

12-1-2010

Measuring University Students' Perceptions of Characteristics of Ideal University Instructor in Saudi Arabia and the United States: An Application of Nonparametric Item Response Theory Study

Hesham Yahya Aljubaily

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digscholarship.unco.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Aljubaily, Hesham Yahya, "Measuring University Students' Perceptions of Characteristics of Ideal University Instructor in Saudi Arabia and the United States: An Application of Nonparametric Item Response Theory Study" (2010). *Dissertations*. Paper 67.

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. For more information, please contact Jane.Monson@unco.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO

Greeley, Colorado

The Graduate School

MEASURING UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF CHARACTERISTICS
OF IDEAL UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTOR IN SAUDI ARABIA AND THE
UNITED STATES: AN APPLICATION OF NONPARAMETRIC
ITEM RESPONSE THEORY STUDY

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Hesham Yahya Aljubaily

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
School of Psychological Sciences
Educational Psychology

December, 2010

ABSTRACT

Aljubaily, Hesham. *Measuring University Students' Perceptions of Characteristics of Ideal University Instructors in Saudi Arabia and the United States: An Application of Non-Parametric Item Response Theory*. Published Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 2010.

The purpose of this study was to obtain the perspectives of Saudi and United States students about the characteristics of ideal university instructors and to construct an instrument to determine characteristics of the ideal university instructor (IUI). A mixed method design, qualitative and quantitative methods, was used in this study. Two studies were conducted using different methodologies. Study 1 consisted of a sample of 180 students (i.e., 75 Saudi and 105 U.S. students); Study 2 consisted of a sample of 2,127 students (i.e., 1,413 Saudi and 714 U.S. students). A qualitative analysis (i.e., content analysis) was used for Study 1, and eight themes were identified. From extensive qualitative data characteristics, 70 items were chosen to construct the IUI scale. The IUI scale was used to conduct the quantitative analyses for Study 2. The results from the Analysis of Frequency indicated that students from Saudi and U.S. and both genders from the two countries reported similar and different desirability at the top of characteristics frequency. The 70 items were analyzed by Mokken analysis, which constructed items in a hierarchical order. Three valid and reliable instruments were constructed for each set of data: (a) Saudi data included 57 items with $r = .98$ and $H = .45$, (b) U.S. data had 43 items with $r = .96$ and $H = .41$, and (c) Combined data had 55 items with $r = .97$ and H

=.44. There was no significant Country by Gender interactions for item level. Few significant gender differences were found in two items, and country differences for the items were bigger and found in 36 items. There were significant correlations only between IUI and Gender in the Saudi data, and IUI with Country, Gender, and GPA in the Combined data. The U.S. data had no significant correlations with any independent variables. There were significant differences between Saudi universities in rating ideal characteristics. The characteristics identified in this study may serve as basis for further research into the perception of the ideal professor and to additional instruments for evaluating faculty.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I thank God for giving me the ability and strength to accomplish this dissertation. It is a pleasure to thank those who made this dissertation possible such as my Father, Mother, brothers, and sisters who gave me support during my study in the United States. I also would like to give special thanks to my wife Samah and my children, Raghad, Khalid, Shahad, and Yousif for their love, support, patience, time, and sacrifices.

I am heartily thankful to my supervisor, Dr. Steven Pulos, whose encouragement, supervision, and support from the beginning to the conclusion of this dissertation enabled me to develop an understanding of the subject. This dissertation would not have been possible without his advice and support. His commitment, care, knowledge, and efforts motivated and inspired me to do this dissertation. I also extend my thanks and gratitude to my committee members: Dr. Nancy Karlin, Dr. Todd Allen, and Dr. Jeffrey Bauer for their support, advice, cooperation, and patience throughout the dissertation process.

Also, I'm appreciative and thankful to my friends and colleagues as well as the faculty of the Psychology department at Al-Imam University, and the Educational Psychology program at the University of Northern Colorado for their help and support in facilitating the procedures of the study and collecting the data. I also wish to thank Dr. Sharon Sweet for her great efforts in editing this dissertation. Lastly, I offer my regards to all of those who supported me in any way during the completion of this dissertation.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, my wife Samah, my children, and to all members of my family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapters	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Research Questions.....	4
Rationale.....	5
Definitions.....	10
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
Historical Background.....	12
Education in Saudi Arabia.....	12
Education in the United States and Other Countries.....	13
Ideal vs. Effective Teachers.....	15
Ideal Teacher and Effective Teacher: College Level.....	17
Effective College Teacher.....	26
Gender and Ethnicity Variables.....	31
Ideal Teacher vs. Effective Teacher: High School Level.....	33
Miscellaneous Findings.....	34
Cultural Studies: Non-American Studies.....	36
III. METHOD.....	38
Study 1.....	39
Sample.....	39
Saudi Arabian Demographic Data.....	39
U.S. Demographic Data.....	40
Combined Demographic Data.....	41
Instrumentation.....	43
Procedures.....	44
Analysis.....	45
Study 2.....	46
Sample.....	46
Saudi Arabian Demographic Data.....	48
U.S. Demographic Data.....	49
Combined Demographic Data.....	51
Instrumentation.....	52
Procedures.....	54
Analysis.....	55

IV. RESULTS.....	60
Study 1 Results.....	60
Content Analysis.....	61
Teaching Style/Skills.....	62
Learning Process.....	63
Scholarly/Teacher Knowledge/Expertise.....	65
Teacher Manners.....	67
Social Skills/Communication.....	69
Personality/Personal Attributes.....	71
Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom.....	73
Testing and Grading.....	75
Study 2 Results.....	77
Item Level Analyses.....	78
Descriptive Analysis.....	78
Correlation Analysis.....	81
ANOVA Analysis.....	82
Frequency Analysis.....	83
Frequency of Response in Saudi Arabian Sample.....	85
Frequency of Responses in U.S. Sample.....	88
Frequency of Response in the Combined Sample.....	91
Scale Level Analysis.....	96
Confirmatory Factor Analysis.....	96
Mokken Scale Analysis.....	97
Saudi Arabian Data.....	98
U.S. Data.....	100
Combined Data.....	102
The Brief Version of the IUI.....	108
Scale Level Correlations with Demographic Data.....	109
ANOVA Analysis.....	111
Item Level Correlations with Demographic Data.....	112
Correlation Analysis for Saudi Data.....	112
Correlation Analysis for U.S. Data.....	114
Correlation Analysis for Combined Data.....	114
V. DISCUSSION.....	117
Discussion of the Research Results.....	118
Study 1 Results.....	118
The Development of the IUI Scale.....	125
Study 2 Results.....	126
Item Level Analyses.....	126
Scale Level Analyses.....	130
The Brief Version of the IUI.....	133
Conclusions.....	137
Implications.....	142

Recommendations for Future Studies.....	147
REFERENCES.....	149
APPENDICES	
A. Characteristics of University Instructor (CUI) Questionnaire, English Version.....	160
B. Characteristics of University Instructor (CUI) Questionnaire, Arabic Version	164
C. Ideal University Instructor (IUI) Scale, English Version	167
D. Ideal University Instructor (IUI) Scale, Arabic Version	175
E. Majors from Saudi and U.S. Universities in Study 1	181
F. UNC IRB Approval Letter	185
G. Example of a Permission to Conduct the Study in Saudi Arabia	188
H. Colleges from Saudi and U.S. Universities in Study 2.....	191
I. Majors from Saudi and U.S. Universities in Study 2	194
J. The IUI Scale Validity and Reliability Based on the Pilot Study Results.....	197
K. Frequencies of Instructors' Type, Based on Hierarchal Order of Ideal from Top to Bottom	201
L. Frequencies of Characteristics Based on Hierarchal Order of Each Theme	218
M. Frequencies of All Saudi Data.....	232
N. Frequencies of All U.S. Data.....	236
O. Frequencies of All Combined Data	240
P. Frequencies of Always and Never Categories for Saudi Data	245
Q. Frequencies of Always and Never Categories for U.S. Data	250
R. Frequencies of Always and Never Categories for Combined Data.....	254
S. Country, Gender, and GPA Means on the Brief IUI Version.....	259
T. IUI Brief Version, Means, and Standard Deviations of Saudi Universities	261
U. Correlations of 16 Items with Independent Variables for Saudi Data.....	263
V. Correlations of 16 Items with Independent Variables for U.S. Data.....	266
W. Correlations of 16 Items with Independent Variables for Combined Data	270

LIST OF TABLES

1. Demographic Data for Saudi Sample in Study 1	40
2. Demographic Data for U.S. Sample in Study 1	42
3. Demographic Data for Combined Sample in Study 1	43
4. Demographic Data for Saudi Student Sample in Study 2	49
5. Demographic Information for U.S. Sample in Study 2	51
6. Demographic Information for the Combined Sample in Study 2.....	53
7. The Most Desirable Characteristics of Teaching Style/Skills Theme	63
8. The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Teaching/Style Skills Theme	64
9. The Most Desirable Characteristics of Learning Process Theme.....	65
10. The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Learning Process Theme.....	66
11. The Most Desirable Characteristics of Teachers' Knowledge and Scholarly Theme	67
12. The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Teachers' Knowledge and Scholarly Theme	67
13. The Most Desirable Characteristics of Teachers' Manner Theme	68
14. The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Teachers' Manner Theme	69
15. The Most Desirable Characteristics of Social and Communication Theme.....	70
16. The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Social and Communication Theme.....	71
17. The Most Desirable Characteristics of Personality/Personal Attribute Theme	72
18. The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Personality/Personal Attributes Theme	73
19. The Most Desirable Characteristics of Leadership/Management Skills Theme	74

20. The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Leadership/Management Skills Theme	74
21. The Most Desirable Characteristics of Testing and Grading Theme	75
22. The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Testing and Grading Theme	76
23. Mean Values for Each Item	79
24. Correlation Matrix of Mean Ratings for the 70 items for Gender and Country	81
25. Items with at Least Small Difference and Statistical Significance by Country	84
26. The 10 Always Characteristics for Saudi Students	85
27. The 10 Sometimes Characteristics for Saudi Students	86
28. The 10 Never Characteristics for Saudi Students	87
29. The 10 Always Characteristics for U.S. Students	89
30. The 10 Sometimes Characteristics for U.S. Students	90
31. The 10 Never Characteristics for U.S. Students	91
32. The 10 Always Characteristics for the Combined Sample	92
33. The 10 Sometimes Characteristics for Combined Sample	93
34. The 10 Never Characteristics for the Combined Sample	94
35. Constructed IUI from the Mokken Analysis of the Saudi Data	99
36. Constructed IUI from the Mokken Analysis of U.S. Data	101
37. The Constructed IUI from the Mokken Analysis of the Combined Data	103
38. Top 10 Characteristics from the Mokken Analysis of the Three Data Sets	106
39. The 16 Items of the Brief IUI scale from Mokken Analysis	109
40. Correlations between the IUI and Selected Demographic Variables	110

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Quality university education is essential to develop skillful and knowledgeable students who can benefit not only themselves, but their societies. Essential to any educational experience is the presence of quality teachers. Skillful and knowledgeable students do not emerge unless there are instructors, who are able to convey appropriate knowledge and help students to excel. Understanding the nature of the quality professor is essential in order to: (a) evaluate, (b) train, and (c) select professors. If the characteristics of the *ideal* professor could be identified, then any individual professor could be evaluated against the standard, and appropriate remediation could be suggested. Unfortunately, the characteristics of the quality teacher are not well understood.

According to several theories (Biernat & Eidelman, 2007; Combs, 1964; Helson, 1964), interpersonal judgments are based upon the discrepancy between the prototypical concept of ideal and the actual person being evaluated. Consequently, a student's evaluation of an instructor is related to the correspondence between the instructor who is rated and a self-internalized prototype of the ideal. When the instructor's behavior approaches the rater's ideal, the instructor is rated favorably; but when the instructor is farther away from the student's ideal, then the instructor is evaluated unfavorably. The authors of a number of studies, which are addressed in Chapter 2, Review of Literature,

have found this framework to be useful in the examination and study of university faculty and instructors.

The lack of knowing what students want from their teachers may lead to misunderstandings and poor communication and result in barriers between instructors and students. Therefore, students may not gain knowledge, which is the ultimate goal of teaching, and both may fail to obtain their goals of being successful students and teachers. Knowledge of the preferred characteristics of ideal university instructors in any culture may encourage university instructors to improve their teaching methods and students' achievement. When university instructors understand what their students' expectations are, that understanding can make teaching easier and the instructors' objectives clearer. Since the ultimate goal of teaching is for students to learn and acquire knowledge, knowledge of the preferred characteristics of the ideal teacher will enhance the task of teaching, communicating, and conveying the content of the curricula more efficiently.

The goal of this study was to identify the preferred characteristics of ideal university instructors in Saudi Arabia and the U.S. from students' perspectives and to determine the differences between the preferred characteristics of university instructors in Saudi Arabia and the U.S. from students' viewpoints. Culture, experience, or university environment may play an important role in the vision of an ideal university instructor. Identification of these characteristics may reveal factors that play a role in the differences in preferring certain characteristics in each country such as the roles of: (a) culture, (b) learning environment, (c) public and private schools, (d) gender, and so on.

Statement of the Problem

The appropriate evaluation of university instructors' performance and quality of teaching is an essential element in order to improve the quality of higher education. Therefore, students' evaluation or description of their university instructor could be an effective tool to know how university professors perform and how students learn. In Saudi Arabia, unlike the U.S., college students do not evaluate college teachers' achievements. In addition, Saudi students complain about: (a) the lack of communication with their teachers, (b) poor teaching methods, and (c) the inappropriate use of authority by college teachers (Krieger, 2007). Problems, such as these, in the higher educational environment must be studied in a practical and scientific approach and must be known by Saudi: (a) educators, (b) college teachers, and (c) members of the Ministry of Higher Education. Also, Saudi college teachers might be not aware of their behaviors and teaching quality because they are not evaluated by their students, so they do not change their behaviors with students and do not improve their teaching quality. The findings from this study may clarify and explicate the importance of students' perspectives and evaluations of university instructors in order to improve the quality of higher education teaching and environment. Knowledge of the characteristics of ideal university instructor will: (a) help educators and evaluators to establish yearly college teacher evaluation, (b) lead to improved quality of teaching in higher education, and (c) improve college students' achievement and performance.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the characteristics of ideal university instructor in Saudi and the U.S., based on college students' perspectives and to develop a reliable and valid instrument to classify the described characteristics. This researcher sought to identify any differences in the preferred characteristics of ideal college teachers in Saudi Arabia and the U.S. from students' viewpoints.

Research Questions

The following seven questions guided this study.

- Q1 What are the Saudi and U.S. universities students' perspectives of the characteristics of ideal university instructor?
- Q2 What are the frequencies of characteristics of ideal university instructor of Saudi and U.S. students?
- Q3 What is the hierarchical list of characteristics of ideal university instructor of Saudi and U.S. students?
- Q4 Are there significant differences between Saudi and the U.S. students' rating of characteristics of ideal university instructor?
- Q5 Are there significant gender differences in rating of the characteristics of ideal college teachers between and within Saudi and U.S. college students?
- Q6 Are there significant differences in the rating of the characteristics of ideal university instructor between Saudi universities?

Q7 Are there significant relationships between characteristics of ideal university instructor and independent variables (i.e., country, gender, age, level of education, universities, college, and GPA)?

Rationale

The purpose of the institutions of higher education is to educate students and prepare them to be successful in their life and work (Knight & Wilcox, 1998). In order to achieve this goal, there are several different factors that must be present in educational settings. One of these factors is ideal teachers. Knowledge of students' concept of the ideal professor is similar to the situation whereby business leaders spend millions of dollars to determine their consumers' perspectives of their product so it can be improved to the satisfaction of their customers. Knowledge of the preferred characteristics of ideal university instructor can play an important role in the process of educational reform and make both teachers and students aware of their responsibilities. When the voices of students are heard, higher education leaders can better assess university teachers, and then improve students' achievement in order to realize greater university success.

The ideal professor, as perceived by students, can serve as a model for instructors to emulate. Any teacher can benefit from the successful experiences of other ideal teachers to improve or reform the educational structure even if they are from different: (a) classrooms, (b) schools, (c) districts, (d) states, or (e) even other countries. This can be accomplished by the use of effective teaching models to change the undesirable characteristics of teaching and improve the quality of educational development work.

A revolution in the Saudi higher educational system occurred, when an educational Spanish website, which rated the rank of universities around the world (Webometrics Ranking of World Universities, 1997), ranked Saudi universities as 2,998 in a list of 3,000 universities. Despite the aim or creditability of this website, that ranking strongly effected Saudi governors, educators, and students, and the members of the Shura Council (i.e., the senate) started to investigate this poor ranking and initiated notable efforts to improve the higher education system in Saudi Arabia (Alsohail, 2006) . The members of the Saudi Arabian government, as well as those in other countries, are striving to improve the quality of education, in general, and higher education, specifically. According to Knight and Wilcox (1998), the emphasis of the staff of higher educational institutions in different countries is on the positive outcomes of effective teaching on students' interests and success. Thus, the improvement of higher educational outcomes involves the focus on the dual interaction between college teaching and college students in every higher educational program. That includes evaluating and rating teachers' performance at the end of each semester. In Saudi Arabia, there are few studies about students' perspectives toward their college teachers' effectiveness and performance. In addition, in the public universities, students do not have the opportunity to evaluate and rate their university instructors' performance or effectiveness.

Nevertheless, the infrequent individual efforts of teaching evaluation by some departments within some Saudi universities were made to improve the quality of teaching content of courses. One of these efforts to evaluate teaching was made by Burney (1989) in the College of Engineering at King Abdul Aziz University to improve teaching. He

focused on the consistency of students' rating and finding norms (e.g., average rate) for the ratings to be the base for future teaching evaluations. Burney found that the: (a) students' level of learning was very low, (b) level of course difficulty was inconsistent, and (c) work load of courses had more consistency. The first finding was not addressed properly, which is very important for the improvement of teaching, and the last two findings were not mentioned in the results. Moreover, there were many limitations to Burney's study, such as: (a) the sample of students was small, (b) there was a lack of informative details, and (c) the study was not conducted in different semesters so that results could be tracked and compared. In addition, the findings were: (a) not used to make critical decisions; (b) not applied systematically in all the departments and universities; (c) not used to promote, hire, and/or screen candidates for teaching; and (d) not required of higher education staff in educational institutions, so there was no effect on improved teaching and decision making. However, in 2001, the members of the Ministry of Higher Education in Saudi Arabia established the National Center for Assessment in Higher Education (NCAHE, 2009) to improve the quality of higher educational process which includes students' rating of their teachers' performance.

According to Schorr and Koellner-Clark (2003), "Models indeed govern the ways in which teachers actually teach. While teachers may express new beliefs about children, teaching or learning, unless fundamental changes in their models occur, their practice will remain relatively unchanged the study above provides documentation for that" (p. 189). In this current study, Saudi college teachers can learn about their teaching competence from college students' perspectives, and they can benefit from the U.S. higher education

teachers since U.S. universities are well regarded on a global level. Ideal teaching is a vital element of successful educational structure and reform. The higher education system in the U.S. is well respected around the world because there is an emphasis on the effectiveness of teaching in its universities. Therefore, U.S. higher education teachers can provide adequate models of effective teaching for Saudi college teachers through descriptions of characteristics of ideal college teachers in the U.S.

Abel, Ausel, and Sparapani (1987) identified several successful examples, with the use of modeling theory, to improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning in different areas. For instance, successful models of characteristics of effective teaching and ideal teaching were reported by: (a) Glover (1978) in health education; (b) Koran and Koran (1981) and (c) Rezba and Andersen (1976) in preservice science teaching; (d) Ivancevich and Smith (1981) in business management; (e) Hirsch and Stone (1982) in counseling; (f) Zimmerman and Ghozeil (1974); (g) Hunter (1984) in teaching; (h) Bandura (1977) in the establishment of abstract and rule governed behavior; and Tyson (1982, all cited in Abel et al.) in the generation of different teaching strategies.

Knowing and discovering the characteristics of ideal teachers in a successful higher education system, which is a model from the social cognitive theory perspective, will help those educators, who seek educational reform, to identify important factors of improving the quality of higher education and education generally at different levels. As mentioned earlier, successful and ideal teaching, in personal and professional levels, will change negative attitudes toward university instructors, such as the use of power inappropriately, unreachability, and poor communication, and then will lead to increase

students' motivations and achievement. Teachers may not be aware of their characteristics or the effectiveness of their teaching, but they can be aware of their teaching from their students' perspectives about their teaching.

The current author investigated the characteristics of ideal university instructors. A modern theoretical measurement model, which can place instructors' characteristics in ordinal classification, was conducted to identify the preferable characteristics of ideal university instructors. That measurement model is the Mokken model which is a type of nonparametric item response. Essentially, the model is a probabilistic Guttman scale. That means, items are ordered in such a manner that, if an item is endorsed, all lower items are likely to be endorsed as well. Therefore, if a characteristic (i.e., an item) is at the top of the scale, the next characteristics (i.e., items) are likely to comprise and structure the characteristics of the ideal university instructor. Further information about this model is presented in Chapters 3 and 4.

Understanding the characteristics of ideal university instructors can demonstrate the needs of college students. Also, it leads to identification of the lack of communication and existing barriers between students and college teachers such as difficulty of reaching their teachers (Denzine & Pulos, 2000). Instructors and educators in Saudi Arabia need to be aware of the negative influences of these barriers, such as the use of the power of teaching negatively against students, and poor quality of teaching, which are based on teacher-centered and rote learning methods. According to the Institute for Higher Education Policy (Phipps & Merisotis, 2005), "Student interaction with faculty and other

students is an essential characteristic and is facilitated through a variety of ways, including voice-mail and/or e-mail” (p. 15).

Ineffective teaching can be the result of not being aware of effective teaching styles and thinking that they are effective teachers. Ramsden (2003) stated, “Most lecturers probably think that they know more about teaching than they really do. University teaching is a very complicated and detailed subject. . . Half the difficulty of doing it better, is understanding what the real problem is, of being aware of what we do not know” (p. 14). Therefore, according to the social cognitive theory, if teachers are more aware of their students' needs, they can change their social and cognitive perceptions and behaviors positively, by models of successful, ideal teachers from other successful higher educational environments.

Definitions

Characteristics of Ideal College Teacher: Students will be given a questionnaire (Characteristics of University Instructor [CUI]) to list characteristics in one to a few words of different types (e.g., ideal, very good, average, below average, and poor) of a university instructor. Based upon the results from the CUI questionnaire, the identified characteristics of college teachers types will be used to form items into a summated rating format for use in the developed instrument. The characteristics of Ideal University Instructor (IUI) instrument will be ordered in a hierarchical way by Mokken analysis based on students’ perspectives from the CUI questionnaire.

Mokken Scale Analysis: The Mokken model is a probabilistic model which was extended and modified from a deterministic Guttman scale which requires a hierarchical

sort of items with no errors in its ordered pattern. That means that items are ordered by level of difficulty, agreement, or endorsement in such a manner that, if an item is endorsed, all lower items are likely to be endorsed as well (Dijkstra, Buist, Moorer, & Dassen, 1999).

Nonparametric Item Response Theory (NIRT): According to Stochl (2007), the “NIRT is a family of statistical measurement models that are based on a minimal set of assumptions necessary to obtain useful measurements of person and items. Generally, this theory can be viewed as nonparametric approach to item response theory. That is because the nonparametric approach does not parametrically define the function describing the relation between the probability of a response in a response category and the latent trait. It implies that NIRT models are generalized IRT models. . . . Because NIRT models allow for ordinal measurement, they are well suited for traditional tests and questionnaires that are presented to each respondent” (p. 2).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the research in regard to the characteristics of the effective and ideal teacher. The research, which is cited in this chapter, indicates that ideal does not equal effective. A teacher can be effective without being ideal, but cannot be ideal without being effective. In addition, this author explored several subtopics, which included cultural and gender influences in order to demonstrate the complexity of the issue.

Historical Background

To better understand the issues involved, it is necessary to review the contexts of education in both Saudi Arabia, the United States, as well as other countries. In the following sections, this background is provided.

Education in Saudi Arabia

In 1926, contemporary education was initiated in Saudi Arabia when the government established the Department of Education (Saleh, 1986). In 1953, the Department of Education became the Minister of Education. Then, the Ministry of Higher Education was established in 1975 (Saleh). Since that time, members of the Saudi government consider higher education a high priority and a critical part of the Saudi educational system. The first university in Saudi Arabia was the University of Riyadh (i.e., now known as King Saud University), and it was established in 1957 in the city of

Riyadh. Five universities were established in different regions in Saudi Arabia prior to the formation of the Ministry of Higher Education, and two other universities have been established since then.

The members of the Ministry of Higher Education identified numerous objectives for higher education, such as: (a) prepare competent and qualified citizens to help and serve the progress of the nation, (b) provide access to talented students who are able to continue in different academic disciplines of education, (c) provide qualified students with knowledge that will benefit them in their present and future life, and (d) offer training services and appropriate courses for graduate students to improve the development of higher education (Saleh, 1986). The previous goals of higher education were to: (a) to improve college students' academic and future success, (b) to provide quality courses and knowledge, and (c) provide appropriate environments for this education. In addition, college students and college teachers are critical factors in the attainment of these objectives.

Education in the United States and Other Countries

The development and improvement of the processes of higher education, especially at colleges and universities, has been the focus of educators in the U.S. and many countries around the world. The assessment of students' learning has been used as evidence of teaching outcomes in the U.S. In Great Britain, the purpose of higher education institutions is to provide students with the quality skills and learning as the outcomes of teaching. Also, in Canada, Hong Kong, and New Zealand, the purpose of higher education is to positively influence students' thinking; in addition, the social and

economic development of states should be the outcome of higher educational system (Knight & Wilcox, 1998). In all of these countries, including Saudi Arabia, government officials are interested in the improvement of the quality of higher education in similar or different ways, but all emphasize the positive outcomes of effective teaching in higher education on students' interests and success. Thus, the improvement in higher educational outcomes involves a focus on the dual interaction between university instructors and college students in higher educational programs.

Interest in students' evaluation of professors in order to improve teaching has a long history and began early in the U.S. (Boyce, 1915). This idea was based on the belief that students, because of their exposure to professors, should know best whether teaching is adequate and whether they are learning (Cruse, 1987). According to Basow (1995), often, student evaluations of faculty have played a major role in many employment decisions.

An important question is what teacher behaviors would be preferable in order to establishment such a classroom environment? Researchers have attempted to find an answer to this question (Acikgoz, 2005; Oord & Brok, 2004). In the U.S., typically, university students evaluate and rate their teachers' performance at the end of each academic term. In contrast, in Saudi Arabia, there are few studies in which researchers have investigated students' perspectives about their college teachers' effectiveness and performance. In addition, at the public universities, students are not provided with an opportunity to evaluate and rate their college teachers' performance or effectiveness. However, in 2001, members of the Higher Education Ministry in Saudi Arabia

established the National Center for Measurement and Evaluation in Higher Education to improve the quality of higher educational process (NCAHE, 2009).

Ideal vs. Effective Teacher

The concepts of ideal vs. effective teacher can be distinguished both conceptually and methodologically. Both terms can be defined, in general, based upon the definitions presented in the *Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary* (2003). The ideal professor is the prototypical standard of excellence as conceived by a given type of students. In contrast, the effective professor is one who can produce an intended result or results. Thus, it would be possible for someone to be an effective teacher but not, necessarily an ideal teacher. The professor could be highly effective in one area, but does not accomplish it in a way that is perceived by students as ideal. Also, the professor could be effective in one area but not in another which is related to the ideal. In addition, the professor could be effective, but not in an area that is meaningful to the student.

Therefore, research on the ideal professor can be contrasted with research on effective professors. Typically, research on the ideal professor is focused on the cognitive representation held by students or other individuals. In comparison, research on effective professors is focused on actual professors.

In the research on students' perception of an ideal professor, three methods are employed. The first is a generation of descriptive factors which are collected by means of free response techniques. Such methods may include interviews, written descriptions, or a short answer questionnaire. The second is a selection procedure, whereby the student selects or rates the ideal professor based upon terms or concepts supplied by the

researcher. Within this second category, two subcategories can be distinguished based upon the source of the terms. The terms may be based upon previous research on students' perspective, or they may be based upon terms from other sources (e.g., theory, previous research or implicit nonspecific criteria, or the researcher). In this latter method, the subdivision is based upon whether the terms stem from the students' perspective or from an external perspective.

The research on effective teachers is focused on ratings of actual professors. In these studies of highly rated or effective teachers, high rated teachers may be compared to lower rated teachers, or teachers may be compared to some external criteria. There is no guarantee that such methods will correspond to the attributes of an ideal professor. Such studies are dependent upon the range and quality of the faculty being compared. Consequently, it may be possible to identify attributes that separate poor from average teaching, or average from good teaching. Also, the source of the ratings system is problematic. It is quite possible that constructs, which are meaningful to students, may not be the same as the constructs, which are generated from an external prospective. Thirdly, when the relation between faculty description and an outcome is examined, it may not be possible to identify the specific attributes, which are associated with other desirable or undesirable outcomes. In this case, only partial descriptions of an ideal teacher can be identified.

As reported by Arreola (2003), more than 2,000 studies on effective teaching have been conducted. Unfortunately, the research is difficult to synthesize due to the broad variety of instruments and approaches used in the studies. In addition, there are

methodological problems in many of the studies. First, frequently, the items and dimensions are based on implicit nonspecific criteria (Loadman, 1976; Peterson, 1984). While the research on the ideal professor is grounded in the prototypes of the students, rarely is there a satisfactory rationale given for item selection in studies on effective teaching (e.g., it may be stated only that the items were selected from departmental evaluation forms; Young, 1996). Second, often, the measurement models are unsatisfactory and based upon instruments developed loosely within the framework of classical theory. The assumptions are rarely examined. While there are exceptions, generally, they are rare (Loadman; Subkoviak & Levin, 1974). For example, items may be given the same weight and treated as interchangeable, when some are much more important than other items. Nevertheless, in the few studies where both effective and ideal professors were examined, ideal and effective teachers still share some common characteristics (Subkoviak & Levin).

Ideal Teacher and Effective Teacher: College Level

Depending on the study, ideal may be conceptualized as exemplary, best, or preferred. In the domain of educational effectiveness research (Creemers, 1994; Lowyck, 1994; Scheerens & Bosker, 1997; all cited in Oord & Brok, 2004), exemplary teachers have been identified by the attempt to link teacher characteristics and behaviors to student achievement and motivation. In this domain, preferred teaching is conceptualized in terms of behaviors that result in students' high learning outcomes. According to Oord and Brok, researchers within this domain have been able to identify a number of teacher behaviors that are beneficial for student outcomes, such as: (a) communicate high

expectations, (b) provide immediate and constructive feedback, (c) deliver content in small and structured units, and (d) clarity of instruction and management skills.

Wubbels and Levy (1993) reported that best teachers are perceived by both teachers and students as someone who: (a) is a good leader, (b) helps and understands students, (c) provides some responsibility and freedom, (d) is not too strict, (e) is not uncertain, and (f) does not admonish or show dissatisfaction with students. As reported by Wubbels and Levy, studies about students' perceptions of their best teachers have been conducted in various countries, such as Australia, the Netherlands, and the U.S. Wubbels and Levy reported that the best interpersonal teacher: (a) is not too strict, (b) is not uncertain, and (c) does not admonish or show dissatisfaction with students. Interestingly, Oord and Grok reported that students in the Netherlands described their best teachers as ones who displayed a little less of these behaviors than students from the U.S. and Australia: (a) leadership, (b) helpful, (c) friendly, (d) understanding, and (e) strict. In comparison, Dutch students described their best teachers as slightly less uncertain and less admonishing of students.

Williams and Ware (1977) found that, primarily, student ratings were sensitive to the: (a) expressive, (b) dynamic, and (c) humorous features of the professor. The students rated enthusiastic and informative performances correctly but, also, they rated enthusiastic professors who provided little information as enthusiastic and informative. It was found that lecture content had less impact on student ratings, but more impact on achievement (Abrami, Leventhal, & Perry, 1982).

The classroom behaviors of low, medium, and highly rated professors were rated by trained observers (Murray, 1983). In comparison to less highly rated professors, the highly rated professors demonstrated: (a) strong interest in the subject, (b) emphasized important points, (c) spoke expressively or emphatically, and (d) showed facial expressions. Also, the highly rated professors exhibited more audience affective skills, such as: (a) move while lecturing, (b) gesture with hands and arms, (c) make eye contact with students, (d) did not speak in a monotone or slowly, and (e) was relaxed and confident but showed energy and excitement. According to Cruse (1987), also, highly rated professors exhibited more audience affecting skills, such as: (a) moved while lecturing, (b) gestured with hands and arms, (c) made eye contact with students, (d) did not speak in a monotone or slowly, and (e) was relaxed and confident while energy and excitement was displayed. There was no significant difference between many teaching skill behaviors, behaviors often found on student opinion scales and assumed to be face valid (i.e., use of concrete examples, repeat difficult ideas, write key terms on the board, use audiovisual aids, use headings and subheadings, explain how topics fit, write outlines of lecture on the board, summarize periodically, and use a variety of media).

Kulik and McKeachie (1975) summarized teacher characteristics as identified by these ratings as: “The highly rated teacher is verbally fluent and strikes his peers as cultured and sophisticated. He is expressive and enthusiastic. The good teacher is a good talker” (p. 219). In looking at the relationship between students’ evaluations of professors and grades, Cruse (1987) reported that the magnitude of the opinion/grade correlations depended, among other things, upon when the student evaluations of the professor were

collected. One of the peculiarities of student ratings of teachers, which casts doubt on the usual validity of interpretation, is that the correlation between overall instructor ratings and student achievement can be .38 if the ratings are made before the students know their final grade, but .85 if the ratings are made after final grading. At the very least, the before and after correlations between ratings and grades show that students are sensitive to grades and that grades may strongly influence ratings.

Kulik and McKeachie (1975) did not recommend the use of student ratings without extensive norms and aware administrators who take teaching conditions into account. They stated: “Without such interpretation, student ratings are likely to provide misleading indices of teaching effectiveness, no better than other popularity polls: the best-seller list as an index of literary excellence, the box-office as a measure of theatrical contribution, the Nielsen rating as a barometer of creativity in television” (p. 732).

Epting, Zinn, Buskist, and Buskist (2004) suggested that ideal professors: (a) are highly accessible to students, (b) allow student input into the course policies and procedures, (c) provide for notable variety in the course, and (d) provide a comfortable learning atmosphere for students. In addition, they found that the preferred qualities and behaviors were not wholly absent in the typical professor; they simply appeared less pronounced than in the ideal professor. Finally, their results suggested that students’ perception of the ideal teacher would capitalize on a subset of behaviors that strengthen the investment, and thus presumably also the rewards, of both the teachers and students in the educational process.

Watts (1996) described the ideal teacher in the following way.

The *ideal teacher* was deemed to have/be:

1. (Personal qualities) enthusiastic, friendly, approachable, helpful, interested in students, caring, motivating, personable, relational and interactive, helpful, sensitive, appreciative, empathetic, accepting and concerned.
2. (Professional qualities) practical, organized, competent, knowledgeable, modern in thought, resourceful, fair and consistent, professional in dress and attitude, cooperative, reflective, colorful, humanistic, creative.
3. (Teaching and communication qualities) good interactive communication skills, clear expectations, proactive involvement with students, good preparation of lessons, sense of humor, assertive abilities, ability to vary teaching to suit different learning styles, competent leadership qualities.

(p. 7)

Additionally, Watts separated his samples into two areas: business student and education students. Overall, the members of both groups described the teacher similarly; however, the education students focused more on: (a) organization, (b) personal involvement, (c) enthusiasm, (d) variety in teaching approaches, and (e) approachability. The business students identified: (a) enthusiasm along with stimulating, inspiring confidence; (b) effective communication; and (c) encouragement. Also, Watts compared the specific rankings for outstanding and ideal teacher in education. Outstanding teachers were those who: (a) understood individual needs, (b) were organized, (c) were enthusiastic, (d) were good communicators, and (e) related well to students. Also, ideal teachers were: (a)

organized and enthusiastic, (b) ranked high in involvement with and care for student as individuals, (c) approachability, and (d) used a variety of teaching approaches.

In Blai's (1973) study, teacher qualities were ranked for their impact on students' thinking process. Thirteen qualities were ranked, and the top 5 teacher qualities were reported as: (a) expert knowledge of the subject, (b) ability to stimulate students' interest, (c) enthusiastic attitude toward subject, (d) ability to explain clearly, and (e) systematic organization of the subject. Similarly, Botas (2004) found that students liked teachers with authority in their subjects, and who were: (a) enthusiastic, (b) passionate, (c) confident, (d) interested, (e) stimulating, and (f) energetic about their own subjects.

Recently, Istrate and Velea (2006) conducted a study in Romania and found that the teacher had to be: (a) "flexible," (b) "open to new ideas," (c) "to make his/her subject attractive through projects and games related to the subject," (d) "to know interesting and interactive pedagogical methods," (e) "to get to know students close to him/her," (f) "to inspire them with the desire to be better than him/her," (g) "to be dedicated to the profession," (h) "to be authoritarian when necessary," and (i) "to have a sense of humor" (p. 14). Without denying the importance of a teacher's academic competences, however, the participants reported that they preferred a teacher: (a) who had moral qualities, (b) who knew how to develop the students' competences and abilities, and (c) who was close to students and understood them. Crumbly, Henry, and Kratchman (2001) rated teacher characteristics in relationship to student evaluation of teaching and found that the top desired characteristics were similar to those from previously cited studies: (a) fair

grading, (b) teaching style, (c) presentation skills, (d) well prepared and organized, (e) enthusiastic, (f) availability, and (g) niceness.

In another study conducted at San Diego State College, Scheck (1978) found similar results. Subject knowledge, enthusiasm, presentation skills, inspiring, motivational, desire to teach, and sincere and honest communications topped the list of desired qualities for the ideal teachers. Similar results were reported by other researchers including Coffman (1954), Crawford and Bradshaw (1968), and French (1957), which were summarized and cited in Costin, Greenough, and Menges (1971).

In a study of medical college instructors to identify ideal bedside teachers, Alweshahi, Harley, and Cook (1979) analyzed two domains: communication and demographics. Communication included such behaviors as the provision of constructive feedback, respect of patient confidentiality, and encouragement of critical thinking, while the demographics included such characteristics as gender, academic rank, and language skills. According to their analysis of the results, the characteristics of the communication domain were perceived as being far more important than the characteristics in the demographic domain.

Potter and Emanuel (1990) focused mainly on communication style, and their findings supported those from previously cited studies. Once again, the key qualities were friendly and attentive, followed by relaxed, impressionable, animated, dramatic, open, precise, dominant, and contentious. They qualified all of these as positive in this way:

It is expected that the styles with the highest general ratings will be relaxed, dramatic and impression leaving. But it is also expected that when students are

given a choice to rate their preferences for all 10 communicator styles, they will also rate highly the styles of attentive, friendly and open, since these are positive interpersonal characteristics. It is expected that the styles of contentious, dominant and precise will be rated lower since these interpersonal characteristics carry some costs for students. While these three characteristics can be thought of as positive, especially in the instructional setting, instructors with these characteristics would also demand more from the student. A contentious teacher would be likely to challenge the student with argumentation and debate. A dominant teacher would provide more direction but less freedom for the student. And a precise teacher would be associated with more exacting standards thus requiring more effort from the student. (p. 239)

In their study of preservice teachers, Proctor, Clarke, and Mygdal (1998) compared and ranked only three characteristics: (a) capability, (b) sensitivity, and (c) authority. Capability ranked highest, followed by sensitivity, and then authority. The researchers found significant differences between self and ideal for all three factors. The preservice teachers rated themselves as more conventional, cautious, controlling, correcting, and directive than their ideal teacher. Also, they perceived themselves as more empathetic, compassionate, gentle, feeling, and patient, but less competent. Additionally, they perceived themselves to be more organized, well read, stimulating, and practical than their ideal. These findings could be an indication that their ideal might be: (a) somewhat conventional, but not too much so; (b) willing to take risks, in charge, but not controlling; and (c) guiding rather than correcting and directive. Also, their ideal might

be more in charge of his or her emotions and reactions, as well as less perfectionistic and practical.

Dunegan and Hrivnak (2003) conducted a study with 127 college students, who provided descriptions of the characteristics of the ideal teacher. The researchers found that it was difficult to assess student evaluations of teachers (SET) to determine the desired characteristics of the ideal teacher. Significant ($p < .01$) correlations were found between the SET scores and overall teacher evaluations, but only when students' images of the current and ideal teacher were not compatible. When the images of the current and ideal teacher were compatible, the correlations between SET and overall scores were not statistically significant.

In spite of the difficulty in the identification of the ideal college teacher, in general, college level students consistently desire teachers who are: (a) enthusiastic; (b) nice, interesting, available, or accessible; (c) knowledgeable; and (d) fair. Students want their ideal teacher to treat them well while they provide them with a challenge (Cruse, 1987; Oord & Brok, 2004; Potter & Emanuel, 1990; Watts, 1996).

Trabue (1951) worked with a different population to provide insight into the definition of the ideal teacher. In a study of 820 college presidents, these college executives were asked to rate 52 traits considered to be desirable, which were derived from feedback from college students and responsible writers in the field. Of the 820 respondents, 92% identified one characteristic as highly desirable as: inspires students to think for themselves and expresses their own ideas sincerely. Additional traits from Trabue's study were rated highly by the college presidents and mirrored the findings

from the studies described above: (a) friendly, (b) democratic, (c) tolerant, (d) helpful, (e) enthusiastic, and (f) understanding.

Also, Wilson, Dienst, and Watson (1973) asked college professors to rate the characteristics of effective teachers. Of the 119 respondents, 103 characteristics were identified which were categorized as five scales: (a) research activity and recognition, (b) participation in the academic community, (c) intellectual breadth, (d) relations with students, and (e) concern for teaching. Differences were found between disciplines. For example, for the sciences disciplines, the respondents rated research higher than for others. However, overall, when the results were compared to the results from similar student ratings, a high agreement emerged between both groups. Those salient characteristics closely matched characteristics described in studies cited previously (Blai, 1973; Epting et al., 2004; Wubbles & Brekelmans, 1998).

Effective College Teacher

According to Witcher, Onwuegbuzie, Collins, Filer, Wiedmaier, and Moore (2003), little documentation exists about what students perceive as the characteristics of effective college teachers. However, they reported that students identified the following characteristics as representative of effective college teaching: (a) student centered, (b) knowledgeable about subject matter, (c) professional, (d) enthusiastic about teaching, (e) effective at communication, (f) accessible, (g) competent at instruction, (h) fair and respectful, and (i) provide adequate feedback about performance. In contrast to Witcher et al., Aleamont and Yimer (1973) maintained that thousands of studies existed even as early as the 1950s. While there is a lack of agreement on the amount of available data, of

the myriad studies examined for this current this study, the use of measures, methods, and foci varied tremendously. Few included the full range of consideration described by Long (1957):

A teacher is effective when he does things or behaves in ways that stimulate the learning of understandings, skills, desirable attitudes and habits, and adequate personal adjustment. Changes must include all-around pupil growth: intellectual, social, emotional, aesthetic, and spiritual. (p. 218)

Most of the researchers grappled with similar questions, such as “How do student describe the ideal teacher? How do students describe effective teachers?” Many questioned the best way to determine teacher effectiveness. They questioned whether students’ or colleagues’ opinions should be studied; however, no concise, complete profile yet exists. However, most researchers identified reported similarities in ideal and effective teacher characteristics. For example, according to Costin et al. (1971) and many of their predecessors, the 10 most common characteristics to describe teaching effectiveness included:

1. Interpreted abstract ideas and theories clearly
2. Motivating interest in the subject
3. Able to increase critical thinking skills in students
4. Helped students to broaden their interests
5. Stressed important materials
6. Made good use of examples and illustrations
7. Motivated good work
8. Inspired class confidence in knowledge of the subject
9. Offered new viewpoints or appreciations

10. Clear and understandable. (p. 515)

While many of these characteristics or behaviors mirrored the findings of other researchers, they more clearly specified the actions, which are needed to be effective. Of particular interest to current application of these actions might include that Costin et al. found no evidence for instructors' entertainment value. They reported that no evidence existed to support the idea that students rated teachers more favorably because of a popularity "halo" (p. 518).

Similar concern about the need to translate characteristics into identifiable actions that stimulate effective teaching was addressed by Pohlman (1975). He cited Costin et al. (1971), Crawford and Bradshaw (1968), and Gadzella (1968); however, Pohlman suggested that three broad clusters of instructional attributes emerged from the previous studies: (a) knowledge of subject matter, (b) organization of that subject matter for a clear and logical presentation, and (c) demonstration of an interest in the subject matter.

In another study, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, Collins, Filer, Wiedmaier, and Moore (2007) conducted a sequential mixed-methods analysis which led to the development of the CARE-RESPECTED Model of Teaching Evaluation. This term was based on students' reported characteristics which reflected effective college teaching and were comprised of four metathemes (e.g., communicator, advocate, responsible, empowering) and nine themes (e.g., responsive, enthusiast, student centered, professional, expert, connector, transmitter, ethical, and director). Additionally, they questioned the score validity of the teacher evaluation forms (TEFs), which cast some serious doubt on the content related validity (i.e., item validity, sampling validity) and construct related

validity (i.e., substantive validity, structural validity, outcome validity, generalizability), which pertained to the TEF under investigation, as well as possibly on other TEFs across institutions that are designed theoretically and are not driven by data. This has serious implications for current policies at institutions in regard to: (a) tenure, (b) promotion, (c) merit pay increases for faculty, and (d) other decisions that are linked to TEFs. Also, the Onwuegbuzie et al. findings might invalidate previous studies like those cited by Schuckman in 1990 (e.g., Centra & Creech, 1976; Marsh, 1982; McKeachie 1951; Milton & Shoben, 1968; Watkins, 1989), in which, generally, it was found that students rated their instructors favorably.

Sherman and Blackburn (1975) studied the personal characteristics and teaching effectiveness of the members of a liberal arts college faculty and linked them to perceived instructional effectiveness. They found that the factors of personality and teaching effectiveness were highly correlated ($r = .77$) and suggested the possibility of “predicting a faculty member's success in the classroom on the basis of his or her perceived personality characteristics” (p. 130). They stated “the evidence leans toward the personal characteristics as the cause of the perceived instructional effectiveness” (p. 130).

Although some researchers have suggested that warmth and a good sense of camaraderie make for an enjoyable learning experience (Best & Addison, 2000), also, it has been found that these qualities in a teacher do not necessarily correlate to perceived teaching effectiveness. Sheehan and DuPrey (1999) showed that the informativeness of the class was the most important factor in students’ assessments of it as worthwhile,

which suggested that the formation of relationships with students might be beside the main point.

Martinazzi and Samples (2000) took a different approach to identify effective teachers. They provided an alternative definition of effective teachers: a professor who touches not only the intellect but is loved by his students. They cited Lowman (1995) who asked whether there are universal qualities of effective teachers, and they based their theory on Lowman's matrix that characterizes the master teacher as one who inspires high intellectual excitement and maintains high interpersonal rapport via student centered activities. The most often cited quality in Lowman's study, later reported in *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, was enthusiasm. This is not surprising when compared to the results from other studies (Cruse, 1987; Watts, 1996; Witcher et al., 2003)

Additionally, Martinazzi and Samples (2000) equated being an effective teacher with leadership. They posited that the teacher/student relationship involves "influence" (p. 1). The teacher must positively influence the student to achieve desired outcomes and that influence, in the context of leadership, is one of the keys to effective teaching. They identified three distinct areas, examined from a leadership paradigm necessary for being effective as a professor, and classified them as: (a) character, (b) competence, and (c) connection. They maintained that these three areas form the foundation of what constitutes legitimate and authentic leadership both inside and outside of academia. An effective professor must exhibit the characteristics and traits inherent in each of these

hallmark areas if the students are to truly have a transformational learning experience in the classroom.

One of the more recent concerns, in regard to college students' teacher evaluations, emerged from the perception that there may be a relationship between teacher evaluations and grade inflation (Eisler, 2002). While these studies do not seek to identify ideal teaching behaviors, they offer insight into the validity of the use of teacher evaluations to make those identifications. In the design of research related to identification of ideal teacher characteristics, the relationship with grade inflation must be taken into account. Eisler reported on this problem and found a statistical significance ($p < .0001$) between student rating and grades. However, he concluded that, generally, students' ratings of teachers remain valid as measures of teaching effectiveness, but may be used in ways that raise questions of validity.

Gender and Ethnicity Variables

Galguera (1998), in a study of mostly Hispanic and African American students, found that gender mattered little, bilinguality mattered slightly more, and teachers of the same ethnicity were rated desirable. For teacher/student interpersonal behavior, Wubbels and Levy (1991) found some differences in respect to gender and countries, specifically in regard to what students considered as exemplary interpersonal teaching. According to Freeman (1994), there was evidence to suggest that the type of course taught may interact with the instructor's gender role to affect student perceptions of the instructor.

Freeman (1994) asked, "Do students display a differential preference for instructors possessing differing gender role characteristics? Does a preference for a

specific gender role hold across different disciplines (e.g., natural science, the arts)?” (p. 627). His results indicated that instructor gender role was more important in affecting student evaluations than were instructor and student gender. His results were supported by those of Basow and Howe (1987). Post hoc comparisons revealed that female students rated androgynous instructors higher than did male students. No significant statistical differences were observed between male and female students in the ratings of masculine and feminine instructors. However, Basow and Distenfeld (1985) and Elmore and LaPointe (1974) found relatively few or no differences in the evaluations of male and female professors on the basis of gender alone. In addition, Kaschak (1978) and Lombardo and Tocci (1979) found a sex bias in teaching evaluation tests. However, the nature of this bias seemed to depend on student gender, the type of questions asked, and specific teacher qualities (Basow & Silberg, 1987).

In support of the predictions that the gender of the professor would interact with the gender of the student on student evaluations of college professors, Kaschak (1978) and Lombardo and Tocci (1979) reported that the notable interaction effects, which were found for all measures except Instructor/Individual Student Interaction, were due to the consistently less favorable ratings of female professors given by male students. Nevertheless, the fact that all professors were rated at least average on each factor suggested that female professors were perceived as effective teachers, despite being rated more negatively than male professors. The pattern of results was contrary to other field research, in which there has been little evidence of differential ratings for male and female professors (Bennett, 1982; Elmore & LaPointe, 1974), perhaps because of

methodological differences (Basow & Silberg, 1987). Clearly, gender must be taken into account in any attempt to identify the qualities of teacher effectiveness.

The findings from more recent studies may show some improvement over previous ones due to changes in current societal norms. For the earlier studies, there may have been an assumption that college teaching was considered a male occupation; subsequently, male students rated female professors lower than rate male professors. Less favorable ratings of women are most likely to occur when women are perceived as not fitting gender stereotypes, in this case by participation in a gender atypical profession (Basow & Silberg, 1987).

However, Bennett (1982) found that both male and female students rated female professors less favorably on Instructor/Individual Student Interaction, which involved questions related to a professor's availability and contact with students. Basow and Silberg (1987) explained that, because of gender stereotypes, female professors may be expected to be more accessible to students than are male professors. The lower ratings of female professors on Instructor/Individual Student Interaction may an indication that they did not conform to this expectation. Basow and Silberg surveyed over 1,000 male and female college students of 16 male and female professors (e.g., matched for course division, years of teaching, and tenure status) to evaluate their instructors in terms of teaching effectiveness and gender type characteristics.

Ideal Teacher vs. Effective Teacher: High School Level

To understand the expectations of new college freshman in regard to the ideal college teacher, it is necessary to examine the research on the effective and ideal high

school teacher. Few researchers have included freshman students in their examination of this issue. However, Richardson (1969) identified and reported a dimension that does not explicitly appear in the literature on ideal and effective college teaching. Richardson reported that mature high school students preferred a teacher who was helpful with their personal problems. An understanding of the differences between the two groups, college and high school students, would seem to be necessary in order to help incoming freshmen and their faculty to better understand instructional and behavioral adjustments needed for these students to achieve success.

In another study, Coward, Davis, and Wichen (1978) investigated whether significant differences in ideal teachers would emerge by inclusion of the variables, field-dependent teachers and field-independent teachers. The dependence dimension is associated with the work of Witkin, Dyk, Faterson, Goodenough, and Karp (1962, as cited in Coward et al.). The sample consisted of 145 students, who completed the Hidden Figures Test (Education Testing Service, 1962, as cited in Coward et al.) to rank the descriptors of the ideal teacher. Five of the teacher characteristics reflected a more social orientation to teaching, and the other five reflected a greater orientation to the task of teaching. They concluded that the rankings were remarkably similar and only one warranted further investigation. That is, there was a small tendency for field-dependent students to prefer teacher traits in which they themselves were deficient.

Miscellaneous Findings

Theory based research offers another view of how instructor course ratings might be interpreted. Filak and Sheldon (2003) used self-determination theory (SDT), an

organismic theory of optimal human motivation, which has been extensively supported in the last three decades by studies in the fields of: (a) education, (b) sport, (c) work, (d) wellbeing, and (e) personal goals. They were interested in what it is that people really need in order to thrive. In contemporary self-determination theory, there are strong assumptions about three proposed universal psychological needs: (a) autonomy, (b) competence, and (c) relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Filak and Sheldon's primary findings indicated that all three needs positively predicted instructor and/or course ratings. Thus, the results were consistent with the hypotheses of this current study, and with the SDT contention that it is important for authorities to try to provide all three of these qualities of experience for their students.

A completely different approach was taken by Purpel (1993), who posited that the ideal teacher can best be understood by an analysis of metaphor in popular literature. Purpel believed that his model reflects the ideal teacher and allows for continual interpretation of the concept situated in the cultural, historical, and ecological setting of the school and grounded in a common mythos of the heroic endeavors of the teacher profession.

Tacke and Hofer (1979) applied achievement motivation theory. They hypothesized that a discrepancy between a present and an anticipated state would motivate achievement. For example, if a teacher rated him or herself to be a very effective teacher, and the students rated that teacher as only moderately effective, then the teacher would respond to the discrepancy and work to improve due to greater motivation. However, they found that the effects of feedback were not especially high.

Teachers, who received feedback, which was discrepant from student feedback, were not more strongly motivated to achieve.

Esposito (1952) looked at the ideal teacher in foreign language courses in U.S. schools to investigate whether it mattered that the teacher was foreign born or U.S. American born. Several crucial characteristics, which are not common for the general classroom, emerged. If the teacher is foreign born, he or she must:

1. understand the U.S. student sufficiently well and teach accordingly;
2. have accurate knowledge of English, as well as the native tongue in order to teach grammar courses;
3. all dialects and personal peculiarities of the language must be abandoned;
and
4. personal experiences are to be reinforced with good educational background.

A teacher born in the U.S. must:

1. speak the foreign language with reasonable accuracy and fluency;
2. be thoroughly familiar with the grammar;
3. have perfect pronunciation; and
4. should have lived or studied abroad for several years, especially to teach civilization, history, or literature.

Esposito pointed out that the qualifications of the foreign language teacher vary somewhat depending on whether the teacher instructs in his or her native language, and that those qualifications matter more than the teacher's country of origin.

Cultural Studies: Non-American Studies

Johnson (2004) compared educational levels and gender in regard to the characteristics that students indicated contribute to effective teachers in both the U.S. and Spain. The rationale was that study student responses in Spain would provide greater insight into Hispanic ethnicity influences in the U.S. Her results were comparable to other studies in which the emphasis was not on ethnicity.

The Canadian researchers, Mueller, Roach, and Malone (1971) sought to identify the ideal teacher from a more Canadian perspective, if such a perspective exists. However, the questionnaire included typically U.S. language and included ratings of previously identified ideal characteristics.

While studies related to or about ideal and effective teachers vary, also, they leave many lines of research untouched. Researchers have yet to look at the differences and similarities that might exist between U.S. and Saudi students' perceptions. Additionally, the findings from the studies that do exist seem to contradict each other as in the gender studies discussed above cited by Freeman (1984). By the identification of bias and poor instrument design in other studies, in addition to contributing to the existing body of research, this current study might be most valuable as a caution for future researchers to be cognizant of questionnaire design and to assure against bias. In addition, this study will provide an apparent model of characteristics of ideal college teacher that can clearly distinguish between ideal and other type of college teachers such as effective, average, or poor teachers.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The purpose of the study was to identify the characteristics of ideal college teachers from the perspectives of U.S. and Saudi college students. Two studies were conducted in the two countries. The first study was an open ended survey Characteristics of University Instructor (CUI; see Appendices A and B) where college students from both countries were asked to describe (e.g., ideal, very good, average, below average, and poor) the characteristics of college teachers. Descriptive statistics were used to identify the frequency of these descriptors for college teachers in each country, and content analysis was conducted to identify the themes of the resultant characteristics. The results from Study 1 were used to develop a scale to measure the characteristics of ideal university instructors. Study 2 was a quantitative study based upon this researcher's newly developed scale, characteristics of Ideal University Instructors (IUI; see Appendices C and D), derived from the first study.

The scale was constructed within the frame work of different measurement models (e.g., item response theory, nonparametric item response theory, unfolding, classical test theory) and were applied until one was found which was consistent with the structure of the data. Once a suitable measurement model was found, the countries were compared as well as gender and the gender by country interaction.

Study 1

Sample

This study was conducted with the use of two samples of university students from the U.S. and Saudi Arabia. A snowball sampling method (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006) was employed to collect data from both countries. In addition, questionnaires were given to Saudi and U.S. students who studied in the U.S. in the Rocky Mountain Region where the researcher could contact them directly, and data were collected directly from them or from cooperative students who suggested participants.

Saudi Arabian Demographic Data

Of the 75 Saudi students respondents in Study 1, 20 (26.7%) were female and 55 (73.3%) were male. Snowball sampling was used. The CUI questionnaire was distributed to Saudi students in Saudi Arabia and in the Rocky Mountain Region where the researcher could access universities, colleges, and college teachers who taught in that region and to students in Saudi Arabia. The completed questionnaires were collected directly from college teachers and students who participated in the study. The ages ranged from 19-45. The mean age reported was 24.86 with a standard deviation of 5.39. The majority of respondents (41.3%) were graduate students, which accounted for the large number of students who responded and were over the age of 22, a total of 46 over the age of 22 (61.3%). The data were not analyzed to account for differences in responses due to age or degree level; consequently, responses are general to all ages and degree levels. Grade point averages (GPA) ranged from 1.30-4.00; a strong majority (78.7%) reported a 3.00 or better. The mean GPA was 3.23 with a standard deviation of .53. Saudi students attended universities in both the

U.S. and Saudi Arabia. A broad variety of majors were reported ($n = 34$). The demographic information for the Saudi sample is shown in Table 1. There were no missing cases for Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Data for Saudi Sample in Study 1

		Freq.	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	Ranged from 19-45			24.86	5.39
Gender	Female	20	26.7	1.73	.44
	Male	55	73.3		
Education Level	First year	18	24.0	3.36	1.66
	Second year	9	12.0		
	Third year	7	9.3		
	Fourth year	10	13.3		
	Graduate	31	41.3		
Majors	Number = 36 (see Appendix E)			16.12	9.74
University	At U.S. universities	21	13.3		
	King Saud	40	53.3		
	Al-Iman	8	10.7		
	Um Alqura	1	1.3		
	King Abdulaziz	5	6.7		
GPA	Ranged from 1.30-4.0			3.38	1.81
				3.23	.53

U.S. Demographic Data

Of the 105 U.S. student respondents for Study 1, 83 (79.0%) were female, and 22 (21.0%) were male. Again, snowball sampling was used. The CUI questionnaire was distributed to U.S. students in the Rocky Mountain Region, where the researcher was able to

access universities, colleges, and college teachers who teach in that region. The completed questionnaires were collected directly from college teachers and students who participated in the study. The ages ranged from 18-38. The mean age reported was 20.31 with a standard deviation of 3.09. The majority of respondents (95.2%) were undergraduate students. Again, the data were not analyzed to account for differences in responses due to age or degree level. Consequently, the responses were general to all ages and degree levels. The reported GPAs ranged from 1.79- 4.00; a majority (79.0%) reported a 3.00 or better. The mean GPA was 3.22 with a standard deviation of .48. All U.S. students attended universities in the U.S. There was a broad variety of majors; 51 different majors were reported. An additional category, ethnicity, was reported by the U.S. students. A majority (84.8%) reported White/Caucasian, 11.4% reported Hispanic/Biracial, 2.9% reported African American, and 1.0% reported Italian as a racial distinction. Demographic details are presented in Table 2. There were no missing cases for Table 2.

Combined Demographic Data

When combined, the majority of student respondents in Study 1 were age 22 or younger, which accounted for 68.9% of the total with an average of 22.21, and a standard deviation of 4.76. There were 103 female students (57.2%), and there were 77 male students (42.8%). Undergraduate students totaled 80% of respondents. One third (36.1%) reported majors in: (a) education (i.e., 6.1% in Special Education, 11.1% in Elementary Education); (b) nursing (5.6%); or (c) psychology (6.1%). The remaining two-thirds were

Table 2

Demographic Data for U.S. Sample in Study 1

		Freq.	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	Ranged from 18-38			20.31	3.09
Gender	Female	83	79.0	1.20	.40
	Male	22	21.0		
Education Level	First year	34	32.4	3.36	1.66
	Second year	40	38.1		
	Third year	19	18.1		
	Fourth year	7	6.7		
	Graduate	5	4.8		
Majors	Number = 26 (see Appendix E)			31.95	14.51
Ethnicity	White/Caucasian	89	84.8		
	Hispanic/Biracial	12	11.4		
	African American	3	2.9		
	Italian	1	1.0		
GPA	Ranged from 1.79-4.0			3.22	.48

broadly distributed among 48 majors (see Appendix E). Education levels fell mostly in the undergraduate level, 144 of 180. Analysis included a mean GPA for all students of 3.23 with a standard deviation of .51. More detailed information about combined demographics are presented in Table 3. There were no missing cases.

Table 3

Demographic Data for Combined Sample in Study 1

		Freq.	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Country	Saudi	75	41.7	1.58	.49
	U.S.	105	58.3		
Age	Ranged from 18-45			22.21	4.76
Gender	Female	103	57.2	1.43	.50
	Male	77	42.8		
Education Level	First year	52	28.9	2.64	1.49
	Second year	49	27.2		
	Third year	26	14.4		
	Fourth year	17	9.4		
	Graduate	36	20.0		
Majors	Number = 53 (see Appendix E)			25.36	14.93
	At U.S. universities	126	63.3		
	King Saud University	40	22.2		
	Al-Imam University	8	4.4		
	Um Alqura University	1	0.6		
	King Abdulaziz	5	2.8		
GPA	Ranged from 1.30-4.0			3.23	.51

Instrumentation

The CUI questionnaire was developed for Study 1 in two languages (e.g., Arabic and English; see Appendices A and B). The questionnaire consists of open-ended questions to describe the characteristics of college teacher based on five types of college teachers: (a) ideal, (b) very good, (c) average, (d) below average, and (e) poor. The

participants described the characteristics of teachers in one or a few words. They were asked to order them hierarchically from preferable (i.e., ideal) teacher to not preferable or undesired (i.e., poor) teacher. Based on the Saudi and the U.S. descriptions, the identified characteristics from college students for each category were determined by the frequency of each. Characteristics can be repeated as more than one type, so one characteristic, for example, could be noted by a respondent as both Ideal and Very good. The most frequently reported characteristic from each category was identified because of the frequency of appearance in each category.

The scale was edited and reviewed by professionals in English and Arabic language translation. The scale was translated from English to Arabic and then from Arabic to English to examine its consistency in both versions. The translations were made by a professional English teacher from the Institute of Public Administration (IPA) in Riyadh, who has teaching experience in the U.S., and by Lufta Translation Office in Riyadh. Then, the scale was edited by an English teacher in the writing center at the University of Northern Colorado; also, it was given to a professor and graduate student to check the translation that was made before and to check the English language properness and clearness for U.S. students. These procedures were done to make sure that the language of the scale was appropriate to the students' level and could be understood clearly.

Procedures

The CUI was administered either in groups or individually. Permission from universities, teachers, and educators in Saudi and the U.S. were obtained to conduct the

CUI questionnaire with undergraduate and graduate college students. This study and the CUI questionnaire were reviewed by the members of the Internal Review Board (IRB) at the University of Northern Colorado to verify the eligibility of this study (see Appendix F); however, such permission was not required in Saudi Arabia to conduct any kind of research. After permission was obtained, the CUI and the consent form (see Appendix A) were distributed to the Saudi and U.S. participants.

The procedures for the conduct of the study went through many processes. A request of permission to conduct the study was submitted to Al-Imam University and King Saud University in Riyadh. The permissions were obtained to collect data from these universities in Saudi Arabia (see Appendix G). A letter, which identified the purpose of the study, was submitted to the departments and participants. The questionnaires were collected directly from the departments and university instructors. As mentioned earlier, a snowball sampling method was used to collect data; therefore, the study included many Saudi students who studied in the U.S. and attended different states and universities.

The study was conducted with students from UNC after the IRB approval was obtained. The questionnaires were collected directly from university instructors and students at different departments at UNC.

Analysis

Content analysis and descriptive analysis were used to determine the frequency of each characteristic of the ideal college teacher from both the Saudi and the U.S. samples. According to Berelson (1952), content analysis is “a research technique for the objective,

systematic, and quantitative description of manifest content of communications" (p. 18). All responses were recorded verbatim. The responses were grouped in categories based upon synonyms (i.e., different words with identical or at least similar meanings). The processes were based upon the use of WordNet (Fellbaum, 1998). WordNet is a semantic lexicon for the English language which: (a) groups English words into sets of synonyms called synsets; (b) provides short, general definitions; and (c) records the various semantic relations between these synonym sets. According to Fellbaum, it was created under the direction of the cognitive psychologist, George A. Miller. The Arabic content analysis was based on Arabic WordNet (WordNet, 2007) and related software. Translation from Arabic to English and English to Arabic was based upon the fourth edition of the *Arabic-English Dictionary* (Wehr & Cowan, 1998).

Categories, that occur in the responses in any group (e.g., Male Saudi, Female Saudi, Male U.S., Female U.S.) were included in Study 2. In addition, categories found in the literature were included as well. The data were analyzed in the narrative form, and they were coded in an Excel program to two numbers (e.g., 1 and 0) for each characteristic and type; 1, if the characteristic was described, and 0, if the characteristic was not described. Each characteristic was classified according to themes which are explained in Chapter 4, as well as positive or negative descriptions. Then, under each characteristic, five types of college teachers were ordered in cells with the first letter from each type (e.g., I, V, A, B, and P).

STUDY 2

Sample

Study 2 was conducted with the use of two samples of college students from Saudi Arabia and the U.S. In Study 2, the IUI scale was distributed to Saudi students in Saudi Arabia and U.S. students in the Rocky Mountain Region where the researcher had access to universities, colleges, and college teachers who taught in that region and to students in Saudi Arabia. In contrast to Study 1, Study 2 was not conducted with Saudi students in the Rocky Mountain Region.

Saudi Arabian Demographic Data

The Saudi sample consisted of 1,413 students from six universities in three different regions in Saudi Arabia: (a) 464 (32.8%) students from Al-Imam University; (b) 277 (19.6%) students from King Saud University; (c) 135 (9.6%) students from Princess Noura Bint Abdulrahman University; (d) 40 (2.8%) students from Arab Open University in Riyadh (i.e., in the middle region of Saudi Arabia); (e) 218 (15.4%) students from King Abdulaziz University in Jeddah (i.e., in the western region of Saudi Arabia); and (f) 278 (19.7%) students from King Faisal University in Al-Ahssa (i.e., in the eastern region of Saudi Arabia). The Arab Open University in Riyadh is a private university, while the other five universities are public universities. All of these universities are for male and female students, except the Princess Noura Bint Abdulrahman University, which is just for female students only. However, female and male students are segregated in all of the universities. Only the completed scales were included, and scales with missing data were excluded. The sample included 572 female (40.5%) and 841 male (59.5%). Ages ranged

from 17-42. The mean age reported was 21.83 with a standard deviation of 2.93. The majority of respondents were undergraduate: (a) 293 (20.7%) in the first year, (b) 330 (23.4%) in the second year, (c) 394 (27.7%) in the third year, and (d) 334 (23.6%) in the fourth year. There were 62 (4.4%) graduate students. These Saudi students were from different colleges and majors (see Appendices H and I). Colleges vary from one university to another and may have similar name or different names. For instance, a College of Arts and College of Education have the same content of majors and disciplines, but they have different names, while some have similar names of colleges, like College of Technology, College of Information Sciences, or College of Computer. However, some majors may come under different colleges such as psychology, for instance, which can be in the College of Social Sciences in Al-Imam University, in the College of Education in King Saud University, and in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities in King Abdulaziz University. The majority of the students were from: (a) College of Education (15%); (b) College of Social Sciences (14.5%); (c) College of Arts (12.4%); and (d) Colleges of Computer, Communication, Information Sciences, and Information Technology (10.8%). The participants were students from 40 majors or disciplines. The students' GPA ranged from 1.10- 4.0. In Saudi Arabia, a 5 point grade system is used; therefore, the grade point averages were converted to a 4 point grade for comparison with the GPA of U.S. students. The mean GPA was 2.66 with a standard deviation of .90. Seventy three students (5.2%) did not report their grades because they were in the first semester. The demographic information for the Saudi students is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Demographic Data for Saudi Student Sample in Study 2

		Freq.	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	Ranged from 17-42			21.83	2.93
Gender	Female	572	40.5	1.60	0.49
	Male	841	59.5		
Education Level	First year	293	20.7	2.64	1.49
	Second year	330	23.4		
	Third year	394	27.7		
	Fourth year	334	23.6		
	Graduate	62	4.4		
College	Number = 18	See Appendix H		7.13	4.42
Majors	Number = 49	See Appendix I		11.80	9.82
University	Al-Imam University	464	32.8	3.70	1.90
	King Saud University	277	19.6		
	Princess Noura Bint Abdulrahman University	135	15.4		
	Arab Open University	40	2.8		
	King Abdulaziz University	218	15.4		
	King Faisal University in Al-Ahssa	278	19.7		
GPA	Ranged from 1.10-4.0			2.66	.90

U.S. Demographic Data

The U.S. sample consisted of 714 students from the Rocky Mountain Region.

Missing demographic data were included, and any missing data from the scale were excluded.

The participants were 492 (68.9%) female and 222 (31.1%) male. The ages of the

participants ranged from 17-67 with a mean of 23.99 and a standard deviation of 7.80 (i.e., 1 missing case). The majority of respondents were undergraduate and included: (a) 97 (13.6%) in the first year, (b) 134 (18.8%) in the second year, (c) 169 (23.7%) in the third year, and (d) 173 (24.2%) in the fourth year. There were 134 (18.8%) graduate students, and 7 (1%) participants reported Other. The U.S. respondents were from various educational backgrounds and colleges and disciplines (see Appendices H and I). The majority of the students were from the: (a) College of Education and Behavioral Sciences (32.1%), (b) College of Natural and Health Sciences (31.2%), (c) College of Arts (12.4%), and (d) Colleges of Humanities and Social Sciences (16.7%). The participants were enrolled in 84 majors, and there were 16 (2.2%), who were undecided about their colleges or majors yet. The U.S. students' GPA ranged from 1.40-4.0. The mean GPA was 3.35 with a standard deviation of .59. Six students (.8%) were in their first semester so they had no GPA yet, and there were 4 (.6%) missing cases. The demographic information for the U.S students is presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Demographic Information for U.S. Sample in Study 2

		Freq.	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	Ranged from 17-67			24.00	7.81
Gender	Female	492	68.9	1.31	0.46
	Male	222	31.1		
Education Level	First year	97	13.6		
	Second year	134	18.8		
	Third year	169	23.7		
	Fourth year	173	24.2	3.19	1.33
	Graduate	134	18.8		
	Other	7	1.0		
College	Number = 6	See Appendix H		18.76	4.06
Majors	Number = 48	See Appendix I		33.68	19.88
University	UNC	714	100.0	2.00	0.00
GPA	Ranged from 1.10-4.0			3.36	0.60

Combined Demographic Data

The total sample for Study 2 was 2,127 students from Saudi Arabia and the U.S. The total sample was 1,413 Saudi students (66.4%) and 714 U.S students (33.6%). The sample consisted of 1,064 females (50%) and 1,063 males (50%). The ages ranged from 17-67; there was 1 missing case. The mean age reported was 22.56 with a standard deviation of 5.21. Also, the majority of students were undergraduate: (a) 390 (18.3%) in the first year, (b) 464 (21.8%) in the second year, (c) 563 (26.5%) in the third year, and

(d) 507 (23.8%) in the fourth year. There were 196 (9.2%) graduate students, and 7 (.3%) students were at other educational levels. The students come from many educational backgrounds and different colleges and disciplines. The college names have slight differences in the U.S. and in Saudi Arabia, but are almost the same disciplines, for instance, the College of Education in Saudi Arabia and College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in the U.S. The majority of the students were from the: (a) College of Education and Behavioral Sciences (10.8%), (b) College of Natural and Health Sciences (10.5%), (c) College of Education (10%); and (d) Colleges of Social Sciences (9.6%). These student participants were enrolled in 70 majors, and there were 16 (.8%), who had not decided their majors yet. The GPA for the sample ranged from 1.10-4.0. The mean GPA was 2.89 with a standard deviation of .88. There were 79 (3.7%) students who were in their first semester and had no GPA yet, and there were 4 (.2%) missing cases. The demographic information for the combined data are presented in Table 6.

Instrumentation

Based upon the results from Study 1, a second instrument, the characteristics of Ideal University Instructor (IUI) instrument was developed. The items were presented in a summated rating scale format that included five categories (e.g., Always = 5, Often = 4, Sometimes = 3, Rarely = 2, and Never = 1; see Appendix C). The equivalence of the English and Arabic versions was examined through the process of Back Translation (Brislin, 1970). Back Translation is the process by which a document, which has been translated in a foreign language, is translated back to the original language. The

Table 6

Demographic Information for the Combined Sample in Study 2

		Freq.	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Country	Saudi	1,413	66.4	1.34	0.47
	U.S.	714	33.6		
Age	Ranged from 17-67			22.56	5.21
Gender	Female	1,064	50.0	1.51	0.50
	Male	1,063	50.0		
Education Level	First year	390	18.3	2.85	1.25
	Second year	464	21.8		
	Third year	563	23.7		
	Fourth year	507	23.8		
	Graduate	196	9.2		
	Other	7	0.3		
College	Number of colleges	See Appendix H		11.04	6.97
Majors	Number of majors	See Appendix I		19.14	17.42
University	Al-Imam University	464	21.8	3.13	1.74
	King Saud University	277	13.0		
	Princess Noura Bint Abdulrahman University	135	6.3		
	Arab Open University	40	1.9		
	King Abdulaziz University	218	10.2		
	King Abdulaziz University in Al-Ahssa	714	13.1		
	UNC	714	33.6		
GPA	Ranged from 1.10-4.0			2.89	0.88

equivalence of the original and back translated version is established by a panel of

independent judges. The translation procedures were the same as in Study 1. Also, these

procedures were done before and after the application of the scale for the pilot study and the study sample for editing, rewording, and changing inappropriate items. The validity and reliability procedures for the scale for the pilot study are discussed in Appendix J as a result of the development of the IUI scale.

Procedures

The procedures for Study 2 and the conduct of the IUI survey were similar to the procedures utilized in Study 1. After collection of the data from first study, a new request of permission from the researcher to conduct the study from the Psychology Department at Al-Imam University in Riyadh was submitted. That request was submitted to the Office of Higher Studies Deanship at that university so they could issue requests for additional permissions to conduct the study at different universities in Saudi Arabia. An example of issued permission to King Saud University and its colleges and departments in Riyadh is displayed in Appendix G. The permissions were issued by: (a) Al-Imam University; (b) King Saud University; (c) Princess Noura Bint Abdulrahman University; (d) Arab Open University in Riyadh (i.e., in the middle region of Saudi Arabia); (e) King Abdulaziz University in Jeddah (i.e., in the western region of Saudi Arabia); and (f) King Faisal University in Al Ahssa (i.e., in the eastern region of Saudi Arabia). The permissions were sent to the offices of administration at all of these universities. All the universities sent the request to conduct the study to the all departments at their universities, with a letter to identify the purpose of the study and return the surveys to their departments which they sent again to administration offices. The surveys were collected from these offices and directly from department and university instructors.

The procedures in the U.S. were different from Saudi Arabia. The study was conducted at University of Northern Colorado. After the IRB approval was obtained, there were two procedures used in the U.S. First, data were collected from university instructors directly in different departments at UNC. Second, the IUI survey was developed into an online survey through Survey Gizmo website. Consent forms were distributed along with the IUI to all students in the two procedures, which were used (see Appendix C). The IUI online survey was distributed to UNC graduate students by email through their email accounts, and a listserv of 5,000 students was created to distribute the online IUI survey by staff of the Technical Support Center at UNC.

Analysis

In contrast to Study 1, the analysis for Study 2 was quantitative and included statistical analyses. The statistical analyses were conducted at two levels: (a) item level analyses, and (b) scale level analyses. The statistical analysis for each level was comprised of: (a) descriptive statistical analysis; (b) correlation analysis; and (c) analysis of variance (ANOVA). Also, scale level analysis required different additional analysis which included a confirmatory factor analysis to test the unidimensionality of the scale and Mokken scaling analysis as a measurement technique to construct the hierarchical and final versions of IUI scale for each data set. These statistical analyses were used for three different sets of data (i.e., Saudi, U.S., and Combined data). Comparisons between these data were conducted to find similarities and differences among the data.

The purpose of this study was to discover the preferred characteristics of an ideal university instructor in a hierarchical way and build a scale based on this desirable

hierarchical order. Therefore, descriptive analysis and Mokken analysis were used to attain this goal. Also, this author intended to find out if there were any significant effects of country and gender, and to discover whether there were any significant relationships between: (a) country, (b) gender, (c) age, (d) educational level, (e) college, and (f) GPA. For these reasons, these statistical analyses were conducted to serve and facilitate the rationale of this study and answer its questions.

A descriptive statistical analysis was used to discover the mean score for each item and the frequency of the 70 items, and then to rank them from highest to lowest mean value and frequency in the three data sets. The focus was on the Always, Sometimes, and Never options because they represent the: (a) most preferable or desired, (b) neutral or controversial between desirable or undesirable, and (c) undesirable or disliked characteristics. Since there were a large number of items, the focus was only on the top 10 characteristics from the three options (i.e., Always, Sometimes, and Never). Also, tables, which summarize the top 10 items, are presented in Chapter 4 to make the results easier to understand for the reader. Descriptive statistical analysis included the: (a) number of frequency, (b) percentage of frequency, and (c) the themes from Study 1 in which the items fell.

In order to develop an IUI scale, a modern measurement model was utilized to fit best the structure of the data. The Mokken model, which is one type of nonparametric item response theory (NIRT) model, was investigated, and it was found that it fits with the data. This model is a probabilistic model, which was extended and modified from a deterministic Guttman scale and required a hierarchical sort of items with no errors in its

ordered pattern. That is, items are ordered by level of difficulty, agreement, or endorsement in such a manner that, if an item is endorsed, all lower items are likely to be endorsed as well (Dijkstra, Buist, Moorer, & Dassen, 1999). In Mokken analysis, Loevinger's coefficient H is used to identify how strong the hierarchical scale is. According to Dijkstra et al., "In Mokken scale analysis reproducibility is measured by Loevinger's coefficient H_i for each item i , and H for the entire scale. The calculation of H_i and H depend on comparing the probability of errors in ranking to the probability of such a ranking occurring if the items are unrelated. H_i and H will take values between 0 and 1" (p. 388). A strong scale should be equal or higher than .5, the scale H score, which ranges between .4-.49, is considered to have medium hierarchical scale, and a scale H score, which ranges between .3-.39, is considered to be a weak scale. Items with low H_i should be deleted (Sitjtsma & Molenaar, 2002; Dijkstra et al.). The same measurement model fits samples, then countries overlapped, and differences between items were explored. A Mokken analysis was conducted for the three data sets, and three IUI scales were constructed, one scale for each country and Combined data. The Mokken analysis reported: (a) scalability H_i score for each item, (b) scalability H score for the whole scale, and (c) reliability of the scale.

In order to discover significant effect and group differences of independent variables, several statistical procedures were taken to justify and ensure the precise statistical analyses. Since college students from both countries had two or more common characteristics of the ideal university instructor, then, all the top characteristics (i.e., 30 items) from the Mokken analysis results from the three data sets were combined to create

a brief version of IUI scale. So, it includes the overlapped items and different items from the 30 items which represented the top characteristics from the three data sets for the IUI scales. This procedure was done to avoid complicated statistical analyses at scale and item levels. There were 16 items, which resulted from the combination of 30 items, and they were formed to make one dependent variable (i.e., the brief IUI). The reliability of these items was calculated to identify the strength of the correlation of the items.

Effect size values of the data were considered and calculated to identify the magnitude of the effect of the variables on the dependent variables. Report of the significant results is neither useful nor meaningful because it does not inform one about the magnitude and strength of the effect (Field, 2005), and Cohen's d was used to calculate effect size. Eta-square was converted to Cohen's d use of Excel spreadsheets designed by DeCoster (2009). Magnitude of effect sizes were suggested by Cohen's (1992) and the Kittler, Menard, and Phillips (2007) guidelines for interpretation of effect sizes from different methods ($r = .1$, Cohen's $d = 0.2$, and eta squared = .01 are small effect sizes, $r = .3$, Cohen's $d = 0.5$, and eta squared = .06 are medium effect size, and $r = .5$, Cohen's $d = 0.8$, and eta squared = .14 are large effect sizes).

A factorial ANOVA (i.e., for more than two independent variables) was used to discover the significant effect of variables and significant differences between groups. Then, it was followed up with the Games-Howell post-hoc test which does not rely on homogeneity of variance. Post-hoc tests were conducted to determine the significant group differences and to verify ANOVA significant results to avoid type I error (e.g., indicating an effect when there is no effect; Field, 2001).

A correlation coefficient was conducted to discover how the variables were significantly correlated to items and the scale. A Bonferroni correction method of level significant was used to attain more precise level of alpha (α), to ensure that it was below the .05 level of significance, and to reduce type I error (Field, 2005). Software programs were used to calculate these statistical analyses, such as: (a) Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for descriptive analysis; (b) LISREL Version 8.8 for a confirmatory factory analysis (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2006); (c) Excel program to calculate effect size; and (d) MSP, a program for Mokken scale analysis (Molenaar, Van Schuur, Sijtsma, & Mokken, 2002).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results from the two studies are discussed and presented, based on the use of qualitative and quantitative analyses. The qualitative results from Study 1 were the foundation and essential data for the quantitative analyses in Study 2. The data collected from the Saudi students, United States students, and the Combined data were considered in all the analyses that were used in this chapter, and all their results are reported separately. In addition, comparisons between and within these three data sets were considered to find similarities and differences among them.

Study 1 Results

The analysis in Study 1 was based upon students' opinions about instructors which were described in an open-ended questionnaire titled, Characteristics of University Instructor (CUI). That questionnaire included descriptions of the characteristics of Ideal, Very good, Average, Below average, and Poor university instructors. Descriptive statistics were used to identify the frequency of these descriptors, and content analysis was conducted to classify the themes in the reported characteristics. The purpose of content analysis is to organize the collected written data and characteristics into a meaningful format and classification. These analyses were used to answer Research Question 1 presented in Chapter 1. The results from Study 1 provided the content that

was used as a blueprint to develop the scale to measure the characteristics of ideal university instructors (IUI).

Content Analysis

Each participant completed an open ended questionnaire, the CUI, described in Chapter 3. The descriptions generated by the students were entered into an Excel Spreadsheet. These characteristics were classified by instructor types (e.g., Ideal, Very good, Average, Below average, and Poor), and they were arranged in a hierarchal order of ideal type from top to bottom (see Appendix K). These characteristics were categorized then in eight themes or categories: (a) Teaching Style/Skills; (a) Learning Process (i.e., of students); (b) Scholarly (i.e., teacher knowledge and expertise); (c) Manners (i.e., of teacher); (d) Social Skills/ Communication; (e) Personality/Personal Attribute, (f) Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom; and (g) Testing and Grading (see Appendix L). Each theme was subdivided into positive or desirable characteristics and negative or undesirable characteristics, and they were arranged in hierarchal order from higher to lower frequency. A comparison of the 10 most desired characteristics and the 10 least desired characteristics in each theme provided insight into how students prefer their teacher to conduct him or herself with students and in classrooms. These insights were examined as a whole, when both Saudi and U.S. responses were combined.

Also, the outcomes from the extensive content analysis and the results from Study 1 provided the basis upon which the table of specifications (i.e., the blueprint) of the IUI scale, which indicated strong evidence of the content validity of the IUI. The eight themes or elements of the blueprint are described below.

Teaching Style/Skills

Desirable characteristics. A majority of students, 107 of 180 (59.4%) reported that teachers should be: (a) interesting, (b) enjoyable, (c) fun, (d) interactive, and (e) make learning worthwhile. Also, over half (55.6%) of the students wanted to be provided with good and useful activities. Other desired characteristics, which half or more of the respondents reported, were that the teacher should be able to: (a) to use good and useful teaching methods; (b) convey information clearly and communicate ideas; (c) explain materials clearly; (d) provide useful and helpful guides, tests, exercises, practices, and assignments; (e) meet students outside of class to help and explain, write teaching objectives clearly and concisely (i.e., understandable by students); (f) complete duties, commitments, and responsibilities; and (g) use teaching methods that hold students' attention. Basically, students desire a teacher, who clearly explains what needs to be done, sets a good example, is accessible, and makes learning relevant and pleasurable. The other desired characteristics were similar. Because the items in the questionnaire were open-ended, many of the responses appear to be the same characteristic written in various ways (see Table 7).

Undesirable characteristics. The most undesirable characteristics mirrored the desirable. Of the students, 63% reported that they did not desire ordinary, traditional, or *old fashioned teaching*. In addition, while the students desired useful activities, they did not desire a *one size fits all* pedagogical approach. They wanted alternative teaching methods. Likewise, 57% reported that a teacher's inability to convey information or communicate clearly was undesirable. The use of a monotone voice was reported by 58%

Table 7

The Most Desirable Characteristics of Teaching Style/Skills Theme

Item	Total	%
Interesting, enjoyable, fun, interesting, interactive, not boring/ learning lectures and teaching, Makes subject interesting/exciting, makes class (learning) worthwhile/fun/interesting	107	59.44
Uses various good and useful activities	100	55.56
Uses various good and useful teaching methods	79	43.89
Able to convey information clearly, Able to communicate ideas	75	41.67
Explains materials clearly	69	38.33
Gives useful and helpful learning guides, tests, study direction, exercises, practices, assignments to explain and understand	63	35.00
Meets students outside of class to help and explain	63	35.00
Plans his/her teaching objectives clearly/concisely to students	60	33.33
Does his/her duties, commitments, responsibilities, responsible	57	31.67
Uses attractive teaching methods that hold students' attention	49	27.22

of the students. These characteristics were opposite to the most desired. Also, other notable characteristics in this category mirrored the results for the desired characteristics, which suggested a consistency in the responses (see Table 8).

Learning Process

Desirable. The students seemed to provide careful responses in several of the areas. Most of these responses reflected an engaged teacher as one who: (a) communicates well with students, (b) clearly articulates course requirements and materials, and (c) supports understanding over memorization. This is a teacher concerned about the learning outcomes and consistently monitors his or her actions and the progress of his or her students. Of the 180 students, 71 reported specifically that the most desirable

Table 8

The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Teaching/Style Skills Theme

Item	Total	%
Ordinary teaching, Traditional teaching, Old fashioned teaching	113	62.78
Does not use various good and useful activities & teaching methods (e.g., PowerPoint, reading from book, notes, etc.), Does not provide alternative ways of teaching	113	62.78
Monotone voice/lectures/teaching methods	104	57.78
Unable to convey/communicate information/ideas clearly	102	56.67
Always uses the same/one style/way (i.e., routine) in teaching & testing, Always same teaching style, Relies on one way of teaching	93	51.67
Straight/pure lectures, All lectures	90	50.00
Not interesting, Boring, Not enjoyable class	88	48.89
Just uses and reads directly from books only for teaching	84	46.67
Uses poor teaching methods, Poor teaching style, Poor instructions	70	38.89
Give lots of assignments/work/requirements and tests, Overloads students with homework/demands	51	28.33

characteristic in this category is that the teacher cares about students' performance/education. While this is slightly more than a third of the students (39.4%), other students reported similar ideas in different ways. Some examples are: (a) makes students understand subject matter, (b) wants students to do well and succeed, (c) encourages thinking, and (d) cares about student needs. In this theme, the focus was on the student and the student's needs such as: (a) learning process, (b) performance, and (c) thinking strategies (see Table 9).

Undesirable. The most frequently reported undesirable trait was, "Doesn't care if students understand." Of 180 respondents, 49 (27%) reported their dislike of this type of

Table 9

The Most Desirable Characteristics of Learning Process Theme

Item	Total	%
Cares about students' performance/education	71	39.44
Cares about students' understanding/knows materials	50	27.78
Allows every, all students to participate, Engaging, Involves students in lectures	44	24.44
Students get/benefit, gain knowledge from his/her class, His/her students are doing well and learning	38	21.11
Asks good questions to arouse critical thinking	29	16.11
Knows students' ability level	28	15.56
Allows students make decisions/choices on projects/class activities/plans/assignments	26	14.44
Cares about students' needs, Understands students' needs	25	13.89
Makes students understand subject matter	25	13.89
His/her students are not just recipient/they are active	25	13.89

teacher. The next most frequently reported characteristic was related to that, and 42 (23%) of the 180 students selected, "His students do not understand the subject matter, don't know what's going on." Others cited undesirable traits, just as in the first set, which mirrored the desirable traits. If students liked a particular trait, also, they reported dislike of the lack of that trait (see Table 10).

Scholarly/Teacher Knowledge/Expertise

Desirable. Student responses to this category indicated that students strongly expected their teachers to be knowledgeable and experts about what they teach. The reports from 148 (82%) of 180 students indicated that a teacher should be versed in the subject matter or knowledgeable about the subject. That result was closely followed by

Table 10

The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Learning Process Theme

Item	Total	%
Doesn't care if students understand	49	27.22
His/her student do not understand subject matters, His/her students don't know what's going on	42	23.33
Centered-teaching, His students are just recipient and not active, don't get information by themselves	34	18.89
Doesn't care about education of student/abilities/level of knowledge	33	18.33
Does not answer students' questions, Unable to answer questions	24	13.33
Doesn't believe, trust in students' ability	23	12.78
Focus on memorizing style of teaching, not thinking	21	11.67
Students don't get learning/education from his class	21	11.67
Do not allow and engage all students to participate, Unengaged, Does not involve class, Uninvolved, No engagement	19	10.56
Doesn't care if students pass or fail	16	8.89

the term, knowledgeable. Of the students, 77% reported that teachers should be well educated and informed, in general, and teachers should like teaching and not seek money or prestige. Additional terms were similar to the concept of knowledgeable (see Table 11).

Undesirable. The most frequently reported undesirable trait, as reported by 69 (38%) of 180 students, was directly opposite to the most desirable traits. These 69 students reported that it was undesirable for a teacher to know little or nothing about his or her subject. Likewise, one of the undesirable traits was to seek money or prestige (see Table 12).

Table 11

The Most Desirable Characteristics of Teachers' Knowledge and Scholarly Theme

Item	Total	%
Versed in subject matter, Knowledgeable about the subject, Influential	148	82.22
Knowledgeable	140	77.78
Scholarly, Educative, Well-educated	95	52.78
Expert in field, Professional	42	23.33
Active, Productive	33	18.33
Has lots of experience	29	16.11
Well prepared	26	14.44
Academically capable, Qualified	23	12.78

Table 12

The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Teachers' Knowledge and Scholarly Theme

Item	Total	%
Is not versed in subject matter, Knows little/nothing about subject	69	38.33
Unknowledgeable, Uneducated, Not scholar, Lacks knowledge, Not thoughtful	60	33.33
Not capable, Unqualified (academically)	31	17.22
Inactive, Unproductive, Not practical, Lazy, Unenergetic	23	12.78
Not expert in field, Not professional	16	8.89
Tired/washy of teaching, Not passionate about teaching	14	7.78

Teacher Manners

Desirable. Teachers should be nice, according to the reports of 100 (56%) of the 180 students. Equally, teachers should be kind, amiable, and outgoing. Nearly as many

respondents (i.e., 79 [44%] of 180) reported that teachers should respect the viewpoints of others. Notably, 69 (38%) responded that teachers should be polite and well mannered (see Table 13).

Table 13

The Most Desirable Characteristics of Teachers' Manner Theme

Item	Total	%
Nice, Kind, Amiable, Outgoing	100	55.56
Respects viewpoints of others	76	42.22
Polite, Well mannered	62	34.44
Sincere, Dependable	45	25.00
Respects students and others	41	22.78
Honest, True, Loyal, Faithful, Devoted	39	21.67
Dignified, Grave, Respectful	26	14.11
Trustable, Trustworthy, Reliable	23	12.78
Modest (humble), Humility, Not egocentric	22	12.22
Forgivable, Tolerant, Not penalize, Doesn't punish	20	11.11

Undesirable. It was clear that these students desired a teacher who behaved nicely toward them. Of the 180 respondents, 57 (32%) reported that being filthy, bawdy, impolite to students, mean, rude, and insulting was undesirable. Also, 52 reported that teachers should not treat students badly. While the term, badly, is somewhat vague, additional responses clearly indicated that these students desired a nice, respectful teacher (see Table 14).

Table 14

The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Teachers' Manner Theme

Item	Total	%
Not sincere	37	20.56
Conceited, Sniffy, Bighead, Boastful, No humility, Stuck-up, Cocky	33	18.33
Not honest or not true, Not faithful, Deceiving, Liar, Not truthful, Hypocrite	29	16.11
Doesn't respect viewpoints, opinions, discussion, or critiques from others	28	15.56
Unforgivable, Intolerant, Punishes	25	13.89
Makes fun of students, Mimics, Sarcastic	24	13.33
Doesn't treat students as adults, Treats them like kids	22	12.22
Doesn't respect students, Disrespectful	21	11.67
Humiliates students	12	6.67

Social Skills/Communication

Desirable. The issue of office hours emerged as a priority with a majority of students. A total of 124 (69%) students responded that having office hours and meeting with students during office hours is desirable. Also, a large number of students, 62 (34%) of 180, reported that teachers should interact with students, although there is no indication of the amount of desired interaction. This was followed by 62 (34%) of 180, who reported that teachers should: (a) communicate with students, (b) connect with students, (c) relate to students, (d) be easy to talk to, (e) talk to students, and (f) be responsive. Several students mentioned the use of email as a desired communication tool (see Table 15).

Table 15

The Most Desirable Characteristics of Social and Communication Theme

Item	Total	%
Has office hours, Meet students in office hours	124	69.89
Approachable at office or by email	116	64.44
Interactive, Interact with students	68	37.78
Communicate with students, Connects, Can relate to students, Relatable, Easy to talk to, Talks to students, Responsive	62	34.44
Treats students and others well	48	26.67
Sociable, Friendly, Has good relationships, good personal connections	43	23.89
Accessible, Has contact information	29	16.11
Knows students' names, Knows majority of students	15	8.33
Treats students like adults	15	8.33
Asks for and responds to feedback and email quickly	11	6.11

Undesirable. The most frequently reported undesirable traits reported by 109 (61%) of the 180 responding students strongly supported the most desired traits. Students reported attitudes of being unapproachable at office or by email as the most undesirable trait. This was followed by 92 (51%) of the 180 respondents, who reported the absence or lack of office hours and lack of communication with students as highly undesirable. Also, 45 (25%) of 180 students identified as undesirable a teacher who did not interact or make conversations with students before, during, or after class (see Table 16). In smaller numbers, the students reported similar traits that reflected their overall desire to interact with their teacher as well as the teacher knowing students' names and quick responses to emails.

Table 16

The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Social and Communication Theme

Item	Total	%
Unapproachable at office and by email	109	60.56
No office hours	92	51.11
No communication with students	60	33.33
Not interactive, Doesn't interact/make conversations with students before/during/after class	45	25.00
Not sociable, Not friendly	29	16.11
Doesn't meet outside of class, Never available	26	14.44
Disconnected with students	21	11.67
Not likable	19	10.56
No contact information, Not accessible	19	10.56
Does not love (hates) students	11	6.11

Personality/Personal Attributes

Desirable. These students reported that they liked help in and out of the classroom. A notable 128 (71%) of 180 students reported “being helpful in and out of the classroom” as the most important personality trait. Also, students desired: (a) support and cooperation (i.e., 104 of 180); (b) understanding (i.e., 94 of 180); (c) fair and unbiased (i.e., 74 of 180); (d) sympathetic, caring, and sensible (i.e., 64 of 180); (e) enthusiastic, passionate [about teaching], and motivated (i.e., 64 of 180); and (f) organized and methodical (i.e., 64 of 180). Other desired traits included: (a) flexible, (b) humorous, (c) encouraging, (d) motivating, (e) hard working, (f) clever, (g) intelligent, (h) thoughtful, and (i) not too strict (see Table 17).

Table 17

The Most Desirable Characteristics of Personality/Personal Attribute Theme

Item	Total	%
Helpful, Helping, Help student, Available for help in and outside class	128	71.11
Cooperative, Supportive	104	57.78
Understanding	94	52.22
Fair, Unbiased, Sees students as equals	74	41.11
Likes teaching, Does not seek money or prestige	65	36.11
Sympathetic, Caring, Sensible	64	35.56
Enthusiastic, Passionate, Excited , Exciting , Passionate/excited about what they teach, Motivated	64	35.56
Organized, Methodical	63	35.00
Loves and enjoys his/her work	45	25.00
Flexible, Resilient	44	24.44

Undesirable. Again, the undesirable traits mirrored the desirable traits. Of the 180 who responded, these students did not desire a teacher who is: (a) apathetic ($n = 69$), (b) unorganized ($n = 59$), (c) uncaring ($n = 58$), (d) unhelpful ($n = 68$), (e) strict ($n = 42$), and (f) only teaches because it is his or her job ($n = 50$; i.e., not interested in teaching). Likewise, many students reported that they do not desire a teacher who: (a) is racist or favors some students over others ($n = 22$), (b) acts as though students have no other classes aside from his/hers ($n = 25$), and (c) does not listen to students ($n = 19$; see Table 18).

Table 18

The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Personality/Personal Attributes Theme

Item	Total	%
Apathetic	69	38.33
Unavailable to help in and outside of class	68	37.78
Not cooperative, Not helpful	61	33.89
Unorganized, Disorganized	59	32.78
Uncaring	58	32.22
Does not like his/her work, Hates job, Not interested in teaching, Is there because it's the job/have to do it	50	27.78
Strict, Rigorous, Too serious, Rigid, Stern	42	23.33
Not available for help	41	22.78
Unfair, Biased	39	21.67
Not understanding, Not sympathetic	28	15.56

Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom

Desirable. The leadership traits, which were listed most frequently, included: (a) on time ($n = 49$), (b) good classroom management and control of student classroom behavior ($n = 34$), and (c) provides guidance and counseling ($n = 22$). However, a few students ($n = 10$) desired a teacher who is: (a) authoritative, (b) dominating, (c) commanding, or (d) ruling (see Table 19).

Undesirable. Numerous students identified specific undesirable traits: (a) late or not on time, not doing work (e.g., grading, $n = 66$); and (b) often absent from class ($n = 55$). For this category of traits, a lower number of students reported on all traits than were reported in other categories (see Table 20).

Table 19

The Most Desirable Characteristics of Leadership/Management Skills Theme

Item	Total	%
On time, Not late	49	27.22
Good management/control of classroom behaviors, Can control students' behavior in class	34	18.89
Provides guidance/consultations, guides, directs	22	12.22
Critically evaluates, Constructive criticism, Positive criticism, Critiques positively, Positive compliments	20	11.11
Strict/stern when needed	17	9.44
Is not absent, Does not cancel classes	17	9.44
A good model	13	7.22
Authoritative, Dominating, Commanding, Ruling	10	5.56
Has leadership skills	8	4.44

Table 20

The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Leadership/Management Skills Theme

Item	Total	%
Not on time, Late in return of student work	66	36.67
Often absent, Cancel classes	55	30.56
Irresponsible	27	15.00
Over critical, Judgmental	25	13.89
Is not a good model, Not inspiring	14	7.78
Gives negative criticism	13	7.22
Cannot manage or handle or control class or students' behaviors in class	12	6.67
Strict attendance policy, Hard to contact	7	3.89
Dependent, Subordinate	4	2.22
Not formidable	2	1.11
Wants to please students	2	1.11

Testing and Grading

Desirable. Of the 180 survey respondents, 84 (47%) reported that fairness was the most desirable trait. In addition, 46 (26%) desired a variety of testing options like: (a) online, (b) take home, and (c) in class. Also, 31 (17%) reported that they preferred useful tests that help students, and 22 (22%) wanted the tests to be clear with no tricky questions or pop quizzes (see Table 21).

Table 21

The Most Desirable Characteristics of Testing and Grading Theme

Item	Total	%
Fair grading and assessment on tests, Grades fairly	84	46.67
Makes various and good ways of testing and grading (e.g., online, take home, in class tests)	46	25.56
Gives useful tests/measures to help student	31	17.22
Clear tests, No unclear or tricky questions/test/pop quizzes	22	12.22
Prepares students for exams	19	10.56
Grades assignments in a timely manner	18	10.00
Fair in timing tests/assignment, Gives enough time/notice for tests /quizzes/assignments, Gives reasonable deadlines/enough time for tests and assignments	15	8.33
Clear about what will be on tests	7	3.89
Does not fail students	3	1.67
Curves tests scores when the class average is poor	2	1.11

Undesirable. Just as fairness was at the top of the list of desirable traits, unfairness was identified by 55 (31%) of the 180 students, who listed it as the least desirable. Similarly, these students did not desire: (a) too difficult tests, which are poorly

formatted; (b) unclear grading methods, and (c) tests that are too easy. These students wanted to be challenged, but fairly (see Table 22).

Table 22

The Most Undesirable Characteristics of Testing and Grading Theme

Item	Total	%
Uses unfair assessment and tests	55	30.56
Unfair grading	45	25.00
Testing and evaluation are done poorly	44	24.44
Gives many low grades, Hard grader	41	22.78
No various ways of testing and grading	35	19.44
Use poor ways of grading	28	15.56
Makes it hard for students to pass the class	24	13.33
Gives too difficult tests	16	8.89
Poor test format	13	7.22

The themes and all of their characteristics are presented in order in Appendix L. The characteristics are listed as they were written by students. As mentioned before, many of the descriptions were the same, similar, or have common characteristics, but they were described in different ways. However, they were modified and reworded in Study 2 in order to develop a clear and understandable instrument for readers and those who answered the scale.

From the previous eight themes, there were two main types of characteristics that described the instructor's characteristics and qualities. These two main types are: (a) pedagogical characteristics, and (b) interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics. The pedagogical characteristics type consisted of several themes: (a) Teaching Style/Skills, (b) Learning Process of Students, (c) Scholarly Teacher, and (d) Testing and Grading.

Thus, this type concerns characteristics related to the profession of teaching, including: (a) application of instruction and learning methods, (b) educational activities, (c) teacher knowledge and expertise, and (d) use of testing and grading techniques. The interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics type included: (a) Manners of Teacher theme, (b) Social Skills/Communication theme, (c) Personality/Personal attribute theme, and (d) Leadership Skills/Managing classroom theme. This type consisted of personal and social traits and their influence on instructors' behaviors with others including: (a) manners, (b) values, (c) social skills, and (d) leadership and managing skills.

Study 2 Results

Study 2 was a quantitative study based upon the current researcher's newly developed scale, the characteristics of Ideal University Instructors (IUI), derived from the described characteristics in Study 1. The IUI instrument consists of 70 items. The items were presented in a Summated rating scale format that included five categories (Always = 5, Often = 4, Sometimes = 3, Rarely = 2, and Never = 1). The procedures of validation and establishment of reliability for the IUI scale are discussed based on the results from the pilot study. The pilot study results are presented in Appendix J. The statistical analysis for Study 2 consisted of items and scale analysis. At the item level, mean response and frequency of responses to each item was investigated. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to examine country and gender differences at the item level. A Bonferroni method was used to keep the level of significance at a constant rate (i.e., to keep the type I error constant). A confirmatory Factor analysis was used to test the unidimensionality of the scale, and Mokken analysis was only conducted in the scale to construct IUI scale for each sample,

and to identify a brief hierarchical scale. The ANOVA and correlations were used to identify any significant influences of independent variables on the perspectives of ideal university instructors.

Item Level Analyses

Descriptive Analysis

The mean of each item was examined and presented in Table 23 for gender including Saudi males, Saudi females, U.S. males, U.S. females, and for country including Saudi, U.S., and Combined data. The presentation of the mean scores for the items provided a better understanding of the data because it illustrated the order of desired or endorsed items and the similarities of means values among genders and countries results. As can be seen, the ordering of the items are similar for both gender and country.

Table 23

Mean Values for Each Item

Item	Gender				Country		
	Saudi Female	Saudi Male	U.S. Female	U.S. Male	Saudi	U.S.	Combined
1	4.21	4.18	4.64	4.61	4.19	4.63	4.34
2	4.20	4.23	4.73	4.66	4.22	4.71	4.39
3	4.30	4.24	4.61	4.60	4.26	4.61	4.39
4	4.42	4.35	4.67	4.57	4.38	4.64	4.47
5	4.18	4.12	4.75	4.65	4.15	4.72	4.34
6	4.04	4.08	4.47	4.52	4.07	4.49	4.21
7	1.36	1.50	1.27	1.50	1.44	1.34	1.31
8	1.38	1.49	1.46	1.57	1.45	1.45	1.46
9	4.18	4.10	4.05	4.05	4.13	4.05	4.11
10	4.57	4.49	4.57	4.58	4.52	4.57	4.54
11	4.48	4.29	4.77	4.70	4.37	4.75	4.50
12	4.41	4.35	4.76	4.74	4.38	4.76	4.50
13	4.32	4.17	3.50	3.55	4.23	3.51	3.99
14	3.83	3.85	4.18	4.09	3.84	4.16	3.95
15	1.99	2.25	2.12	2.12	2.15	2.13	2.14
16	2.81	2.98	2.04	2.10	2.91	2.06	2.62
17	4.60	4.53	4.75	4.69	4.56	4.73	4.62
18	3.62	3.46	2.86	3.00	3.52	2.90	3.31
19	1.73	1.86	1.40	1.55	1.81	1.44	1.68
20	4.62	4.53	4.84	4.80	4.57	4.83	4.66
21	4.17	4.26	4.20	4.26	4.23	4.22	4.22
22	4.69	4.56	4.76	4.71	4.62	4.74	4.66
23	4.52	4.48	4.72	4.77	4.50	4.74	4.58
24	4.32	4.38	4.53	4.56	4.36	4.54	4.42
25	3.81	3.86	3.52	3.50	3.84	3.51	3.73
26	4.17	4.21	4.57	4.61	4.19	4.58	4.32
27	3.78	3.86	4.27	4.11	3.83	4.22	3.96
28	2.08	2.24	2.34	2.32	2.18	2.33	2.23
29	3.77	3.76	3.74	3.86	3.77	3.78	3.77
30	4.10	4.14	4.21	4.33	4.12	4.25	4.17
31	4.19	4.23	4.45	4.47	4.21	4.46	4.29
32	4.43	4.34	4.81	4.65	4.38	4.76	4.51
33	4.28	4.14	4.46	4.41	4.19	4.44	4.28

Table 23 (cont.)

Mean Values for Each Item

Item	Gender				Country		
	Saudi Female	Saudi Male	U.S. Female	U.S. Male	Saudi	U.S.	Combined
34	4.30	4.15	4.17	4.25	4.21	4.20	4.21
35	4.31	4.26	4.69	4.68	4.28	4.69	4.42
36	4.47	4.40	4.57	4.55	4.43	4.56	4.47
37	4.51	4.40	4.69	4.66	4.45	4.68	4.53
38	4.56	4.50	4.72	4.68	4.53	4.71	4.59
39	4.53	4.46	4.62	4.64	4.49	4.63	4.54
40	4.75	4.68	4.84	4.78	4.71	4.82	4.75
41	4.49	4.48	4.69	4.81	4.48	4.73	4.57
42	4.54	4.46	4.68	4.69	4.49	4.68	4.56
43	4.53	4.51	4.43	4.45	4.51	4.44	4.49
44	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.28	4.31	4.27	4.29
45	4.50	4.42	4.56	4.50	4.45	4.54	4.48
46	4.63	4.63	4.55	4.56	4.63	4.56	4.60
47	4.56	4.53	4.29	4.32	4.54	4.30	4.46
48	1.35	1.55	1.37	1.55	1.47	1.43	1.46
49	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.15	4.16	4.17	4.16
50	4.43	4.43	4.57	4.47	4.43	4.54	4.47
51	4.54	4.45	4.76	4.70	4.49	4.74	4.57
52	4.76	4.65	4.80	4.78	4.66	4.79	4.70
53	4.41	4.38	4.57	4.60	4.39	4.58	4.46
54	4.55	4.50	3.80	3.94	4.52	3.85	4.30
55	1.59	1.72	1.14	1.27	1.67	1.18	1.50
56	4.42	4.43	4.42	4.37	4.43	4.40	4.42
57	4.60	4.54	4.52	4.42	4.56	4.49	4.54
58	4.29	4.28	4.39	4.37	4.28	4.38	4.32
59	4.51	4.39	4.40	4.49	4.44	4.42	4.43
60	4.69	4.62	4.80	4.77	4.65	4.79	4.70
61	4.53	4.39	4.57	4.46	4.44	4.53	4.47
62	3.66	3.71	4.06	3.91	3.69	4.01	3.80
63	4.56	4.42	4.37	4.36	4.47	4.37	4.44
64	4.62	4.56	4.58	4.57	4.58	4.58	4.58
65	1.48	1.59	1.74	1.68	1.54	1.72	1.60
66	4.53	4.48	4.79	4.76	4.50	4.72	4.60

Table 23 (cont.)

Mean Values for Each Item

Item	Gender				Country		
	Saudi Female	Saudi Male	U.S. Female	U.S. Male	Saudi	U.S.	Combined
67	4.36	4.45	4.71	4.67	4.41	4.70	4.51
68	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.50	4.48	4.50
69	4.66	4.58	4.42	4.40	4.62	4.41	4.55
70	4.58	4.46	4.66	4.63	4.51	4.65	4.56

Correlation Analysis

From Table 23, the similarities among these data are noticeable, and the differences are small. To test the strength of the similarities of mean score responses for gender and country, a correlation test was conducted. The correlation results are presented in Table 24.

Table 24

Correlation Matrix of Mean Ratings for the 70 items for Gender and Country

	Saudi Males	Saudi Females	U.S. Males	U.S. Females
Saudi Males	1.000			
Saudi Females	.997	1.000		
U.S. Males	.967	.963	1.000	
U.S. Females	.961	.958	.998	1.000

The high correlations between gender and country in the previous table indicated

strong similarities in responses between Saudi males, Saudi females, U.S. males, U.S. females, Saudi students, U.S. students, and the Combined samples. The correlation between the ratings for Male Saudi students, Female Saudi students, Male U.S. students, and Female U.S. students were very high (see Table 24); all were above .95. Even though the ratings were highly correlated, there may still be differences in absolute ratings for males and females.

ANOVA Analysis

To examine gender and country differences in response to each of the items, 70 Gender X Country ANOVAs were conducted. Due to the large number of tests, Bonferroni's adjustments were conducted to keep the level of significance at the .05 level. Even with the adjustments, given the relatively large sample size, a comparison may be significant, but the magnitude of the effect may be trivial. Accordingly, the magnitude of the effect was examined as well. Cohen's *d* was calculated for each comparison, with the Cohen's standard of: (a) small (i.e., *d* between .20 and .49); (b) medium (i.e., *d* between .50 and .79); and (c) large (i.e., *d* greater .80). In the case of the interaction term, the magnitude was estimated by eta-square.

There were no significant Gender by Country interactions. The magnitude of the interactions were all small, with the largest eta-square being only .004. That is, only .04% of the variance could be attributed to the interaction.

Also, there were few significant gender effects. Only two items were statistically significant at the .05 level, and even here, the magnitudes were trivial. Females rated Item 17 (i.e., Humiliate Students) and Item 18 (i.e., Neglectful) more negatively than did

males. None of the other items had even a small effect size.

In contrast, there were 36 items with significant country effect. Yet most of the differences were small; only 5 items had a moderate effect size. For Items 54 (i.e., Modest), Item 13 (i.e., Gives extra credit for more effort), Item 16 (i.e., Relies on one way of teaching), and Item 18 (i.e., Requires few assignments), the Saudi Students assigned higher ratings than the U.S. students; but for Item 5 (i.e., Approachable during office hours), U.S. students assigned higher ratings. The other items are displayed in Table 25. The previous results addressed Questions 4 and 5 of the study.

Frequency Analysis

The frequency of each statement or item was examined for each country. The frequencies for all categories (i.e., Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely, and Never) and items for Saudi, U.S., and Combined data are presented in Appendices M, N, and O. The frequencies of Always and Never categories from the three data sets are presented in tables since they represent desirable and undesirable characteristics (see Appendices P, Q, and R).

Due to the large number of characteristics and frequencies, the focus is on the first 10 higher frequency result and their percentage of: (a) the Always category, which represents the desired characteristics of ideal instructor; (b) the Sometimes category, which represents the neutral or controversial characteristics between desired and undesired or not applied to ideal or poor instructor; and (c) the Never category, which represents undesired characteristics. The number of items in some categories may have

Table 25

Items with at Least Small Difference and Statistical Significance by Country

Items	Cohen's d	Country with Highest Score
54 Modest	0.70	Saudi
13 Gives extra credit for more effort	0.63	Saudi
16 Relies on one way of teaching	0.59	Saudi
5 Approachable during office hours	0.56	U.S.
18 Requires few assignments	0.55	Saudi
2 Cares about students' performance	0.48	U.S.
6 Provided positive criticism	0.46	U.S.
1 Prepares students for examinations	0.44	U.S.
12 Gives clear feedback	0.44	U.S.
35 Challenges students to do their best	0.43	U.S.
55 Discriminates against some students	0.42	Saudi
11 Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	0.39	U.S.
66 Knowledgeable	0.38	U.S.
32 Provides a clear syllabus	0.36	U.S.
67 Intelligent	0.36	U.S.
26 Able to hold students' attention	0.35	U.S.
41 Like teaching	0.35	U.S.
47 Energetic	0.29	Saudi
69 Expert in field	0.28	Saudi
14 Knows students' names	0.27	U.S.
25 Prepares different forms for examinations	0.27	Saudi
31 Helps students to expand their ideas	0.26	U.S.
37 Motivates students to learn	0.26	U.S.
4 A good listener	0.26	U.S.
62 Strict when needed	0.26	U.S.
42 Answers students' questions inside and outside class	0.24	U.S.
27 Uses various teaching methods	0.23	U.S.
3 Improves her/his teaching skills	0.23	U.S.
23 Encourages thinking	0.22	U.S.
24 Good management of classroom behaviors	0.22	U.S.
33 Connects topic to students' knowledge	0.22	U.S.
19 Questions on the examinations are unclear	0.21	Saudi
20 Grades fairly	0.21	U.S.
51 Effective teacher	0.21	U.S.
17 Treats students well	0.20	U.S.
38 Well prepared	0.20	Saudi

more than 10 items or characteristics, because if 2 items have the same frequency, they have the same rank or order. Only countries are compared, since there was no significant gender by country differences, and few gender differences.

Frequency of response in Saudi Arabian sample. The Saudi university students described the 10 most preferred characteristics of ideal university instructor as: (a) respect students and peers (80.68%), (b) fair (77.85%), (c) honest (76.86%), (d) grades fairly (73.74%), (e) explains materials clearly (73.18%), (f) confident (72.47%), (g) understanding (71.90%), (h) expert in field (70.98%), (i) provides clearly formatted tests (69.92%), and (j) treats students well (69.71%). These characteristics represented various themes that were found in Study 1. These themes included: (a) manners and personality/ personal attributes (i.e., 3 characteristics); (b) testing and grading (i.e., 2 characteristics); and (c) teaching style/skills and scholarly (1 characteristic; see Table 26).

Table 26

The 10 Always Characteristics for Saudi Students

Item	Frequency (%)	Theme
Respect students and peers	1,140 (80.68%)	Manners
Fair	1,100 (77.85%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Honest	1,086 (76.86%)	Manners
Grades fairly	1,042 (73.74%)	Testing and Grading
Explains materials clearly	1,024 (73.18%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Confident	1,016 (71.90%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Understanding	1,016 (71.90%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Expert in field	1,003 (70.98%)	Scholarly
Provides clearly formatted tests	988 (69.92%)	Testing and Grading
Treats students well	985 (69.71%)	Manners

The Saudi students identified the 10 characteristics that could be seen between

preferred or not preferred, but which did not depict ideal or bad instructor. These characteristics were: (a) requires few assignments (35.95%), (b) strict when needed (26.04%), (c) prepares different forms for examinations (24.35%), (d) relies on one way of teaching (23.50%), (e) punishes students strictly (23.21%), (f) tests are too difficult (23%), (g) applies technology in teaching (22.93%), (h) knows students' names (22.01%), (i) provides study direction to students (19.39%), and (j) uses various teaching methods (19.11%). Most of these characteristics were from: (a) the Teaching Style/Skills theme (i.e., 5 characteristics), (b) the Testing and Grading theme (i.e., 2 characteristics); and Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom, Manners, and Social Skills/Communication themes (i.e., 1 characteristic; see Table 27).

Table 27

The 10 Sometimes Characteristics for Saudi Students

Item	Frequency (%)	Theme
Requires few assignments	508 (35.95%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Strict when needed	388 (26.04%)	Leadership Skills/ Managing Classroom
Prepares difference forms for exams	344 (24.35%)	Testing and Grading
Relies on one way of teaching	332 (23.50%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Punishes students strictly	328 (23.00%)	Manners
Tests are too difficult	325 (23.00%)	Testing and Grading
Applies technology in teaching	324 (22.93%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Knows students' names	311 (22.01%)	Social Skills/Communications
Provides study directions to students	274 (19.39%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Uses various teaching methods	270 (19.11%)	Teaching Style/Skills

Also, the Saudi students identified the undesirable characteristics that the ideal instructor should never have. These 10 characteristics are: (a) insults students (73.04%),

(b) neglectful of responsibilities (71.90%), (c) provides confusing information (70.84%), (d) is moody (66.53%), (e) discriminates against some students (65.25%), (f) questions on the exams are unclear (56.48%), (g) tests are too difficult (38.71%), (h) punishes students strictly (34.39%), (i) relies on one way of teaching (23.28%), and (j) strict when needed (6.37%). Two characteristics were from Manners, Teaching Style/ Skills, Personality/Personal attribute, and Testing and Grading themes, and 1 characteristic from Learning Process and Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom themes (see Table 28).

Table 28

The 10 Never Characteristics for Saudi Students

Item	Frequency (%)	Theme
Insults students	1,032 (73.04%)	Manners
Neglectful of responsibilities	1,016 (71.90%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Provides confusing information	1,001 (70.84%)	Learning Process
Is moody	940 (66.53%)	Personality Personal Attribute
Discriminates against some students	922 (65.25%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Questions on exams are unclear	798 (56.48%)	Testing and Grading
Tests are too difficult	547 (38.71%)	Testing and Grading
Punishes students strictly	486 (34.39%)	Testing and Grading
Relies on one way of teaching	329 (23.28%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Strict when needed	90 (6.37%)	Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom

It should be noted that four of the items (e.g., relies on one way of teaching, strict when needed, tests are too difficult, and punishes students strictly) were in both the Sometimes and Never categories. These characteristics were near the top 10 in the Sometimes category and at the end of top 10 characteristics in the Never category. This result indicates that these characteristics are controversial and, sometimes, can be perceived as

acceptable characteristics in an ideal instructor by some people, while others consider them as never acceptable and are not desirable characteristics in an ideal instructor.

Frequency of response in U.S. sample. The U.S students identified the 10 characteristics for their ideal instructor as: (a) grades fairly (86.27%); (b) respects students and peers (83.75%); (c) honest (81.79%); (d) fair (81.65%); (e) provides a clear syllabus (81.09%); (f) gives clear feedback (79.69%); (g) knowledgeable (78.57%); (h) explains materials clearly (77.59%); (i) provides sufficient time for tests and assignments (77.31%); and (j) approachable during office hours, encourages thinking, and effective teacher (76.19%). Of these items, 4 characteristics were from the Teaching Style/Skills theme, 2 from Testing and Grading theme, 2 characteristics from Manners theme, 1 from Personality/Personal attribute theme, 1 from Scholarly theme, 1 from Social Skills/Communication theme, and 1 from Learning Process theme (see Table 29).

Table 29

The 10 Always Characteristics for U.S. Students

Item	Frequency (%)	Theme
Grades fairly	616 (86.27%)	Testing and Grading
Respects students and peers	598 (83.75%)	Manners
Honest	584 (81.79%)	Manners
Fair	583 (81.65%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Provides a clear syllabus	595 (81.09%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Gives clear feedback	569 (79.69%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Knowledgeable	561 (78.57%)	Scholarly
Explains materials clearly	554 (77.59%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	552 (77.31%)	Testing and Grading
Approachable during office hours	544 (76.19%)	Social Skills/Communication
Encourages thinking	544 (76.19%)	Learning Process
Effective teacher	544 (76.19%)	Teaching Style/Skills

Also, the U.S. students identified characteristics that can be found Sometimes in the ideal university instructor. These 10 characteristics were: (a) requires few assignments (60.50%), (b) gives extra credit for more effort (43.70%), (c) prepares different forms for examinations (38.52%), (d) punishes students strictly (35.71%), (e) applies technology in teaching (34.03%), (f) modest (33.61%), (g) tests are too difficult (28.99%), (h) strict when needed (22.27%), (i) relies on one way of teaching (21.43%), and (j) willing to consider students' life circumstances (20.73%). There were: (a) 4 items for Teaching Style/Skills theme, (b) 2 for the Manners theme, (c) 2 for the Testing and Grading theme, (d) 1 for the Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom theme, and (e) 1 for the Personality/Personal attribute theme (see Table 30).

Table 30

The 10 Sometimes Characteristics for U.S. Students

Item	Frequency (%)	Theme
Requires few assignments	432 (60.50%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Gives extra credit for more effort	312 (43.70%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Prepares different forms for examinations	275 (38.52%)	Testing and Grading
Punishes students strictly	255 (38.52%)	Manners
Applies technology in teaching	243 (33.61%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Modest	240 (33.61%)	Manners
Tests are too difficult	207 (28.99%)	Testing and Grading
Strict when needed	159 (22.27%)	Leadership Skills/ Managing Classroom
Relies on one way of teaching	153 (21.43%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Willing to consider students' life circumstances	148 (20.74%)	Personality/Personal Attribute

For the U.S. students, the 10 undesirable characteristics for an ideal university instructor were: (a) discriminates against some students (85.43%), (b) insults students (73.81%), (c) neglectful of responsibilities (65.41%), (d) questions on the exams are unclear (65.13%), (e) provides confusing information (62.46%), (f) is moody (37.11%), (g) relies on one way of teaching (28.57%), (h) tests are too difficult (24.09%), (i) punishes students strictly (19.61%), and (j) prepares different forms for examinations (2.66%). Of these items, 3 were from the Testing and Grading theme, 2 were from the Personality/Personal attribute theme, 2 were from the Manners theme, 2 were from the Teaching Style/Skills theme, and 1 from the Learning Process theme (see Table 31).

Table 31

The 10 Never Characteristics for U.S. Students

Item	Frequency (%)	Theme
Discriminates against some students	610 (85.43%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Insults students	527 (73.81%)	Manners
Neglectful of responsibilities	467 (65.41%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Questions on the exams are unclear	465 (37.11%)	Testing and Grading
Provides confusing information	446 (62.46%)	Learning Process
Is moody	265 (37.11%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Relies on one way of teaching	204 (28.57%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Tests are too difficult	172 (24.09%)	Testing and Grading
Punishes students strictly	140 (19.61%)	Manners
Prepares different forms for exams	19 (1.66%)	Testing and Grading

Also, the U.S. students reported that four items (e.g., relies on one way of teaching, tests are too difficult, punishes students strictly, and prepares different forms for examinations) as being in the Sometimes as well as the Never categories. Some U.S. students considered these characteristics as those of an ideal instructor, and others believed that these characteristics could not depict an ideal university instructor.

Frequency of response in the Combined sample. The students from both countries identified the ideal university instructor's 10 items as: (a) respect students and peers (81.71%), (b) fair (79.13%), (c) honest (78.51%), (d) grades fairly (77.95%), (e) explains materials clearly (74.66%), (f) treats students well (71.70%), (g) provides clearly formatted tests (70.38%), (h) well prepared (70.15%), (i) encourages thinking (69.49%), and (j) confident (69.25%). Two of these items were from the Manners theme, 2 from the Personality/Personal attribute theme, 2 from the Testing and Grading theme, 1 from the

Teaching Style/Skills theme, 1 from the Scholarly theme, and 1 from the Learning Process theme (see Table 32).

Table 32

The 10 Always Characteristics for the Combined Sample

Item	Frequency (%)	Theme
Respect students and peers	1,738 (81.71%)	Manners
Fair	1,683 (79.13%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Honest	1, 670 (78.51%)	Manners
Grades fairly	1, 658 (77.95%)	Testing and Grading
Explains materials clearly	1, 588 (74.66%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Treats students well	1,525 (71.70%)	Manners
Provides clearly formatted tests	1,497 (70.38%)	Testing and Grading
Well prepared	1,492 (70.15%)	Scholarly
Encourages thinking	1,478 (69.49%)	Learning Process
Confident	1,473 (69.25%)	Personality/Personal Attribute

The 10 items identified in the Sometimes category by the Combined students were: (a) requires few assignments (44.19%), (b) prepares different forms for examinations (29.10%), (c) punishes students strictly (27.41%), (d) applies technology in teaching (26.66%), (e) tests are too difficult (25.01%), (f) strict when needed (24.78%), (g) gives extra credit for more effort (23.27%), (h) relies on one way of teaching (22.80%), (i) knows students' names (20.78%), and (j) provides study direction to students (18.99%). There were 5 items from the Teaching Style/Skills theme, 2 from the Testing and Grading theme, 1 from the Manners theme, 1 from the Leadership Skills/

Managing Classroom theme, and 1 from the Social Skills/Communication theme (see Table 33).

Table 33

The 10 Sometimes Characteristics for Combined Sample

Item	Frequency (%)	Theme
Requires few assignments	940 (44.19%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Prepares different forms for examinations	619 (29.10%)	Testing and Grading
Punishes students strictly	583 (27.41%)	Manners
Applies technology in teaching	567 (25.01%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Tests are too difficult	532 (25.01%)	Testing and Grading
Strict when needed	527 (24.78%)	Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom
Gives extra credit for more effort	495 (23.27%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Relies on one way of teaching	485 (22.80%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Knows students' names	442 (20.78%)	Social Skills/Communication
Provides study direction to students	404 (18.99%)	Teaching Style/Skills

For the Combined sample, the most frequently identified 10 items of the Never category were: (a) insults students (73.30%), (b) discriminates against some students (72.03%), (c) neglectful of responsibilities (69.72%), (d) provides confusing information (68.03%), (e) questions on the exams are unclear (59.38%), (f) is moody (56.65%), (g) tests are too difficult (33.80%), (h) punishes students strictly (29.43%), (j) relies on one way of teaching (25.06%), and (j) strict when needed (4.33%). There were 2 items from the Manners theme, 2 from the Personality/Personal attribute theme, 2 from the Teaching Style/Skills theme, 2 from the Testing and Grading theme, 1 from the Learning Process theme, and 1 from the Leadership Skills/ Managing classroom theme (see Table 34).

Table 34

The 10 Never Characteristics for the Combined Sample

Item	Frequency (%)	Theme
Insults students	1,559 (73.30%)	Manners
Discriminates against some students	1,532 (72.03%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Neglectful of responsibilities	1,483 (69.03%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Provides confusing information	1,447 (68.03%)	Learning Process
Questions on the exams are unclear	1,263 (59.38%)	Testing and Grading
Is moody	1,205 (56.65%)	Personality/Personal Attribute
Tests are too difficult	719 (33.80%)	Testing and Grading
Punishes students strictly	626 (29.43%)	Manners
Relies on one way of teaching	533 (25.06%)	Teaching Style/Skills
Strict when needed	92 (4.33%)	Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom

In a comparison of the Combined Saudi and U.S. data for the Always items, there were five similar items: (a) respect students and peers, (b) fair, (c) honest, (d) grades fairly, and (e) explains materials clearly. Items, which were found only in the Saudi data, were: (a) confident, (b) understanding, (c) expert in field, (d) provides clearly formatted tests, and (e) treats students well. The items, which were found only in the U.S. data, were: (a) provides a clear syllabus, (b) gives clear feedback, (c) knowledgeable, (d) provides sufficient time for tests and assignments, (e) approachable during office hours, (f) encourages thinking, and (g) effective teacher.

The students from Saudi Arabia and the U.S. had similar responses in regard to the themes of Personal and Manners, but they had different opinions about pedagogy, like teaching, learning, and testing, which represented the nature of teaching in each country. For example, none of the Saudi students selected the items, no provided syllabus, office

hours, and feedback, because the Saudi students are not used to these characteristics. Also, in the Sometimes category, 7 of 10 items were identified by students in each country. The undesirable characteristics were almost identical; only 1 characteristic of the 10 was different in each country.

The preceding frequency results answer Research Question 2. Also, comparisons between data were investigated to clarify the similarities between the U.S. and Saudi data. In a comparison of the Saudi and U.S. data for the combined data, items from both countries, items from one country, and a new item were found in the combined data. In the Always category, five items were found in both countries: (a) respect students and peers, (b) fair, (c) honest, (d) grades fairly, and (e) explains materials clearly. Three items were found only in the Saudi data: (a) treats students well, (b) provides clearly formatted tests, and (c) confident. Only one item from the U.S. results was found in the combined data, which was, encourages thinking, and one new item which was not found in either country was, Well prepared.

In the Sometimes category, there were more common items from the two data sets in the Combined data. There were seven items from the two countries in the Combined data: (a) requires few assignments, (b) prepares different forms for examinations, (c) punishes students strictly, (d) applies technology in teaching, (e) tests are too difficult, (f) strict when needed, and (g) relies on one way of teaching. Only two items from the Saudi data were found in the combined data: (a) knows students' names and (b) provides study direction to students; only one item from the U.S. data were found, Knows students' names. In the Never category, the items were almost identical to the Never category in

the Saudi and U.S. data. Nine items in the Saudi and U.S. data were found in the combined data. Only one item from the Saudi data were found in the combined data, which was, Strict when needed.

Scale Level Analysis

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Confirmatory factory analysis was used to investigate whether the ratings of the ideal professor were unidimensional. The confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with LISREL Version 8.8 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2006). Model fit was determined by two sets of indices with different measurement properties. Two measures of incremental fit were included, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and two based upon a residuals-based fit index, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). An acceptable fit (Schreiber, Stage, King, Nora, & Barlow, 2006) to the proposed model is suggested if the CFI and TLI are greater than .95, and the SRMR and the RMSEA are less than .08.

The fit of the unidimensional model was satisfactory for the total sample, Saudi sample, and U.S. sample. The fit for the total sample was satisfactory (RMSEA = .073; SRMR = .048; CFI = 0.976; Tucker & Lewis Index = 0.976). Also, the fit for the Saudi sample was satisfactory (RMSEA = .069; SRMR = .045; CFI = 0.980; Tucker & Lewis Index = 0.976). In addition, the fit for the U.S. sample was satisfactory (RMSEA = .079; SRMR = .061; CFI = 0.955; Tucker & Lewis Index = 0.940).

Mokken Scale Analysis

Mokken scale analysis is a type of non-parametric Item Response Theory (NIRT). It was used to answer Research Question 3. It is an appropriate method to order the characteristics of ideal university instructor in a hierarchical classification which serves the purpose of the study in finding the most desired to less desired traits of an ideal university instructor. As mentioned in Chapter II, the ideal instructor should have a list of characteristics; at the same time, Mokken analysis can help to find hierarchical order of this list and determine that the top characteristic requires the presence of other characteristics in an ideal university instructor. That means each characteristic necessitates the presence of previous characteristics; therefore, characteristics from top to bottom are in sequential order and necessary to be present in an ideal instructor. In general, Mokken analysis is a model or method of the measurement theory that can construct items of a scale in a hierarchical order.

The data from the Saudi and U.S. samples were analyzed by use of the Mokken Scale Program (MSPWin 5.0; Molenaar, Van Schuur, Sijtsma, & Mokken, 2002). This program was used to conduct an exploratory method of the Mokken scale analysis and classified items that fit with the Mokken scale analyses and assumptions; it excludes items that do not meet its assumptions. The Loevinger's scalability coefficient H value of .35 was used to examine the homogeneity and unidimensionality of the items and the scale. The items were examined in steps until the Loevinger scalability coefficient H reached the lower bound (i.e., cutoff) value of 0.35, so the items lower than $H < .35$ and negative H values were excluded from the scale. Results from both samples and

combined data are presented to show the ideal characteristics in a hierarchical arrangement for each country and from the total sample of the study.

Saudi Arabian Data

The MSP program was used to examine the Saudi data and resulted in 57 items, which can structure the IUI scale based on the Mokken scale analysis (see Table 35). The scale has a high reliability of .98 and scale coefficient H of .45. The hierarchical order of 57 items that structured the IUI scale for the Saudi sample are presented and listed in Table 35 with the H and Z value of each item.

Table 35

Constructed IUI from the Mokken Analysis of the Saudi Data

Item #	Item Description	H Value	Z Value
40	Respects students and peers	0.52	122.78
52	Honest	0.52	128.49
60	Fair	0.52	126.81
46	Confident	0.37	94.44
22	Explains materials clearly	0.54	134.53
69	Expert in field	0.43	113.08
64	Understanding	0.53	135.70
20	Grades fairly	0.40	99.47
57	A good speaker	0.45	117.26
17	Treats students well	0.48	121.37
47	Energetic	0.46	124.17
38	Well prepared	0.50	129.12
10	Hard working	0.44	114.19
54	Modest	0.45	128.68
43	Interacts with students	0.47	123.97
70	Provides clearly formatted tests	0.52	133.21
66	Knowledgeable	0.38	97.94
68	Organized	0.43	111.98
23	Encourages thinking	0.50	131.37
42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	0.38	97.76
39	Sets clear goals of teaching	0.49	126.61
51	Effective teacher	0.52	135.39
41	Likes teaching	0.36	94.74
63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	0.46	121.03
45	Friendly	0.51	133.88
37	Motivates students to learn	0.50	131.99
61	Student assignments are reasonable	0.43	113.42
59	Able to simplify concepts	0.53	138.78
50	On time to class	0.36	94.70
56	Enthusiastic	0.44	115.66
36	Focused while teaching	0.49	127.69
67	Intelligent	0.38	97.73
53	Makes class interesting	0.55	145.39
32	Provides a clear syllabus	0.45	117.96
4	A good listener	0.40	105.72
12	Gives clear feedback	0.43	112.68
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	0.40	105.04
24	Good management of classroom behaviors	0.35	90.43

Table 35 (cont.)

Constructed IUI from the Mokken Analysis of the Saudi Data

Item #	Item Description	<i>H</i> Value	<i>Z</i> Value
44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	0.50	129.70
58	A creative teacher	0.50	130.36
35	Challenges students to do their best	0.52	135.89
3	Improves her/his teaching skills	0.45	118.43
13	Gives extra credit for more effort	0.36	98.20
2	Cares about students' performance	0.41	107.56
34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	0.49	127.67
31	Helps students to expand their ideas	0.51	131.21
33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	0.42	108.88
1	Prepares students for examination	0.36	91.87
26	Able to hold students' attention	0.50	132.68
49	Flexible	0.42	104.91
5	Approachable during office hours	0.35	91.39
9	Provides study direction to students	0.36	88.64
30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	0.44	109.74
6	Provides positive criticism	0.35	88.09
14	Knows students' names	0.37	91.48
27	Uses various teaching methods	0.41	104.89
29	Applies technology in teaching	0.40	99.56

Note. Total number of items = 57; reliability of scale = .98; coefficient *H* of scale = .45.

U.S. Data

The U.S. data resulted in 43 items to construct the IUI scale. The scale had a high reliability of .96 and scale coefficient *H* of .41. In sequence, the items are listed in Table 36.

Table 36

Constructed IUI from the Mokken Analysis of U.S. Data

Item #	Item Description	H Value	Z Value
20	Grades fairly	0.42	53.43
40	Respects students and peers	0.46	60.75
52	Honest	0.40	53.66
60	Fair	0.43	57.21
66	Knowledgeable	0.41	56.33
32	Provides a clear syllabus	0.39	54.81
12	Gives clear feedback	0.38	58.78
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	0.41	61.23
51	Effective teacher	0.48	69.43
22	Explains materials clearly	0.51	71.63
23	Encourages thinking	0.40	56.57
17	Treats students well	0.46	65.49
41	Likes teaching	0.41	58.24
38	Well prepared	0.47	68.66
67	Intelligent	0.35	54.08
35	Challenges students to do their best	0.33	54.59
42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	0.42	61.21
37	Motivates students to learn	0.48	71.15
70	Provides clearly formatted tests	0.42	63.67
4	A good listener	0.38	57.97
39	Sets clear goals of teaching	0.47	68.91
53	Makes class interesting	0.42	64.71
26	Able to hold students' attention	0.45	69.59
64	Understanding	0.43	69.62
10	Hard working	0.40	61.57
36	Focused while teaching	0.41	61.88
45	Friendly	0.42	62.77
24	Good management of classroom behaviors	0.38	59.14
61	Students assignments are reasonable	0.39	59.55
57	A good speaker	0.38	55.82
6	Provides positive criticism	0.37	56.56
68	Organized	0.41	62.57
31	Helps students to expand their ideas	0.39	57.05
33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	0.40	57.74
43	Interacts with students	0.44	64.12
59	Able to simplify concepts	0.37	54.20
56	Enthusiastic	0.46	66.45
58	A creative teacher	0.45	64.80

Table 36 (cont.)

Constructed IUI from the Mokken Analysis of U.S. Data

Item #	Item Description	<i>H</i> Value	<i>Z</i> Value
63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	0.37	57.15
47	Energetic	0.40	60.61
44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	0.42	57.66
30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	0.35	46.02
49	Flexible	0.45	59.13

Note. Total number of items = 43; reliability of scale = .96; coefficient *H* of scale = .41.

Combined Data

The combined data from both samples resulted in 55 items to construct the IUI scale. Also, the scale had a high reliability of .97 and scale coefficient *H* of .44. All of the items in the Saudi data were found in the combined data except two items: Gives extra credit for more effort, and Provides study direction to students. The hierarchical order of the 55 items is presented in Table 37. The combined data results and the *H* and *Z* values for each item are presented in Table 37.

Table 37

The Constructed IUI from the Mokken Analysis of the Combined Data

Item #	Item Description	H Value	Z Value
40	Respects students and peers	0.51	142.35
52	Honest	0.51	146.04
60	Fair	0.51	145.35
22	Explains materials clearly	0.53	156.42
20	Grades fairly	0.41	117.74
17	Treats students well	0.47	142.52
46	Confident	0.39	105.48
66	Knowledgeable	0.39	118.30
38	Well prepared	0.50	151.28
64	Understanding	0.51	155.05
23	Encourages thinking	0.49	150.22
51	Effective teacher	0.52	158.45
41	Likes teaching	0.38	115.71
42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	0.39	118.26
70	Provides clearly formatted tests	0.50	152.70
69	Expert in field	0.37	113.65
10	Hard working	0.43	141.58
57	A good speaker	0.43	130.18
39	Sets clear goals of teaching	0.48	148.47
37	Motivates students to learn	0.50	155.35
32	Provides a clear syllabus	0.45	137.22
67	Intelligent	0.38	117.64
12	Gives clear feedback	0.43	132.70
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	0.41	126.06
68	Organized	0.42	128.66
43	Interacts with students	0.45	139.79
45	Friendly	0.49	153.16
61	Student assignments are reasonable	0.42	131.67
36	Focused while teaching	0.48	147.66
50	On time to class	0.36	109.72
4	A good listener	0.40	125.78
47	Energetic	0.43	133.20
53	Makes class interesting	0.53	164.64
63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	0.43	132.72
59	Able to simplify concepts	0.49	151.57
56	Enthusiastic	0.44	134.97
24	Good management of classroom behaviors	0.36	110.73
35	Challenges students to do their best	0.50	154.33

Table 37 (cont.)

The Constructed IUI from the Mokken Analysis of the Combined Data

Item #	Item Description	<i>H</i> Value	<i>Z</i> Value
2	Cares about students' performance	0.41	127.16
3	Improves her/his teaching skills	0.44	136.46
1	Prepares students for examination	0.35	109.25
5	Approachable during office hours	0.36	110.25
26	Able to hold students' attention	0.50	155.89
58	A creative teacher	0.49	150.80
54	Modest	0.37	112.03
44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	0.48	144.76
31	Helps students to expand their ideas	0.50	150.10
33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	0.43	129.90
6	Provides positive criticism	0.37	108.57
34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	0.46	139.21
30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	0.43	124.63
49	Flexible	0.43	122.66
27	Uses various teaching methods	0.41	122.89
14	Knows students' names	0.36	105.60
29	Applies technology in teaching	0.36	106.76

Note. Total number of items = 55; reliability of scale = .97; coefficient *H* of scale = .44.

The scale in the three data sets (i.e., Saudi, U.S., and Combined data), which were acquired from the Mokken analyses are unidimensional, and approve the assumption of monotonicity, because they all obtained 3.5 and higher *Hi* and *H* of the Mokken scale analysis (Sijtsma & Molenaar, 2002). The results from the three sets of data showed the differences in the hierarchal order of the IUI items for each sample. The differences between the top 10 items in each study are discussed since they represent the peak of the ordered IUI items, and indicate that items in the higher order in the scale can be in the

middle or lower order in the other scales from the other data. These differences in the hierarchal order of the IUI items are displayed in Tables 35, 36, and 37.

From the previous Mokken analysis results, similar items in the first 10 ordered items were determined from the three data sets. There were 5 similar items in the first 10 items in the three data sets (i.e., Saudi, U.S., and Combined data): (a) Respect students and peers (i.e., Manners theme); (b) Honest (i.e., Manners theme); (c) Fair (i.e., Personality/Personal attribute theme); (d) Explains materials clearly (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); and (e) Grades fairly (i.e., Testing and Grading theme). Three similar items were found in the Saudi and Combined data: (a) Treats students well (i.e., Manners theme); (b) Confident (i.e., Personality/Personal attribute theme); and (c) understanding (i.e., Personality/Personal attribute theme). One similar item was found in the U.S. and Combined data: knowledgeable (i.e., Scholarly theme). There were 4 items, which occurred only in the U.S. scale: (a) Provides a clear syllabus (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); (b) Gives clear feedback (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); (c) Effective teacher (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); and (d) Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments (i.e., Testing and Grading theme). Two items were found only in the Saudi data: (a) Expert in field (i.e., Scholarly theme); and (b) A good speaker (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme). Only 1 item was found in the Combined data: well prepared (i.e., Scholarly theme). These results are presented in Table 38.

Table 38

Top 10 Characteristics from the Mokken Analysis of the Three Data Sets

IUI Saudi Scale		IUI U.S. Scale		IUI Combined Scale	
Item	Theme	Item	Theme	Item	Theme
Respects students and peers	Manners	Grades fairly	Testing and Grading	Respects students and peers	Manners
Honest	Manners	Respects students and peers	Manners	Honest	Manners
Fair	Personality/Personal	Honest	Manners	Fair	Personality/Personal Attributes
Confident	Personality/Personal	Fair	Personality/Personal	Explains materials clearly	Teaching Style Skills
Explains material clearly	Teaching Style/Skills	Knowledgeable	Scholarly	Grades fairly	Testing and Grading
Expert in field	Scholarly	Provides clear syllabus	Teaching Style/Skills	Treats students well	Manners
Understanding	Personality/Personal	Gives clear feedback	Teaching Style/Skills	Confident	Personality/Personal

For the top 10 characteristics, based on the previous results, the Saudi students preferred interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics (i.e., 6 characteristics) over pedagogical characteristics (i.e., 4 characteristics). The U.S. students preferred pedagogical characteristics (i.e., 7 characteristics) more than interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics (i.e., 3 characteristics). Both the Saudi and the U.S. students favored interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics (i.e., 7 characteristics) more than pedagogical characteristics (i.e., 3 characteristics).

Comparisons between the three data sets (i.e., Saudi, U.S., and Combined data) resulted in matching and unlike items in the entire and final three scales. There were 43 items matched in the three scales, and all these items structured the U.S. IUI scale. There were 12 items matched between the Saudi and combined scales; these 12 items were: (a) Confident (i.e., Personality/ Personal attribute theme); (b) Expert in field (i.e., Scholarly theme); (c) Modest (i.e., Manners theme); (d) On time to class (i.e., Leadership skills/managing classroom theme); (e) Improves her/his teaching skills (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); (f) Cares about students' performance (i.e., Learning process theme); (g) Willing to consider students' life circumstances (i.e., Personality/Personal attribute theme); (h) Prepares students for examination (i.e., Testing and Grading theme); (i) approachable during office hours (i.e., Social skills/Communication theme); (j) Knows students' names (i.e., Social skills /Communication theme); (k) Uses various teaching methods (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); and (l) Applies technology in teaching (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme). There were only 2 items in the Saudi IUI scale which were not found in either the U.S. or combined scales. The 2 items were: (a) Gives extra credit for more effort (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); and (b) Provides study direction to

students (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme). The presence of these 2 items in the Saudi scale may be due to the lack of their use in the teaching methods at college or university level.

Interestingly, the top 10 items in the three scales from the three data sets are almost identical with the top 10 items in the frequency results, with only a slight difference in the order of the items. In the U.S. data, the top 10 items from the Mokken analysis were identical with the top 10 items from the frequency analysis. Nine items from the Saudi data were the same in the Mokken analysis and frequency analysis, and only 1 new item only was found in the Mokken analysis, which was not in the frequency analysis: A good speaker (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme). Eight matching items in the Mokken analysis and frequency analysis in the combined data were identified, and only 2 new items were in the Mokken analysis: (a) Knowledgeable (i.e., Scholarly theme), and (b) understanding (i.e., Personality/Personal attribute theme).

The Brief Version of the IUI

Based upon the Mokken scale analysis, a brief version of the IUI was developed. The top 30 items from Mokken analysis were combined to create a dependent variable IUI. They were based on Mokken analysis only because it is the chosen measurement model which is also the hierarchical and probabilistic model. When the 30 items were combined, they included the overlapped and different items to ensure that they covered the three data sets. The 16 items that formed (IUI) dependent variable are presented in Table 39.

Table 39

The 16 Items of the Brief IUI scale from Mokken Analysis

Item #	Item Description
40	Respects students and peers
52	Honest
60	Fair
22	Explains materials clearly
20	Grades fairly
17	Treats students well
46	Confident
66	Knowledgeable
38	Well prepared
64	Understanding
69	Expert in field
57	A good speaker
32	Provides a clear syllabus
12	Gives clear feedback
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments
51	Effective teacher

These 16 items were weighted to make one dependent variable which is the IUI; the reliability (i.e., Cronbach's alpha) of these 16 items is .92, which indicates a strong correlation of items and $H = .47$. For the Saudi sample, the alpha was .93 and $H = .47$; for the U.S. sample, the alpha was .90 and $H = .39$. The correlation between the 16 item scale and the total 70 item scale was .95 for the total sample, .96 for the Saudi sample, and .92 for the U.S. sample.

Scale Level Correlations with Demographic Data

In order to examine the generalizability of the ratings of the ideal professor, the correlations between IUI and the demographic variables (i.e., Country, Gender, Age,

Level of Education, College, and GPA) were examined (see Table 40). College was dichotomized into the colleges of physical sciences and other colleges. There were few significant correlations, and the magnitudes of those were trivial. The overall R-Square and R-Square for all demographic variables were significant for the Combined and Saudi sample, but they were of very small magnitude and accounted for less than 4% of the variance. Even here, it is not clear whether the relations reflect different ratings of the ideal professor or merely a difference in general response style.

Table 40

Correlations between the IUI and Selected Demographic Variables

Variables	Saudi	U.S.	Combined
Country	---	---	.149*
GPA	.174	.050	.168*
Gender	-.064*	-.067	-.102*
Level of Education	.026	-.040	.055
Age	-.006	-.017	.021
College	.035	.003	.031
R-Square	.022*	.009	.040*
Adjusted R Square	.018	.002	.037

Note. * $p < .001$ Bonferroni corrected.

The data in Table 40 indicated that Country, Gender, and GPA significantly correlated with the brief IUI version in the combined data, and only Gender significantly correlated with the brief IUI version in the Saudi data. There were no demographic variables, which correlated significantly with the brief version of IUI in the U.S. data. Female students in both Saudi and combined data had trivially higher ratings of Ideal

instructors than male students, the U.S. students had higher ratings than Saudi students, and the students with higher GPA had higher ratings of Ideal professor than students with low GPA (see Appendix S). These results answer Research Question 7 at the scale level of the brief IUI version.

ANOVA Analysis

The ANOVA analysis was conducted to answer Question 6 of the study because only multiple universities were in the Saudi sample. Accordingly, a one way ANOVA was conducted. The results were statistically significant ($df = 5, 1407; F = 10.17, p < .001$), but of very small magnitude (eta-squared = .035). The Games-Howell post-hoc test indicated significant differences between Saudi universities. For the students of King Saud University ($M = 70.43, SD = 1.39$), there was significantly lower endorsement of IUI characteristics than the students at Imam Muhammed University ($M = 73.97, SD = 0.88, p = .000 < .05$) or those at King Faisal University ($M = 74.24, SD = 0.92, p = .000 < .05$). Students from Imam Muhammed University had significantly higher endorsement of IUI traits than those from Princess Nora Bint Abdul Rahman ($M = 70.31, SD = 1.30, p = .001 < .05$). Also, the King Faisal University students reported significantly higher agreement of IUI traits than those from Princess Nora Bint Abdul Rahman ($p = .001 < .05$). For Arab Open University and King Abdul Aziz University, there were no significant differences in the IUI scale in comparison with the other Saudi universities (see Appendix T) for a brief version of the IUI means and standard deviations for all Saudi Universities.

Item Level Correlations with Demographic Data

These next results answer Research Question 7 at the item level of the brief IUI version. Also, the focus in this analysis is based on the Mokken analysis and the 16 item results for the three data sets. A Pearson correlation coefficient analysis was used to determine the strength of relationship between the 16 items and independent variables (e.g., Country, Gender, Age, Level of education, GPA, and College). As mentioned, the 16 items had a high reliability of .92, which indicated high overall correlation between items. In this section, each item was correlated with other items and independent variables separately to discover the strength of the correlation for the item independently. Correlation level of significance was corrected by a Bonferroni correction method to reduce type I error and to obtain an accurate level of alpha (α). For the 16 items, the 6 independent variables, and the 5 independent variables, Bonferroni correction method suggested a corrected level of significance at .05 alpha to .001 and lower, and at .01 alpha to .000. This level of significance was used for the correlation analysis in the three data sets (i.e., Saudi, U.S., and Combined).

Correlation analysis for Saudi data. Correlations between the 16 items were tested. Also, correlations between the 16 items with the Gender, Age, Level of education, College, University, and GPA variables were tested, based on the corrected level of significance. All the 16 items correlated significantly with each other at $p = .000$, which meant that they were significant at the corrected alpha level of significance as well.

The correlations between the 16 items and the demographic variables for the Saudi data are presented in Appendix U. The item, Respects students and peers, was correlated significantly only with GPA ($r = .098, p = .000$). The item, Honest, correlated significantly with College ($r = -.106, p = .000$) and GPA ($r = .124, p = .000$). The item, Fair, correlated significantly with College ($r = -.098, p = .000$) and GPA ($r = .127, p = .000$). The item, Explains materials clearly, correlated significantly with Gender ($r = -.087, p = .001$), College ($r = -.086, p = .001$), and GPA ($r = .085, p = .001$) at the corrected alpha level of .001, but was not significant at the corrected level .000. The item, Grades fairly, correlated significantly only with GPA ($r = .127, p = .000$). The item, Treats students well, correlated significantly with College ($r = -.091, p = .001$) only at the corrected alpha level .001, and correlated significantly with GPA ($r = .121, p = .000$). The item, Confident, correlated significantly with College ($r = -.085, p = .001$) at the .001 level. The item, Knowledgeable, did not correlate with any variable. The item, Well prepared, correlated significantly with GPA ($r = .112, p = .000$). The item, Understanding, correlated significantly with College ($r = -.096, p = .000$). However, the item, Expert in field, did not correlate with any variable. The item, A good speaker, was not correlated with any variable. The item, Provides a clear syllabus, correlated significantly with GPA ($r = .128, p = .000$). The item, Gives clear feedback, correlated significantly with GPA ($r = .100, p = .000$). The item, Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments, correlated significantly with Gender ($r = -.099, p = .000$), and GPA ($r = .093, p = .000$). Finally, the item, Effective teacher, correlated significantly with GPA ($r = .114, p = .000$).

There were 35 significant relationships between the 16 items with independent variables at .05 and .01 alpha level in the Saudi data, but they were reduced to 19 significant correlations after the use of Bonferroni correction methods at .001 and .000 levels. That was an indication that type I error was reduced, and the significance level below .05 was assured.

Correlation analysis for U.S. data. Correlations between the 16 items with Gender, Age, Level of education, College, and GPA variables were analyzed for the U.S. data. Also, each item from the 16 items was significantly correlated with the other 15 items at corrected .000 level. That indicated a strong relationship between the 16 items.

The correlations between the demographic variables and the brief IUI for the U.S. data are presented in Appendix V. The items, Respects students and peers, Honest, Fair, Explains materials clearly, Grades fairly, Treats students well, Confident, Knowledgeable, Well prepared, Understanding, Expert in field, Gives clear feedback, Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments, and Effective teacher, were not correlated with any variable. The item, A good speaker ($r = -.127, p = .001$) correlated significantly with Level of education at the .001 level. Finally, the item, Provides a clear syllabus, correlated significantly with Gender ($r = -.137, p = .000$; see Appendix V). There were 13 significant correlations between the 16 items with the independent variables at .05 and .01 alpha level in the U.S. data, but they were reduced to 2 significant correlations at .001 and .000 levels after they were corrected by the Bonferroni test.

Correlation analysis for Combined data. Correlations between the 16 items with Country, Gender, Age, Level of education, College, and GPA variables were analyzed for the data from both countries. Also, each item from the 16 items was significantly

correlated with the other items at corrected .000 level.

The correlations between the brief IUI and the demographic variables for the Combined data are presented in Appendix W. The item, Respects students and peers, correlated significantly with Country ($r = .086, p = .000$) and GPA ($r = .123, p = .000$). The item, Honest, correlated significantly with Country ($r = .100, p = .000$) and GPA ($r = .137, p = .000$). The item, Fair, correlated significantly with Country ($r = .099, p = .000$) and GPA ($r = .153, p = .000$). The item, Explains materials clearly, correlated significantly with: (a) Country ($r = .089, p = .000$), (b) GPA ($r = .103, p = .000$), and (c) Gender ($r = -.096, p = .000$). The item, Grades fairly, was correlated significantly with: (a) country ($r = .162, p = .000$), (b) GPA ($r = .175, p = .000$), (c) gender ($r = -.090, p = .000$), (d) educational level ($r = .080, p = .000$), and (e) college ($r = .100, p = .000$). The item, Treats students well, correlated significantly with: (a) country ($r = .117, p = .000$), (b) GPA ($r = .143, p = .000$), and (c) gender ($r = -.078, p = .000$). The item, Confident, correlated significantly only with college ($r = -.085, p = .000$). The item, Knowledgeable, was significantly correlated with: (a) country ($r = .204, p = .000$), (b) GPA ($r = .091, p = .000$), (c) gender ($r = -.088, p = .000$), and (d) college ($r = .153, p = .000$). The item, Well prepared, correlated significantly with country ($r = .114, p = .000$), and GPA ($r = .141, p = .000$). The item, Expert in field, correlated significantly with country ($r = -.140, p = .000$), and college ($r = -.133, p = .000$). The item, Provides a clear syllabus correlated significantly with: (a) country ($r = .208, p = .000$), (b) GPA ($r = .176, p = .000$), (c) gender ($r = -.115, p = .000$), and (d) college ($r = .133, p = .000$) at the .000 level, and with (e) educational level ($r = .074, p = .001$) at the .001 level. The item, Gives clear feedback, correlated significantly with: (a) country ($r = .239, p = .000$), (b) GPA ($r = .172, p =$

.000), (c) gender ($r = -.090, p = .000$), (d) educational level ($r = .091, p = .000$), and (e) college ($r = .165, p = .000$). The item, Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments, correlated significantly with: (a) country ($r = .217, p = .000$), (b) GPA ($r = .157, p = .000$), (c) gender ($r = -.142, p = .000$), and (d) college ($r = .148, p = .000$). The item, Effective teacher, correlated significantly with: (a) country ($r = .167, p = .000$), (b) GPA ($r = .159, p = .000$), (c) gender ($r = -.094, p = .000$), and (d) college ($r = .104, p = .000$). Finally, the items, Understanding and A good speaker, were not correlated significantly with any independent variable (see Appendix W). There were 64 significant relationships between the 16 items with independent variables at .05 and .01 alpha level from the Combined data, but with the Bonferroni correction test, there were 44 significant correlations. The magnitudes of all correlations were trivial and never reached even the level of a small effect size.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to identify the characteristics of ideal university instructors from the perspective of Saudi and United States students by constructing a scale based on Mokken scale analysis. This study was guided by seven questions to accomplish its intentions and aims. These questions were:

- Q1 What are the Saudi and U.S. universities students' perspectives of the characteristics of ideal university instructor?
- Q2 What are the frequencies of characteristics of ideal university instructor of Saudi and U.S. students?
- Q3 What is the hierarchical list of characteristics of ideal university instructor of Saudi and U.S. students?
- Q4 Are there significant differences between Saudi and the U.S. students' ratings of characteristics of ideal university instructor?
- Q5 Are there significant gender differences in the ratings of the characteristics of ideal college teachers between and within Saudi and U.S. college students?
- Q6 Are there significant differences in the ratings of the characteristics of ideal university instructor between Saudi universities?
- Q7 Are there significant relationships between ratings of the ideal university instructor and independent variables (i.e., country, gender, age, level of

education, universities, college, and GPA)?

The results for these questions were presented in Chapter IV and are discussed later in this chapter.

To attain the purpose of this study, two studies were conducted. Each study was considered as a stage and integrated studies (e.g., Study 1 was the first stage, and Study 2 was the second stage), and their results were dependent on each other. Therefore, Study 1 was the first step to identify the characteristics of university instructors including positive and negative traits by the conduct of a content analysis of the data collected from Saudi and U.S. students ($N = 180$). The results from Study 1 were used to answer Research Question 1. Then, these characteristics were used to form 70 items for Study 2. The sample consisted of 2,127 university students (e.g., 1,413 students from Saudi Arabia, and 714 students from the U.S.). The data collected from the sample were analyzed quantitatively. The results from Study 2 were used to answer Research Questions 2-7.

Discussion of the Research Results

Study 1 Results

Content analysis was conducted to identify the characteristics of university instructors. An open-ended survey, the Characteristics of University Instructor (CUI), was given to Saudi and U.S. university students ($N = 180$) to describe the different types (e.g., Ideal, Very good, Average, Below average, and Poor) of instructors. In Study 1, the data included the Saudi and the U.S. samples; these data were combined for several reasons. First, separate analysis of the data were not a practical procedure, because of the large number of characteristics from each sample. Second, combining the data provided better and broader descriptions of the characteristics of instructors. Third, the result from

this study was to have strong content validity, based on the combined students' perspectives to develop a valid scale that can be generalized to different cultures. Therefore, in the first phase, Study 1 was conducted to construct a valid instrument and to construct the table of specifications (i.e., blueprint) of the IUI scale.

There were large numbers of descriptions of university instructors, as reported by the Saudi and U.S. students (see Appendices K and L). These described characteristics of instructors were qualitatively analyzed by content analysis method, and then they were categorized according to eight themes: (a) Teaching Style/Skills; (b) Learning process (i.e., of students); (c) Scholarly (i.e., teacher knowledge and expertise); (d) Manners (i.e., of teacher); (e) Social Skills/Communication; (f) Personality/Personal attributes; (g) Leadership Skills/Managing Classroom; and (h) Testing and Grading. It was necessary to identify the characteristics of an instructor in order to define an ideal instructor. Exemplary or ideal instructors can be recognized by their behaviors and characteristics and their influence on students' motivations and performances (Oord & Brok, 2004). The focus was on the most frequently identified desirable and undesirable characteristics in each theme, but since the goal of this study was to discover ideal characteristics, desirable characteristics are presented only in the discussion. Participants were asked to identify undesirable characteristics in order to determine whether they were the opposite of the desired and to find the contradictory in the ideal type.

The Teaching Style/Skills theme was about the strategies and methods that teachers use to facilitate teaching and create effective teaching including a comfortable environment in the classroom. The most frequent desirable characteristics were: (a) makes interesting class; (b) enjoyable; (c) fun and interactive; (d) makes learning

worthwhile; (e) uses good and useful activities; (f) ability to use good and useful teaching methods; (g) conveys information clearly and communicates ideas; (h) explains materials clearly; (i) gives useful and helpful guides, tests, exercises, practices, and assignments; (j) meets students outside of class to help and explain; (k) write teaching objectives clearly and concisely (i.e., understandable by students); (l) completes duties, commitments, and responsibilities; and (m) uses teaching methods that grasp students' attention.

The Learning process of students theme is about teachers' concern about students' learning outcomes, and how their actions affect the performance and progress of their students. The most positive desired traits of instructor in this theme were: (a) cares about students' performance/education, (b) supports understanding over memorization, (c) facilitates students' understanding of subject matter, (d) wants students to do well and succeed, (e) encourages thinking, and (f) cares about student needs.

The Scholarly theme is about instructors' knowledge and expertise in teaching and in their fields or subject matters. The most desired descriptions in this theme were: (a) versed in the subject matter, knowledgeable, scholarly, and well-educated; (b) expert in field; (c) well prepared; (d) academically capable and qualified; and (e) seeks further knowledge in his or her field.

The Teacher manners theme is about how instructors behave with students and others. Mainly, students want their teacher to: (a) be nice, kind, amiable; (b) be outgoing; (c) respect students and others; (d) respect the viewpoints of others; (e) be polite and well-mannered; and (f) sincere, honest, modest, dignified, reliable, and tolerant.

The Instructors' social and communication skills theme concerns the: (a) skills of

interaction between instructor and students, (b) expression of ideas and information, and (c) ability to speak and listen to students. This theme was endorsed frequently as desired characteristics by students, such as: (a) meets students during office hours, (b) approachability, (c) interactive teacher, (d) communicates and talks with students, (e) responds to students, (f) provides feedback, (g) treats students and others well, (h) friendly, (i) provides contact information, and (j) knows students' names.

The Personality and personal attributes theme involves instructors' personal, psychological, and emotional traits that were described by students. The high frequency desired Personality and personal characteristics included: (a) helpful inside and outside the classroom, (b) cooperative, (c) supportive, (d) understanding, (e) fair, (f) unbiased, (g) likes teaching, (h) caring, (i) enthusiastic, (j) passionate, (k) organized, and (l) resilient.

The theme of Leadership and managing classroom skills comprises the abilities of: (a) controls and manages students' behaviors in classroom, (b) good planning of teaching, (c) solves problems facing students, (d) manages time and meetings, (e) guides students to achieve goals of teaching, and (f) makes appropriate decisions to facilitate teaching and learning. The most frequent descriptions in this theme were: (a) on time; (b) good management/control of classroom behaviors; (c) provides guidance, consults, and directions; (d) provides positive criticisms; (e) strict when needed; (f) a good model; and (g) is dominating, commanding, and ruling.

The Testing and Grading theme is about the methods used to assess students including tests, exams, quizzes, assignments, projects, and so on as well as the way of grading of assessments. Students wished for: (a) fair grading, (b) assessment and tests, (c) makes various and adequate ways of testing and grading, (d) provides useful tests to help

student, (e) tests are clear, (f) prepare students for exams, and (g) grades assignments in a timely manner.

The resultant characteristics found in the eight themes were extensive and were found in many studies either described by instructors or students, but many studies addressed and focused on only one or a few of the identified themes in this study (Blai, 1973; Botas, 2004; Crumbly, Henry, & Kratchman, 2001; Cruse, 1987; Denzine & Pulos, 2000; Epting, Zinn, Buskist, & Buskist, 2004; Kulick & McKeachie, 1975; Martinazzi & Samples, 2000; Murray, 1983; Oord & Brok, 2004; Trabue, 1951; Watts, 1996; Williams & Ware, 1977; Wubbels & Levy, 1993).

The eight themes were categorized into two major types of characteristics: (a) pedagogical characteristics, and (b) interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics. The pedagogical characteristics type is comprised of: (a) Teaching Style/Skills theme, (b) Learning process of students theme, (c) Scholarly of teacher theme, and (d) Testing and Grading theme. This type is about characteristics related to professional teaching skills such as: (a) instruction and learning styles, (b) knowledge in subject matter, and (c) testing and grading methods. The interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics type is comprised of: (a) Manners of teacher theme, (b) Social Skills/Communication theme, (c) Personality/Personal attribute theme, and (d) Leadership Skills/Managing classroom theme. This type is about instructors' personal and social characteristics and their interactions and behaviors with others such as: (a) social interaction, (b) manners, and (c) leadership skills. These types involve many different characteristics, which have been related to teaching and considered in the past. Long (1957) asserted that social, personal adjustment, behaviors, skills, intellectual, emotional, desirable attitudes, and learning

aspects should be the characteristics of an effective instructor. Also, personal and teaching characteristics were essential and universal in many studies (Cruse, 1987; Lowman, 1966; Lowman, 1995; Martinazzi & Samples, 2000; Watts, 1996; Witcher et al., 2003).

However, in most of the previous studies, which were mentioned earlier, the authors did not provide any hierarchical organization of instructors' characteristics. Instead, they provided lists of characteristics, major themes, or types of ideal characteristics rather they were for particular majors. In a few exceptions, some authors tried to classify instructors based on characteristic types, but they were not organized in a hierarchical, ranking order. For example, in the Onwuegbuzie et al. (2007) study, a similar approach was used to classify qualitative themes, which were described by students. They found different nine themes (e.g., responsive, enthusiast, student centered, professional, expert, connector, transmitter, ethical, and director), and these nine themes were classified as four major types, which they called meta-themes (e.g., communicator, advocate, responsible, empowering). The author of this current study provided fewer major types, but the types were a more comprehensible, clear, and understandable taxonomy. Also, Watts (1996) found similar types of characteristics of ideal instructors, but they were classified as three types of qualities. These three types of ideal teacher were: (a) Personal qualities such as enthusiastic, friendly, approachable, helpful, caring, motivating, and interactive; (b) Professional qualities such as practical, organized, knowledgeable, fair and consistent, reflective, and creative; and (c) Teaching and communication qualities such as communication skills, clear expectations, involve students in the classroom and topics, prepared for lessons, sense of humor, uses a variety

of teaching methods, applies different learning styles, and leadership skills. In the current study, the characteristics were classified somewhat differently and, in general, were comprised of personal qualities, which included intrapersonal characteristics, communication qualities including interpersonal characteristics, and were categorized in one type, and professional qualities including teaching and learning characteristics and leadership skills were categorized in the pedagogical type. Proctor, Clarke, and Mygdal (1998) had different classifications of instructors and investigated specific characteristics such as: (a) capability, (b) sensitivity, and (c) authority. These three themes do not cover all the eight themes, and they are very narrow and not as comprehensive as the eight themes identified in this study.

In comparison, some studies were focused only on one or a few themes. For instance, Potter and Emanuel (1990) focused on the communication theme, which this study supported. Potter and Emanuel's other characteristics included: (a) friendly and attentive, (b) impressionable, (c) open, (d) precise, and (e) dominant. In the Alweshahi, Harley, and Cook (1979) study, the communication characteristics such as provide feedback, respectful, and encourage critical thinking were very important in comparison to demographic characteristics such as gender, educational level, and language skills. However, the focus of the Alweshahi et al. was only on ideal instructors in medical college.

Other researchers (Costin, Greenough, & Menges, 1971; Pohlman, 1975) focused only on pedagogical characteristics such as: (a) motivates interest in the subject, (b) encourages critical thinking, (c) focuses on important materials, (d) provides good examples and illustrations, (e) provides clear explanations and presentation, (f)

knowledgeable of subject matter, and (g) organized. These characteristics were found in the current study. In addition, pedagogical characteristics in this study were similar to the pedagogical characteristics described by both instructors and students in the Wilson, Dienst, and Watson (1973) study. For instance, similar pedagogical characteristics were: (a) research productivity and activity, (b) participation in and contribution to the academic field, (c) concerns about teaching, (d) have good relation with students, and (e) stay updated to what is new in the field.

The Development of the IUI Scale

The previous results were used to construct a valid and reliable IUI scale. As mentioned before, the results from Study 1 formed the content validity of the scale based on broad descriptions of ideal university instructors. The eight themes structured the table of specifications (i.e., blueprint) of the IUI scale, which assured the strength of the content validity because the eight themes were derived from the students' own opinions (Denzine & Pulos, 2000). Also, the findings from other studies, mentioned previously, were found in this study which confirmed the strength of the blueprint, and then the content validity and the construct validity of the IUI instrument. Onwuegbuzie et al. (2007) emphasized the importance of strong validity of teaching evaluation that is driven by data and theoretical framework. From the huge number of characteristics and descriptions, 70 items were chosen by the panel of experts in the educational psychology field to cover and involve all of the eight themes. The included described characteristics (e.g., items) in the IUI scale were carefully chosen. General, vague, unclear, and not understandable characteristics were excluded or reworded to be adequate and understandable items. A pilot study was conducted to test the efficiency and reliability of

the scale (see Appendix J).

The 70 items, which comprised the IUI scale, had a strong reliability with a Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$ from the total sample of the study ($N = 2,127$ participants). The reliability of the IUI for the Saudi sample ($n = 1,413$ participants) was .95, and for the U.S. sample ($n = 714$ participants), the reliability was .93. Previous results from Study 1 and the pilot study showed that the IUI scale is a highly reliable and valid instrument, which was based on careful and well planned producers of the construction of the scale.

Study 2 Results

Study 2 was analyzed quantitatively based on the data collected from the IUI scale. The data were tested at two levels: Item level analyses and scale level analyses. These two levels comprised many types of appropriate statistical tests such as: (a) descriptive analyses, (b) analysis of variance (ANOVA), (c) correlation coefficient, (d) confirmatory Factor analysis, and (d) Mokken Scale analysis. A Bonferroni method was used to correct the level of significance of alpha (α) and to reduce type I error.

Item Level Analyses

The mean score for each item was tested for each country and for genders in each country. As can be seen in Table 23, the mean scores for each item were similar in Saudi males, Saudi females, U.S. males, U.S. females, Saudi, U.S., and Combined data. This finding means that the similarities among the data are obvious, and there were few differences. Then, a correlation analyses was conducted to test the strength of gender and nationality similarities of means. There were high correlations (e.g., all above .95) between country and genders, which confirmed the strong similarities in the rating characteristics of an ideal instructor.

Also, an ANOVA was conducted to examine country and gender differences in each item; therefore, 70 gender X country ANOVAs were conducted. There were no significant Country by Gender interactions. However, there were few significant gender effects. Only two items were statistically significant different, but their effect sizes were small. Females rated Item 17 (i.e., Humiliate students) and Item 18 (i.e., Neglectful) significantly different than male students; these items were rated negatively more frequently by female students than male students. The other items had no effect sizes at all.

In contrast, there were 36 significant country effects for the items. Yet, most of the differences had small effect size, and only 5 items had a moderate effect size. Saudi students assigned significantly higher ratings than the U.S. students for several items: (a) Modest, (b) Give extra credit, (c) One way of teaching, and (d) Gives few assignments. The U.S. students assigned significant higher ratings only for item, Approachable. The other items with lower effect sizes are presented in Table 25. These results are the answers for Research Questions 4 and 5 of the study.

Frequency analysis was used because it can determine the hierarchical order of items from higher to lower frequency. This analysis was used to answer Research Question 2 of the study. The frequencies of the five options (i.e., Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely, and Never) for each item were calculated for the three data sets (i.e., Saudi, U.S., and Combined). The focus in Chapter IV was on the top 10 items in the Always option which represents the desired characteristics, in the Sometimes option which represents the neutral or controversial characteristics between desired and undesired, and in the Never option which represents the undesirable characteristics of

instructors. The top items were presented with their corresponding themes to illustrate the variety of classification of instructors. Again, in this discussion, the focus was on the frequency of the Always option results, since it serves the main goal of the study. Only countries were compared, because there was no significant gender X country differences, and only small gender differences.

The Saudi university students described the 10 most preferred characteristics of ideal university instructor as: (a) respect students and peers, (b) fair, (c) honest, (d) grades fairly, (e) explains materials clearly, (f) confident, (g) understanding, (h) expert in field, (i) provides clearly formatted tests, and (j) treats students well. The most desirable characteristics of ideal instructor for U.S students were: (a) grades fairly, (b) respects students and peers, (c) honest, (d) fair, (e) provides a clear syllabus, (f) gives clear feedback, (g) knowledgeable, (h) explains materials clearly, (i) provides sufficient time for tests and assignments, and (j) approachable during office hours, (k) encourages thinking, and (l) effective teacher. The students from both countries identified the most desirable characteristics of the ideal university instructor as: (a) respects students and peers, (b) fair, (c) honest, (d) grades fairly, (e) explains materials clearly, (f) treats students well, (g) provides clearly formatted tests, (h) well prepared, (i) encourages thinking, and (j) confident.

There were five typical items found in the most desirable characteristics in the Saudi and U.S. data. These five items are: (a) respects students and peers, (b) fair, (c) honest, (d) grades fairly, and (e) explains materials clearly. There were different items in the most desirable characteristics found in only one sample. Items, which were found only in the Saudi data, were: (a) confident, (b) understanding, (c) expert in field, (d)

provides clearly formatted tests, and (e) treats students well. The most desirable characteristics items found only in the U.S. data were: (a) provides a clear syllabus, (b) gives clear feedback, (c) knowledgeable, (d) provides sufficient time for tests and assignments, (e) approachable during office hours, (f) encourages thinking, and (g) effective teacher.

The two countries have similarities in interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics but different in Pedagogical characteristics like teaching, learning, and testing. That may be the result of the different nature of teaching in each country. For example, typically, in Saudi universities, a syllabus is not provided, thinking skills are not encouraged, instructors are not available during office hours, nor is feedback available from an instructor. Therefore, that can explain their absence from the top 10 characteristics of the Saudi sample because Saudi students do not have access to nor are they accustomed to these characteristics. Teaching methods are different from classroom to classroom, so it is expected to be different in two different countries and cultures. While interpersonal and intrapersonal are universal cross cultural characteristics.

Similar to the findings from this study, students in Romania (Istrate & Velea, 2006) emphasized the personal and moral qualities of an instructor such as: (a) flexible; (b) open minded; (c) close to students; (d) motivates success; (e) has sense of humor; as well as (f) professional qualities such as attractive and interesting pedagogical approaches, authoritarian when necessary, and well educated. However, unlike this study, the Istrate and Velea findings were not compared with any other country or culture; therefore, it cannot be known whether Romanian students are significantly different from other students in other countries or cultures. Yet, in a comparison study (Johnson, 2004),

U.S. students showed significant preference for pedagogical characteristics when they were compared to Spanish students; this was found in frequency results for the U.S. students in this study. Further discussion about countries and cultural differences is presented for Question 4 later in this chapter.

Scale Level Analyses

The unidimensionality was tested by the use of Confirmatory Factor Analysis. The unidimensional model fit significantly and was satisfactory for the Combined sample, the Saudi sample, and the U.S. sample. Research Question 3 was answered by use of Mokken Scale analysis. Mokken scale analysis is a measurement model and a type of non-parametric Item Response Theory (NIRT), which is used to analyze items and construct scales. It orders the items in the scale in a hierarchal way. Therefore, it was used to sort the most desired to least desired characteristics of an ideal university instructor.

The Mokken Scale analysis constructed three IUI scales for each sample (e.g., Saudi, U.S., and combined samples). The constructed IUI for the Saudi sample contained 57 items that had a high reliability of .98 and scale coefficient H of .45. The hierarchal order of 57 items that structured the IUI scale for the Saudi sample are displayed in Table 35. The constructed IUI scale for the U.S. data resulted in 43 items, had a high reliability of .96, and scale coefficient H of .41(see Table 36). The constructed IUI scale for both samples included 55 items and, also, had a high reliability of .97 and scale coefficient H of .44 (see Table 37). The Saudi and combined data were typical, except that the combined data did not include: (a) gives extra credit for more effort, and (b) provides study direction to students.

All three of the constructed scales by the Mokken analysis are unidimensional and have monotonicity. The differences between higher ordered items of each scale were compared and discussed. Also, similarities were found in the results from the Mokken analysis. From the three IUI scales, constructed by Mokken analysis, the overlapped items at the higher ordered items were identified. There were 5 matched items in the first 10 items in the three data sets (i.e., Saudi, U.S., and combined data): (a) Respect students and peers (i.e., Manners theme); (b) Honest (i.e., Manners theme); (c) Fair (i.e., Personality/Personal attribute theme); (d) Explains materials clearly (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); and (e) Grades fairly (i.e., Testing and Grading theme). Three matched items were found in the Saudi and Combined data: (a) Treats students well (i.e., Manners theme); (b) Confident (i.e., Personality/Personal attribute theme); and (c) Understanding (i.e., Personality/Personal attribute theme). One matched item was found in the U.S. and combined data, Knowledgeable (i.e., Scholarly theme).

Also, differences were identified in the three data sets. Only four items were found in the U.S. IUI scale: (a) Provides a clear syllabus (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); (b) Gives clear feedback (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); (c) Effective teacher (i.e., Teaching Style/Skills theme); and (d) Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments (i.e. Testing and Grading theme). Only two items were found in the Saudi data: (a) Expert in field (i.e., Scholarly theme), and (b) A good speaker (Teaching Style/Skills theme). One item was found in the combined data, Well prepared (i.e., Scholarly theme). The similarities and differences can be seen in Table 38.

The comparisons of the Mokken analysis results indicated that: (a) the Saudi students favored interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics (i.e., six characteristics)

over pedagogical characteristics (i.e., four characteristics); and (b) the U.S. students preferred pedagogical characteristics (i.e., seven characteristics) more than interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics (i.e., three characteristics). The students in the combined sample favored interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics (i.e., seven characteristics) more than pedagogical characteristics (i.e., three characteristics).

The Mokken Scale analysis is a very useful method for ordinal scales, and it has many advantages in the construction and validation of scales and maintaining reliable items that related strongly to the latent trait (Sijtsma & Molenaar, 2002). It provide a better understanding of Item Response Theory models, it is more flexible and has less strict assumptions, it can be applied to a small sample size and small number of items, and it is easy to use and based on uncomplicated statistics (Junker & Sijtsma, 2001; Molenaar, 2001). The three scales from the Mokken analysis can be considered as a standard model for each data set. Schorr and Koellner-Clark (2003) indicated that it is important to modify and change teaching model. The use of Mokken analysis constructs a pool of items into a strong model that has high reliability and covers the measured trait (Junker & Sijtsma; Sijtsma, 1998). Hence, the Saudi IUI scale, the U.S. IUI scale, and the combined IUI can be models or standards for an ideal university instructor in Saudi Arabia, the U.S., and both countries. Modification and change in the used model is the aim of social cognitive theory which encourages the changing of ineffective behaviors by changing beliefs, cognitions, and behaviors. Therefore, the ideal characteristics in the IUI scales, which include interpersonal, intrapersonal, and pedagogical characteristics, can change instructors' undesired personal and professional beliefs and behaviors.

The Brief Version of the IUI

A brief version of the IUI was developed based on the Mokken analysis results. The top 30 items from constructed IUI scales were combined to create the brief IUI. The brief IUI is comprised of 16 matched and different items to cover the three data sets (see Table 39). The reliability of the brief version of IUI was examined and indicated a high reliability. Statistical analyses were conducted at the brief IUI scale level.

The generalizability of the ratings of the ideal instructor was tested by conducting correlation tests between the demographic variables (e.g., Country, Gender, Age, Level of Education, College, and GPA) and the brief IUI. There were few significant correlations, and they had small effect sizes. There were significant correlations only between IUI and Gender in the Saudi data, and IUI with Country, Gender, and GPA in the Combined data. There were no significant correlations between the demographic variables and IUI in the U.S. data. Previous significant correlations indicated that female students in Saudi and Combined data assigned higher ratings for ideal instructors than male students, the U.S. students assigned higher ratings than Saudi students, and students with higher GPA assigned higher ratings of ideal professor than students with low GPA (see Appendix S). These results addressed Research Question 7 of the study.

Country differences at the item and scale levels were found in this study. Country differences have been found in many studies. For instance, there were significant differences in the description of ideal or effective instructors between: (a) U.S. students and Spanish students (Johnson, 2004); (b) U.S. students and Canadian students (Mueller, Roach, & Malone, 1971); (c) U.S. students and Saudi students in the current study; and (d) even in single country studies as found by Istrate and Velea (2006) with Romanian

students. However, also, similarities were found in the previous studies. Therefore, as found in this study, differences and similarities do exist when countries are compared. That means there are universal characteristics across cultures and countries, which are mostly personal, manners, values, or ethical characteristics, and there are different characteristics which are usually found in the pedagogical, teaching, or learning characteristics as they are used differently across cultures and countries.

The significant difference between Saudi and U.S. students that the U.S. students rated more ideal characteristics, which supported the rationale for using modeling theory. Abel, Ausel, and Sparapani (1987) showed that modeling theory was successfully effective in different fields of teaching and learning. Since U.S. universities are respected and have better ratings than Saudi universities, the U.S. students significantly endorsed the ideal characteristics of instructors higher than Saudi students. Also, the highest U.S. frequency results had more pedagogical characteristics; therefore, the U.S. results for frequency of characteristics, and Mokken analysis can be models and standards for Saudi students. Kulick and McKeachie (1975) emphasized the importance for the establishment of norms and standards for students' evaluation of instructors to interpret teaching effectiveness precisely. As mentioned earlier, these standards can direct the social cognitive theory perspective to: (a) affect positive changes in students' attitude toward the personal and professional characteristics of ideal instructors, (b) guide instructors themselves to alter their personal and professional characteristics positively, and (c) change the teaching and classroom environment to an improved atmosphere.

Some researchers (Freeman, 1994; Galguera, 1998; Kaschak, 1978; Lombardo & Tocci, 1979; Wubbels & Levy, 1991) indicated that the factor of gender for both

instructors and students can slightly or strongly influence students' rating of instructors. However, many researchers (Basow & Distenfeld, 1985; Basow & Howe, 1987; Basow & Silberg, 1987; Bennett, 1982; Elmore & LaPointe, 1974; Etaugh & Riley, 1983) found no significant gender differences in rating and evaluation of instructors as was found in this current study. In this study, the goal was to portray ideal university instructors where the instructor's gender did not matter for being ideal instructors.

According to Eisler (2002), students' grades should be considered, and they may influence significantly when they rate and evaluate professors. Cruse (1987) indicated that students' grades can influence their rating of instructors, which will result in a low correlation before knowing the grade, and correlate highly after knowing the grade. The factor of students' grades can influence the validity of the evaluation (Eisler), although in this study, students did not expect a grade, therefore, their responses were based just on their opinions about ideal characteristics.

Again, the ANOVA analysis was used to find differences among Saudi universities and in order to answer Research Question 6 of the study. There were significant differences between Saudi universities in rating of ideal characteristics. However, the significant effect had a small effect size. For Imam Muhammed University and King Faisal University, there was a significantly higher rating of IUI characteristics than for King Saud University. The students at Imam Muhammed University and King Faisal University had significantly higher ratings for IUI traits than the students from Princess Nora Bint Abdul Rahman (e.g., university for female students only). For Arab Open University and King Abdul Aziz University, there were no significant differences with the other universities in the IUI scale.

Since these universities are located in different regions, and each region has its unique different accent, geographical nature, and cultural traditions, differences between universities are expected to be present. For instance, the IUI ratings from King Faisal University, in the eastern part of Saudi Arabia, were significantly different from King Saud University, which is in the middle region of Saudi Arabia. For King Abdul Aziz University, which is located in the western region, the ratings were not significantly different from Universities in the middle and eastern regions. However, there are other factors. which need further investigations for future studies, such as: (a) the segregation system (e.g., Princess Nora Bint Abdul Rahman is just for women; males and females in Saudi universities are segregated in different locations); (b) the differences between public universities (e.g., King Faisal University, King Saud University, and Imam Muhammed University) and private universities (e.g., Arab Open University); and (c) religious nature of the university (e.g., Imam Muhammed University is an Islamic university).

Correlation coefficients were used to test the relationships with the demographic variables at the item level with the brief IUI. Also, the results from this analysis was used to answer Research Question 7 of the study. Again, the Bonferroni correction method was used to get accurate level of alpha (α). All 16 items correlated significantly with each other in the three data sets.

Correlation between the brief IUI and demographic variables for the Saudi, U.S., and Combined data indicated many significant correlations, which were presented in detail in Chapter IV (see Appendices U, V, and W). There were 19 significant relationships between the 16 items with demographic variables in the Saudi data, there

were 2 significant correlations between the 16 items with demographic variables, and there were 44 significant relationships between the 16 items with demographic variables. However, the magnitude for all correlations was trivial for the effect size.

In addition, previous results indicated that many interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics correlated significantly with pedagogical characteristics. These findings verified the strong significant relationship and correlation between personal characteristics and teaching effectiveness in some studies (Best & Addison, 2000; Sherman & Blackburn, 1975). All of the 16 items, including interpersonal and intrapersonal and pedagogical characteristics, correlated highly significantly. For instance, the Effective teacher item correlated highly significantly with the Fair item, the Treats students well item was highly significantly correlated with the item, Knowledgeable, and so on.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to discover the ideal characteristics of university instructors in Saudi Arabia and the U.S. from students' perspectives, so students' viewpoints and needs can inform their instructors about which their teaching methods and interactions should be used to meet students' needs. This current study is different from evaluation studies. In this study, the author sought to discover ideal characteristics to encourage better growth of personal and professional qualities, while the purpose of evaluation studies is to assess current instructors in order to judge their outcomes and teaching efficiency. Dunegan and Hrivnak (2003) indicated that students are only able to differentiate current instructors from ideal instructors significantly if they have compatible and clear images about ideal instructors.

A new scale, the IUI, was developed in this study to reach that goal, and then it was used to analyze the data from both countries. Simultaneously, this author conducted three studies to produce three data sets with numerous findings. The most important findings were the discovered ideal characteristics of ideal university instructor in an empirical approach. If any person is asked to list the characteristics of an ideal university instructor, she/he will give perspectives which are different or similar to other persons, but they are still general perspectives and not based on empirical studies. For this study, the author strengthened these perspectives empirically by the application of adequate analyses, which is a uniquely different approach from previous studies. In this study, students' described characteristics were organized into restricted types of characteristics. Therefore, any described characteristic from any person can be classified under a specific theme from the eight themes and the major two types of characteristics.

In addition, no previous researchers have used a modern measurement such as Mokken and NIRT analysis, nor constructed a scale to discover and explore the ideal characteristics of an university instructor. In fact, the theory and applications of NIRT analysis have not been commonly used in educational and psychological measurement in the past. Only recently, has NIRT analysis been applied in these areas, but it has been known as Item Response Theory (Junker & Sijtsma, 2001; Stout, 2001). Also, there have been few studies conducted to investigate the characteristics of ideal university instructor. Some were conducted some time ago, and they based their work on traditional Classical Test Theory (CTT; Arreola, 2003; Loadman, 1976; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2007; Oord & Brok, 2004; Oord & Brok, 2004; Peterson, 1984; Subkoviak & Levin, 1974; Wubbels & Levy, 1993; Young, 1996).

Also, although some of these studies indicated the presence of the influences of independent variables (e.g., gender, country, etc.) on these evaluation studies, they were not about students' perspectives about instructor and endorsement of ideal characteristics. In addition, some studies addressed characteristics of instructors in a specific aspect of teaching. For instance, characteristics of instructors' interaction and interpersonal relationship or communication with students (Alweshahi et al., 1979; Emanuel, 1990; Wubbels & Levy, 1993), and some were focused only on teaching characteristics (Costin, Greenough, & Menges, 1971; Pohlman, 1975; Wilson, Dienst, & Watson, 1973).

In only a few studies did the researchers utilize a mixed qualitative and quantitative method in order to discover the ideal characteristics of instructors. However, those studies, which were based on a mixed method, had different purposes and methodological issues such as the instruments and measurement techniques or theories. For instance, the Onwuegbuzie et al. (2007) study was conducted to validate an existent instrument and then to test whether the discovered qualitative characteristics of effective teaching were present in that instrument. Yet, in this current study, a mixed qualitative and quantitative method was used, and the researcher found numerous and similar qualitative characteristics. However, in this study, more comprehensive and different qualitative themes were found for ideal instructors, a modern measurement theory was used for two different countries and cultures, and the influence of many variables were tested.

Moreover, student perspectives of characteristics created a bank of items which was used in the construction of the IUI scale by use of Mokken analysis. Then, the Mokken analysis was used to construct three highly valid and reliable IUI scales including the ideal characteristics for the Saudi, the U.S., and the Combined cultures. Now, if one was asked to list the characteristics of the ideal Saudi, U.S., and Saudi and U.S. university instructor, it is possible to list them based on the empirical findings from this study. The Mokken analysis indicated that the ideal Saudi university instructor had 57 characteristics, the ideal U.S. university instructor had 43 characteristics, and the Combined (i.e., Saudi and U.S.) ideal university instructor had 55 characteristics. These findings do not mean that the Saudi instructor had more ideal characteristics than the U.S. instructor, it just means that the items in each scale had an acceptable probability of endorsement in that data set, based on a cutoff score for the inclusion of items.

In general, from the findings of this study, there were many conclusions. First, the characteristics of university instructors ranged from hundreds to thousands based on students perspectives. Qualitative analysis can be used to classify this large number of characteristics. The extensive content analysis of instructors' characteristics in this study resulted in eight themes and then classified two major types of characteristics. These eight themes and two major types of characteristics can include any descriptions or characteristics expressed or portrayed by any person, educator, parent, student, or instructor. Hence, these findings can be a theory base for instructors' classification or evaluation, and for the improvement of teaching methods which include pedagogical and personality characteristics. According to Creswell (1998), the intent of the use of qualitative grounded theory approach is:

to move beyond description and to generate or discover a theory, an abstract analytical schema of a process. Participants in the study would all have experienced the process, and the development of the theory might help explain practice or provide a framework for further research. A key idea is that this theory-development does not come “off the shelf,” but rather is generated or “grounded” in data from participants who have experienced the process. Thus, grounded theory is a qualitative research design in which the inquirer generates a general explanation (a theory) of a process, action, or interaction shaped by the views of a large number of participants. (p. 62)

Therefore, since there were no qualitative or quantitative studies that addressed the characteristics of ideal instructors extensively, the qualitative approach used in this study can be considered as a grounded theory research and the base for further and future studies of the ideal instructor’s characteristics.

Moreover, this study applied a measurement theory to reach purpose of the study. The Mokken analysis constructed a highly valid and reliable instrument to measure the characteristics of ideal university instructor (IUI) by sorting the items with a high probability of endorsement and reliability, and excluding poor items that did not fit in the scale. This study produced a unique instrument developed carefully and appropriately, based on modern measurement theory and approaches, that is the Mokken Scale Analysis, a pilot study, blueprint, and content described by the members of the target population. Use of the perspectives of the target population as the source of the content of the scale was essential in this study in order to build a strong content validity. The high reliability, over .9 of the scale in the pilot study, and the three study samples indicated

high stability among participants and a highly reliable scale.

Furthermore, the findings indicated that the rating or preferences of characteristics have a different order, whereby some characteristics have higher endorsement or preferences, and some have lesser endorsement or preferences as resulted in the descriptive and Mokken analyses. Various factors influence the order of characteristics, and generated different findings such as cultures, country, and gender. Also, many factors or variables, such as country, gender, age, level of education, GPA, majors, and university, can make significant as well as insignificant differences in endorsement or preferences of characteristics within and between cultures as seen in the ANOVA. However, the focus of this study was on the ideal characteristics, so endorsement of positive characteristics is expected. Therefore, significant differences may not have existed, regardless of students' gender, country, age, level of education, colleges, university, and GPA. Finally, characteristics of ideal instructors can be correlated significantly and insignificantly with prior variables as discovered in the correlation analyses findings. In addition, similarities and differences between countries and genders were determined in the findings which indicated that there was culture and gender similarity as well as diversity in the endorsement or favored characteristics of the ideal instructor.

Implications

The results from this study can be utilized to improve the pedagogical approaches, including personal and professional growth, which can then lead to improvement in students' achievement, classroom environment, and teaching methods. The higher education objectives in many countries include the: (a) improvement of improving

teaching skills, (b) provision of skilled, successful, educated, and knowledgeable students, (d) provision of appropriate graduate programs and courses, and (e) development of social and economic growth. Thus, students' success and performances is the intended outcome of effective teaching in higher education (Knight & Wilcox, 1998; Saleh, 1986). These objectives cannot be achieved without the knowledge or evaluation of instructors' qualities by their students, which comprise their personal or pedagogical characteristics (Cruse, 1987).

The study findings can be applied to educational settings and fields in many ways. This study provided an instrument that can be added to the psychometric pool, and it can be used in higher education as well as in postsecondary education to measure the characteristics of ideal university instructors. The IUI scale is a measurement tool, which can be used in future studies about the characteristics of teaching and instructors. It is impossible to measure or investigate, analyze, and reach a theory for this kind of studies without a valid and reliable measure or instrument. For evaluation programs, it is very important to construct clear, comprehensive, reliable, valid, and adequate teaching evaluation scales in educational institutions and organizations (Cronbach, 1983). Second, the findings from this study showed how the analysis of qualitative information played a critical role in the construction of an instrument. It resulted in a huge number of items, which were the described characteristics. Qualitative description is an essential tool, and its analyzed themes can be the foundation to build any scale as they were in this study, and they can be a theory base for future works as mentioned earlier.

Instructors' characteristics, either described in this study or in other studies, can be included under the eight themes and the two major types of instructor's characteristics.

These eight themes and the two types of characteristics can be used to classify instructors' qualities and traits in many research areas such as pedagogical, educational psychology, personality, communication studies and their related fields. In addition to prior implementations in research areas, the findings from this study as well as the developed instrument can be used in many practical settings. For instance, the IUI scale and the two major types can be used as a foundation to establish evaluation and rating approach for university instructors to know teaching outcomes (Cruse, 1987). In Saudi Arabia, where instructor evaluation is not frequently applied at universities, the findings from this study can be used as: (a) an approach to screen university instructors as well as employment decisions (Basow, 1995; Mueller et al., 1971); (b) a basis or resource to develop training programs for university instructors (Mueller et al.); (c) a groundwork for the improvement of teaching methodologies; (d) the promotion and hiring of university instructors; and (e) a self-check or self-report framework for teachers so they can improve their interaction with students, teaching skills, and effectiveness. Most of the previous implementations have not been applied in Saudi Arabia, and there is no clear promotion and hiring system for Saudi professors at universities. However, members of the Saudi government and Ministry of Higher Education are currently making great efforts to reform higher education and eliminate the prior dilemmas (Krieger, 2007).

The purpose of this current study was to make students' perspectives and desires known by their instructors, so they can meet their needs. Therefore, previous impelimentions are efforts to improve teaching to meet students' needs, and then to improve their edcucational performance. University instructors should listen to their students in order to improve their teaching methods and relationships with students,

especially in the Saudi universities. Poor teaching, and lack of ability and enthusiasm in regard to teaching are common complaints in Saudi universities (Krieger, 2007). In this case, university instructors can be made aware of their teaching and weaknesses in order to improve it, and lack of awareness about their teaching would be the actual dilemma in university teaching (Ramsden, 2003). In addition, instructors can reduce the gap and barriers between their interaction and approachability, which is one of the critical difficulties that face university students (Denzine & Pulos, 2000; Phipps & Merisotis, 2005). Thus, students can feel that instructors are available for helping and for educating them, and that they are passionate and sincere in their teaching work.

Third, many practical implementations in the measurement area can be accomplished, based on the findings from this study and the developed scale. As mentioned earlier, the developed IUI scale can be used in the higher education settings for many purposes such as the screening, training, and evaluation of university instructors. Thus, the findings from this study indicated the importance of the use of modern measurement theory in higher education assessment and evaluation. Moreover, the IUI scale can be applied with current evaluation assessment as a concurrent validity method for teaching evaluation tests to examine their correlation when both are concerned with students' perspectives. Onwuegbuzie et al. (2007) maintained that most teaching evaluations used in institutions currently have no strong validity, so they have improper implications and influence policies negatively in making critical decisions such as: (a) tenure, (b) promotion, (c) increase in faculty payment, and (d) other decisions.

Furthermore, this study showed the appropriate use of measurement methods and a theory as the base for construction of a scale to measure the endorsement of ideal

university instructors. It used a method to build the content validity based on the students' perspectives, since they were the targeted population, and their descriptions of instructors' characteristics were the base of the developed blueprint for the scale. Thus, it ensures the strength of the content of the IUI scale. Onwuegbuzie et al. (2007) indicated that previous studies on teaching evaluation might lack validity because they were not driven by data and not based on a theoretical framework. These procedures can be used as guidelines and approaches for other studies that aim to develop and construct instruments based on the opinions, performance, perceptions, or attitudes of the target population.

Moreover, this cross cultural study showed how a pool of items can be obtained from two different samples from different cultures as well as their combined data. The modern measurement theory, Mokken analysis, allowed the construction of three different scales for the Saudi, the U.S., and the Combined data. These constructed scales indicated that some items may fit in one culture, but they do not fit in another cultures. Hence, the implication of measurement methods of different cultures can show the similarities and differences in constructed scales for different cultures. In addition, the combination of the data from two different cultures can be used to construct a general scale that is appropriate for both cultures as in this study, 55 items were constructed for both cultures. For example, the constructed IUI scale of combined data can be valid for both cultures because all 43 items are in the U.S. IUI. Also, it added 12 items that were in the Saudi IUI scale, and excluded 2 items from the Saudi IUI scale to construct a scale that fits both cultures. Therefore, in the measurement field, it is very important to consider how scales are valid and reliable for different people and cultures, and how to

construct scales that fit appropriately for a certain culture.

Recommendations for Future Studies

This study was comprehensive and addressed many factors that related to characteristics of ideal instructors such as: (a) different cultures represented by two countries (e.g., Saudi Arabia, and the U.S.); (b) gender; (c) age; (d) level of education; (e) colleges and majors; universities; and (f) students' GPA. However, there are some recommendations for future studies to address different factors or topics. Future studies in regard to the ideal characteristics of instructors can be self-applied by university instructors as well as applied to postsecondary instructors and educators who work in the educational settings (Mueller et al., 1971). In addition, it can be applied in different fields to find the ideal characteristics for professional workers based on others' perspectives such as clients, employees, colleagues, patients, and the like. For example, researchers might want to find the ideal characteristics for counselors, psychologists, managers, doctors, supervisors, administrators, and so forth. Hence, every area can have its types of personal and professional characteristics as in this study, which found personal, social, and pedagogical characteristics. Also, future studies can be applied in different countries, cultures, or regions; therefore, future results in addition to this study results can be compared, and similarities and differences can be found.

Also, the ideal characteristics of instructors can be investigated separately for specific educational stages or levels such as freshmen, seniors, master, or doctoral students (Mueller et al., 1971), or for each postsecondary level alone such as first grade, sixth grade, and so on. In addition, it can be conducted for a specific major or college to find its ideal characteristics for their instructors in that field. Therefore, each field can

establish its types of characteristics and can be compared to other fields or majors.

However, types of characteristics for any majors or level of education will be under the two types of characteristics that were found in this study, because any characteristic related to teaching or pedagogy should be comprised in the pedagogical characteristics and interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics. Previous recommendations, which suggest different settings, locations, and areas, will involve different samples with different backgrounds, opinions, experiences, values, and so on, so they will generate more variability and generalizability.

The purpose of this study was to find the ideal characteristics of instructor, so participants were asked to endorse the characteristics in the scale to portray the ideal instructor or not. Nevertheless, the IUI can be used to investigate current characteristics in an instructor like an evaluation test, instead of endorsement scale. Finally, other modern measurement theories and approaches can be applied for future instructors' ideal characteristics studies such as IRT, unfolding, partial credit model, Rasch model, and so forth. These measurement methods can construct appropriate instruments for higher education assessments, evaluations, and research studies.

REFERENCES

- Abel, F., Ausel, D., & Sparapani, E. (1987). Using instructional design and modeling theory in educational psychology. *Education*, 108(2), 180-185.
- Abrami, P. C., Leventhal, L., & Perry, R. P. (1982). Educational seduction. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 446-464.
- Acikgoz, F. (2005). A study on teacher characteristics and their effects on students' attitudes. *The Reading Matrix*, 5(2), 103-115.
- Aleamont, L., & Yimer, M. (1973). An investigation of the relationship between colleague rating, student rating, research productivity, and academic rank in rating instructional effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 64(3), 274-277.
- Alsohail, T. (2006, November 6). Controversy in the Shura Council about Saudi universities' ability to compete internationally. *Middle East Newspaper*, 1.0205 Retrieved August 24, 2009, <http://www.aawsat.com/details.asp?section=&issueno=10205&article=390752&feature=>
- Alweshahi, Y., Harley, D., & Cook, D. (1979). Students' perception of the characteristics of the ideal bedside teacher. *Medical Teacher*, 29(2/3), 204-209.
- Arreola, R. A. (2003). Review of the teacher performance assessment. In J. C. Impara & B. S. Plake (Eds.), *The fifteenth mental measurement yearbook*, Buros Institute of Mental Measurements (pp. 930-933). Lincoln: University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). *Introduction to research in education* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Basow, S. (1995). Student evaluations of college professors: When gender matters, 87(4), 656-665.
- Basow, S. A., & Distenfeld, M. S. (1985). Teacher expressiveness: More important for males than females? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 45-52.
- Basow, S. A., & Howe, K. G. (1987). Evaluations of college professors: Effects of professors, sex-type and sex, and students' sex. *Psychological Reports*, 60, 671-678.
- Basow, S., & Silberg, N. (1987). Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(3), 308-314.
- Bennett, S. (1982). Student perceptions of and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(2), 170-179.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: Free Press.
- Best, J., & Addison, W. (2000). A preliminary study of perceived warmth of professor and student evaluations. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27, 60-62.
- Biernat, M., & Eidelman, S. (2007). Translating subjective language in letters of recommendation: The case of the sexist professor. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(6), 1149-1175.
- Blai, B. (1973). Student thinking and good teaching. *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis*, 11(2), 149-156.

- Botas, P. (2004). Students' perceptions of teachers' pedagogical styles in higher education. *Journal of Doctoral Research in Education*, 4(1), 16-30.
- Boyce, A. C. (1915). Methods of measuring teachers' efficiency. *Fourteenth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II*. Bloomington, IL: Public School.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1, 185-216
- Burney, F. A. (1989). Students' evaluation of teaching in a Saudi Arabian university. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 20(3), 200-208.
- Cohen, J (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155–159.
- Combs, A. W. (1964). Can we measure good teaching objectively? *National Education Association Journal*, 53, 34-36.
- Costin, F., Greenough, W., & Menges, R. (1971). Student ratings of college teaching: Reliability, validity, and usefulness. *Review of Educational Research*, 41(5), 511-535.
- Coward, R., Davis, J., & Wichen, R. (1978). Cognitive style and perceptions of the ideal teacher. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 3, 232-238.
- Crawford, P., & Bradshaw, H. (1968). Perception of characteristics of effective university teachers: A scaling analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 28(4), 1079-1085.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Cronbach, L. J. (1983). *Designing evaluations of educational and social programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crumbly, L., Henry, B., & Kratchman, S. (2001). Students' perceptions of the evaluation of college teaching. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 9(4), 197-207.
- Cruse, D. (1987). Student evaluations and the university professor: Caveat professor. *Higher Education*, 16(6), 723-737.
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11,4, 227-268.
- DeCoster, J. (2009). *Converting effect sizes. Excel spreadsheets*. Retrieved March 17, 2010, from <http://www.stat-help.com>
- Denzine, G. M., & Pulos, S. (2000). College students' perceptions of faculty approachability. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 24(1), 56-66.
- Dijkstra, A., Buist, G., Moorer, P., & Dassen, T. (1999). Construct validity of the nursing care dependency scale. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 8, 380-388.
- Dunegan, K., & Hrivnak, M. (2003). Characteristics of mindless teaching evaluations and the moderating effects of image compatibility. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(3), 280-303.
- Eisler, C. (2002). College students' evaluations of teaching and grade inflation. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(4), 483-501.
- Elmore, P. B., & LaPointe, K. A. (1974). Effects of teacher sex and student sex on the evaluation of college instructors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66, 386-389.

- Epting, L., Zinn, T., Buskist, C., & Buskist, W. (2004). Students' perspective on the distinction between ideal and typical teachers. *Teaching of Psychology, 31*(3), 181-183.
- Esposito, P. (1952). A problem -- Foreign born or American born language teachers in our American colleges. *Modern Language Journal, 36*(2), 93-96.
- Etaugh, C., & Riley, S. (1983). Evaluating competence of women and men: Effects of marital and parental status and occupational sex-typing. *Sex Roles, 9*, 943-952.
- Fellbaum, C. (1998). *Wordnet: An electronic lexical database*. Boston: Bradford Books
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Field, A. P. (2001). Meta-analysis of correlation coefficients: A Monte Carlo comparison of fixed- and random-effects methods. *Psychological Methods, 6*(2), 161–180.
- Filak, V., & Sheldon, K. (2003). Student psychological need satisfaction and college teacher-course evaluations. *Educational Psychology, 23*(3), 235-247.
- Freeman, H. (1994). Student evaluations of college instructors: Effects of type of course taught, instructor gender and gender role, and student gender. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(4), 627-630.
- Galguera, T. (1998). Students' attitudes toward teachers' ethnicity, bilinguality, and gender. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 20*(4), 411-428.
- Helson, H. (1964). *Adaptation-level theory*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Istrate, O., & Velea, L.-S. (2006). *Student voice Romania*. Centre for Development and Innovation in Education: Institute for Education Sciences, Bucharest. Bucharest: British Council.

- Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (2006). *LISREL 8 (version 8.8)*. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Johnson, P. (2004). An instrument to examine students' perceptions of excellence in the United States and Spain. *Northeastern Educational Research Association Conference*. NERA.
- Junker, B., W., & Sijtsma, K. (2001). Nonparametric item response theory in action: An overview of the special issue. *Applied Psychological Measurement* 2001, 25, 211.
- Kaschak, E. (1978). Sex bias in student evaluations of college professors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 3, 235-243.
- Kittler, J. E., Menard, W., & Phillips, K. A. (2007). Weight concerns in individuals with body dysmorphic disorder. *Eating Behaviors*, 8, 115–120.
- Knight, P., & Wilcox, S. (1998). Effectiveness and ethics in educational development: Changing contexts, changing notions. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 3(2), 97-106.
- Krieger, Z. (2007). Saudi Arabia puts its billions behind Western-style higher education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(3), A1.
- Kulik, J. A., & McKeachie, W. J. (1975). The evaluation of teachers in higher education. *Review of Research in Education*, 3, 210-240.
- Loadman, W. E. (1976, April 19-23). *Identifying the characteristics of the ideal professor: An application of multidimensional scaling*. Paper presented at the 60th annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education. San Francisco, CA.

- Lombardo, J., & Tocci, M. (1979). Attribution of positive and negative characteristics of instructors as a function of attractiveness and sex of instructor and sex of subject. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 48, 491-494.
- Long, M. B., Sr. (1957). A synthesis of recent research studies on predicting teaching efficiency. *Catholic Educational Review*, 55, 217-231.
- Lowman, J. (1966). Characteristics of exemplary teachers. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 65, 33-40.
- Lowman, J. (1995). *Mastering the techniques of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Martinazzi, R., & Samples, J. (2000). *Characteristics and traits of an effective professor*. 30th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (pp. 7-9). Kansas City, MO: IEEE.
- Molenaar, I. W. (2001). Thirty years of nonparametric item response theory. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 25, 295.
- Molenaar, I. W., Van Schuur, W. H., Sijtsma, K., & Mokken, R. J. (2002). *MSPWIN 5.0 A program for Mokken scale analysis for polytomous items*. Groningen, The Netherlands: Science Plus Group.
- Mueller, R., Roach, P., & Malone, J. (1971). College students' views of the characteristics of an "ideal" professor. *Psychology in the Schools*, 8(2), 161-167.
- Murray, H. G. (1983). Low-inference classroom teaching behavior and student ratings of college teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 138-149.
- The National Center for Assessment in Higher Education. (2009). *About the NCAHE*. Retrieved August 27, 2009, from <http://www.qiyas.org/Qiyas/Info/English.aspx>

- Onwuegbuzie, A., Witcher, A., Collins, K., Filer, J., Wiedmaier, C., & Moore, C. (2007). Students' perceptions of characteristics of effective college teachers: A validity study of a teaching evaluation form using a mixed-methods analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(1), 113-160.
- Oord, L., & Brok, P. (2004). The international teacher: Students' and teachers' perceptions of preferred teacher-student interpersonal behaviour in two United World Colleges. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 3(2), 131-155.
- Peterson, K. (1984). Methodological problems in teacher evaluation. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 17, 62-70.
- Phipps, R., & Merisotis, J. (2005). Fifty-one competencies for online instruction. *The Journal of Educators Online*, 2, 2.
- Pohlman, J. (1975). A description of teaching effectiveness as measured by student ratings. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 12(1), 49-54.
- Potter, W., & Emanuel, R. (1990). Students' preferences for communication styles and their relationship to achievement. *Communication Education*, 39, 234-249.
- Proctor, T., Clarke, C., & Mygdal, W. (1998). Teacher education students' perceptions of self and the ideal teacher. *Education Research Quarterly*, 13(3), 44-52.
- Purpel, D. (1993). A study of the ideal teacher: Heroic metaphors of teacher in popular literature. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53(10), 3471-A.
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary* (2nd ed.). (2003). New York: Author.

- Richardson, W. (1969). A study of mature student opinion of the characteristics of the best liked, the best, the least liked, and ideal high school teacher. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 29(12), 4169.
- Saleh, M. (1986). Development of higher education in Saudi Arabia. *Higher Education*, 15(1/2), 17-23.
- Scheck, D. (1978). Students' perceptions of the ideal professor. *College Student Journal*, 11(4), 335-342.
- Schorr, R., & Koellner-Clark, K. (2003). Using a modeling approach to analyze the ways in which teachers consider new ways to teach mathematics. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, 5(2/3), 191-210.
- Schreiber, J. N. A., Stage, F. K., & Barlow, L. (2006). Confirmatory factor analyses and structural equations modeling: An introduction and review. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99(6), 323-337.
- Schuckman, H. (1990). Students' perceptions of faculty and graduate students as classroom teachers. *Teaching of Psychology*, 17(3), 162-165.
- Sheehan, E., & DuPrey, T. (1999). Student evaluations of university teaching. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 26, 188-193.
- Sherman, B. R., & Blackburn, R. T. (1975). Personal characteristics and teaching effectiveness of college faculty. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67, 124-131.
- Sijtsma, K. (1998). Methodology review: Nonparametric IRT approaches to the analysis of dichotomous item scores. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 22, 3.
- Sijtsma, K., & Molenaar, I. W. (2002). *Introduction to nonparametric item response theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Stochl, J. (2007). Nonparametric extension of item response theory models and its usefulness for assessment of dimensionality of motor yests. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae*, 42(1), 75-94.
- Stout, W. (2001). Nonparametric item response theory: A maturing and applicable measurement modeling approach. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 25, 300.
- Subkoviak, M. J., & Levin, J. R. (1974, April 15-19). *Determining the characteristics of the ideal professor: An alternative approach*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.
- Tacke, G., & Hofer, M. (1979). Behavioral changes in teachers as a function of student feedback: A case for the acheivement motivation theory? *Journal of School Psychology*, 17(2), 172-181.
- Trabue, M. (1951). Characteristics of college teachers desired by college presidents. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 2, 133.
- Watts, J. (1996, October 24). *Student ratings of lecturer-related characteristics most conducive to establishing and maintaining an ideal learning environment in higher education*. Retrieved October 24, 2007, from <http://education.curtin.edu.au/iier/qjer/qr12/watts.html>
- Webometrics Ranking of World Universities. (1997). Retrieved August 24, 2009, from <http://www.webometrics.info/about.html>
- Wehr, H., & Cowan, J. M. (1998). *Arabic-English dictionary* (4th ed.). Ithaca, NJ: Spoken Language Services.

- Williams, R. G., & Ware, J. E. (1977). An extended visit with Dr. Fox: Validity of student satisfaction with instruction ratings after repeated exposures to a lecturer. *American Educational Research Journal*, 14(4), 449-457.
- Wilson, R., Dienst, E., & Watson, N. (1973). Characteristics of effective college teachers as perceived by their colleagues. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 10(1), 31-37.
- Witcher, A., Onwuegbuzie, A., Collins, K., Filer, J., Wiedmaier, C., & Moore, C. (2003). *Students' perception of characteristics of effective college teachers*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 482517)
- WordNet. (2007). Retrieved May 3, 2008, from <http://www.wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn>
- Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (1991). A comparison of interpersonal behavior of Dutch and American teachers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15, 1-18.
- Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (1993). *Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education*. London, England: Falmer Press.
- Wubbels, T., & Brekelmans, M. (1998). The teacher factor in the social climate of the classroom. In B. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), *International handbook of science education* (pp. 565-580). London: Kluwer.
- Young, K. (1996, May 7-9). *Quality assurance in higher education in Hong Kong*. A paper presented at the International Conference on Quality Assurance and Evaluation in Higher Education, Beijing, China.

APPENDIX A

Characteristics of University Instructor (CUI) Questionnaire (English Version)

UNIVERSITY of
NORTHERN COLORADO



*Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Educational Leadership
Higher Education and Student Affairs Leadership*

Informed Consent for Participation in Research

University of Northern Colorado
Project Title: Ideal University Instructors

Researcher: Hesham Aljubaily, Doctoral Student, Educational Psychology
Phone Number: 970.354.6973

The purpose of the study will be to determine characteristics of ideal college teachers in Saudi and the U.S. based on college students' perspectives, and to develop a reliable and valid instrument to classify described characteristics. This researcher seeks to identify any differences in the preferred characteristics of ideal college teachers in Saudi Arabia and the U.S. from students' viewpoints. If you volunteer for this research study, you will be asked to participate in answering open ended questions. Questions will include your opinions about characteristics of college teachers. All participants in the study will be college students at from American and Saudi universities. The topics are not intended to be embarrassing nor upsetting.

The results of your participation will be strictly confidential. Your real name will not be used. Your responses in the questionnaire will be transcribed. Beyond myself, no one will be allowed to see or discuss any of the individual responses. The findings of this study will be combined with many others and reported in a group format in a paper.

Your participation in this study will result in any direct benefits to you. Your participation will contribute to the understanding of how characteristics of college teachers are perceived by different cultures. There are no risks to you in this study.

Participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate in this study, and, if you begin to participate you may still decide to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision will be respected and will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Having read the above and having had an opportunity to ask any questions, please sign below if you would like to participate in this research. A copy of this form will be given to you to retain for future reference. If you have concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact the Sponsored Program and Academic Research Center, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO 80639; 970.351.1907.

Thank you for assisting me with my research,

Sincerely,

Hesham Aljubaily
Educational Psychology, PhD Program
University of Northern Colorado

Characteristics of University Instructor

Five types of college teacher are listed below. In one or few words, please list and describe characteristics of each Type of college teachers. You may repeat a description in more than category, if you wish.

1- Ideal college teacher:

• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____

2- Good college teacher:

• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____

3- Average college teacher:

• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____

4- Below Average college teacher:

• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____

5- Poor college teacher:

• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____
• _____	• _____

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: Female_____ Male_____
3. Ethnicity: _____
4. Level of Education: Freshmen __ Sophomore____ Junior __Senior __
Graduate____ Other____
5. Major: _____
6. University: _____
7. GPA: _____

APPENDIX B

Characteristics of University Instructor (CUI) Questionnaire (Arabic Version)

"صفات المدرس الجامعي"

فيما يلي خمسة أصناف من مدرسي الجامعة. الرجاء عدّد صفات كل صنف من مدرسي الجامعة بكلمة واحدة أو بعدة

كلمات لكل صفة. بإمكانك تكرار بعض الصفات في أكثر من صنف إذا أردت.

١ - صفات مدرس الجامعة المثالي:

_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•

٢ - صفات مدرس الجامعة الجيد:

_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•

٣ - صفات مدرس الجامعة المتوسط:

_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•

٤ - صفات مدرس الجامعة دون المتوسط:

_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•

٥ - صفات مدرس الجامعة السيء:

_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•
_____	•	_____	•

١- العمر: _____

٢- الجنس: ذكر _____ أنثى _____

٣- مستوى التعليم الجامعي: السنة الأولى _____ الثانية _____ الثالثة _____ الرابعة _____ دراسات عليا _____

٤- التخصص: _____

٥- إسم الجامعة: _____

٦- معدل التحصيل الدراسي: _____

APPENDIX C

Ideal University Instructor (IUI) Scale (English Version)

UNIVERSITY of
NORTHERN COLORADO



*Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Educational Leadership
Higher Education and Student Affairs Leadership*

Informed Consent for Participation in Research

University of Northern Colorado
Project Title: Ideal University Instructors

Researcher: Hesham Aljubaily, Doctoral Student, Educational Psychology
Phone Number: 970.354.6973

The purpose of the study will be to determine characteristics of ideal college teachers in Saudi and the U.S. based on college students' perspectives, and to develop a reliable and valid instrument to classify described characteristics. This researcher seeks to identify any differences in the preferred characteristics of ideal college teachers in Saudi Arabia and the U.S. from students' viewpoints. If you volunteer for this research study, you will be asked to participate in answering open ended questions. Questions will include your opinions about characteristics of college teachers. All participants in the study will be college students at from American and Saudi universities. The topics are not intended to be embarrassing nor upsetting.

The results of your participation will be strictly confidential. Your real name will not be used. Your responses in the questionnaire will be transcribed. Beyond myself, no one will be allowed to see or discuss any of the individual responses. The findings of this study will be combined with many others and reported in a group format in a paper.

Your participation in this study will result in any direct benefits to you. Your participation will contribute to the understanding of how characteristics of college teachers are perceived by different cultures. There are no risks to you in this study.

Participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate in this study, and, if you begin to participate you may still decide to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision will be respected and will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Having read the above and having had an opportunity to ask any questions, please sign below if you would like to participate in this research. A copy of this form will be given to you to retain for future reference. If you have concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact the Sponsored Program and Academic Research Center, Kepner Hall, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO 80639; 970.351.1907.

Thank you for assisting me with my research,

Sincerely,

Hesham Aljubaily
Educational Psychology, PhD Program
University of Northern Colorado

IDEAL UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTOR

Dear student:

This scale is concerns ***your point of view*** about the ***IDEAL*** university instructor.
Please circle only ***ONE*** answer for each quality.

Note:

This scale is ***not*** about your current university instructors or instructors who have had in the past. It is about the qualities you think an ideal professor should have.

Thank you for your cooperation and wish you every success.

Please fill personal details first, and then answer the questions of the scale.

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: Female _____ Male _____
3. Level of Education: Freshmen _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____
Graduate _____ Other _____
4. Your Major and college: Major () College ()
5. University: _____
6. GPA: _____

Items/Characteristics	Answers				
1- Prepares students for examination	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
2- Cares about students' performance	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
3- Improves her/his teaching skills	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
4- A good listener	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
5- Approachable during office hours	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
6- Provides positive criticism	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
7- Insults students	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
8- Provides confusing information	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
9- Provides study direction to students	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
10- Hardworking	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
11- Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
12- Gives clear feedback	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
13- Gives extra credit for more effort	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
14- Knows students' names	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
15- Tests are too difficult	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>

16- Relies on one way of teaching	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
17- Treats students well	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
18- Requires few assignments	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
19- Questions on the exams are unclear	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
20- Grades fairly	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
21- Engages students in classroom discussion	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
22- Explains materials clearly	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
23- Encourages thinking	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
24- Good management of classroom behaviors	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
25- Prepares different forms for examinations	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
26- Able to hold students' attention	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
27- Uses various teaching methods	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
28- Punishes students strictly	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
29- Applies technology in teaching	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
30- Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
31- Helps students to expand their ideas	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>

32- Provides a clear syllabus	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
33- Connects topic to students' knowledge	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
34- Willing to consider students' life circumstances	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
35- Challenges students to do their best	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
36- Focused while teaching	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
37- Motivates students to learn	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
38- Well prepared	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
39- Sets clear goals of teaching	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
40- Respect students and peers	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
41- Likes teaching	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
42- Answers students' questions inside and outside class	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
43- Interacts with students	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
44- Takes students' suggestions into consideration	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
45- Friendly	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
46- Confident	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
47- Energetic	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>

48- Neglectful of responsibilities	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
49- Flexible	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
50- On time to class	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
51- Effective teacher	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
52- Honest	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
53- Makes class interesting	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
54- Modest	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
55- Discriminates against some students	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
56- Enthusiastic	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
57- A good speaker	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
58- A creative teacher	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
59- Able to simplify concepts	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
60- Fair	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
61- Student assignments are reasonable	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
62- Strict when needed	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
63- Speaks to students' level of knowledge	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>

64- Understanding	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
65- Is moody	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
66- Knowledgeable	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
67- Intelligent	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
68- Organized	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
69- Expert in field	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
70- Provides clearly formatted tests	<i>Always</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>

APPENDIX D

Ideal University Instructor (IUI) Scale (Arabic Version)

أستاذ الجامعة المثالي

أخي الطالب/ أختي الطالبة:
هذا المقياس مصمم لمعرفة وجهة نظرك ومدى موافقتك ورغبتك في توافر الصفات المذكورة لاحقاً في أستاذ/ أستاذة الجامعة المثالي/المثالية.
الرجاء ضع دائرة حول جواب واحد فقط لكل صفة ترى مستوى أهمية تواجهها وتؤيد توفرها لدى مدرس الجامعة المثالي من وجهة نظرك.
ملاحظة:

هذا المقياس ليس لوصف أستاذ/أستاذة الجامعة في الواقع أو أستاذتك اللذين درسوك في السابق أو يدرسوك حالياً بل هو مقياس لمعرفة الصفات المثالية التي ترغب أو تؤيد بتواجدها أو من المفترض أن تتوفر لدى أستاذك/أستاذتك الجامعي/الجامعية و هل ينبغي أن يتصف/تتصف أستاذ/أستاذة الجامعة المثالي/المثالية بهذه الصفة في أم لا. على سبيل المثال، في السؤال الأول هل ترغب أو تؤيد أو هل من المفترض بأن تكون صفة تهيئة الطلاب للإختبارات موجودة لدى أستاذ/أستاذة الجامعة المثالي دائماً أو غالباً أو أحياناً أو نادراً أو لا يقوم بها أبداً.
شاكراً لكم تعاونكم مع تمنياتي لكم بالنجاح والتوفيق،،

الرجاء تعبئة البيانات الشخصية أولاً قبل الإجابة على أسئلة المقياس:
١- العمر: _____

٢- الجنس: ذكر _____ أنثى _____

٣- مستوى التعليم الجامعي: السنة الأولى _____ الثانية _____ الثالثة _____ الرابعة _____ دراسات عليا _____

٤- إسم التخصص والكلية :

٥- إسم الجامعة:

٦- معدل التحصيل الدراسي رقماً:

الصفة					الإجابة
١-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
٢-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
٣-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
٤-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
٥-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
٦-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
٧-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
٨-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
٩-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١٠-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١١-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١٢-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١٣-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١٤-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١٥-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١٦-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١٧-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١٨-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
١٩-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً
٢٠-	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبداً

٢١-	يُشرك الطلاب في نقاشات الصف	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٢٢-	يشرح المادة بوضوح	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٢٣-	يشجع على الفهم والتفكير	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٢٤-	يسيطر على سلوكيات الطلاب في الفصل بشكل جيد	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٢٥-	يستخدم ويعد طرق متنوعة للإختبارات	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٢٦-	يستخدم طرق تدريس مشوقة لجذب إنتباه الطلاب	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٢٧-	يستخدم طرق تدريس متعددة	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٢٨-	يستخدم أساليب عقاب صارمة وشديدة	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٢٩-	يستخدم التقنية في التدريس	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣٠-	يسأل أسئلة جيدة ليحث الطلاب على التفكير	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣١-	يساعد الطلاب على توسيع مداركهم أفكارهم	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣٢-	يزود الطلاب بخطة دراسية واضحة للمنهج	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣٣-	يربط المعلومات الجديدة بمعلومات الطالب القديمة	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣٤-	يراعي ظروف الطلاب المختلفة	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣٥-	يدفع الطلاب ليعملوا أفضل ما لديهم	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣٦-	يُدرّس بطريقة مركّزة وغير مشتتة	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣٧-	يحفّز الطلاب على التعلم	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣٨-	يحضّر المواضيع التي يدرسها جيد	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٣٩-	يحدد أهداف واضحة لتدريسه	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا

٤٠ -	يحترم الطلاب و زملاء العمل	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٤١ -	يحب التدريس	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٤٢ -	يجيب على أسئلة الطلاب داخل وخارج الفصل	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٤٣ -	يتحدث ويتفاعل مع الطلاب	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٤٤ -	يأخذ رأي وإقتراحات الطلاب بعين الاعتبار	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٤٥ -	وُدِّي ومُحَب	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٤٦ -	واثق من نفسه	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٤٧ -	نشط وذو همة عالية	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٤٨ -	مهمل لمسؤولياته	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٤٩ -	شخص مرن	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥٠ -	منضبط بمواعيده مع الطلاب والحضور للصف	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥١ -	مدرس فعال ومؤثر	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥٢ -	مخلص وصادق	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥٣ -	محاضراته ممتعة	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥٤ -	متواضع	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥٥ -	متحيز ضد بعض الطلاب	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥٦ -	متحمس للعمل والتدريس	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥٧ -	متحدث جيد	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥٨ -	مبدع ومبتكر في طرق تدريسه	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٥٩ -	قادر على تبسيط المفاهيم	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا
٦٠ -	عادل	دائمًا	غالبًا	أحيانًا	نادرًا	أبدًا

٦١ - طلباته الدراسية معقولة ومناسبة	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا
٦٢ - شديد وصارم عند اللزوم	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا
٦٣ - يتحدث بشكل مناسب لمستوى الطلاب العلمي	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا
٦٤ - شخص متفهم	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا
٦٥ - سيئ المزاج	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا
٦٦ - ذو معرفة وعلم واسع	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا
٦٧ - نكي	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا
٦٨ - شخص منظم	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا
٦٩ - خبير في مجاله العلمي	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا
٧٠ - إختباراته معدة ومصاغة بشكل جيد وواضح	دائماً	غالباً	أحياناً	نادراً	أبدًا

APPENDIX E

Majors from Saudi and U.S. Universities in Study 1

Majors	Frequency	Percent
Arabic Language	4	2.2
Special education	11	6.1
Pre-School Education	1	.6
History	2	1.1
Social Science	1	.6
Politics	2	1.1
Computer Science	4	2.2
Statistic & Research Methods	2	1.1
Public Relationship	1	.6
Business Administration	4	2.2
Education	5	2.8
Psychology	24	13.3
Dentistry	1	.6
Educational Psychology	3	1.7
ESL	3	1.7
Counseling Psychology	1	.6
Applied Linguistics	1	.6
Educational Technology	2	1.1
Chemistry	1	.6
Social Psychology	2	1.1
Agriculture	2	1.1
Electronic Engineering	2	1.1
Engineering	5	2.8
Archaeology	1	.6
Media, Mass Communication	2	1.1
Islamic Science	1	.6
Accounting	1	.6

Majors	Frequency	Percent
Language & Translation	3	1.7
Literature	5	2.8
Science	3	1.7
Geophysics	1	.6
Geography	1	.6
Geology	1	.6
Health Science	1	.6
Physical Education	2	1.1
IDLA	10	5.6
Elementary Education	20	11.1
Dietetic	2	1.1
Nursing	10	5.6
Sport & Exercise	3	1.7
Undecided	6	3.3
SES	3	1.7
Music	5	2.8
Human Science	1	.6
English Language ESL	3	1.7
Earth Science	1	.6
CRJ	1	.6
Theatrical Studies	2	1.1
Biology	1	.6
Biomedical Science	2	1.1
Math	1	.6
Art	1	.6
Criminal Justice	2	1.1
Total	180	100.0

APPENDIX F

UNC IRB Approval Letter

May 15, 2008

TO: Gary Heise
School of Sport and Exercise Science

FROM: SPARC

RE: Exempt Review of *Measuring College Students' Perceptions of Characteristics of Ideal University Instructors in Saudi Arabia and the U.S.*, submitted by Hesham Aljubaily (Research Advisor: Steven Pulos)

The above proposal is being submitted to you for exemption review. When approved, return the proposal to Sherry May in SPARC.

I recommend approval.

 18 June 08
Signature of Co-Chair Date

The above referenced prospectus has been reviewed for compliance with HHS guidelines for ethical principles in human subjects research. The decision of the Institutional Review Board is that the project is exempt from further review.

IT IS THE ADVISOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO NOTIFY THE STUDENT OF THIS STATUS.

Comments:

e-mailed comments 2 June 08
** add Pulos; delete wordy of signature 18 June 08 SDH*

UNIVERSITY of
NORTHERN COLORADO



APPENDIX G

An Example of Permission to Conduct the Study in Saudi Arabia

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

السرتم :

التاريخ:

المشروعات:

الموضوع:



الملكة العربية السعودية

وزارة التعليم العالي

جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية

وكيل الجامعة

للدراسات العليا والبحث العلمي

سعادة وكيل جامعة الملك سعود للدراسات العليا والبحث العلمي حفظه الله

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته وبعد...

فحيث يقوم الطالب / هشام يحيى الجبيلي المبتعث من قبل الجامعة للدراسة في الولايات المتحدة بإعداد أطروحته لمرحلة الدكتوراه في علم النفس ، ويرغب في تطبيق مقياس " أستاذ الجامعة المثالي " على عينه من طلاب وطالبات البكالوريوس والدراسات العليا بجامعة الملك سعود في كليات التربية، والآداب، والطب، واللغات والترجمة، والعلوم الطبية ، وذلك لمعرفة وجهة نظرهم عن الصفات السلوكية والنفسية والتدريسية لأستاذ الجامعة المثالي. ويرغب مساعدته في القيام بهذه الدراسة وتسهيل مهمته في توزيع الاستبانة المرفقة.

لذا أمل تطف سعادتك بتوجيه من يلزم بمساعدة الطالب وتسهيل مهمته في القيام بهذه الدراسة.

شاكراً ومقدراً تعاونكم.

والله يحفظكم ويرحمكم .. والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته ...

وكيل جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية

للدراسات العليا والبحث العلمي

١١٤٥

د. عبدالله حمد الخلف

APPENDIX H

Colleges from Saudi and U.S. Universities in Study 2

Saudi Universities			U.S. Universities		
Colleges	Freq.	%	Colleges	Freq.	%
Social Sciences	205	14.5	Undecided	16	2.2
Computer, Communication, Information Sciences, & Information Technology	153	10.8	College of Management, Business and Planning	70	9.8
Mass Communication	38	2.7	College of Engineering	1	.1
Languages & Translations	37	2.6	College of Education and Behavioral Science	229	32.1
Arabic Language	69	4.9	College of Natural and Health Sciences	224	31.4
the Body of Islamic Law, Sharia	115	8.1	College of Performing and Visual Arts	55	7.7
College of Education	212	15.0	College of Humanities and Social Sciences	119	16.7
College of Clinical Pharmacy	38	2.7			
College of Agriculture	58	4.1			
College of Sciences	85	6.0			
College of Management, Business and Planning	82	5.8			
College of Arts	175	12.4			
College of Medicine	20	1.4			
Faculty of Arts & Humanities	95	6.7			
Applied Sciences	1	.1			
Faculty of Economics and Administration	16	1.1			
College of Applied Medical Sciences	2	.1			
College of Engineering	12	.8			

APPENDIX I

Majors from Saudi and U.S. Universities in Study 2

Saudi Universities			U.S. Universities		
Majors	Freq.	%	Majors	Freq.	%
Psychology	254	18.0	Undecided	16	2.2
Computer Science	71	5.0	Psychology	49	6.9
Dawa	32	2.3	Mass Communication & Journalism	24	3.4
Mass Communication & Journalism	7	.5	English Language	28	3.9
English Language	117	8.3	Special Education	17	2.4
Arabic Language	93	6.6	Sociology	18	2.5
the Body of Islamic Law, Sharia	115	8.1	Dietetics Sciences	13	1.8
Special Education	80	5.7	Chemistry	10	1.4
Sociology	18	1.3	Business Administration	24	3.4
Pharmacology	46	3.3	Marketing	21	2.9
Dietetics Science	44	3.1	Accounting	19	2.7
Agricultural Business	7	.5	History	31	4.3
Wealth of Water	3	.2	Physics	1	.1
Agricultural Engineering	1	.1	Biology	20	2.8
Plant Protection	2	.1	Biochemistry	1	.1
Animal Production	1	.1	Art	11	1.5
Information System	28	2.0	Sport and Exercise Science	22	3.1
Information Technology	54	3.8	Clinical Lab Sciences	2	.3
Chemistry	36	2.5	Engineering	1	.1
Business Administration	63	4.5	Statistics	8	1.1
Marketing	16	1.1	Educational Psychology	15	2.1
Accounting	19	1.3	Teacher Education- Art K- 12 Education	31	4.3
Islamic Studies	47	3.3	Teacher Education- Elementary Education	60	8.4

Saudi Universities			U.S. Universities		
Majors	Freq.	%	Majors	Freq.	%
History	93	6.6	Music Education	44	6.2
Libraries & Information	52	3.7	Mathematics	24	3.4
Physics	10	.7	Earth Science	11	1.5
Biology	28	2.0	Bilingual Education	6	.8
Biochemistry	11	.8	Exercise Physiology	14	2.0
Plant Habitat	1	.1	Counseling Psychology	7	1.0
European Languages	10	.7	Nursing	45	6.3
English Literature	4	.3	Criminal Justice	23	3.2
Art	12	.8	Educational Technology	9	1.3
Sport and Exercise Science	12	.8	German	2	.3
Clinical Lab Sciences	2	.1	Management	6	.8
Medicine	6	.4	Anthropology	8	1.1
Dentistry	6	.4	Geography	5	.7
Mechanical Engineering	3	.2	Audiology	15	2.1
Engineering	3	.2	School Psychology	3	.4
Electrical Engineering	4	.3	Biomedical Sciences	5	.7
Industrial Engineering	2	.1	Economics	2	.3
			Human Services	9	1.3
			Political Science	7	1.0
			International Studies	6	.8
			Recreation and Tourism	4	.6
			Philosophy	1	.1
			Clinical Psychology	5	.7
			Public Health	3	.4
			Higher Education	5	.7
			Human Rehabilitation	3	.4
Total	1,413	100	Total	714	100

APPENDIX J

The IUI Scale Validity and Reliability Based on the Pilot Study Results

Validity and Reliability of Developed Scale

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to develop the IUI scale and examine its design. Based on the results from Study 1, which framed the general blueprint of the IUI scale, the described characteristics were analyzed, and 70 comprehensive items were developed to address the eight categories discussed in Study 1. Four forms of summated rating scale options (e.g., Form 1, Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly disagree; Form 2, Essential, Important, Somewhat Important, and Not important; Form 3, Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely, and Never; and Form 4, Ideal, Good, Average, and Poor) were conducted with 121 participants (i.e., 30, 30, 31, and 30 for each form in order) to test the variability of the test. The pilot study was conducted in Saudi Arabia and the U.S. at two universities (i.e., King Saud University, and Al Imam University) in Riyadh and at a university in the Rocky Mountain region. The scale was administered by volunteer teachers at universities in the two countries. The pilot study sample consisted of 88 (72.7%) Saudi participants and 33 (27.3%) U.S. participants; the ages ranged from 18-31 ($M = 21.66$; $SD = 2.22$; 9 cases were missing). The pilot study sample included 91 (75.2%) male students and 21 (17.4%) female with 9 missing cases. The students' educational levels were: (a) 18 (14.9%) Freshmen students, (b) 35 (28.9%) sophomore students, (c) 23 (19%) junior students, (d) 25 (20.7%), senior students, (e) 9 (7.4%) graduate students, and 11 (9.1%) cases were missing. Saudi students were 88 (72.7%) students (i.e., 82 students from King Saud University and 6 students from Al Imam

University), and there were 33 (27.3%) U.S. students from the Rocky Mountain region. Based on the findings, the IUI had a strong evidence of content validity because it is based on a blue print (i.e., table of content or specifications; see Appendix K) of the eight categories that were described by the students' perspectives, the target population of this study. The reliabilities of the four forms were tested, and the reliability statistics were: (a) Cronbach's Alpha was .95 for Form 1, (b) Cronbach's Alpha was .92 for Form 2, (c) Cronbach's Alpha was .94 for Form 3, and (d) Cronbach's Alpha was .95 for Form 4. The four forms had high reliability and showed high internal consistency; nevertheless, Form 3 had the highest variability within each items and across items. It had more variability (variance= 942.46) than the other forms, which had lower variance (595.64, 441.58, and 586.76 for Forms 1, 2, and 4, respectively). After the pilot study was conducted, the scale was reviewed to avoid inappropriate items. Many items were reworded to be clearer, simpler, and understandable by Arabic and English translators. Also, from the results and translators' suggestions, five items were changed and replaced by items from the table of contents (i.e., the blueprint) which was also checked and approved by the translators.

Reliability and Validity

The IUI is based on an extensive content analysis of university instructors' characteristics which was conducted in Study 1 to build a reliable, valid, generalizable and comprehensive scale and to strengthen the content validity of IUI. Based upon the eight themes or categories from the content analysis (e.g., Teaching Style/Skills, Learning process of students, Scholarly teacher knowledge and expertise, Manners of teacher, Social Relations/Communication, Personality/Personal attribute, Leadership

Skills/Managing, and Testing/Grading), a table of specification (i.e., a blueprint) was constructed and developed from the students' perspectives into a summated scale to measure the characteristics of ideal university instructors. Based upon the table of specifications (i.e., blueprint), 70 items from the eight themes were constructed to develop the IUI scale. Many of the described characteristics in the blueprint have similar common meanings; nevertheless, the items were carefully chosen to cover all the characteristics and to fit with the eight categories. Items were selected by a panel of professors and graduate students from a public university in the in the Rocky Mountain region. The previous procedures of developing the scale strengthen the content validity of the scale because the items were constructed from students' perspectives and opinions, not from the researcher or instructors. The IUI scale has high reliability; Cronbach's alpha was .94 for the total sample of the study (i.e., 2,127 participants). The reliability for the Saudi sample (i.e., 1,413 participants) was .95, and for the U.S. sample (i.e., 714 participants), the reliability was .93. These results indicated that the IUI is a highly reliable instrument.

APPENDIX K

Frequencies of Instructor's Type, Based on Hierarchal Order of Ideal Type
from Top to Bottom

Items	Frequencies of Types*					Total	%
	I	G	A	B	P		
Helpful, Helping, Help student, Available for help in and outside class	67	31	23	7	0	128	71.11
Versed in subject matter, Knowledgeable of the subject, Influential	65	46	28	9	0	148	82.22
Interesting, Enjoyable, Fun, Interesting, Interactive, Not boring /learning lectures and teaching, Makes subject interesting/exciting, Makes class (learning), worthwhile/ fun/interesting	65	32	10	0	0	107	59.44
Approachable, Approachable at office or by email, Knowledgeable	64	33	16	3	0	116	64.44
Cooperative, supportive	62	41	27	10	0	140	77.78
Understanding	55	29	17	3	0	104	57.78
Has office hours, Meets students in office hours	54	32	8	0	0	94	52.22
Nice, kind, amiable, Outgoing	53	41	25	5	0	124	68.89
Uses various good and useful activities	53	33	12	1	1	100	55.56
Fair grading and assessment and tests, Grades fairly	50	34	15	1	0	100	55.56
Enthusiastic, passionate, excited, exciting, Passionate /excited about what they teach, motivated	47	24	11	2	0	84	46.67
Explains materials clearly , Scholarly, educative, well-educated	45	18	1	0	0	64	35.56
Gives useful and helpful learning, guides, tests, exercises, practices, assignments to explain and understand	44	20	5	0	0	69	38.33
Uses various good and useful teaching methods	43	31	16	5	0	95	52.78
Interactive, interacts with students	43	15	5	0	0	63	35
Able to convey information clearly, Able to communicate ideas	42	27	9	1	0	79	43.89
Cares about students'	42	19	7	0	0	68	37.78
	41	22	12	0	0	75	41.67
	41	20	8	2	0	71	39.44

performance/education							
Respects viewpoints of others	40	24	12	0	0	76	42.22
Sympathetic, caring, sensible	38	21	5	0	0	64	25.56
Likes teaching and does not seek money or prestige	37	19	8	1	0	65	36.11
Plans his teaching objectives clearly/concisely to students	37	18	5	0	0	60	33.33
Fair, unbiased, Sees students as equals	36	24	13	1	0	74	41.11
Gives time to help and explain, Meets students outside of class	34	18	9	2	0	63	35
Care about students' understanding, Knows materials	34	13	3	0	0	50	27.78
Encourages students to learn, cheerful, motivating, Incentive	34	8	2	0	0	44	24.44
Polite, well mannered	33	15	8	6	0	62	34.44
Sincere, dependable	33	10	2	0	0	45	25
Uses attractive teaching methods that grasp students' attention	32	14	3	0	0	49	27.22
Organized, methodical	31	21	11	0	0	63	35
Sociable, friendly, has good relationships, good personal connections	31	10	2	0	0	43	23.89
Communicates with students, connects, can relate to students, relatable, Easy to talk to, Talks to students, Responsive	30	21	11	0	0	62	34.44
Does his duties/commitments, responsibilities, responsible	30	15	9	3	0	57	31.67
Makes various and good ways of testing and grading (online, take home, in class tests) ,	30	14	2	0	0	46	25.56
Treats students and others well	28	13	7	0	0	48	26.67
Has excellent/good teaching skills, Skillful	28	13	3	0	0	44	24.44
On time, not late	27	16	13	3	0	49	27.22
Asks for feasible, reasonable/ realistic requirements, demands	27	9	9	0	0	45	25
Respects students and others	27	10	4	0	0	41	22.78
Students get/benefit, gain knowledge from his/her class, His students are doing well and learning	27	9	2	0	0	38	21.11
Loves and enjoys his work	26	15	4	0	0	45	25
Flexible, resilient	25	14	5	0	0	44	24.44
Expert in field, Professional	25	14	3	0	0	42	23.33

Provides updated information	25	12	5	0	0	42	23.33
Honest, true, loyal, faithful, devoted	25	10	4	0	0	39	21.67
Gives useful handouts	25	7	3	0	0	35	19.44
Considers students' circumstances, considerate, Updated	25	8	2	0	0	35	19.44
Not extremely/rigid/strict, Not pushover, not so serious	25	4	2	0	0	31	17.22
Good management/control of classroom behaviors, Can control students' behavior in class	24	10	3	1	2	40	22.22
Has sense of humor, humorous, comical, funny	24	7	3	0	0	34	18.89
Allows every (all) student to participate, Engaging, involves students in lectures	23	17	4	0	0	44	24.44
Persistent, diligent, hard working, willing, works hard, Takes work seriously	23	14	7	0	0	44	24.44
Focused, Punctual, Very punctual/precise	23	11	6	1	0	41	22.78
Excited/passionate about teaching	22	11	2	0	0	35	19.44
Gives useful tests/measures to help student	21	13	5	0	0	39	21.67
Reviews previous classes	21	9	1	0	0	31	17.22
Knows students' ability level , Sets clear expectations	21	7	1	0	0	29	16.11
Gives extra credit for more effort as appreciate, Allows make up points	21	6	1	0	0	28	15.56
Allows students to make decisions/choices on projects/ class activities/ plans/assignments	21	5	1	0	0	27	15
His students are not just recipient/they are active	21	5	1	0	0	27	15
Asks good questions to arouse critical thinking	21	5	0	0	0	26	14.44
Understands that students have several or other classes/ commitments, not only his class, life circumstances, Understands that students get sick and miss classes	21	4	0	0	0	25	13.89
	20	7	2	0	0	29	16.11
	20	7	2	0	0	29	16.11

Creative, inventive, Creative teaching style/ways of teaching	20	4	0	0	0	24	13.33
Active, productive	19	9	4	1	0	33	18.33
Has a good & clear lesson plan and sticks to it	19	8	3	0	0	30	16.67
Has lots of experience	19	9	1	0	0	29	16.11
Use technology in teaching (like online classes, Videos, TV, etc)	19	4	2	0	0	25	13.89
Clear requirements/assignments	18	9	4	0	0	31	17.22
Accessible, Has contact information	18	7	4	0	0	29	16.11
Answers students' questions, during, after, and before class, willing to answer questions	18	6	3	0	0	27	15
Relates topic/subjects to students, Relatable, Relates to students	18	8	1	0	0	27	15
Makes students understand subject matter	18	6	1	0	0	25	13.89
Makes students understand, not memorize	18	4	2	0	0	24	13.33
Improves, develops, enhances his teaching skills	18	4	1	0	0	23	12.78
Uses classroom discussion, Leads lots of discussion, discussion based class, has discussions with students	17	10	5	1	0	33	18.33
Keeps student interest, Holds students' attention,	17	8	2	0	0	27	15
Dignified, grave, respectful	17	7	2	0	0	26	14.44
Provides guidance and consults, Guides, Directs	17	4	1	0	0	22	12.22
Seeks further knowledge/ education/information in his field, inquisitive	17	2	1	0	0	20	11.11
Smart, clever, intelligent, genius, thoughtful, strong minded	16	10	5	0	0	31	17.22
Doesn't give busy/overload work	16	6	5	0	0	27	15
Effective teacher, teaches materials efficiently/effectively	16	8	2	0	0	26	14.44
Creates comfortable/fun/relaxed atmosphere	16	7	2	0	0	25	13.89
Modest (humble), Humility, Not egocentric	16	6	0	0	0	22	12.22
Turn assignments back	15	7	6	3	0	31	17.22

immediately							
Give feedback	15	8	4	0	0	27	15
Cares about students' needs,	15	6	3	1	0	25	13.89
Understands students' needs							
Presents relevant topics and	15	8	1	0	0	24	13.33
subjects, On topic, connects							
material to relevance							
Trustable, trustworthy, reliable	15	6	2	0	0	23	12.78
Provides a good & clear	15	6	1	0	0	22	12.22
syllabus and sticks to it							
Forgivable, tolerant, Does not	15	5	0	0	0	20	11.11
penalize							
Critically evaluates,	15	4	1	0	0	20	11.11
constructive criticism, positive							
criticism, Critiques positively,							
positive compliments							
Good speaker and presentation	14	9	5	2	0	30	16.67
skills, speaks affectively							
Competent	14	7	2	0	0	23	12.78
Energetic	14	5	2	0	0	21	11.67
Prepares students for exams	14	5	0	0	0	19	10.56
Self-assured, has high self-	14	4	0	0	0	18	10
esteem, Confident, independent							
Well prepared	13	8	5	0	0	26	14.44
Does demonstration	13	7	3	0	0	23	12.78
Takes students' opinions into	13	6	3	0	0	22	12.22
consideration							
Clear tests, no unclear or tricky	13	6	3	0	0	22	12.22
questions/test/pop quizzes							
Provides different resources of	13	6	2	0	0	21	11.67
information							
Wants students to do well and	13	4	2	1	0	20	11.11
succeed							
Encourages thinking, Allows	13	6	0	0	0	19	10.56
students to think, Thought							
provoking							
Understanding of students'	13	5	0	0	0	18	10
problem in and outside the class							
Fosters critical thinking and	13	4	0	0	0	17	9.44
problem solving							
Academically capable,	12	5	4	1	0	23	12.78
qualified							
Reasonable	12	5	3	0	0	22	12.22
Attends & participates in	12	6	3	1	0	22	12.22
scientific committees,							
workshops, conferences,							
seminars, journals							

Adequate/appropriate/ reasonable expectations	12	7	2	0	0	21	11.67
Give examples, gives extra examples	12	4	1	0	0	17	9.44
Know students' names, Knows majority of students	12	2	0	1	0	15	8.33
Gives opportunity to improve bad grade	12	3	0	0	0	15	8.33
A good model	12	1	0	0	0	13	7.22
Doesn't just lecture	11	8	3	0	0	22	12.22
Easy to follow/understand, Understandable	11	6	1	0	0	18	10
Cares about students' gaining knowledge	11	6	1	0	0	18	10
Strict/stern when needed	11	5	1	0	0	17	9.44
Has an interest/interested in the subject	11	5	1	0	0	17	9.44
Doesn't make obstacles in teaching,	11	4	1	0	0	16	8.89
Not authoritarian	11	4	1	0	0	16	8.89
Simplifies concepts	11	3	1	0	0	15	8.33
Talks properly to students knowledge level,	11	4	0	0	0	15	8.33
Pays attention to individual differences	11	3	0	0	0	14	7.78
Makes sure/checks students' understanding, learning	11	2	0	0	0	13	7.22
Uses blackboard, Puts notes on blackboard	11	2	0	0	0	13	7.22
Speaks clearly, Clear voice	10	6	2	1	0	19	10.56
Makes students develop and expand their information and ideas	10	4	0	0	0	14	7.78
Positive, optimistic	10	3	0	0	0	13	7.22
Grades assignments in a timely manner	9	5	3	1	0	18	10
Patient	9	4	2	0	0	15	8.33
Fair in timing tests/assignment, Gives enough time/notice for tests/quizzes/assignments, Gives reasonable deadlines/ enough time for tests and assignments	9	5	1	0	0	15	8.33
Clear instruction	9	4	1	0	0	14	7.78
Logical, reasonable, Wise, Foresight	9	3	1	1	0	14	7.78
Gives good lectures,	9	4	1	0	0	14	7.78

Open to change	9	3	1	0	0	13	7.22
Has a good & clear curriculum and sticks to it	9	4	0	0	0	13	7.22
Asks students for opinions	9	3	0	0	0	12	6.67
Enhances students' self-esteem	9	3	0	0	0	12	6.67
Gives useful PowerPoint	9	1	0	0	0	10	5.56
Give few or no assignments and requirements, doesn't give a lot of exhausting assignments	8	3	4	6	5	26	14.44
Listener, listens to students, listens to students' suggestions	8	5	3	0	0	16	8.89
Treats students like adults	8	5	2	0	0	15	8.33
Calm, peaceful, cool, Easygoing, Good tempered	8	4	3	0	0	15	8.33
Ambitious, aspirant	8	6	1	0	0	15	8.33
Clear directions	8	3	1	0	0	12	6.67
Personable, elegance, good looking, decent looking	8	3	1	0	0	12	6.67
Sets high expectations	8	3	0	0	1	12	6.67
Gives clear notes	8	2	1	0	0	11	6.11
Gets information and explores/ thinks by themselves, enhances/increases learning outside of classroom (conference, events, club, etc.)	8	3	0	0	0	11	6.11
Loves/likes students	8	2	0	0	0	10	5.56
Has high religious manners, Religious	8	1	0	0	0	9	5
Is not absent, Doesn't cancel classes	7	6	2	2	0	17	9.44
Talks slowly, teaches at a reasonable speed	7	3	1	0	0	11	6.11
Asks for and responds to feedback and email quickly	7	3	1	0	0	11	6.11
Open-minded	7	3	0	0	0	10	5.56
Uses and provides clear rubrics	7	3	0	0	0	10	5.56
A worthwhile class	7	3	0	0	0	10	5.56
Does self-assessment or evaluation	7	2	0	0	0	9	5
Uses real life examples	7	2	0	0	0	9	5
Gives extra opportunity for more effort as appreciation	7	2	0	0	0	9	5
Inspires his students, inspiring	7	0	0	0	0	7	3.89
Does research continuously, Publishes research	6	4	1	0	0	11	6.11
Not moody, Has a good mood	6	3	2	0	0	11	6.11
Doesn't overload students with	6	3	2	0	0	11	6.11

assignments, undemanding							
Authoritative, Dominating, commanding, ruling	6	2	0	1	1	10	5.56
Realistic	6	4	0	0	0	10	5.56
Covers all materials and content, teaches students all that they are required to learn	6	2	2	0	0	10	5.56
Doesn't over expect students' limits	6	3	0	0	0	9	5
Cares about students' passing	6	2	0	0	0	8	4.44
Ethical, has scientific ethics, strong work ethic	6	2	0	0	0	8	4.44
Tries to accommodate class and students' needs	6	2	0	0	0	8	4.44
Has leadership skills	6	2	0	0	0	8	4.44
Encourages application of learned information	6	2	0	0	0	8	4.44
Challenges students, challenging courses, challenges students to think	6	2	0	0	0	8	4.44
Relates material to real world/major	6	2	0	0	0	8	4.44
Smiles at students, Happy	6	1	0	0	0	7	3.89
Practical	5	2	1	0	0	8	4.44
Likeable	5	3	0	0	0	8	4.44
Returns emails quickly	5	2	1	0	0	8	4.44
Corrects students' mistakes	5	2	0	0	0	7	3.89
Clear objectives	5	2	0	0	0	7	3.89
Teaches to ensure learning	5	2	0	0	0	7	3.89
Clear about what will be on tests	5	2	0	0	0	7	3.89
Expects the best	5	2	0	0	0	7	3.89
Makes effort to know you	5	1	0	0	0	6	3.33
Has a good personality and mental health	4	2	2	0	0	8	4.44
Allows room for students' thoughts	4	2	0	0	0	6	3.33
Connects topic to real life situations	4	1	0	0	0	5	2.78
Visual, use visual aids, uses visual material	3	2	1	1	0	7	3.89
Assigns group work, makes students work on group projects, Allows group projects	3	1	0	0	1	5	2.78
Not intimidating	3	2	0	0	0	5	2.78
Doesn't fail students	3	1	0	0	0	4	2.22
Learns from his mistakes	3	0	0	0	0	3	1.67

Easy grading, easy class, Easy assignment	2	1	0	3	3	9	5
Practices what they teach	2	1	0	0	0	3	1.67
Give lots of assignments/ work/requirements and tests, Overloads students with homework/demands	1	2	5	12	31	51	28.33
Strict, rigorous, too serious, rigid, stern	1	1	7	9	24	42	23.33
Has good/fair attitude	1	1	1	1	0	4	2.22
Curves tests when the class average is poor,	1	1	0	0	0	2	1.11
Doesn't give cumulative finals	1	1	0	0	0	2	1.11
Gives short tests on sections	1	1	0	0	0	2	1.11
Ordinary teaching, Traditional teaching, Old fashion teaching	0	2	43	37	31	113	62.78
Not using various good and useful activities & teaching methods, (PowerPoint, reading from book, notes, etc.), Doesn't provide alternative ways of teaching	0	2	24	33	44	113	62.78
Unapproachable at office and by email	0	0	11	38	60	109	60.56
monotone voice, lectures/ teaching methods	0	0	38	31	35	104	57.78
Unable to convey/communicate information/ideas clearly	0	1	6	31	64	102	56.67
Always use the same/one style/way (routine) in teaching & testing, Always same one teaching style, Relies on one way of teaching	0	0	36	24	33	93	51.67
No office hours	0	0	9	31	52	92	51.11
Straight/pure lectures, All lectures	0	0	27	33	30	90	50
Not interesting, Boring, not enjoyable class	0	0	9	29	50	88	48.89
Just uses and reads (directly) from books only for teaching	0	0	30	26	28	84	46.67
Uses poor teaching methods, poor teaching style, poor instructions	0	0	8	22	40	70	38.89
Is not versed in subject matter, Knows little/nothing about subject	0	0	4	22	43	69	38.33
Apathetic	0	0	6	18	45	69	38.33

Unavailable to help in & outside of class	0	0	4	23	41	68	37.78
Not on time, Late in time and doing work	0	2	8	24	32	66	36.67
Not cooperative, not helpful	0	0	2	20	39	61	33.89
Does not communicate with students	0	0	7	16	37	60	33.33
Unknowledgeable, uneducated, not scholar, lacks knowledge, Not thoughtful	0	0	0	20	40	60	33.33
Unorganized, disorganized	0	0	5	24	30	59	32.78
Uncaring	0	0	4	14	40	58	32.22
filthy, bawdy, impolite to students, mean, rude, insulting	0	0	2	14	41	57	31.67
Uses unfair assessment and tests	0	1	4	17	32	55	30.56
Often absent, cancels classes	0	0	8	18	29	55	30.56
Treats students badly	0	0	3	11	38	52	28.89
Does not like his work, hates his job, Not interested in teaching, Is there because its their job/ has to do it	0	0	6	19	25	50	27.78
Doesn't use different resources of information	0	0	5	10	34	49	27.22
Doesn't care if students understand	0	1	5	13	30	49	27.22
Only lectures, lecture based class	0	0	21	12	14	47	26.11
Does not do his duties, responsibilities	0	0	1	8	37	46	25.56
No clear plan of his goals to students, No syllabus/lesson plan	0	0	6	14	26	46	25.56
Talks over students' knowledge	0	0	3	17	25	45	25
Does not explain clearly, No clear instructions	0	0	2	11	32	45	25
Unfair grading	0	0	0	18	27	45	25
Not interactive, doesn't interact/make conversations with students before/ during/ after class	0	0	2	12	31	45	25
Does poor testing and evaluation	0	0	2	12	30	44	24.44
His students do not understand subject matters, His students don't know what's going on	0	0	3	11	28	42	23.33
Not available for help	0	0	1	13	27	41	22.78
Miser in giving grades, uneasy	0	0	0	10	31	41	22.78

(hard) grading,							
Unfair, biased	0	0	0	13	26	39	21.67
His requirements/demands are not feasible, Unreasonable	0	0	5	6	27	38	21.11
Bad teacher, bad teaching skills, not skillful	0	0	2	13	23	38	21.11
Not sincere	0	0	1	9	27	37	20.56
No explanation	0	0	1	8	27	36	20
No various ways of testing and grading	0	0	1	9	25	35	19.44
Centered-teaching, His students are just recipients and not active, don't get information by themselves	0	0	3	10	21	34	18.89
Poor speaker	0	0	6	9	19	34	18.89
Conceited, sniffy, bighead, Boastful, No humility, Stuck-up, Cocky	0	0	0	9	24	33	18.33
Overly demanding	0	0	1	9	23	33	18.33
Doesn't care about education of student/abilities/level of knowledge	0	0	2	9	22	33	18.33
Not capable, unqualified (academically)	0	0	0	7	24	31	17.22
Does not give meaningful, useful, and helpful exercises, activities, practices, assignments	0	0	1	10	20	31	17.22
Presents irrelevant subjects, tests, papers	0	0	6	9	15	30	16.67
Not honest or not true, not faithful, deceiving, Liar, Not truthful, Hypocrite	0	0	1	8	20	29	16.11
Not sociable, Not friendly	0	0	0	8	21	29	16.11
Doesn't respect viewpoints, opinions, discussion, or critiques from others	0	0	1	10	17	28	15.56
Not understanding, not sympathetic	0	0	5	10	13	28	15.56
Does poor ways of grading	0	0	0	7	21	28	15.56
Irresponsible	0	0	0	6	21	27	15
Doesn't turn assignments back on time(in a timely manner)	0	0	4	7	16	27	15
Can't simplify concepts	0	0	1	8	17	26	14.44
Verbatim,	0	0	5	8	13	26	14.44
Doesn't meet outside of class, never available	0	0	1	7	18	26	14.44

Unforgivable, intolerant,	0	0	1	4	20	25	13.89
Fuzzy/unclear expectations	0	0	2	7	16	25	13.89
Over critical, judgmental	0	0	1	3	21	25	13.89
Does not use attractive teaching methods	0	0	1	8	16	25	13.89
Thinks/doesn't understand that students only have his class,	0	1	2	3	19	25	13.89
Unconcerned, not considering, Inconsiderate	0	0	0	6	18	24	13.33
Threaten students by failing them, intimidating (like: Says no one will get better than F/C)	0	0	1	4	19	24	13.33
Does not answer students' questions, unable to answer questions	0	0	3	5	16	24	13.33
Makes it hard for students to pass the class	0	0	0	6	18	24	13.33
Makes fun of students, mimics, sarcastic	0	0	0	5	19	24	13.33
Neglectful	0	0	0	5	18	23	12.78
Doesn't believe, trust in students' ability	0	0	1	3	19	23	12.78
Inactive, unproductive, not practical, lazy, unenergetic	0	0	2	8	13	23	12.78
Doesn't provide students with information to help with learning material	0	0	1	4	17	22	12.22
Doesn't treat students as adults , Treats them like kids	0	0	0	7	15	22	12.22
Racist, Discriminates, favors certain students	0	0	0	5	17	22	12.22
Does not encourage students, not cheerful, not motivating	0	1	2	8	11	22	12.22
Doesn't give notes	0	0	0	9	13	22	12.22
Bad presentation and speaker	0	0	3	7	12	22	12.22
Disconnects with students	0	0	1	7	13	21	11.67
Focused on memorizing style of teaching, not thinking	0	0	0	3	18	21	11.67
Doesn't respect students, Disrespectful	0	0	0	4	17	21	11.67
Put obstacles for students' success	0	0	2	4	15	21	11.67
Unenthusiastic, not passionate, not excited, Not motivated	0	0	0	5	16	21	11.67
Inflexible, not resilient	0	0	3	7	11	21	11.67
Students don't get learning/ education from his class	0	0	0	7	14	21	11.67

Careless	0	0	1	6	13	20	11.11
Not relatable, Does not relate to students	0	0	1	4	15	20	11.11
Doesn't hold students' attention	0	0	2	7	12	19	10.56
Delays classes	0	0	2	6	11	19	10.56
Ask unclear questions	0	0	3	9	7	19	10.56
Not expert in field, Not professional	0	0	2	4	13	19	10.56
Not likable	0	0	0	2	17	19	10.56
Not a listener, does not listen to students	0	0	0	3	16	19	10.56
No contact info, not accessible	0	0	2	6	11	19	10.56
Has negative attitudes toward students, has bad attitude	0	0	0	3	16	19	10.56
Do not allow and engage all students to participate, unengaged, does not involve class, uninvolved, No engagement	0	0	2	6	11	19	10.56
Doesn't give feedback	0	0	3	6	10	19	10.56
Gets off topic	0	0	2	5	11	18	10
Not encouraging, cheerless, Not motivating, not prompt, Puts students down	0	0	1	3	14	18	10
Not creative, no creative teaching	0	0	0	6	12	18	10
Use poor curricula and criteria	0	1	1	5	10	17	9.44
Gives hard assignments	0	0	0	4	13	17	9.44
Doesn't use discussion, or discuss with students	0	1	2	6	8	17	9.44
Gives too difficult tests	0	0	1	6	9	16	8.89
Doesn't care if students pass or fail	0	0	0	3	13	16	8.89
Not persistent, not diligent, Not competent	0	0	0	3	13	16	8.89
Tired/washy of teaching, not passionate about teaching	0	0	0	5	11	16	8.89
Unfocused	0	0	2	4	9	15	8.33
Not fun/friendly/relaxed/uncomfortable atmosphere learning	0	0	0	3	12	15	8.33
Cheerless, morbid, bored, unhappy, sad, Never happy	0	0	0	4	11	15	8.33
No patience	0	0	0	4	11	15	8.33
Doesn't allow thinking	0	0	0	4	11	15	8.33
Doesn't use technology in teaching	0	0	1	4	9	14	7.78

Unprepared	0	0	0	5	9	14	7.78
Doesn't care about students' needs	0	0	0	3	11	14	7.78
Is not a good model, Not inspiring	0	0	0	2	12	14	7.78
Doesn't care about students' emotions (mentality),	0	0	0	3	10	13	7.22
Not open-minded, closed-mind, Narrow-minded, Hidebound	0	0	0	1	12	13	7.22
Underestimates students	0	0	0	2	11	13	7.22
Poor test formats	0	0	0	4	9	13	7.22
Gives negative criticism	0	0	0	2	11	13	7.22
Hard to understand, or not understandable	0	0	1	5	7	13	7.22
Punishing	0	0	0	4	8	12	6.67
Moody, has bad mood, Grumpy	0	0	1	5	6	12	6.67
Humiliates students	0	0	0	3	9	12	6.67
Not smart, not clever, not intelligent, not thoughtful	0	0	1	3	8	12	6.67
Cannot manage or handle or control class or students' behaviors in class	0	0	0	5	7	12	6.67
Does not improve, develop, enhance his skills	0	0	1	4	7	12	6.67
Just do it for money, Seeking money/prestige, Doesn't teach for students	0	0	1	3	8	12	6.67
Not punctual	0	0	0	4	7	11	6.11
Gets nervous easily, emotional	0	0	0	2	9	11	6.11
Doesn't provide good learning environment	0	0	1	2	9	11	6.11
Doesn't provide, teach new and updated information	0	0	8	1	2	11	6.11
Doesn't ask questions	0	0	1	4	6	11	6.11
Doesn't smile at students	0	0	0	4	7	11	6.11
Doesn't cover all materials,	0	1	3	2	5	11	6.11
Doesn't care about students' performance	0	0	0	2	9	11	6.11
Unclear grading methods	0	0	0	4	7	11	6.11
Unrealistic expectations	0	0	0	4	7	11	6.11
Not ambitious, not aspirant	0	0	0	6	5	11	6.11
Does not love/hates students	0	0	0	2	9	11	6.11
Goes over materials quickly, rushes through material, rushes to put all chapters in one test	0	0	2	3	6	11	6.11
Doesn't care if students have other work from other classes	0	0	0	2	9	11	6.11

Doesn't review for tests ,	0	0	0	2	9	11	6.11
No expectations at all/Low expectations	0	0	1	3	6	10	5.56
Doesn't give enough time/notice for tests/quizzes	0	0	0	3	6	9	5
Unclear teaching, hard to understand/follow	0	0	1	5	3	9	5
No experiences	0	0	1	2	6	9	5
Fails lots of students, has to give bad grades	0	0	0	2	7	9	5
Has no good relationships with others	0	0	0	3	6	9	5
Doesn't give enough or clear feedback	0	0	1	2	4	7	5
No high self-esteem, not confident	0	0	0	3	6	9	5
Pointless class	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.44
Gives unclear tests/questions	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.44
Stressful atmosphere of learning	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44
Weak or poor personality	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.44
Stubborn, hardhead, One-sided mind	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.44
Grades only on test, Only has midterm & final for grades	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.44
Unupdated, not open to change	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.44
Expects too much from students, Too strict expectations	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.44
His voice not clear, students can't understand his speech, Doesn't speak clearly	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.44
Too busy, over worked, Very scheduled, preoccupied	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.44
Doesn't give examples, Examples not explanatory	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.44
Unscientific	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44
Strict attendance policy, Hard to get a hold of	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.44
Gets angry, Angry	0	0	0	0	7	7	3.89
Does not give another opportunity(ies)/make-up points	0	0	0	2	5	7	3.89
Not personable, Not elegance, not clean, Sloppy	0	0	0	2	5	7	3.89
Ambiguous	0	0	0	2	5	7	3.89
Doesn't encourage students to learn and apply concepts (in real life)	0	0	0	1	6	7	3.89
Teaches misconceptions	0	0	0	1	6	7	3.89

Revengeful, hateful, spiteful	0	0	0	2	5	7	3.89
Doesn't talk to students	0	0	0	2	4	6	3.33
Doesn't teach enough information	0	0	1	1	4	6	3.33
Doesn't respond to feedback and email	0	0	0	2	4	6	3.33
Has no sense of humor, Not funny	0	0	0	2	4	6	3.33
Doesn't prepare students for exams	0	0	0	2	4	6	3.33
Gives pop quizzes	0	0	0	1	4	5	2.78
Aggressive	0	0	0	1	4	5	2.78
Does not do research continuously	0	0	1	1	3	5	2.78
Makes students confused, confusing	0	0	0	1	4	5	2.78
Provides no/little evidence for students	0	0	0	1	4	5	2.78
Annoyed by students' questions	0	0	0	1	3	4	2.22
Selfish	0	0	1	1	2	4	2.22
Available only during class	0	0	1	3	0	4	2.22
Dependant, subordinate	0	0	2	1	1	4	2.22
Wants students to have hard time/to do poorly	0	0	0	1	3	4	2.22
Uses his opinions, not facts ,	0	0	0	1	3	4	2.22
Pessimistic	0	0	0	1	2	3	1.67
Does things just his way, thinks that his way is the only correct way	0	0	0	1	2	3	1.67
Talks quickly	0	0	0	1	2	3	1.67
Easily frustrated	0	0	0	1	1	2	1.11
Not formidable	0	0	0	1	1	2	1.11
Wants to please students	0	0	0	1	1	2	1.11
Gives cumulative finals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1.11
Assigns useless text books that will never be used	0	0	0	1	1	2	1.11

Note: I, Ideal; V, Very good; A, Average; B, Below average; and P, Poor instructor.

APPENDIX L

Frequencies of Characteristics Based on Hierarchal Order of Each Theme

Characteristics Theme	Items	Total	%
Teaching Style/Skills	Positive Interesting, Enjoyable, fun, interesting, interactive, not boring /learning lectures and teaching, Makes subject interesting/exciting, makes class (learning) worthwhile/fun/ interesting	107	59.44
	Uses various good and useful activities	100	55.56
	Uses various good and useful teaching methods	79	43.89
	Able to convey information clearly, Able to communicate ideas,	75	41.67
	Explains materials clearly	69	38.33
	Gives useful and helpful learning, guides, tests, study direction, exercises , practices , assignments to explain and understand	63	35.00
	Gives time to help and explain, Meets students outside of class	63	35.00
	Plans his teaching objectives clearly/concisely to students	60	33.33
	Does his duties/commitments, responsibilities, responsible	57	31.67
	Uses attractive teaching methods that hold students' attention	49	27.22
	Asks for feasible, reasonable/realistic requirements, demands	45	25.00
	Has excellent/good teaching skills, Skillful	44	24.44
	Provides updated information	42	23.33
	Gives useful handouts	35	19.44
	Focused, Punctual, Very punctual/precise	35	19.44
	Uses classroom discussion, Leads lots of discussion, discussion based class , has discussions with students	33	18.33
	Updated	31	17.22
	Clear requirements/assignments	31	17.22
	Turns assignments back immediately	31	17.22
	Has a good & clear lesson plan and stick to it	30	16.67
	Good speaker and presentation skills, speaks affectively	30	16.67
	Reviews previous classes	29	16.11
	Answers students' questions, during, after, and before class, willing to answer questions	27	15.00
	Keeps student interested, Holds students' attention	27	15.00
	Doesn't give busy/overload work	27	15.00
	Gives feedback	27	15.00

Sets clear expectation	27	15.00
Gives extra credits for more effort as appreciate, Allows make up points	27	15.00
Relates topic/subjects to students, Relatable, Relates to students	27	15.00
Effective teacher, teaches materials efficiently/effectively	26	14.44
Uses technology in teaching (like online classes, Videos, TV, etc)	25	13.89
Creates comfortable/fun/relaxed atmosphere	25	13.89
Creative, inventive, Creative teaching style/ ways of teaching	24	13.33
Presents relevant topics and subjects, On topic, connects material to relevance	24	13.33
Improves, develops, enhances his teaching skills	23	12.78
Does demonstration	23	12.78
Doesn't just lecture	22	12.22
Provides a good & clear syllabus and sticks to it	22	12.22
Provides different resources of information	21	11.67
Adequate/appropriate/reasonable expectations	21	11.67
Asks unclear questions	19	10.56
Speaks clearly, Clear voice	19	10.56
Easy to follow/understand, Understandable	18	10.00
Gives examples, gives extra examples	17	9.44
Doesn't make obstacles in teaching	16	8.89
Simplifies concepts	15	8.33
Gives opportunity to improve bad grade	15	8.33
Clear instruction	14	7.78
Gives good lectures	14	7.78
Uses Blackboard, Puts notes on blackboard	13	7.22
Open to change	13	7.22
Has a good & clear curriculum and sticks to it	13	7.22
Clear directions	12	6.67
Sets high expectations	12	6.67
Gives clear notes	11	6.11
Talks slowly, teaches at reasonable speed	11	6.11
Doesn't overload students with assignments, undemanding	11	6.11
Gives useful PowerPoint	10	5.56
Uses and provides clear rubrics	10	5.56
A worthwhile class	10	5.56
Covers all materials and content , teaches	10	5.56

	students all that they are required to learn		
	Uses real life example	9	5.00
	Doesn't expect beyond students' limits	9	5.00
	Gives extra opportunity for more effort as appreciated	9	5.00
	Give few or no assignments and requirements, doesn't give a lot of exhausted assignments	8	4.44
	Relates material to real world/major	8	4.44
	Clear objectives	7	3.89
	Visual, use visual aids , uses visual material	7	3.89
	Expects the best	7	3.89
	Assigns group work, makes students work on group projects, Allows group projects	5	2.78
	Not intimidating	5	2.78
Negative	Ordinary Teaching , Traditional Teaching, Old fashion teaching	113	62.78
	Not using various good and useful activities & teaching methods (PowerPoint, reading from book, notes, etc.) , Doesn't provide alternative ways of teaching	113	62.78
	Unable to convey/communicate information/ ideas clearly	102	56.67
	Monotone voice/ lectures/teaching methods	104	57.78
	Always uses the same/one style/way (routine) in teaching & testing, Always same one teaching style, Relies on one way of teaching	93	51.67
	Straight/pure lectures, All lectures	90	50.00
	Not interesting, Boring, not enjoyable class	88	48.89
	Just uses and reads (directly) from books only for teaching	84	46.67
	Uses poor teaching methods, poor teaching style, poor instructions	70	38.89
	Gives lots of assignments/work/requirements and tests, Overloads students with homework/demands	51	28.33
	Doesn't use different resources of information	49	27.22
	Only lectures, lecture based class	47	26.11
	Does not do his duties, responsibilities	46	25.56
	No clear plan of his goals to students, No syllabus/lesson plan	46	25.56
	Talks over students' knowledge	45	25.00
	Does not explain clearly, No clear	45	25.00

instructions		
His requirements/demands are not feasible, Unreasonable	38	21.11
Bad teacher, bad teaching skills, not skillful	38	21.11
No explanation	36	20.00
Poor speaker	34	18.89
Overly demanding	33	18.33
Does not give meaningful, useful and helpful exercises, activities, practices, assignments	31	17.22
Presents irrelevant subjects, tests, papers	30	16.67
Doesn't turn assignments back on time(in a timely manner)	27	15.00
Can't simplify concepts	26	14.44
Verbatim	26	14.44
No fuzzy/clear expectations	25	13.89
Not using attractive teaching methods	25	13.89
Threatens students by failing them, intimidating (like: Says no one will get better than F/C)	24	13.33
Neglecting	23	12.78
Doesn't provide students with information to help with learning material	22	12.22
Doesn't give notes	22	12.22
Bad presentation and speaker	22	12.22
Put obstacles for students' successful	21	11.67
Not relatable, Does not relate to students	20	11.11
Doesn't hold students' attention	19	10.56
Delays classes	19	10.56
Doesn't give feedback	19	10.56
Gets off topic	18	10.00
Not creative, no creative teaching	18	10.00
Gives hard assignments	17	9.44
Doesn't use discussion, or discuss with students	17	9.44
Unfocused	15	8.33
Doesn't use technology in teaching	14	7.78
Punishing	12	6.67
Not punctual	11	6.11
Doesn't provide, teach new and updated information	11	6.11
Doesn't ask questions	11	6.11
Doesn't cover all materials	11	6.11
Unrealistic expectations	11	6.11
Goes over materials quickly, rushes through material, rushes to put all chapters	11	6.11

		in one test		
		No expectations at all/Low expectation	10	5.56
		Unupdated, not open to change	8	4.44
		Expects too much from students, Too strict expectations	8	4.44
		His voice not clear, students can't understand his speech , Doesn't speak clearly	8	4.44
		Doesn't give examples, Examples not explanatory	8	4.44
		Unscientific	8	4.44
		Does not give another opportunity(ies)/make-up points	7	3.89
		Ambiguous	7	3.89
		Doesn't give enough or clear feedback	7	3.89
		Not teach enough information	6	3.33
		Provides no/little evidence for students	5	2.78
		Uses his opinions, not facts	4	2.22
		Talks quickly	3	1.67
		Assigns useless text books that will never be used	2	1.11
Learning process	Positive	Cares about students' performance/education	71	39.44
		Cares about students' understanding/knows materials	50	27.78
		Allows every (all) student to participate, engaging , involves students in lectures	44	24.44
		Students get/benefit gain knowledge from his/her class, His students are doing well and learning	38	21.11
		Asks good questions to arouse critical thinking	29	16.11
		Knows students' ability level	28	15.56
		Allows students make decisions/choices on projects/class activities/plans/assignments	26	14.44
		Cares about students' needs, Understands students' needs	25	13.89
		Makes students understand subject matter	25	13.89
		His students are not just recipient/they are active	25	13.89
		Makes students understand not memorize	24	13.33
		Takes students' opinions into consideration	22	12.22
		Wants students to do well and succeed	20	11.11
		Encourages thinking, Allows students to think , Thought provoking	19	10.56
		Cares about students' gaining knowledge	18	10.00
		Fosters critical thinking and problem	17	9.44

	solving		
	Talks properly to students' knowledge level	15	8.33
	Pays attention to individual differences	14	7.78
	Makes students develop and expand their information and ideas	14	7.78
	Makes sure/check students understanding , learning	13	7.22
	Asks students for opinions	12	6.67
	Gets information and explore/think by themselves , enhance/increase learning outside of classroom (conference, events, club, ...) ,	11	6.11
	Cares about students' passing	8	4.44
	Tries to accommodate class and students' needs	8	4.44
	Encourages application of learned information	8	4.44
	Challenges students, challenging courses , challenges students to think	8	4.44
	Corrects students' mistakes	7	3.89
	Teaches to ensure learning	7	3.89
	Allows room for students thoughts	6	3.33
	Connects topic to real life situations	5	2.78
Negative	Doesn't care if students understand	49	27.22
	His students do not understand subject matters, His students don't know what's going on	42	23.33
	Centered-teaching, His students are just recipient and not active, don't get information by themselves	34	18.89
	Doesn't care about education of student/ abilities/level of knowledge	33	18.33
	Does not answer students' questions , unable to answer questions	24	13.33
	Doesn't believe, trust in students' ability	23	12.78
	Focus on memorizing style of teaching not thinking	21	11.67
	Students don't get learning/education from his class	21	11.67
	Does not allow and engage all students to participate, unengaged, does not involve class , uninvolved, No engagement	19	10.56
	Doesn't care if students pass or fail	16	8.89
	Not fun/friendly/relaxed/uncomfortable atmosphere learning	15	8.33
	Doesn't allow thinking	15	8.33

		Doesn't care about students' needs	14	7.78
		Underestimates students	13	7.22
		Hard to understand, or not understandable	13	7.22
		Doesn't provide good learning environment	11	6.11
		Doesn't care about students' performance	11	6.11
		Unclear teaching, hard to understand/follow	9	5.00
		Pointless class	8	4.44
		Stressful atmosphere learning	8	4.44
		Doesn't encourage students to learn and apply concepts (in real life)	7	3.89
		Teaches misconceptions	7	3.89
		Makes students confused, confusing	5	2.78
		Annoyed by students' questions	4	2.22
		Wants students to have hard time/to do poor	4	2.22
Scholarly	Positive	Versed in subject matter, knowledgeable of the subject, influential	148	82.22
		Knowledgeable	140	77.78
		Scholarly, educative, well-educated	95	52.78
		Expert in field , Professional	42	23.33
		Active, productive	33	18.33
		Has lots of experiences	29	16.11
		Well prepared	26	14.44
		Academically capable, qualified	23	12.78
		Attend & Participate in scientific committees, workshops, and conference, seminars, journals	22	12.22
		Seeks further knowledge/education/ information in his field, inquisitive	20	11.11
		Has an interest/interested in their subject	17	9.44
		Does researches continuously, Publishes research	11	6.11
		Does self-assessment or evaluation	9	5.00
		Practical	8	4.44
		Learns from his mistakes	3	1.67
		Practices what they teach	3	1.67
	Negative	Is not versed in subject matter, Knows little/nothing about subject	69	38.33
		Unknowledgeable, uneducated, not scholar, lacks knowledge, Not thoughtful	60	33.33
		Not capable, unqualified (academically)	31	17.22
		Inactive, unproductive, not practical, lazy, unenergetic	23	12.78
		Not expert in field , Not professional	19	10.56
		Tired/washy of teaching , not passionate about teaching	16	8.89

		unprepared	14	7.78
		Does not improve, develop, enhance his skills	12	6.67
		Just does it for money, Seeks money/prestige, Doesn't teach for students	12	6.67
		No experiences	9	5.00
		Too busy, over worked , Very scheduled , preoccupied	8	4.44
		Do not do research continuously	5	2.78
Manners	Positive	Nice, kind, amiable, Outgoing	100	55.56
		Respects viewpoints of others	76	42.22
		Polite, well mannered	62	34.44
		Sincere, dependable	45	25.00
		Respects students and others	41	22.78
		Honest ,true, loyal, faithful, devoted	39	21.67
		Dignified, grave, respectful	26	14.44
		Trustable , trustworthy , reliable	23	12.78
		Modest (humble), Humility, Not egocentric	22	12.22
		Forgivable, tolerant, Not penalize, doesn't punish	20	11.11
		Has high religious manners, Religious	9	5.00
		Ethical, has scientific ethics , strong work ethic	8	4.44
		Inspires his students, inspiring	7	3.89
	Negative	Filthy, bawdy , impolite to students, mean, rude, insulting	57	31.67
		Treats students badly	52	28.89
		Not sincere	37	20.56
		Conceited, sniffy, bighead , Boastful , No humility , Stuck-up , Cocky	33	18.33
		Not honest or not true, not faithful , deceiving, Liar, Not truthful, Hypocrite	29	16.11
		Doesn't respect viewpoints, opinions, discussion, or critiques from others	28	15.56
		Unforgivable, intolerant, punishes	25	13.89
		Makes fun of students, mimics, sarcastic	24	13.33
		Doesn't treat students as adults, Treats them like kids	22	12.22
		Doesn't respect students, Disrespectful	21	11.67
		Humiliates students	12	6.67
Social skills/ Communication	Positive	Has office hours, meets students in office hours	124	68.89
		Approachable , approachable at office or by email	116	64.44
		Interactive, interacts with students	68	37.78
		Communicates with students, connects , can relate to students, relatable, Easy to	62	34.44

		talk to, Talks to students, Responsive		
		Treats students and others well	48	26.67
		Sociable, friendly, has good relationships, good personal connections	43	23.89
		Accessible, Has contact information	29	16.11
		Knows students' names, Knows majority of students	15	8.33
		Treats students like adults	15	8.33
		Asks for and responds to feedback and email quickly	11	6.11
		Likeable	8	4.44
		Returns emails quickly	8	4.44
		Makes effort to know you	6	3.33
	Negative	Unapproachable at office and by email	109	60.56
		No office hours	92	51.11
		No communication with students	60	33.33
		Not interactive, doesn't interact/make conversations with students before/during/after class,	45	25.00
		Not sociable, Not friendly	29	16.11
		Doesn't meet outside of class, never available	26	14.44
		Disconnected from students	21	11.67
		Not likable	19	10.56
		No contact info, not accessible	19	10.56
		Does not love/hates students	11	6.11
		Has no good relationships with others	9	5.00
		Doesn't talk to students	6	3.33
		Doesn't respond to feedback and email	6	3.33
		Available only during class	4	2.22
Personality/ Personal attribute	Positive	Helpful, Helping, help student, Available for help in and outside class	128	71.11
		Cooperative, supportive	104	57.78
		Understanding	94	52.22
		Fair, unbiased , Sees students as equals	74	41.11
		Likes teaching and not seeking money or Prestige	65	36.11
		Sympathetic, caring, sensible	64	35.56
		Enthusiastic, passionate, excited , exciting , passionate/excited about what they teach, motivated	64	35.56
		Organized, methodical	63	35.00
		Loves and enjoys his work	45	25.00
		Flexible, resilient	44	24.44
		Has sense of humor, humorous, comical, funny	44	24.44
		Encourages students to learn, cheerful,	44	24.44

	motivating , Incentive		
	Persistent, diligent, hard working, willing , works hard , Takes work seriously	41	22.78
	Not extremely/rigid/strict, pushover, not so serious	40	22.22
	Excited/passionate about teaching	39	21.67
	Considers students' circumstances, considerate	35	19.44
	Smart, clever, intelligent, genius, thoughtful, strong minded	31	17.22
	Understands that students have several or other classes/commitments not only his class and life circumstances, Understands that students get sick and miss classes	29	16.11
	Competent	23	12.78
	Reasonable	22	12.22
	Energetic	21	11.67
	Inflexible, not resilient	21	11.67
	Understanding of students' problem in and outside the class	18	10.00
	Self-assured, has high self esteem, Confident, independent	18	10.00
	Not authoritarian	16	8.89
	Listener, listens to students, listens to students' suggestions	16	8.89
	Patient	15	8.33
	Calm, peaceful, cool, Easygoing ,Good tempered	15	8.33
	Ambitious, aspirant	15	8.33
	Logical, reasonable , Wise, Foresight	14	7.78
	Positive, optimistic	13	7.22
	Enhances students' self-esteem	12	6.67
	Personable, elegance, good looking, decent looking	12	6.67
	Not moody, Has a good mood	11	6.11
	Open-minded	10	5.56
	Realistic	10	5.56
	Loves/likes students	10	5.56
	Has a good personality and mental health	8	4.44
	Smiles at students, Happy	7	3.89
	Has good/fair attitude	4	2.22
Negative	Apathetic,	69	38.33
	Unavailable to help in & outside of class	68	37.78
	Unorganized , disorganized	59	32.78
	Uncaring	58	32.22
	Not cooperative, not helpful	61	33.89
	Does not like his work , hates his job , Not	50	27.78

interested in teaching, Is there because its their job/have to do it		
Strict, rigorous, too serious , rigid , stern	42	23.33
Not available for help	41	22.78
Unfair, biased	39	21.67
Not understanding, not sympathetic	28	15.56
Thinks/doesn't understand that students only have his class	25	13.89
Unconcerned, not considering, Inconsiderate	24	13.33
Racist, Discriminates, favors certain students	22	12.22
Not encouraging students, not cheerful, not motivating	22	12.22
Unenthusiastic, not passionate , not excited, Not motivated	21	11.67
Careless	20	11.11
Not a listener, does not listen to students	19	10.56
Has negative attitudes toward students, has bad attitude	19	10.56
Not encouraging, cheerless, Not motivating, not prompt, Puts students down	18	10.00
Not persistent, not diligent , Not competent	16	8.89
Cheerless, morbid, bored, unhappy, sad, Never happy	15	8.33
Not patient	15	8.33
Doesn't care about students' emotions (mentality),	13	7.22
Not open-minded, close-mind, Narrow- mind, Hidebound	13	7.22
Moody, has bad mood , Grumpy	12	6.67
Not smart, not clever, not intelligent, not thoughtful	12	6.67
Gets nervous easily, emotionally	11	6.11
Not ambitious, not aspirant	11	6.11
Doesn't smile at students	11	6.11
Doesn't care if they have work from other classes	11	6.11
No high self-esteem, not confident	9	5.00
Weak or poor personality	8	4.44
Stubborn, hardhead, One-sided mind	8	4.44
Get angry, Angry	7	3.89
Not personable, Not elegance, not clean , Sloppy	7	3.89
Revengeful, hateful, spiteful	7	3.89
Has no sense of humor, Not funny	6	3.33
Aggressive	5	2.78

		Selfish	4	2.22
		Pessimistic	3	1.67
		Does things just on his way, thinks that his way is the only correct way	3	1.67
		Easily frustrated	2	1.11
Leadership skills/ managing classroom	Positive	On time, not late	49	27.22
		Good managing/control of classroom behaviors, Can control students' behavior in class	34	18.89
		Provides guidance and consults, Guides, Directs	22	12.22
		Critically evaluates, constructive criticism, positive criticism, Critiques positively, positive compliments	20	11.11
		Strict/stern when needed	17	9.44
		Is not absent, Doesn't cancel classes	17	9.44
		A good model	13	7.22
		Authoritative, dominating, commanding, ruling	10	5.56
		Has leadership skills	8	4.44
	Negative	Not on time, Late in time and doing work	66	36.67
		Often absent, cancels classes	55	30.56
		Irresponsible	27	15.00
		Over critical, judgmental	25	13.89
		Is not a good model, Not inspiring	14	7.78
		Gives negative criticism	13	7.22
		Cannot manage or handle or control class or students' behaviors in class	12	6.67
		Strict attendance policy, Hard to get a hold of	7	3.89
		Dependant, subordinate	4	2.22
		Not formidable	2	1.11
		Wants to please students	2	1.11
Testing & Grading	Positive	Fair grading and assessment and tests, Grades fairly	84	46.67
		Makes various and good ways of testing and grading (online, take home, in class tests)	46	25.56
		Gives useful tests/measures to help student	31	17.22
		Clear tests, no unclear or tricky questions/test/pop quizzes	22	12.22
		Prepares students for exams	19	10.56
		Grades assignments in a timely manner	18	10.00
		Fair in timing tests/assignment , Gives enough time/notice for tests/quizzes/assignments, Gives reasonable deadlines/enough time for tests	15	8.33

	and assignments		
	Clear about what will be on tests	7	3.89
	Doesn't fail students	3	1.67
	Curves tests when the class average is poor	2	1.11
	Doesn't give cumulative finals	2	1.11
	Gives short tests on sections	2	1.11
Negative	Uses unfair assessment and tests	55	30.56
	Unfair grading	45	25.00
	Does poor testing and evaluation	44	24.44
	Miser in giving grades, uneasy (hard) grading	41	22.78
	No various ways of testing and grading	35	19.44
	Does poor ways of grading	28	15.56
	Makes it hard for students to pass the class	24	13.33
	Gives too difficult tests	16	8.89
	Poor test formatted	13	7.22
	Unclear grading methods	11	6.11
	Doesn't review for tests	11	6.11
	Doesn't give enough time/notice for tests/quizzes	9	5.00
	Fails lots of students, has to give bad grades	9	5.00
	Gives unclear tests/questions	8	4.44
	Grades only on test, Only has midterm & final for grades	8	4.44
	Doesn't prepare students for exams	6	3.33
	Gives pop quizzes	5	2.78
	Easy grading, easy class, Easy assignment	3	1.67
	Gives cumulative finals	2	1.11

APPENDIX M

Frequencies of All Saudi Data

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	Prepares students for examination	708	382	234	65	24
2	Cares about students' performance	747	368	187	86	25
3	Improves her/his teaching skills	808	303	189	92	21
4	A good listener	839	344	166	52	12
5	Approachable during office hours	680	391	233	86	23
6	Provides positive criticism	586	462	265	74	26
7	Insults students	22	35	108	216	1032
8	Provides confusing information	14	31	114	253	1001
9	Provides study direction to students	605	469	274	54	11
10	Hardworking	919	347	116	29	2
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	847	329	163	60	14
12	Gives clear feedback	798	384	197	31	3
13	Gives extra credit for more effort	793	313	183	88	36
14	Knows students' names	459	480	311	121	42
15	Tests are too difficult	52	137	325	352	547
16	Relies on one way of teaching	240	280	332	232	329
17	Treats students well	985	275	116	33	4
18	Requires few assignments	336	348	508	158	63
19	Questions on the exams are unclear	42	101	196	276	798
20	Grades fairly	1042	209	103	42	17
21	Engages students in classroom discussion	680	453	221	37	22
22	Explains materials clearly	1034	257	88	28	6
23	Encourages thinking	934	297	134	45	3
24	Good managing of classroom behaviors	785	409	173	34	12
25	Prepares different forms for examinations	514	382	344	126	47
26	Able to hold students' attention	834	262	133	122	62
27	Uses various teaching methods	563	354	270	141	85
28	Punishes students strictly	58	117	328	424	486
29	Applies technology in teaching	495	383	324	130	81
30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	616	465	240	76	16

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
31	Helps students to expand their ideas	721	373	228	78	13
32	Provides a clear syllabus	888	286	149	68	22
33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	713	386	213	78	23
34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	794	299	188	91	41
35	Challenges students to do their best	772	363	194	72	12
36	Focused while teaching	912	276	159	47	19
37	Motivates students to learn	888	319	163	33	10
38	Well prepared	962	293	108	42	8
39	Sets clear goals of teaching	921	316	132	37	7
40	Respect students and peers	1140	179	60	25	9
41	Likes teaching	865	402	117	23	6
42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	885	373	126	25	4
43	Interacts with students	920	337	123	29	4
44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	788	363	182	67	13
45	Friendly	927	276	147	50	13
46	Confident	1024	277	90	19	3
47	Energetic	967	288	126	24	8
48	Neglectful of responsibilities	40	35	79	243	1016
49	Flexible	632	454	262	49	16
50	On time to class	849	387	127	37	13
51	Effective teacher	918	313	141	35	6
52	Honest	1086	206	93	21	7
53	Makes class interesting	944	216	154	64	35
54	Modest	981	251	131	38	12
55	Discriminates against some students	55	77	130	229	922
56	Enthusiastic	843	384	143	35	8
57	A good speaker	949	335	107	19	3
58	A creative teacher	807	324	180	81	21
59	Able to simplify concepts	897	308	150	49	9
60	Fair	1100	185	81	36	11
61	Student assignments are reasonable	892	322	145	41	13
62	Strict when needed	397	458	368	100	90
63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	881	375	114	33	10
64	Understanding	1016	256	99	35	7
65	Is moody	17	58	125	273	940
66	Knowledgeable	859	423	116	14	1

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
67	Intelligent	803	428	147	30	5
68	Organized	888	370	136	13	6
69	Expert in field	1003	304	85	15	6
70	Provides clearly formatted tests	988	237	122	51	15

APPENDIX N

Frequencies of All U.S. Data

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	Prepares students for examination	497	176	39	1	1
2	Cares about students' performance	540	146	24	2	2
3	Improves her/his teaching skills	472	211	27	3	1
4	A good listener	494	189	28	2	1
5	Approachable during office hours	544	145	22	2	1
6	Provides positive criticism	401	266	43	3	1
7	Insults students	5	3	33	146	527
8	Provides confusing information	5	7	54	202	446
9	Provides study direction to students	234	319	130	26	5
10	Hardworking	452	221	39	0	2
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	552	148	11	1	2
12	Gives clear feedback	569	121	21	2	1
13	Gives extra credit for more effort	147	171	312	68	16
14	Knows students' names	266	306	131	9	2
15	Tests are too difficult	7	20	207	308	172
16	Relies on one way of teaching	9	33	153	315	204
17	Treats students well	540	157	16	1	0
18	Requires few assignments	23	79	432	164	16
19	Questions on the exams are unclear	7	6	35	201	465
20	Grades fairly	616	80	14	1	3
21	Engages students in classroom discussion	287	314	101	8	4
22	Explains materials clearly	554	142	14	3	1
23	Encourages thinking	544	154	13	3	0
24	Good managing of classroom behaviors	435	236	37	5	1
25	Prepares different forms for examinations	138	205	275	77	19
26	Able to hold students' attention	448	238	24	2	2
27	Uses various teaching methods	292	305	103	13	1
28	Punishes students strictly	13	42	255	264	140
29	Applies technology in teaching	130	320	243	17	4
30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	275	350	83	4	2
31	Helps students to expand their ideas	373	302	33	4	2
32	Provides a clear syllabus	579	107	24	1	3

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	371	294	44	4	1
34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	311	245	148	8	2
35	Challenges students to do their best	516	180	14	1	3
36	Focused while teaching	423	272	18	0	1
37	Motivates students to learn	503	198	12	0	1
38	Well prepared	530	163	18	1	2
39	Sets clear goals of teaching	475	218	18	2	1
40	Respect students and peers	598	106	9	1	0
41	Likes teaching	536	162	15	1	0
42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	503	201	7	2	1
43	Interacts with students	365	302	44	2	1
44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	290	331	89	3	1
45	Friendly	431	241	41	1	0
46	Confident	449	221	37	6	1
47	Energetic	299	335	78	1	1
48	Neglectful of responsibilities	7	7	22	211	467
49	Flexible	242	354	113	4	1
50	On time to class	420	263	29	2	0
51	Effective teacher	544	159	9	2	0
52	Honest	584	114	15	1	0
53	Makes class interesting	449	237	25	1	2
54	Modest	179	273	240	17	5
55	Discriminates against some students	3	2	12	87	610
56	Enthusiastic	344	319	49	0	2
57	A good speaker	379	307	27	1	0
58	A creative teacher	352	288	70	3	1
59	Able to simplify concepts	368	284	59	3	0
60	Fair	583	117	11	2	1
61	Student assignments are reasonable	424	252	34	3	1
62	Strict when needed	224	304	159	25	2
63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	347	287	75	4	1
64	Understanding	446	235	32	1	0
65	Is moody	3	5	48	393	265

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
66	Knowledgeable	561	147	6	0	0
67	Intelligent	507	198	9	0	0
68	Organized	408	247	57	1	1
69	Expert in field	363	283	68	0	0
70	Provides clearly formatted tests	509	169	31	3	2

APPENDIX O

Frequencies of All Combined Data

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	Prepares students for examination	1205	558	273	66	25
2	Cares about students' performance	1287	514	211	88	27
3	Improves her/his teaching skills	1280	514	216	95	22
4	A good listener	1333	533	194	54	13
5	Approachable during office hours	1224	536	255	88	24
6	Provides positive criticism	987	728	308	77	27
7	Insults students	27	38	141	362	1559
8	Provides confusing information	19	38	168	455	1447
9	Provides study direction to students	839	788	404	80	16
10	Hardworking	1371	568	155	29	4
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	1399	477	174	61	16
12	Gives clear feedback	1367	505	218	33	4
13	Gives extra credit for more effort	940	484	495	156	52
14	Knows students' names	725	786	442	130	44
15	Tests are too difficult	59	157	532	660	719
16	Relies on one way of teaching	249	313	485	547	533
17	Treats students well	1525	432	132	34	4
18	Requires few assignments	359	427	940	322	79
19	Questions on the exams are unclear	49	107	231	477	1263
20	Grades fairly	1658	289	117	43	20
21	Engages students in classroom discussion	967	767	322	45	26
22	Explains materials clearly	1588	399	102	31	7
23	Encourages thinking	1478	451	147	48	3

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
24	Good managing of classroom behaviors	1220	645	210	39	13
25	Prepares different forms for examinations	652	587	619	203	66
26	Able to hold students' attention	1282	500	157	124	64
27	Uses various teaching methods	855	659	373	154	86
28	Punishes students strictly	71	159	583	688	626
29	Applies technology in teaching	625	703	567	147	85
30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	891	815	323	80	18
31	Helps students to expand their ideas	1094	675	261	82	15
32	Provides a clear syllabus	1467	393	173	69	25
33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	1084	680	257	82	24
34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	1105	544	336	99	43
35	Challenges students to do their best	1288	543	208	73	15
36	Focused while teaching	1335	548	177	47	20
37	Motivates students to learn	1391	517	175	33	11
38	Well prepared	1492	456	126	43	10
39	Sets clear goals of teaching	1396	534	150	39	8
40	Respect students and peers	1738	285	69	26	9
41	Likes teaching	1401	564	132	24	6
42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	1388	574	133	27	5
43	Interacts with students	1285	639	167	31	5
44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	1078	694	271	70	14
45	Friendly	1358	517	188	51	13
46	Confident	1473	498	127	25	4

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
47	Energetic	1266	623	204	25	9
48	Neglectful of responsibilities	47	42	101	454	1483
49	Flexible	874	808	375	53	17
50	On time to class	1269	650	156	39	13
51	Effective teacher	1462	472	150	37	6
52	Honest	1670	320	108	22	7
53	Makes class interesting	1393	453	179	65	37
54	Modest	1160	524	371	55	17
55	Discriminates against some students	58	79	142	316	1532
56	Enthusiastic	1187	703	192	35	10
57	A good speaker	1328	642	134	20	3
58	A creative teacher	1159	612	250	84	22
59	Able to simplify concepts	1265	592	209	52	9
60	Fair	1683	302	92	38	12
61	Student assignments are reasonable	1316	574	179	44	14
62	Strict when needed	621	762	527	125	92
63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	1228	662	189	37	11
64	Understanding	1462	491	131	36	7
65	Is moody	20	63	173	666	1205
66	Knowledgeable	1420	570	122	14	1
67	Intelligent	1310	626	156	30	5
68	Organized	1296	617	193	14	7
69	Expert in field	1366	587	153	15	6

#	Items	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
70	Provides clearly formatted tests	1497	406	153	54	17

APPENDIX P

Frequencies of Always and Never Categories for Saudi Data

Always				Never			
#	Items	Freq.	%	#	Items	Freq.	%
40	Respect students and peers	1140	80.68	7	Insults students	1032	73.04
60	Fair	1100	77.85	48	Neglectful of responsibilities	1016	71.90
52	Honest	1086	76.86	8	Provides confusing information	1001	70.84
20	Grades fairly	1042	73.74	65	Is moody	940	66.53
22	Explains materials clearly	1034	73.18	55	Discriminates against some students	922	65.25
46	Confident	1024	72.47	19	Questions on the exams are unclear	798	56.48
64	Understanding	1016	71.90	15	Tests are too difficult	547	38.71
69	Expert in field	1003	70.98	28	Punishes students strictly	486	34.39
70	Provides clearly formatted tests	988	69.92	16	Relies on one way of teaching	329	23.28
17	Treats students well	985	69.71	62	Strict when needed	90	6.37
54	Modest	981	69.43	27	Uses various teaching methods	85	6.02
47	Energetic	967	68.44	29	Applies technology in teaching	81	5.73
38	Well prepared	962	68.08	18	Requires few assignments	63	4.46
57	A good speaker	949	67.16	26	Able to hold students' attention	62	4.39
53	Makes class interesting	944	66.81	25	Prepares different forms for examinations	47	3.33
23	Encourages thinking	934	66.10	14	Knows students' names	42	2.97
45	Friendly	927	65.61	34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	41	2.90
39	Sets clear goals of teaching	921	65.18	13	Gives extra credit for more effort	36	2.55
43	Interacts with students	920	65.11	53	Makes class interesting	35	2.48
10	Hardworking	919	65.04	6	Provides positive criticism	26	1.84
51	Effective teacher	918	64.97	2	Cares about students' performance	25	1.77
36	Focused while teaching	912	64.54	1	Prepares students for examination	24	1.70
59	Able to simplify	897	63.48	5	Approachable during	23	1.63

	concepts				office hours		
61	Student assignments are reasonable	892	63.13	33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	23	1.63
32	Provides a clear syllabus	888	62.85	21	Engages students in classroom discussion	22	1.56
37	Motivates students to learn	888	62.85	32	Provides a clear syllabus	22	1.56
68	Organized	888	62.85	3	Improves her/his teaching skills	21	1.49
42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	885	62.63	58	A creative teacher	21	1.49
63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	881	62.35	36	Focused while teaching	19	1.34
41	Likes teaching	865	61.22	20	Grades fairly	17	1.20
66	Knowledgeable	859	60.79	30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	16	1.13
50	On time to class	849	60.08	49	Flexible	16	1.13
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	847	59.94	70	Provides clearly formatted tests	15	1.06
56	Enthusiastic	843	59.66	11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	14	0.99
4	A good listener	839	59.38	31	Helps students to expand their ideas	13	0.92
26	Able to hold students' attention	834	59.02	44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	13	0.92
3	Improves her/his teaching skills	808	57.18	45	Friendly	13	0.92
58	A creative teacher	807	57.11	50	On time to class	13	0.92
67	Intelligent	803	56.83	61	Student assignments are reasonable	13	0.92
12	Gives clear feedback	798	56.48	4	A good listener	12	0.85
34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	794	56.19	24	Good managing of classroom behaviors	12	0.85

13	Gives extra credit for more effort	793	56.12	35	Challenges students to do their best	12	0.85
44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	788	55.77	54	Modest	12	0.85
24	Good managing of classroom behaviors	785	55.56	9	Provides study direction to students	11	0.78
35	Challenges students to do their best	772	54.64	60	Fair	11	0.78
2	Cares about students' performance	747	52.87	37	Motivates students to learn	10	0.71
31	Helps students to expand their ideas	721	51.03	63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	10	0.71
33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	713	50.46	40	Respect students and peers	9	0.64
1	Prepares students for examination	708	50.11	59	Able to simplify concepts	9	0.64
5	Approachable during office hours	680	48.12	38	Well prepared	8	0.57
21	Engages students in classroom discussion	680	48.12	47	Energetic	8	0.57
49	Flexible	632	44.73	56	Enthusiastic	8	0.57
30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	616	43.60	39	Sets clear goals of teaching	7	0.50
9	Provides study direction to students	605	42.82	52	Honest	7	0.50
6	Provides positive criticism	586	41.47	64	Understanding	7	0.50
27	Uses various teaching methods	563	39.84	22	Explains materials clearly	6	0.42
25	Prepares different forms for examinations	514	36.38	41	Likes teaching	6	0.42
29	Applies technology in teaching	495	35.03	51	Effective teacher	6	0.42
14	Knows students' names	459	32.48	68	Organized	6	0.42

62	Strict when needed	397	28.10	69	Expert in field	6	0.42
18	Requires few assignments	336	23.78	67	Intelligent	5	0.35
16	Relies on one way of teaching	240	16.99	17	Treats students well	4	0.28
28	Punishes students strictly	58	4.10	42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	4	0.28
55	Discriminates against some students	55	3.89	43	Interacts with students	4	0.28
15	Tests are too difficult	52	3.68	12	Gives clear feedback	3	0.21
19	Questions on the exams are unclear	42	2.97	23	Encourages thinking	3	0.21
48	Neglectful of responsibilities	40	2.83	46	Confident	3	0.21
7	Insults students	22	1.56	57	A good speaker	3	0.21
65	Is moody	17	1.20	10	Hardworking	2	0.14
8	Provides confusing information	14	0.99	66	Knowledgeable	1	0.07

APPENDIX Q

Frequencies of Always and Never Categories for U.S. Data

Always				Never			
#	Items	Freq.	%	#	Items	Freq.	%
20	Grades fairly	616	86.27	55	Discriminates against some students	610	85.43
40	Respect students and peers	598	83.75	7	Insults students	527	73.81
52	Honest	584	81.79	48	Neglectful of responsibilities	467	65.41
60	Fair	583	81.65	19	Questions on the exams are unclear	465	65.13
32	Provides a clear syllabus	579	81.09	8	Provides confusing information	446	62.46
12	Gives clear feedback	569	79.69	65	Is moody	265	37.11
66	Knowledgeable	561	78.57	16	Relies on one way of teaching	204	28.57
22	Explains materials clearly	554	77.59	15	Tests are too difficult	172	24.09
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	552	77.31	28	Punishes students strictly	140	19.61
5	Approachable during office hours	544	76.19	25	Prepares different forms for examinations	19	2.66
23	Encourages thinking	544	76.19	13	Gives extra credit for more effort	16	2.24
51	Effective teacher	544	76.19	18	Requires few assignments	16	2.24
2	Cares about students' performance	540	75.63	9	Provides study direction to students	5	0.70
17	Treats students well	540	75.63	54	Modest	5	0.70
41	Likes teaching	536	75.07	21	Engages students in classroom discussion	4	0.56
38	Well prepared	530	74.23	29	Applies technology in teaching	4	0.56
35	Challenges students to do their best	516	72.27	20	Grades fairly	3	0.42
70	Provides clearly formatted tests	509	71.29	32	Provides a clear syllabus	3	0.42
67	Intelligent	507	71.01	35	Challenges students to do their best	3	0.42
37	Motivates students to learn	503	70.45	2	Cares about students' performance	2	0.28

42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	503	70.45	10	Hardworking	2	0.28
1	Prepares students for examination	497	69.61	11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	2	0.28
4	A good listener	494	69.19	14	Knows students' names	2	0.28
39	Sets clear goals of teaching	475	66.53	26	Able to hold students' attention	2	0.28
3	Improves her/his teaching skills	472	66.11	30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	2	0.28
10	Hardworking	452	63.31	31	Helps students to expand their ideas	2	0.28
46	Confident	449	62.89	34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	2	0.28
53	Makes class interesting	449	62.89	38	Well prepared	2	0.28
26	Able to hold students' attention	448	62.75	53	Makes class interesting	2	0.28
64	Understanding	446	62.46	56	Enthusiastic	2	0.28
24	Good managing of classroom behaviors	435	60.92	62	Strict when needed	2	0.28
45	Friendly	431	60.36	70	Provides clearly formatted tests	2	0.28
61	Student assignments are reasonable	424	59.38	1	Prepares students for examination	1	0.14
36	Focused while teaching	423	59.24	3	Improves her/his teaching skills	1	0.14
50	On time to class	420	58.82	4	A good listener	1	0.14
68	Organized	408	57.14	5	Approachable during office hours	1	0.14
6	Provides positive criticism	401	56.16	6	Provides positive criticism	1	0.14
57	A good speaker	379	53.08	12	Gives clear feedback	1	0.14
31	Helps students to expand their ideas	373	52.24	22	Explains materials clearly	1	0.14
33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	371	51.96	24	Good managing of classroom behaviors	1	0.14
59	Able to simplify concepts	368	51.54	27	Uses various teaching methods	1	0.14
43	Interacts with students	365	51.12	33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	1	0.14
69	Expert in field	363	50.84	36	Focused while teaching	1	0.14

58	A creative teacher	352	49.30	37	Motivates students to	1	0.14
63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	347	48.60	39	learn Sets clear goals of teaching	1	0.14
56	Enthusiastic	344	48.18	42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	1	0.14
34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	311	43.56	43	Interacts with students	1	0.14
47	Energetic	299	41.88	44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	1	0.14
27	Uses various teaching methods	292	40.90	46	Confident	1	0.14
44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	290	40.62	47	Energetic	1	0.14
21	Engages students in classroom discussion	287	40.20	49	Flexible	1	0.14
30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	275	38.52	58	A creative teacher	1	0.14
14	Knows students' names	266	37.25	60	Fair	1	0.14
49	Flexible	242	33.89	61	Student assignments are reasonable	1	0.14
9	Provides study direction to students	234	32.77	63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	1	0.14
62	Strict when needed	224	31.37	68	Organized	1	0.14
54	Modest	179	25.07	17	Treats students well	0	0.00
13	Gives extra credit for more effort	147	20.59	23	Encourages thinking	0	0.00
25	Prepares different forms for examinations	138	19.33	40	Respect students and peers	0	0.00
29	Applies technology in teaching	130	18.21	41	Likes teaching	0	0.00
18	Requires few assignments	23	3.22	45	Friendly	0	0.00
28	Punishes students strictly	13	1.82	50	On time to class	0	0.00
16	Relies on one way of teaching	9	1.26	51	Effective teacher	0	0.00
15	Tests are too difficult	7	0.98	52	Honest	0	0.00
19	Questions on the exams are unclear	7	0.98	57	A good speaker	0	0.00

48	Neglectful of responsibilities	7	0.98	59	Able to simplify concepts	0	0.00
7	Insults students	5	0.70	64	Understanding	0	0.00
8	Provides confusing information	5	0.70	66	Knowledgeable	0	0.00
55	Discriminates against some students	3	0.42	67	Intelligent	0	0.00
65	Is moody	3	0.42	69	Expert in field	0	0.00

APPENDIX R

Frequencies of Always and Never Categories for Combined Data

Always				Never			
#	Items	Freq.	%	#	Items	Freq.	%
40	Respects students and peers	1738	81.71	7	Insults students	1559	73.30
60	Fair	1683	79.13	55	Discriminates against some students	1532	72.03
52	Honest	1670	78.51	48	Neglectful of responsibilities	1483	69.72
20	Grades fairly	1658	77.95	8	Provides confusing information	1447	68.03
22	Explains materials clearly	1588	74.66	19	Questions on the exams are unclear	1263	59.38
17	Treats students well	1525	71.70	65	Is moody	1205	56.65
70	Provides clearly formatted tests	1497	70.38	15	Tests are too difficult	719	33.80
38	Well prepared	1492	70.15	28	Punishes students strictly	626	29.43
23	Encourages thinking	1478	69.49	16	Relies on one way of teaching	533	25.06
46	Confident	1473	69.25	62	Strict when needed	92	4.33
32	Provides a clear syllabus	1467	68.97	27	Uses various teaching methods	86	4.04
51	Effective teacher	1462	68.74	29	Applies technology in teaching	85	4.00
64	Understanding	1462	68.74	18	Requires few assignments	79	3.71
66	Knowledgeable	1420	66.76	25	Prepares different forms for examinations	66	3.10
41	Likes teaching	1401	65.87	26	Able to hold students' attention	64	3.01
11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	1399	65.77	13	Gives extra credit for more effort	52	2.44
39	Sets clear goals of teaching	1396	65.63	14	Knows students' names	44	2.07
53	Makes class interesting	1393	65.49	34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	43	2.02

37	Motivates students to learn	1391	65.40	53	Makes class interesting	37	1.74
42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	1388	65.26	2	Cares about students' performance	27	1.27
10	Hardworking	1371	64.46	6	Provides positive criticism	27	1.27
12	Gives clear feedback	1367	64.27	21	Engages students in classroom discussion	26	1.22
69	Expert in field	1366	64.22	1	Prepares students for examination	25	1.18
45	Friendly	1358	63.85	32	Provides a clear syllabus	25	1.18
36	Focused while teaching	1335	62.76	5	Approachable during office hours	24	1.13
4	A good listener	1333	62.67	33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	24	1.13
57	A good speaker	1328	62.44	3	Improves her/his teaching skills	22	1.03
61	Student assignments are reasonable	1316	61.87	58	A creative teacher	22	1.03
67	Intelligent	1310	61.59	20	Grades fairly	20	0.94
68	Organized	1296	60.93	36	Focused while teaching	20	0.94
35	Challenges students to do their best	1288	60.55	30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	18	0.85
2	Cares about students' performance	1287	60.51	49	Flexible	17	0.80
43	Interacts with students	1285	60.41	54	Modest	17	0.80
26	Able to hold students' attention	1282	60.27	70	Provides clearly formatted tests	17	0.80
3	Improves her/his teaching skills	1280	60.18	9	Provides study direction to students	16	0.75
50	On time to class	1269	59.66	11	Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	16	0.75
47	Energetic	1266	59.52	31	Helps students to expand their ideas	15	0.71
59	Able to simplify concepts	1265	59.47	35	Challenges students to do their best	15	0.71
63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	1228	57.73	44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	14	0.66

5	Approachable during office hours	1224	57.55	61	Student assignments are reasonable	14	0.66
24	Good managing of classroom behaviors	1220	57.36	4	A good listener	13	0.61
1	Prepares students for examination	1205	56.65	24	Good managing of classroom behaviors	13	0.61
56	Enthusiastic	1187	55.81	45	Friendly	13	0.61
54	Modest	1160	54.54	50	On time to class	13	0.61
58	A creative teacher	1159	54.49	60	Fair	12	0.56
34	Willing to consider students' life circumstances	1105	51.95	37	Motivates students to learn	11	0.52
31	Helps students to expand their ideas	1094	51.43	63	Speaks to students' level of knowledge	11	0.52
33	Connects topic to students' knowledge	1084	50.96	38	Well prepared	10	0.47
44	Takes students' suggestions into consideration	1078	50.68	56	Enthusiastic	10	0.47
6	Provides positive criticism	987	46.40	40	Respect students and peers	9	0.42
21	Engages students in classroom discussion	967	45.46	47	Energetic	9	0.42
13	Gives extra credit for more effort	940	44.19	59	Able to simplify concepts	9	0.42
30	Asks questions to elicit critical thinking	891	41.89	39	Sets clear goals of teaching	8	0.38
49	Flexible	874	41.09	22	Explains materials clearly	7	0.33
27	Uses various teaching methods	855	40.20	52	Honest	7	0.33
9	Provides study direction to students	839	39.45	64	Understanding	7	0.33
14	Knows students' names	725	34.09	68	Organized	7	0.33
25	Prepares different forms for examinations	652	30.65	41	Likes teaching	6	0.28
29	Applies technology in teaching	625	29.38	51	Effective teacher	6	0.28
62	Strict when needed	621	29.20	69	Expert in field	6	0.28
18	Requires few assignments	359	16.88	42	Answers students' questions inside and outside class	5	0.24
16	Relies on one way of teaching	249	11.71	43	Interacts with students	5	0.24

28	Punishes students strictly	71	3.34	67	Intelligent	5	0.24
15	Tests are too difficult	59	2.77	10	Hardworking	4	0.19
55	Discriminates against some students	58	2.73	12	Gives clear feedback	4	0.19
19	Questions on the exams are unclear	49	2.30	17	Treats students well	4	0.19
48	Neglectful of responsibilities	47	2.21	46	Confident	4	0.19
7	Insults students	27	1.27	23	Encourages thinking	3	0.14
65	Is moody	20	0.94	57	A good speaker	3	0.14
8	Provides confusing information	19	0.89	66	Knowledgeable	1	0.05

APPENDIX S

Country, Gender, and GPA Means on the Brief IUI Version

Variable	Group	Mean	SD
Country	Saudi	72.79	6.84
	US	75.23	8.44
Gender (Saudi Sample)	Female	73.48	7.97
	Male	72.32	8.96
GPA	Group 1 (1 to 2)	69.67	11.15
	Group 2 (2.1 to 3)	73.27	8.09
	Group 3 (3.1 to 4)	74.69	6.24

Note. Higher means indicate higher rating of characteristics of ideal university instructor.

APPENDIX T

The IUI Brief Version Means and Standard Deviations of Saudi Universities

University	Mean	SD
King Saud	70.4332	10.67471
Imam Muhammed	73.9763	6.84584
King Faisal	74.2401	7.12249
Princess Nora Bint Abdul Rahman	70.3185	9.99377
Arab Open University	73.7500	7.40668
King Abdul Aziz	72.7936	9.08579
Total	72.7955	8.59573

Note. Higher means indicate higher rating of characteristics of ideal university instructor.

APPENDIX U

Correlations of 16 Items with Independent Variables for Saudi Data

		Gender	College	University	Education level	GPA	Age
Respect students and peers	Pearson Correlation	-.044	-.076	.076	.009	.098	-.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.099	.004	.004	.739	.000	.208
Honest	Pearson Correlation	-.011	-.106	.020	.019	.124	-.002
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.674	.000	.449	.473	.000	.952
Fair	Pearson Correlation	-.043	-.098	.021	.018	.127	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.105	.000	.437	.491	.000	.676
Explains materials clearly	Pearson Correlation	-.087	-.086	.056	.066	.085	.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.034	.013	.001	.561
Grades fairly	Pearson Correlation	-.054	-.060	.029	.067	.127	.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.043	.025	.278	.012	.000	.143
Treats students well	Pearson Correlation	-.047	-.091	.047	.007	.121	-.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.001	.077	.803	.000	.394
Confident	Pearson Correlation	.002	-.085	-.010	.044	.056	.032
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.933	.001	.703	.100	.037	.232
Knowledgeable	Pearson Correlation	-.037	-.014	.006	-.005	.009	-.048
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.166	.607	.830	.839	.726	.073
Well prepared	Pearson Correlation	-.038	-.081	.023	.047	.112	.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.158	.002	.395	.076	.000	.307
Understanding	Pearson Correlation	-.033	-.096	.043	.018	.080	-.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.214	.000	.105	.502	.003	.220
Expert in field	Pearson Correlation	-.056	-.044	.044	.024	.047	-.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.034	.100	.101	.372	.079	.415
A good speaker	Pearson Correlation	-.043	-.029	.027	.052	.065	.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.106	.278	.308	.052	.014	.742
Provides a clear syllabus	Pearson Correlation	-.044	-.069	.046	.065	.128	-.002
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.095	.010	.083	.015	.000	.937

Gives clear feedback	Pearson	-.031	-.057	.043	.050	.100	.004
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.248	.031	.105	.060	.000	.872
Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	Pearson	-.099	-.056	.052	.039	.093	-.037
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.036	.053	.142	.000	.166
Effective teacher	Pearson	-.052	-.062	.028	.042	.114	.013
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.050	.019	.291	.112	.000	.628

APPENDIX V

Correlations of 16 Items with Independent Variables for U.S. Data

		Age	Gender	Education level	College	GPA
Respect students and peers	Pearson	.042	-.061	-.025	-.002	.095
	Correlation					
Honest	Sig. (2-tailed)	.265	.105	.502	.949	.012
	Pearson	.034	-.015	-.046	.024	.034
Fair	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.359	.689	.216	.521	.366
Explains materials clearly	Pearson	.018	-.036	.026	.091	.118
	Correlation					
Grades fairly	Sig. (2-tailed)	.634	.339	.484	.015	.002
	Pearson	.006	-.041	-.015	-.014	.036
Treats students well	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.880	.271	.681	.716	.342
Confident	Pearson	.028	-.036	.011	.016	.114
	Correlation					
Knowledgeable	Sig. (2-tailed)	.460	.343	.771	.665	.002
	Pearson	-.002	-.056	.034	.000	.044
Well prepared	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.958	.133	.369	.997	.242
Understanding	Pearson	-.098	.003	-.066	-.048	-.066
	Correlation					
Expert in field	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.944	.079	.198	.077
	Pearson	-.015	-.032	-.008	-.007	.043
A good speaker	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.688	.398	.839	.853	.248
Provides a clear syllabus	Pearson	.033	-.032	-.055	-.043	.080
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.375	.400	.143	.251	.034
	Pearson	-.119	-.006	-.080	.012	-.036
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.879	.033	.748	.344
	Pearson	.004	-.013	.100	-.022	.012
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.908	.738	.007	.565	.740
	Pearson	-.105	-.083	-.127	-.037	-.053
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.027	.001	.325	.162
	Pearson	.026	-.137	-.049	.004	.008
	Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.481	.000	.187	.913	.838

Gives clear feedback	Pearson Correlation	.032	-.018	.045	.020	.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.399	.622	.231	.601	.139
Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	Pearson Correlation	.026	-.063	-.039	.026	.032
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.492	.091	.297	.495	.396
Effective teacher	Pearson Correlation	-.023	-.057	-.056	.008	.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.541	.127	.136	.827	.139

APPENDIX W

Correlations of 16 Items with Independent Variables for Combined Data

		Country	Age	Gender	Education Level	College	GPA
Respect students and peers	Pearson Correlation	.086	.017	-.068	.017	.032	.123
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.424	.002	.443	.141	.000
Honest	Pearson Correlation	.100	.031	-.038	.021	.033	.137
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.148	.077	.344	.128	.000
Fair	Pearson Correlation	.099	.021	-.066	.038	.044	.153
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.333	.002	.077	.041	.000
Explains materials clearly	Pearson Correlation	.089	.026	-.096	.058	.029	.103
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.231	.000	.008	.183	.000
Grades fairly	Pearson Correlation	.162	.057	-.090	.080	.101	.175
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.009	.000	.000	.000	.000
Treats students well	Pearson Correlation	.117	.013	-.078	.036	.050	.143
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.557	.000	.098	.021	.000
Confident	Pearson Correlation	-.050	-.045	.016	-.005	-.085	.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.020	.038	.466	.828	.000	.789
Knowledgeable	Pearson Correlation	.204	.015	-.088	.034	.153	.091
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.478	.000	.119	.000	.000
Well prepared	Pearson Correlation	.114	.046	-.065	.040	.047	.141
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.034	.003	.068	.032	.000

Understanding	Pearson Correlation	-.005	-.063	-.023	-.012	-.046	.052
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.818	.004	.281	.569	.035	.017
Expert in field	Pearson Correlation	-.140	-.033	-.003	.022	-.133	-.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.126	.888	.305	.000	.451
A good speaker	Pearson Correlation	-.051	-.052	-.038	-.015	-.059	.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.018	.016	.078	.491	.006	.395
Provides a clear syllabus	Pearson Correlation	.208	.048	-.115	.074	.133	.176
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.026	.000	.001	.000	.000
Gives clear feedback	Pearson Correlation	.239	.060	-.090	.091	.165	.172
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.006	.000	.000	.000	.000
Provides sufficient time for tests and assignments	Pearson Correlation	.217	.035	-.142	.060	.148	.157
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.105	.000	.005	.000	.000
Effective teacher	Pearson Correlation	.167	.030	-.094	.048	.104	.159
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.161	.000	.026	.000	.000