស់បុគ្គលិកនេះទេ									
សូមគូសសញ្ញាដូចរបៀបនេះ	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	5	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

ការប្រលង - *EXAMINATIONS*									
25. ផ្តល់ពិត៍មានត្រឡប់អំពីចំណុចត្រូវប្រលង និងចំណុចត្រូវដាក់ពិន្ទុ គឺមានសារៈសំខាន់ណាស់	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26. វិធិសាស្ត្រសំរាប់ធ្វើការវាយតំលៃការងាររបស់និស្សិត គឺសមរម្យ និងយុត្តិធម៌	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
27. អ្វីដែលគ្រូបានសន្យាធ្វើនៅក្នុងការប្រលងត្រូវបានធ្វើមែន	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
កិច្ចការសាលា - *ASSIGNMENTS*									
28. អត្ថបទដែលដាក់ឱ្យសិស្សនិស្សិតអានមានខ្លឹមសារល្អ និង មានតំលៃ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29. ការអាន កិច្ចការផ្ទះ ការធ្វើពីសោធន៏ បានចូលរួមចំណែកធ្វើអោយមានការឃើញពីគុណតំលៃនិងយល់អំពីមុខវិជ្ជា	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

ការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រលប់របស់និសិត្សទៅលើការបង្រៀន 6 / 7

មិនយល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង		មិនយល់ស្រប		អព្យាក្រឹត		យល់ស្រប		យល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*
កំណត់សំគាល់: សូមទុកចោលចំពោះសំណួរណាដែលមិនទាក់ទងការបង្រៀនរបស់បុគ្គលិកនេះទេ								
សូមគូសសញ្ញាដូចរបៀបនេះ:	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	5	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

ទំហំកិច្ចការ/ការពិបាក-*WORKLOAD / DIFFICULTY*									
30. តើអ្នកអាចប្រៀបធៀបមុខវិជ្ជារបស់អ្នកទៅមុខវិជ្ជាដទៃទៀតយ៉ាងដូចម្តេច?	**ងាយស្រួលបំផុត**				**មធ្យម**				**ពិបាកណាស់**
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31. ទំហំកិច្ចការរបស់មុខវិជ្ជានេះបើប្រៀបធៀបជាមួយមុខវិជ្ជាដទៃទៀត គឺ:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
32. ល្បឿនបង្រៀនរបស់មុខវិជ្ជានេះ គឺ:	**យឺតបំផុត**				**ល្មម**				**លឿនខ្លាំងណាស់**
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
33. ចំនួនម៉ោងជាមធ្យមក្នុងមួយអាទិត្យ ដែលត្រូវការ ក្រៅពីក្នុងថ្នាក់រៀន	**ចំនួនម៉ោងជាធម្យមក្នុងមួយអាទិត្យ**								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+

ការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រលប់របស់និសិត្សទៅលើការបង្រៀន 7 / 7

មិនយល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង		មិនយល់ស្រប		អព្យាក្រឹត		យល់ស្រប		យល់ស្របយ៉ាងខ្លាំង
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

កំណត់សំគាល់: សូមទុកចោលចំពោះសំណួរណាដែលមិនទាក់ទងការបង្រៀនរបស់បុគ្គលិកនេះទេ

សូមគូសសញ្ញាដូចរបៀបនេះ	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	5	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

ការវាយតំលៃរបស់និស្សិតចំពោះគ្រូបង្រៀន – *STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHERS*

34. ការទទួលបានការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រឡប់ពីនិស្សិតនៅពាក់កណ្តាលឆមាស ជួយគ្រូដើម្បីធ្វើអោយប្រសើរឡើងដល់ប្រសិទ្ធិបង្រៀនរបស់ពួកគេ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
35. និស្សិតវាយតំលៃគ្រូបង្រៀនយ៉ាងយុត្តិធម៌	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
36. ខ្ញុំជឿថា វាគ្មានបញ្ហាទេដែលនិស្សិតធ្វើការវាយតំលៃ ការបង្រៀនរបស់គ្រូនោះ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
37. គ្រូៗមានអារម្មណ៍មិនសុខស្រួលនៅពេលត្រូវបានវាយតំលៃដោយនិស្សិត	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

38. សូមកត់ត្រាសំណួររហូតដល់៥ដែលអ្នកគិតថាមិនសមស្រប:					

ប្រជាសាស្ត្រ – *DEMOGRAPHICS*

39. ភេទ: ប្រុស ♂ ស្រី ♀	41. ឆ្នាំសិក្សា: 1 2 3 4

Appendix B. SEEQ-KL Questionnaire (Khmer language version)
(Page 7 continued)

40. អាយុ:	42. ភាសាកំណើត:
43. យោបល់បន្ថែម:	

Class:
Instructor: **Date:**

Instructions: *Please indicate the EXTENT of your agreement / disagreement with the following statements as descriptions of this class by using this scale:*								
Strongly Disagree	***Disagree***		***Neutral***		***Agree***			***Strongly Agree***
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*
NOTE: Leave blank any items that do not apply for this staff member's teaching.								
Please MARK LIKE THIS: *1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

LEARNING									
1. I have found the course intellectually challenging and stimulating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. I have learned something which I consider valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. My interest in the subject has increased as a consequence of this course	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. I have learned and understood the subject materials of this course	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ENTHUSIASM									
5. Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the course.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. Instructor was dynamic and energetic in conducting the course	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Instructor enhanced presentations with the use of humor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. Instructor's style of presentation held my interest during class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Strongly Disagree		***Disagree***		***Neutral***		***Agree***				***Strongly Agree***
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*		
NOTE: Leave blank any items that do not apply for this staff member's teaching.										
Please MARK LIKE THIS:				*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	***X***	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

ORGANIZATION									
9. Instructor's explanations were clear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. Instructor's materials were well prepared and carefully explained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. Proposed objectives agreed with those actually taught so I knew where the course was going	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. Instructor gave lectures that facilitated taking notes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
GROUP INTERACTION									
13. Students were encouraged to participate in class discussions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14. Students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15. Students were encouraged to ask questions and were given meaningful answers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16. Students were encouraged to express their own ideas and/or question the instructor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Strongly Disagree		***Disagree***		***Neutral***		***Agree***		***Strongly Agree***
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*
NOTE: Leave blank any items that do not apply for this staff member's teaching.								
Please MARK LIKE THIS:	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	***5***	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

INDIVIDUAL RAPPORT									
17. Instructor was friendly towards individual students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18. Instructor made students feel welcome in seeking help/ advice in or outside of class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19. Instructor had a genuine interest in individual students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
20. Instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
BREADTH									
21. Instructor contrasted the implications of various theories	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
22. Instructor presented the background or origin of ideas/ concepts developed in class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
23. Instructor presented points of view other than his/her own when appropriate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
24. Instructor adequately discussed current developments in the field	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Strongly Disagree		***Disagree***		***Neutral***		***Agree***		***Strongly Agree***
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*
NOTE: Leave blank any items that do not apply for this staff member's teaching.								
Please MARK LIKE THIS:	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	***5***	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

EXAMINATIONS									
25. Feedback on examinations/graded materials was valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26. Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
27. Examinations/graded materials tested course content as emphasized by the instructor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ASSIGNMENTS									
28. Required readings/texts were valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29. Readings, homework, laboratories contributed to appreciation and understanding of subject	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
WORKLOAD / DIFFICULTY									
30. Class difficulty, relative to other classes, was:	**Very Easy** 1	2	3	4	**Medium** 5	6	7	8	**Very Hard** 9
31. Class workload, relative to other classes, was:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Strongly Disagree		***Disagree***		***Neutral***		***Agree***		***Strongly Agree***
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

NOTE: Leave blank any items that do not apply for this staff member's teaching.

Please MARK LIKE THIS: *1 2 3 4* ~~*5*~~ *6 7 8 9*

32. Class pace was:	**Too Slow**				**About Right**				**Too Fast**
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

33. Average number of hours per week required outside class	**Average Number of Hours Per Week**									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+

STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHERS

34. Receiving student feedback at mid-semester helps instructors improve their teaching effectiveness.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
35. Students evaluate instructors fairly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
36. It is acceptable for students to evaluate instructors' teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
37. Instructors lose face when evaluated by students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

38. List up to 5 questions that you think are not appropriate:					

DEMOGRAPHICS

39. Your sex: Male ♂ Female ♀	41. First Language:
40. Your age:	42. RUPP Class Level: 1 2 3 4

Interview Guide: Instructor Orientation Page 1 of 2

Start Time: _____ **Finish Time:** _____

Date: _____

Conditions for Orientation: (√ Indicates condition were met)

1. _____ Investigator describes study.
2. _____ Investigator describes expectations for self and faculty.
3. _____ Investigator obtains signed copy the *Instructor Consent to Participate in Research* form from each instructor choosing to participate in study.

Notes:

Interview Guide: Instructor Orientation Page 2 of 2

Orientation Topics:

1. Greeting & Introduction
2. Goals of study
    a. Discover if SETs work at RUPP
    b. Learn what instructors & students think and how they feel about SETs
    c. Learn how gender affects SETs
3. Description of study
    a. Describe study (Orientation, O_1, X, O_2, Debriefing)
    b. Expectations for investigator
        i. Provide faculty with respect, confidentiality, and reliability
        ii. Provide participants with letter of professional development
        iii. Provide participants with $50 stipend
    c. Expectations for faculty
        i. Time commitments (P_1, O_1, self-evaluation, X, O_2, P_2)
        ii. Willingness to allow investigator to record comments using digital recorder
4. *Instructor Consent to Participate in Research* form (Khmer language version)
    a. Give instructors two copies of form
    b. Answer questions about consent
    c. Collect one signed copy of the form from participating instructors
5. Answer remaining questions

Instructor Consent to Participate in Research

Purpose
You are being asked to participate in a study which is being conducted by John Nash in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctorate from Lehigh University under the direction of Dr. Roland Yoshida. The purpose of this research is to learn more about whether feedback from Cambodian university students helps instructors improve their teaching effectiveness.

Procedures
During this study, you will do a self-evaluation and meet with John Nash at mid-semester and again at the end of the semester to discuss your self-evaluation and to receive feedback from students' evaluations. Your self-evaluation is a survey that will take about 20 minutes to complete. The survey asks you to assess various aspects of your teaching. You may skip questions. Your responses are confidential. Comments provided by participants will not be attributed to individual instructors or classes. You can choose to withdraw your responses at any time before you submit your answers. The completed survey will be submitted directly to the researcher. Your participation is the study is voluntary.

Discomforts and Risks
There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Some of the questions might cause discomfort. In the event that any questions asked are disturbing, you may stop responding to the survey at any time. Instructors who experience discomfort or want answers to questions about the research and research subjects' rights are encouraged to contact the researcher conducting this study, John Nash, by email at *john_nash.study@yahoo.com* or by telephone at 092.319.509. Instructors may also contact John Nash's advisor at Lehigh University, Dr. Roland Yoshida, by email at rky2@lehigh.edu or by phone at +1.610.758.6249 (USA).

Benefits
The results of the survey will provide important information about whether feedback from Cambodian university students helps instructors improve their teaching effectiveness.

Statement of Confidentiality
Information you provide on the survey and during conversations will remain confidential. At different times during the study, instructor's verbal responses will be electronically recorded. Comments and quotes may be noted throughout the study. Anonymous quotes may be used to give "voice" to quantitative and qualitative data. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception by any third parties of data sent via the Internet. Please also remember that you do not have to answer any question or questions about which you are uncomfortable.

Voluntary Participation
Participation in this research is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you do not have to answer any questions on the survey that you do not wish to answer. Individuals will not be identified and only group data will be reported (e.g., the analysis will include only aggregated data). By completing the survey, your informed consent will be implied. Please note that you can choose to withdraw your responses at any time before you submit your answers. Refusal to take part in this research study will involve no penalty. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), **you are encouraged** to contact to Ruth Tallman or Susan Disidore at telephone number: +1.610.758.3021 (USA) and/or email: inors@lehigh.edu of Lehigh University's Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. All reports or correspondence will be kept confidential.

Thank You for Participating In This Survey

_____ _____

Signature Date

កិច្ចព្រមព្រៀងចូលរួមការស្រាវជ្រាវរបស់គ្រូ

គោលបំណង:

យើងស្នើអោយអ្នកចូលរួមនៅក្នុងការសិក្សាស្រាវជ្រាវមួយ ដែលរៀបចំឡើងដោយ លោក John Nash ក្រោមការដឹកនាំរបស់ លោកបណ្ឌិត Roland Yoshida ។ ការសិក្សានេះជាផ្នែកមួយដើម្បី បំពេញតាមតំរូវការរបស់ថ្នាក់បណ្ឌិត នៃសកលវិទ្យាល័យ Lehigh ។ គោលបំណងនៃការសិក្សានេះ គឺ ចង់ដឹងបន្ថែមទៀត ថាតើ ការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រឡប់របស់និសិត្សកម្ពុជារៀននៅសកលវិទ្យាល័យ ជួយគ្រូ បង្រៀនក្នុងការធ្វើអោយប្រសើរឡើងដល់ប្រសិទ្ធភាពបង្រៀនរបស់ពួកគេដែរឬទេ ។

វិធីសាស្ត្រ:

ក្នុងអំឡុងពេលនៃការសិក្សានេះ អ្នកនឹងធ្វើការវាយតម្លៃដោយខ្លួនឯង ហើយជួបជាមួយ លោក John Nash នៅពាក់កណ្តាលឆមាស និងនៅចុងបញ្ចប់ឆមាស ដើម្បីពិភាក្សាអំពីការវាយតម្លៃដោយខ្លួនឯង ព្រមទាំងទទួលយោបល់ត្រឡប់ពីការវាយតម្លៃធ្វើឡើងដោយនិស្សិត ។ ការវាយតម្លៃដោយខ្លួនឯង គឺជាការ អង្កេតមួយ ដែលនឹងត្រូវចំណាយពេលប្រហែលជា២០នាទីដើម្បីបំពេញ ។ ការអង្កេតនេះស្នើអោយអ្នកធ្វើ ការវាយតម្លៃអំពីផ្នែកផ្សេងៗនៃការបង្រៀនរបស់អ្នក ។ អ្នកអាចរំលងចោលនូវសំណួរទាំងឡាយណាដែល អ្នកមិនចង់បំពេញ ។ ចម្លើយរបស់អ្នកនឹងត្រូវរក្សាជាការសម្ងាត់ ។ យោបល់នានារបស់អ្នកចូលរួមក្នុងការ សិក្សានេះនឹងមិនចាត់ទុកថាជារបស់គ្រូណាម្នាក់ឬថ្នាក់រៀនណាមួយឡើយ ។ មុនពេលអ្នកបញ្ជូនចម្លើយ អ្នក អាចសម្រេចថា មិនបញ្ជូនចម្លើយរបស់អ្នកនៅពេលណាមួយក៏បាន ។ ទម្រង់នៃការអង្កេតដែលបំពេញរួចនឹង បញ្ជូនទៅអោយអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវដោយផ្ទាល់ ។ ការចូលរួមរបស់អ្នកក្នុងការសិក្សានេះ គឺជាការស្ម័គ្រចិត្ត ។

គ្រោះថ្នាក់ និងភាពមិនស្រួលក្នុងអារម្មណ៍:

ការចូលរួមនៅក្នុងការសិក្សានេះគ្មានគ្រោះថ្នាក់អ្វីទេ ។ សំណួរខ្លះអាចធ្វើអោយ អ្នកមិនស្រួលក្នុង អារម្មណ៍ ។ ប្រសិនបើមានសំណួរណាមួយ ពេលសួរទៅនាំអោយរំខាន អ្នកអាចឈប់ឆ្លើយចំពោះការអង្កេត នេះនៅពេលណាក៏បាន ។ គ្រូដែលធ្លាប់ទទួលភាពមិនស្រួលក្នុងអារម្មណ៍ ចំពោះការបំពេញទម្រង់ការអង្កេត នេះ ឬក៏មានចំងល់ផ្សេងៗទាក់ទងទៅនឹងការស្រាវជ្រាវ និងសិទ្ធិរបស់អ្នកចូលរួមក្នុងការសិក្សា សូមទំនាក់ ទំនងមកកាន់ អ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវដែលធ្វើការសិក្សានេះ គឺលោក John Nash តាមរយៈ

john_nash.study@yahoo.com ឬតាមរយៈទូរស័ព្ទលេខ ០៩២ ៣១៩ ៥០៩។
គ្រូបង្រៀនទាំងឡាយក៏អាចធ្វើការទំនាក់ទំនងជាមួយទីប្រឹក្សារបស់លោក John Nash នៅឯសកលវិទ្យាល័យ Lehigh ដោយផ្ទាល់ផងដែរ គឺលោកបណ្ឌិត Roland Yoshida តាមរយៈ rky2@lehigh.edu ឬតាមរយៈទូរស័ព្ទលេខ +១ ៦១០ ៧៥៨ ៦២៨៩ (សហរដ្ឋអាមេរិក)។

ផលប្រយោជន៍:

លទ្ធផលនៃការសិក្សានេះនឹងផ្តល់ព័ត៌មានដែលមានសារៈសំខាន់ អំពីថាតើយោបល់ត្រឡប់របស់ និស្សិតកម្ពុជារៀននៅសកលវិទ្យាល័យ ជួយគ្រូបង្រៀនក្នុងការ ធ្វើអោយប្រសើរឡើងដល់ប្រសិទ្ធភាព បង្រៀនរបស់ពួកគេដែរឬទេ។

ការរក្សាការសម្ងាត់:

ព័ត៌មានដែលអ្នកបំពេញនៅលើទម្រង់នៃការអង្កេត និងក្នុងអំឡុងពេលសន្ទនា នឹងរក្សាជាការ សម្ងាត់។ ក្នុងអំឡុងពេលណាមួយនៃការសិក្សា ចម្លើយផ្ទាល់មាត់របស់គ្រូបង្រៀននឹងត្រូវថតទុកដោយ ប្រដាប់ថតសម្លេង។ យោបល់និងការដកស្រង់សំដី អាចត្រូវបានកត់ចំណាំក្នុងពេលធ្វើការសិក្សា។ ការដក ស្រង់សំដីដោយមិនបញ្ចេញឈ្មោះ អាចត្រូវបានប្រើដើម្បីគាំទ្រ ដល់ទិន្នន័យបែបបរិមាណ និងគុណភាព។ នៅពេលយើងធ្វើការបោះពុម្ពផ្សាយ ឬបទបង្ហាញអំពីលទ្ធផលនៃការសិក្សាស្រាវជ្រាវនេះ គឺយើងមិន ផ្សព្វផ្សាយអំពី ព័ត៌មានកំណត់សំគាល់របស់បុគ្គលណាម្នាក់ឡើយ។ យើងនឹងរក្សាការសំងាត់របស់អ្នក ត្រឹម ក៏រឹតរបស់បច្ចេកវិទ្យាដែលបានប្រើ។ យើងមិនអាចធានាអំពីបញ្ហាការស្ទាក់យកទិន្នន័យអំពីអ្នកផ្សេងតាម រយៈអ៊ិនធឺណែតទេ។ សូមចងចាំផងដែរថា អ្នកមិនចាំបាច់ឆ្លើយនូវរាល់សំណួរទាំងឡាយណា ដែលអ្នកមាន អារម្មណ៍ថាមិនសុខស្រួលក្នុងការឆ្លើយនោះទេ។

ការចូលរួមដោយស្ម័គ្រចិត្ត:

ការចូលរួមក្នុងការស្រាវជ្រាវនេះគឺធ្វើឡើងដោយស្ម័គ្រចិត្ត។ ប្រសិនបើអ្នកសំរេចចិត្តថាចូលរួម អ្នកមិនចាំបាច់ត្រូវតែឆ្លើយនូវសំណួរណាមួយដែលអ្នកមិនចង់ឆ្លើយនោះទេ។ ការសិក្សានេះនឹងមិនបង្ហាញអំពីអត្តសញ្ញាណរបស់បុគ្គលម្នាក់ៗទេ គឺបង្ហាញទិន្នន័យជាក្រុមតែប៉ុណ្ណោះ (ឧ. ការវិភាគនឹងគិតតែទៅលើទិន្នន័យ សរុបទេ)។ សូមចុះហត្ថលេខាលើកិច្ចព្រមព្រៀងចូលរួមការស្រាវជ្រាវ មុនពេលចាប់ផ្តើមបំពេញទម្រង់ការ អង្កេតនេះ។ សូមចងចាំថា អ្នកអាចសម្រេចថា មិនបញ្ជូនចម្លើយរបស់អ្នកនៅពេលណាមួយក៏បាន មុនពេល

ដែលអ្នកបញ្ជូនទៅអោយអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវរួច ។ ការបដិសេធន៍មិនចូលរួមក្នុងការសិក្សាស្រាវជ្រាវនេះ នឹងមិនត្រូវទទួលការពិន័យទេ ។ ប្រសិនបើអ្នកមានចំងល់ឬសំណួរនានា ស្តីពីការសិក្សានេះ ហើយចង់និយាយជាមួយ អ្នកផ្សេងក្រៅពីអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវ សូមធ្វើការទំនាក់ទំនងជាមួយ Ruth Tallman ឬ Susan Disidore តាមរយៈ ទូរស័ព្ទលេខ + ១ ៦១០ ៧៥៨ ៣០២១ (សហរដ្ឋអាមេរិក) ឬតាមរយៈអ៊ីម៉ែលរបស់ កម្មវិធីការគាំទ្រ និងការស្រាវជ្រាវនៃការិយាល័យសកលវិទ្យាល័យ Lehigh គឺ inors@lehigh.edu ។ ការរាយការណ៍ឬការឆ្លើយឆ្លងទាំងអស់នឹងរក្សាជាការសម្ងាត់ ។

_____ _____

ហត្ថលេខា កាលបរិច្ឆេទ

_____

Print Name

Interview Guide: Student Orientation Page 1 of 2

Start Time: _____ **Finish Time:** _____

Date: _____

Conditions for Orientation: (√ Indicates condition were met)

4. _____ Instructor not present during orientation.
5. _____ Investigator describes study.
6. _____ Investigator describes expectations for self and students.
7. _____ Investigator obtains signed copy the *Student Consent to Participate in Research* form from each student choosing to participate in study.
8. _____ Students complete SEEQ-KL.

Notes:

Interview Guide: Student Orientation Page 2 of 2

Orientation Topics:

1. Greeting & Introduction
2. Goals of study
    d. Discover if SETs work at RUPP
    e. Learn what students and instructors think & how they feel about SETs
    f. Learn how gender affects SETs
3. Description of study
    a. Describe study (Orientation, O_1, X, O_2, Debriefing)
    b. Expectations for investigator
        i. Provide students with respect, confidentiality, and reliability
        ii. Provide incentive for participation (cash raffle)
    c. Expectations for students
        i. Time commitments (P_1, O_1, O_2, P_2)
        ii. Willingness to allow investigator to record comments using digital recorder
4. *Student Consent to Participate in Research* form (Khmer language version)
    a. Give students two copies of form
    b. Answer questions about consent
    c. Collect one signed copy of the form from participating students
5. Answer remaining questions
6. Participating students complete SEEQ-KL

កិច្ចព្រមព្រៀងចូលរួមការស្រាវជ្រាវរបស់និស្សិត

គោលបំណង:

យើងស្នើអោយអ្នកចូលរួមនៅក្នុងការសិក្សាស្រាវជ្រាវមួយ ដែលរៀបចំឡើងដោយ លោក John Nash ក្រោមការដឹកនាំរបស់ លោកបណ្ឌិត Roland Yoshida ។ ការសិក្សានេះជាផ្នែកមួយដើម្បី បំពេញតាមតំរូវការរបស់ថ្នាក់បណ្ឌិត នៃសកលវិទ្យាល័យ Lehigh ។ គោលបំណងនៃការសិក្សានេះ គឺចង់ដឹងបន្ថែមទៀត ថាតើការផ្តល់យោបល់ត្រឡប់របស់និស្សិតកម្ពុជា រៀននៅសកលវិទ្យាល័យ ជួយគ្រូ បង្រៀនក្នុងការធ្វើអោយប្រសើរឡើងដល់ប្រសិទ្ធភាពបង្រៀនរបស់ពួកគេដែរឬទេ ។

វិធីសាស្ត្រ:

ក្នុងអំឡុងពេលនៃការសិក្សានេះ យើងស្នើអោយអ្នកបំពេញនូវទម្រង់នៃការអង្កេតមួយ នៅពាក់ កណ្តាលឆមាស និងនៅចុងបញ្ចប់ឆមាស ដែលស្នើអោយអ្នកធ្វើការ វាយតំលៃអំពីផ្នែកផ្សេងៗនៃប្រសិទ្ធភាព បង្រៀនរបស់គ្រូអ្នក ។ គ្រូរបស់អ្នកនឹងគ្មានវត្តមាន នៅពេលដែល អ្នកបំពេញទម្រង់នៃការអង្កេតនោះទេ ។ ដើម្បីចូលរួមក្នុងការអង្កេតនេះ អ្នកត្រូវតែមានអាយុ១៨ឆ្នាំឬលើស ។ អ្នកអាចចំណាយពេលប្រហែលជា២០ នាទីដើម្បីបំពេញទម្រង់នេះ ។ ចម្លើយរបស់អ្នកនឹងរក្សាជាការសម្ងាត់ ។ អ្នកអាចរំលងចោលនូវសំណួរណា ដែលអ្នកមិនចង់បំពេញ ។ រាល់យោបល់នានារបស់អ្នកចូលរួមក្នុងការសិក្សានេះ នឹងមិនចាត់ទុកថាជារបស់ និសិត្សណាម្នាក់ឬថ្នាក់រៀនណាមួយឡើយ ។ មុនពេលអ្នកបញ្ជូនចម្លើយ អ្នកអាចសម្រេចថាមិនបញ្ជូនចម្លើយ របស់អ្នកនៅពេលណាមួយក៏បាន ។ ទម្រង់នៃការអង្កេតដែលបំពេញរួច នឹងបញ្ជូនទៅអោយអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវ ដោយផ្ទាល់ ការចូលរួមរបស់អ្នកក្នុងការសិក្សានេះ គឺជាការស្ម័គ្រចិត្ត ។

គ្រោះថ្នាក់ និងភាពមិនស្រួលក្នុងអារម្មណ៍:

ការចូលរួមនៅក្នុងការសិក្សានេះគ្មានគ្រោះថ្នាក់អ្វីទេ ។ សំណួរខ្លះអាចធ្វើអោយ អ្នកមិនស្រួលក្នុង អារម្មណ៍ ។ ប្រសិនបើមានសំណួរណាមួយ ពេលសួរទៅនាំអោយរំខាន អ្នកអាចឈប់ឆ្លើយចំពោះការអង្កេត នេះនៅពេលណាក៏បាន ។ និសិត្សដែលធ្លាប់ទទួលភាពមិនស្រួលក្នុងអារម្មណ៍ ចំពោះការបំពេញទម្រង់ការ អង្កេតនេះ ឬក៏មានចំងល់ផ្សេងៗទាក់ទងទៅនឹងការស្រាវជ្រាវ និងសិទ្ធិរបស់អ្នកចូលរួមក្នុងការសិក្សា សូម ទំនាក់ទំនងមកកាន់ អ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវដែលធ្វើការសិក្សានេះ គឺលោក John Nash តាមរយៈ john_nash.study@yahoo.com ឬតាមរយៈទូរស័ព្ទលេខ ០៩២ ៣១៩ ៥០៩ ។ និស្សិតទាំងឡាយក៏អាច ធ្វើការទំនាក់ទំនងជាមួយទីប្រឹក្សារបស់លោក John Nash នៅឯសកលវិទ្យាល័យ Lehigh ដោយផ្ទាល់ផង

ដែរ គឺលោកបណ្ឌិត Roland Yoshida តាមរយៈ rky2@lehigh.edu ឬតាមរយៈទូរស័ព្ទលេខ +១ ៦១០ ៧៥៨ ៦២៨៩ (សហរដ្ឋអាមេរិក)។

ផលប្រយោជន៍:

លទ្ធផលនៃការសិក្សានេះនឹងផ្តល់ព័ត៌មានដែលមានសារៈសំខាន់ អំពីថាតើយោបល់ត្រឡប់របស់ និស្សិតកម្ពុជារៀននៅសកលវិទ្យាល័យ ជួយគ្រូបង្រៀនក្នុងការធ្វើអោយប្រសើរឡើងដល់ប្រសិទ្ធភាព បង្រៀនរបស់ពួកគេដែរឬទេ។

ការរក្សាការសំងាត់:

ព័ត៌មានដែលអ្នកបំពេញនៅលើទម្រង់នៃការអង្កេត និងក្នុងអំឡុងពេលសន្ទនា នឹងរក្សាជាការ សម្ងាត់។ ក្នុងអំឡុងពេលណាមួយនៃការសិក្សា ចម្លើយផ្ទាល់មាត់របស់និស្សិតនឹងត្រូវថតទុកដោយ ប្រដាប់ ថតសម្លេង។ យោបល់និងការដកស្រង់សំដី អាចត្រូវបានកត់ចំណាំក្នុងពេលធ្វើការសិក្សា។ ការដកស្រង់សំដី ដោយមិនបញ្ចេញឈ្មោះ អាចត្រូវបានប្រើដើម្បីគាំទ្រ ដល់ទិន្នន័យបែបបរិមាណ និងគុណភាព។ នៅពេល យើងធ្វើការបោះពុម្ពផ្សាយ ឬបទបង្ហាញអំពីលទ្ធផលនៃការសិក្សាស្រាវជ្រាវនេះ គឺយើងមិនផ្សព្វផ្សាយអំពី ព័ត៌មានកំណត់សំគាល់របស់បុគ្គលណាម្នាក់ឡើយ។ យើងនឹងរក្សាការសំងាត់ របស់អ្នកត្រឹមកិរិតរបស់ បច្ចេកវិទ្យាដែលបានប្រើ។ យើងមិនអាចធានាអំពីបញ្ហាការស្ទាក់យកទិន្នន័យអំពីអ្នកផ្សេងតាមរយៈ អ៊ិនធឺណែតទេ។ សូមចងចាំផងដែរ ថាអ្នកមិនចាំបាច់ឆ្លើយនូវរាល់សំណួរទាំងឡាយណា ដែលអ្នកមាន អារម្មណ៍ថាមិនសុខស្រួលក្នុងការឆ្លើយនោះទេ។

ការចូលរួមដោយស្ម័គ្រចិត្ត:

ការចូលរួមក្នុងការស្រាវជ្រាវនេះគឺធ្វើឡើងដោយស្ម័គ្រចិត្ត។ ប្រសិនបើអ្នកសំរេចចិត្តថាចូលរួម អ្នកមិនចាំបាច់ត្រូវតែឆ្លើយនូវសំណួរនានាដែលអ្នកមិនចង់ឆ្លើយនោះទេ។ ការសិក្សានេះ នឹងមិនបង្ហាញអំពីអត្តសញ្ញាណរបស់បុគ្គលម្នាក់ៗទេ គឺបង្ហាញទិន្នន័យជាក្រុមតែប៉ុណ្ណោះ (ឧ. ការវិភាគនឹងគិតតែទៅលើទិន្នន័យ សរុបទេ)។ សូមចុះហត្ថលេខាលើកិច្ចព្រមព្រៀងចូលរួមការស្រាវជ្រាវ មុនពេលចាប់ផ្តើមបំពេញទម្រង់ ការអង្កេតនេះ។ សូមចងចាំថាអ្នកអាចសម្រេចថា មិនបញ្ជូនចម្លើយរបស់អ្នកនៅពេលណាមួយក៏បាន មុន ពេលដែលអ្នកបញ្ជូនទៅអោយអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវរួច។ ការបដិសេធន៍មិនចូលរួមក្នុងការសិក្សាស្រាវជ្រាវនេះ នឹង មិនត្រូវទទួលការពិន័យទេ។ ប្រសិនបើអ្នកមានចង់ឲ្យសំណួរនានាស្តីពីការសិក្សានេះ ហើយចង់និយាយ ជាមួយ អ្នកផ្សេងក្រៅពីអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវ សូមធ្វើការទំនាក់ទំនងជាមួយ Ruth Tallman ឬ Susan Disidore

តាមរយៈ ទូរស័ព្ទលេខ + ១ ៦១0 ៧៥៨ ៣0២១ (សហរដ្ឋអាមេរិក) ឬតាមរយៈអ៊ីម៉ែលរបស់ កម្មវិធីការគាំទ្រ និងការស្រាវជ្រាវនៃការិយាល័យសកលវិទ្យាល័យ Lehigh គឺ inors@lehigh.edu ។ ការរាយការណ៍ ឬការឆ្លើយឆ្លងទាំងអស់នឹងរក្សាជាការសម្ងាត់ ។

សូមអគុណចំពោះការចូលរួមក្នុងការអង្កេតនេះ ។

យើងនឹងអញ្ជើញនិស្សិត ដែលចូលរួមក្នុងការសិក្សាស្រាវជ្រាវនេះ អោយចូលរួមក្នុងកម្មវិធីចាប់ឆ្នោតផ្សងសំណាងយករង្វាន់ជាទឹកប្រាក់ ។ កម្មវិធីចាប់ឆ្នោតផ្សងសំណាងនឹងចាប់ផ្តើម បន្ទាប់ពីនិស្សិតទាំង ឡាយ បានបំពេញទម្រង់ការអង្កេតនេះចប់ ។

_____ _____

ហត្ថលេខា កាលបរិច្ឆេទ

_____

Name in English

Student Consent to Participate in Research

Purpose
The purpose of this research is to learn more about whether feedback from Cambodian university students helps instructors improve their teaching effectiveness. You are asking to participate in a study which is being conducted by John Nash in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctorate from Lehigh University under the direction of Dr. Roland Yoshida.

Procedures
During this study, you will be asked to complete a survey at mid-semester and again at the end of the semester that asks you to assess various aspects of your instructor's teaching effectiveness. Your instructor will not be present when you complete the survey. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate. The survey will take about 20 minutes to complete. Your responses are confidential. You may skip questions. Comments provided by participants will not be attributed to individual students or classes. You can choose to withdraw your responses at any time before you submit your answers. The completed survey will be submitted directly to the researcher. Your participation is the study is voluntary.

Discomforts and Risks
There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Some of the questions might cause discomfort. In the event that any questions asked are disturbing, you may stop responding to the survey at any time. Students who experience discomfort or want answers to pertinent questions about the research and research subjects' rights are encouraged to contact the researcher conducting this study, John Nash, by email at *john_nash.study@yahoo.com* or by telephone at 092.319.509. Students may also contact John Nash's advisor at Lehigh University, Dr. Roland Yoshida, by email at *rky2@lehigh.edu* or by phone at +1.610.758.6249 (USA).

Benefits
The results of the survey will provide important information about whether feedback from Cambodian university students helps instructors improve their teaching effectiveness.

Statement of Confidentiality
Information you provide on the survey and during conversations will remain confidential. At different times during the study, student's verbal responses will be electronically recorded. Comments and quotes may be noted throughout the study. Anonymous quotes may be used to give "voice" to quantitative and qualitative data. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception by any third parties of data sent via the Internet. Please also remember that you do not have to answer any question or questions about which you are uncomfortable.

Voluntary Participation
Participation in this research is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you do not have to answer any questions on the survey that you do not wish to answer. Individuals will not be identified and only group data will be reported (e.g., the analysis will include only aggregated data). By completing the survey, your informed consent will be implied. Please note that you can choose to withdraw your responses at any time before you submit your answers. Refusal to take part in this research study will involve no penalty. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), **you are encouraged** to contact to Ruth Tallman or Susan Disidore at telephone number: +1.610.758.3021 (USA) and/or email: inors@lehigh.edu of Lehigh University's Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. All reports or correspondence will be kept confidential.

Thank You for Participating In This Survey
Students participating in the research are invited to participate in a raffle to win a cash prize. The raffle will take place after students have completed the survey.

_____ _____

Signature Date

Interview Guide: Instructor Consultation Page 1 of 3

Start Time:_____ Finish Time:_____

Date:_____

Male_____ Female_____ First Language _____

Years of Teaching: Tertiary _____ Secondary_____ Primary_____

Conditions for Consultation: (√ Indicates condition were met)

1. _____ Instructor consents to participate in the study.
2. _____ Investigator has a signed copy of the *Instructor Consent to Participate in Research – Khmer language version* form.
3. _____ Consultation took place in a private environment in which the conversation between the investigator and instructor could not be overheard.

Consultation's Sequential Steps: (√ Indicates step completed)

1. _____ **Class Performance:** Instructor described how she/he thinks her/his class performed during the semester.
2. _____ **Instructor Self-Assessment:** Instructor described her/his teaching performance during the semester.
3. _____ **SEEQ-KL Data:** Investigator provided instructor with summary of SEEQ-KL data from her/his class.
4. _____ **Perception Congruency:** Investigator and instructor discussed the level of congruency between the instructors' and students' perceptions of the instructor's teaching effectiveness.
5. _____ **Improvement Area:** Instructor identified one area of teaching she/he wants to improve upon during current semester.
6. _____ **Improvement Goal:** End-of-semester improvement goal identified.
7. _____ **Improvement Strategy:** Instructor's strategy to meet end-of-semester improvement goal.

8. _____ **Open-Ended Questions:** Instructor responded to open-ended questions.

Interview Guide: Instructor Consultation Page 2 of 3

5. _____ **Improvement Area:** One area of teaching instructor believes she/he can make significant, observable improvement during the current semester.

_____

_____

_____

6. _____ **Improvement Goal:** End-of-semester goal for improvement area.
(e.g., "I will improve in this area from my current score to _____ score.")

_____

_____

_____

7. _____ **Improvement Strategy:** Instructor's strategy to meet end-of-semester improvement goal.

_____

_____

Interview Guide: Instructor Consultation Page 3 of 3

8. _____ **Open-Ended Questions:**

1. _____ What do you think about the SEEQ as an evaluation tool?
2. _____ How do you feel about participating in the study?
3. _____ What do you think about students evaluating instructors?
4. _____ How did you feel about being evaluated?
5. _____ What do you think about having SETs next semester?
6. _____ What is your perspective on female instructors?

Appendix K. Interview Guide: Student Debriefing

Interview Guide: Student Debriefing

Start Time: _____ **Finish Time:** _____

Date: _____

Conditions for Debriefing: (√ Indicates condition were met)

1. _____ Instructor not present during debriefing.
2. _____ Investigator has copy the *Student Consent to Participate in Research – Khmer language version* form signed by all students in class wishing to participate in study.
3. _____ Debriefing date, start time, and finish time recorded.

Questions: For Students:

1. _____ What do you think about the SEEQ as an evaluation tool?
2. _____ How do you feel about participating in the study?
3. _____ What do you think about students evaluating instructors?
4. _____ How did you feel about evaluating your instructor?
5. _____ What do you think about having SETs next semester?
6. _____ What is your perspective on female instructors?

Interview Guide: Instructor Debriefing Page 1 of 3

Start Time: **Finish Time:**

Date:

Conditions for Debriefing: (√ Indicates condition were met)

1. _____ Instructor consents to participate in the study.
2. _____ Investigator has copy the *Instructor Consent to Participate in Research - Khmer language version* form signed by the instructor.
3. _____ Consultation took place in a private environment in which the conversation between the investigator and instructor could not be overheard.
4. _____ Consultation's date, start time, and finish time recorded.

Debriefing's Sequential Steps: (√ Indicates step completed)

1. _____ **Class Performance:** Instructor described how she/he thinks her/his class performed during the semester.
2. _____ **Instructor Self-Assessment:** Instructor described her/his teaching performance during the semester.
3. _____ **SEEQ-KL Data:** Investigator provided instructor with summary of SEEQ-KL data from her/his class.
4. _____ **Perception Congruency:** Investigator and instructor discussed the level of congruency between the instructors' and students' perceptions of the instructor's teaching effectiveness.
5. _____ **Improvement Area:** Instructor identified one area of teaching she/he wants to improve upon during next semester.
6. _____ **Improvement Goal:** End-of-semester improvement goal identified.
7. _____ **Improvement Strategy:** Instructor's strategy to meet end-of-semester improvement goal.
8. _____ **Open-Ended Questions:** Instructor responded to open-ended questions.

Interview Guide: Instructor Debriefing Page 2 of 3

5. _____ **Improvement Area:** One area of teaching instructor believes she/he can make significant, observable improvement during the upcoming semester.

6. _____ **Improvement Goal:** End-of-semester goal for improvement area.
(e.g., "I will improve in this area from my current score to _____ score.")

7. _____ **Improvement Strategy:** Instructor's strategy to meet end-of-semester improvement goal.

Interview Guide: Instructor Debriefing Page 3 of 3

8. _____ **Open-Ended Questions:**
    1. _____ What do you think about the SEEQ as an evaluation tool?
    2. _____ How do you feel about participating in the study?
    3. _____ What do you think about students evaluating instructors?
    4. _____ How did you feel about being evaluated?
    5. _____ What do you think about having SETs next semester?
    6. _____ What is your perspective on female instructors?

M

SEEQ Survey Items and Total Mean Scores at Mid-Semester (O_1) and End-of-Semester (O_2)

	Experimental						Control					
Factor	O_1			O_2			O_1			O_2		
Survey Item	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Learning												
Challenged and stimulated	6.3	1.5	118	7.0	1.3	127	6.6	1.6	124	6.7	1.6	119
Learned something valuable	7.2	1.5	120	7.6	1.2	127	7.4	1.5	124	7.3	1.4	119
Increased subject interest	7.2	1.0	120	7.4	1.4	127	7.3	1.4	124	6.9	1.5	118
Understood subject matter	6.6	1.4	120	6.3	1.3	126	7.1	1.3	124	6.6	1.3	119
Total mean score	27.0	4.2	121	28.3	3.8	127	28.2	3.9	124	27.5	4.4	119
Enthusiasm												
Enthusiastic about teaching	7.0	1.4	119	7.4	1.2	127	7.5	1.3	124	6.9	1.5	118
Dynamic and energetic	6.8	1.3	120	7.1	1.3	127	7.2	1.5	123	6.8	1.4	119
Instructor used humor	7.2	1.2	119	7.3	1.2	127	7.0	1.7	123	6.9	1.3	118
Held your interest	6.7	1.4	120	7.0	1.3	127	6.9	1.7	122	6.8	1.5	119
Total mean score	27.3	4.4	121	28.8	4.0	127	28.4	4.9	124	27.2	4.4	96
Organization/Clarity												
Instructor explanations clear	6.7	1.5	120	7.2	1.3	126	6.9	1.5	123	7.1	1.5	118
Materials explained, prepared	6.8	1.4	120	7.1	1.5	127	6.8	1.5	121	6.9	1.5	119
Objectives stated and pursued	6.9	1.2	117	7.4	1.3	127	7.1	1.5	118	6.9	1.6	117
Facilitated taking notes	7.6	1.2	120	7.6	1.1	127	7.2	1.5	123	7.1	1.6	118
Total mean score	27.9	4.1	120	29.3	4.2	127	27.7	4.4	123	27.7	5.2	119
Group Interaction												
Encouraged class discussion	7.8	1.1	121	7.7	1.1	127	7.2	1.5	124	7.2	1.6	119
Students shared ideas	6.9	1.5	119	7.1	1.2	127	6.8	1.8	124	6.9	1.5	119
Encouraged questions/answers	7.3	1.3	121	7.6	1.2	127	7.4	1.4	124	7.1	1.6	119
Encouraged expression	7.4	1.4	119	7.5	1.3	127	7.5	1.4	123	7.0	1.7	118
Total mean score	29.1	4.1	121	29.6	4.6	127	28.8	5.1	124	27.4	5.3	96
Individual Rapport												
Friendly to individual students	7.2	1.5	120	7.6	1.2	127	6.8	2.0	124	6.5	1.9	119
Welcomed seeking help	6.8	1.5	119	7.2	1.3	127	6.6	1.7	123	6.6	1.7	119
Interested in individual students	6.7	1.4	119	6.9	1.4	127	6.4	1.8	123	6.2	1.8	119
Accessible to students	5.7	1.5	120	6.0	1.7	126	5.6	1.6	121	5.7	1.7	119
Total mean score	26.0	4.9	121	27.6	4.3	127	25.2	6.0	124	25.1	5.9	119
Breadth of Coverage												
Contrasted implications	6.2	1.3	116	6.4	1.5	124	6.1	1.6	120	6.4	1.3	118
Gave background of ideas	6.0	1.4	113	6.4	1.4	123	6.1	1.5	113	6.1	1.5	117
Gave different views	5.9	1.4	116	6.2	1.5	124	5.6	1.6	117	5.5	1.5	116
Gave current developments	6.3	1.5	115	6.4	1.5	123	6.2	1.8	118	6.3	1.4	118
Total mean score	23.4	5.2	120	24.9	5.4	126	23.0	5.9	122	23.9	4.6	119
Exams												
Feedback valuable	7.5	1.2	120	7.8	1.2	126	7.5	1.5	122	7.4	1.5	119
Evaluations methods fair	7.4	1.2	118	7.7	1.2	127	7.5	1.3	124	7.2	1.4	119
Tested course as emphasized	7.8	1.1	118	7.8	1.2	127	7.5	1.5	122	7.6	1.3	119
Total mean score	22.4	3.4	120	23.2	2.8	127	22.3	3.6	124	22.2	3.2	119
Assignments												
Readings were valuable	7.8	1.1	119	7.9	1.0	127	7.9	1.1	124	7.8	1.2	119
Contributed Understanding	7.8	1.1	119	7.8	1.2	127	7.8	1.2	124	7.6	1.1	119
Total mean score	15.5	2.3	120	15.7	2.0	127	15.7	2.1	124	15.4	2.1	119

Appendix M. *SEEQ Survey Items and Total Mean Scores at Mid-Semester (O_1) and End-of-Semester (O_2)*

Factor	Experimental						Control					
	O_1			O_2			O_1			O_2		
Survey Item	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Workload / Difficulty												
Difficulty (easy-hard)	5.2	1.2	118	5.3	1.4	127	5.4	1.6	122	5.8	1.5	119
Workload (light-heavy)	5.5	1.2	117	5.5	1.3	127	5.7	1.5	122	5.7	1.4	119
Pace (slow-fast)	5.4	1.0	120	5.5	0.9	127	5.6	1.0	122	5.5	0.9	119
Hours out of class	5.6	2.0	116	5.3	1.9	125	5.7	2.2	119	5.3	1.9	118
Total mean score	21.3	3.6	120	21.5	3.5	127	22.1	4.3	123	22.3	3.5	119
Student Evaluations of Teachers												
Feedback improves teaching	7.3	1.4	117	7.5	1.3	126	7.1	1.3	122	7.0	1.5	119
Students evaluate fairly	7.4	1.4	119	7.6	1.3	127	7.4	1.4	121	7.3	1.6	119
Student evaluations acceptable	7.6	1.6	118	7.8	1.4	126	7.4	1.0	120	7.7	1.6	118
Evaluated instructors lose face	**4.6**	2.2	115	**4.7**	2.4	125	**4.9**	2.0	122	**4.8**	2.2	118
Total mean score	26.3	4.9	120	27.4	3.9	127	26.9	3.5	122	26.6	4.1	119

Note. SEEQ = Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality.

CURRICULUM VITAE

John Lysne Nash

Names of Parents	**Date of Birth**	**Place of Birth**
Mother: Doreé Nash Smith	August 25, 1955	California, USA
Father: John Barnard Nash		

Education

Doctorate of Education in Educational Leadership, 2011
Lehigh University, College of Education, PA, USA

Masters of Science in Social Work, 1990
Columbia University School of Social Work, NY, USA

Bachelors of Arts in Social Work, 1989
California State University at Long Beach, CA, USA

Professional Experience

College/School Counselor, 2011 –
Northbridge International School Cambodia

College/School Counselor, 2005 – 2006
International School of Dakar, Senegal

Assistant Director, 2002 – 2005
American School of Yaounde, Cameroon

School Counselor, 2001 – 2002
American School of Yaounde, Cameroon

Program Coordinator / Special Projects Coordinator, 1999 – 2000
Helen Keller International, Manila, Philippines

College Instructor & Program Coordinator, 1994 – 1999
College of the Menominee Nation, Keshena, Wisconsin

Program Coordinator, 1990 – 1994
Pius XII Youth & Family Services, Bronx, NY