

**PERSONALITY, JOB CHARACTERISTICS, WORK EXPERIENCE AND THEIR
RELATIONSHIPS WITH TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

by

NORAZUWA BINTI MAT

**Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

December 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdulillah, Praise to Allah Al-Mighty Who has granted me the strength to complete this study. There are many individuals who have helped me develop during this journey to my PhD. Although it is impossible to list down all the names here, my prayers are always with all of you. First of all, I would like to acknowledge the guidance and support provided by my supervisors, Dr. Noornina Dahlan and Associate Professor Intan Osman. They were always patient and understanding as I slowly worked to complete my study. They also provide me with the combination of academic guidance and friendship, one which I realize is rare.

I also wish to thank Associate Professor Zainal Ariffin Ahmad and Dr. Azura for their comments and guidance. Dr. Zainal taught me on how to become a good teacher and researcher with emphasizing on human-orientation. I also cannot forget Prof. Mahfooz Ansari for his guidance. Thank you Prof!

My family- mak and abah (Hjh. Chik & Hj. Mat), mak and ayah (Hjh. Imchah & Hj. Romli), my brothers and sisters, for their dua', prayers and encouragement.

Lastly, but definitely not the least, I would like to acknowledge my husband, Hj Ruslan Romli. We have journeyed through our PhD. I always pray that he will also complete his study soon. His encouragement, understanding, and willingness to sacrifice played a key role in helping me to develop. There were many times when I felt that I would never finish and he provided that extra push to keep me going. For my daughters, Nur Najihah, Nur Nasyrah and Nur Nasyithah, the three of you are my source of inspiration. Thank you for being understood, support and sacrifice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
ABSTRAK	xiii
ABSTRACT	xv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 National Higher Education Action Plan	4
1.3 Problem Statement	5
1.4 Research Objectives	9
1.5 Research Questions	9
1.6 Definition of Key Terms	9
1.7 Significance of the Study	12
1.8 Organization of Thesis	13

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0	Introduction	15
2.1	Conceptualization of Teaching Effectiveness	16
2.1.1	Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness	23
2.1.2	Dimensions in Teaching Effectiveness	26
2.2	Underlying Theory	28
2.2.1	Job Characteristic Theory	28
2.3	Antecedents of Teaching Effectiveness	30
2.3.1	Individual Factors	30
2.3.2	Subject Factors	32
2.3.3	Class Factors	34
2.3.4	Student Factors	35
2.4	Variables Relating to the Study	35
2.4.1	Personality	36
2.4.2	An Evolution of Five Factor Model	37
2.4.3	Job Characteristics	44
2.4.4	Work Experience	47
2.5	Gaps in the Literature	49

2.6	Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses	50
2.6.1	Relationships between Personality and Teaching Effectiveness	52
2.6.2	Relationships between Job Characteristics and Teaching Effectiveness	58
2.6.3	Moderating Effect of Work Experience	62

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.0	Introduction	67
3.1	Research Approach	67
3.2	Population and Sample Design	68
3.3	Data Collection Method	71
3.3.1	Pilot Study	72
3.4	Variables and Measures	73
3.4.1	Teaching Effectiveness	74
3.4.2	Job Characteristics	75
3.4.3	Personality	75
3.5	Data Analysis	77
3.5.1	Structural Equation Modeling	78
3.5.2	Descriptive Analyses	83
3.5.3	Factor and Reliability Analyses	83
3.5.4	Model Specification	84
3.5.5	Model Testing	89

3.6	Assumptions	96
3.6.1	Normality	96
3.6.2	Sample size	96

CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSES AND RESULTS

4.0	Introduction	97
4.1	Overview of Data Gathered	97
4.1.1	Missing Data	99
4.2	Data Analysis	99
4.2.1	Demographic Characteristics	100
4.2.2	Test of Non-Response Bias	103
4.3	Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Measurement Model	104
4.3.1	Measurement Model for Teaching Effectiveness	106
4.3.2	Measurement Model for Personality	118
4.3.3	Measurement Model for Job Characteristics	133
4.4	Second-Order Factors	137
4.5	Structural Model	141
4.6	Hypotheses Testing	144
4.7	Moderating Effect of Experience	150
4.8	Summary of Hypotheses Testing	153
4.9	Comparison of Alternative Model	157

CHAPTER 5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	
5.0	Introduction	159
5.1	Overview of the Findings	159
5.2	Discussion	161
	5.2.1 The Direct Relations between Personality and Teaching Effectiveness	162
	5.2.2 The Direct Relations between Job Characteristics and Teaching Effectiveness	167
	5.2.3 The Moderating Effect of Work Experience	171
5.3	Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	172
5.4	Contributions of the Study	174
	5.4.1 Theoretical Implication	174
	5.4.2 Practical Implication	175
	5.4.3 Methodological Contribution	176
5.5	Conclusion	177
REFERENCES		178
APPENDICES		
	APPENDIX A Questionnaire	213
	APPENDIX B Data analysis	223

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 3.1	List of University Colleges Upgraded to University Status	68
Table 3.2	List of Newly Established University	69
Table 3.3	Number of Academic Staffs in the Public Higher Education Institution in 2006	70
Table 3.4	Sources and Description of All Study Variables Measures	76
Table 3.5	Comparative Analysis between Techniques	80
Table 3.6	Capabilities by Research Approach	81
Table 3.4	A Summary of Fit Index	95
Table 4.1	Sample Characteristics for Lecturers	101
Table 4.2	Sample Characteristics for Students	102
Table 4.3	Results of Chi-Square Tests on Demographic Variables for Early and Late Responses	103
Table 4.4	Standardized Regression for Delivery of Information	107
Table 4.5	Results of Fit Indices before Model Revised	108
Table 4.6	Results of Fit Indices after Model Revised	109
Table 4.7	Standardized Factor Loading for Delivery of Information Measurement Model	110
Table 4.8	Standardized Regression for Feedback and Treatment	111
Table 4.9	Results of Fit Indices before Model Revised	111
Table 4.10	Results of Fit Indices after Model Revised	112
Table 4.11	Standardized Factor Loading for Feedback and	113

Treatment Measurement Model

Table 4.12	Standardized Regression for Interaction Dimension	113
Table 4.13	Results of Fit Indices before Model Revised	114
Table 4.14	Results of Fit Indices after Model Revised	115
Table 4.15	Standardized Factor Loading for Interaction Dimension	116
Table 4.16	Overall reliability for Measurement Model of Teaching Effectiveness	117
Table 4.17	Standardized Regression for Extraversion	119
Table 4.18	Results of Fit Indices before Model Revised	119
Table 4.19	Results of Fit Indices after Model Revised	120
Table 4.20	Standardized Factor Loading for Extraversion	121
Table 4.21	Standardized Regression for Agreeableness	121
Table 4.22	Results of Fit Indices before Model Revised	122
Table 4.23	Results of Fit Indices after Model Revised	123
Table 4.24	Standardized Factor Loading for Agreeableness	124
Table 4.25	Standardized Regression for Openness to Experience	124
Table 4.26	Results of Fit Indices before Model Revised	125
Table 4.27	Results of Fit Indices after Model Revised	126
Table 4.28	Standardized Factor Loading for Openness to Experience	126
Table 4.29	Standardized Regression for Emotional Stability	127
Table 4.30	Results of Fit Indices before Model Revised	127
Table 4.31	Results of Fit Indices after Model Revised	128

Table 4.32	Standardized Factor Loading for Emotional Stability	129
Table 4.33	Standardized Regression for Conscientiousness	129
Table 4.34	Results of Fit Indices before Model Revised	130
Table 4.35	Results of Fit Indices after Model Revised	131
Table 4.36	Standardized Factor Loading for Conscientiousness	132
Table 4.37	Overall Reliability for Measurement Model of Personality	132
Table 4.38	Standardized Regression for Job Characteristics	134
Table 4.39	Results of Fit Indices before Model Revised	135
Table 4.40	Results of Fit Indices after Model Revised	136
Table 4.41	Overall Reliability of the Job Characteristics Measurement Model	136
Table 4.42	Standardized Regression for Structural Model	144
Table 4.43	Chi Square Difference Test for Moderator Effects of Work Experience	152
Table 4.44	Summary of Hypothesis Testing	153

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1	Theoretical Framework of the study 52
Figure 3.1.	A flowchart of the Approach to SEM 87
Figure 3.2.	A Hypothetical Full Structural Equation Model 88
Figure 4.1	Measurement model for teaching effectiveness 106
Figure 4.2	Measurement model for personality 118
Figure 4.3	Measurement Model for Job Characteristics 133
Figure 4.4.	Second-order factors for personality dimension 138
Figure 4.5	Second-order factors for job characteristics dimension 139
Figure 4.6	Second-order factors for teaching effectiveness dimension 140
Figure 4.7	A structural model 142
Figure 4.8	Alternative structural model 158

PERSONALITI, CIRI-CIRI PEKERJAAN, PENGALAMAN KERJA SERTA KAITANNYA DENGAN KEBERKESANAN PENGAJARAN

ABSTRAK

Keberkesanan pengajaran adalah merupakan suatu bidang kajian yang kompleks tanpa sokongan dari penyelidikan empirikal. Membina gelagat pengajaran yang berkesan merupakan aspek yang penting bagi pensyarah di institusi pengajian tinggi di Malaysia. Pertambahan yang mendadak institusi pengajian tinggi sektor awam serta tanggungjawab tentang kualiti pengajaran universiti telah menyebabkan penilaian keberkesanan pengajaran di universiti satu tugas yang penting. Ini disebabkan banyak keputusan pentadbiran boleh dilakukan berdasarkan penilaian tersebut. Imej serta kepuasan personal dan profesional pensyarah juga bergantung kepada keberkesanan pengajaran. Oleh yang demikian, penilaian yang betul tentang keberkesanan pengajaran akan mewujudkan hubungan yang dapat menghasilkan komitmen kepada pembaikan profesional serta pernyataan yang mengharapkan pensyarah dapat memberikan sumbangan yang bernilai untuk kejayaan universiti. Kajian ini melihat perhubungan terus antara personaliti dan ciri-ciri pekerjaan dengan keberkesanan pengajaran. Kajian ini juga melihat pengaruh pengalaman kerja sebagai pembolehubah penyederhana ke atas hubungan antara personaliti, ciri-ciri pekerjaan, dan keberkesanan pengajaran. Sejumlah 193 pensyarah serta 997 pelajar telah menyertai kajian ini dengan melengkapkan borang soalselidik yang diberikan. Analisis Permodelan Persamaan Struktur (*Structural Equation Modeling*) dengan

bantuan pakej statistik *Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS)* telah dijalankan untuk menguji perhubungan terus dan tidak terus serta untuk menguji *model fit*. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan ekstraversi dan keterbukaan kepada pengalaman adalah antara dimensi personaliti yang mempunyai impak terus terhadap keberkesanan pengajaran. Kepelbagaian kemahiran serta maklumbalas juga didapati mempunyai perhubungan terus dengan keberkesanan pengajaran. Dapatan kajian juga menunjukkan pengalaman kerja menjadi pembolehubah penyederhana bagi perhubungan antara ekstraversi dan penyampaian maklumat, interaksi yang bermakna serta layanan yang adil. Pengalaman kerja juga menjadi penyederhana antara hubungan kestabilan emosi dan penyampaian maklumat serta keterbukaan pada pengalaman dan interaksi yang bermakna. Berdasarkan dapatan kajian, implikasi dari segi teori dan praktikal telah dibincangkan. Kekangan serta cadangan untuk kajian akan datang juga telah dikemukakan.

PERSONALITY, JOB CHARACTERISTICS, WORK EXPERIENCE AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

ABSTRACT

Teaching effectiveness is a complex area of study without supported by an extensive body of empirical research. Developing effective teaching behaviors is a part of every lecturer in Malaysian higher education institution. With the surge in public demand for accountability in higher education and the growing concern for quality of university teaching, evaluating teaching effectiveness is a very important function in all universities because important administrative decisions could be based on these evaluations. A lecturer's image and personal/professional satisfaction are also based on teaching effectiveness. Therefore, proper evaluation of teaching effectiveness establishes a climate that communicates a commitment to professional improvement and a statement that is expected that each lecturer will make a valuable contribution to the achievement of the goals of the university. This study examined the direct relationship between personality and job characteristics on teaching effectiveness. This study also examined the influence of work experience as a moderator on the relationship between personality, job characteristics and teaching effectiveness. A total of 193 lecturers with their 997 students participated in this study by completing the survey questionnaire. Structural equation modeling (SEM) analyses were conducted to test the direct, indirect relationship and also model fit. Findings indicate that extraversion and openness to experience were among the personalities that have a direct impact on

teaching effectiveness. Skill variety and feedback were also found to have a direct impact on teaching effectiveness. The findings also showed that work experience had significantly moderated the relationships between extraversion and delivery of information, meaningful interaction and fair treatment. Work experience also moderated the relationship between emotional stability and delivery of information and openness to experience and meaningful interaction. Based on the research findings, theoretical and practical implications are discussed. Limitations and suggestions for future research are also highlighted.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the background of the study, discussion of the problem statement, research objectives, research questions, and scope of the study. Definitions of key terms are also provided at the end of the chapter.

1.1 Background of the study

Higher education institutions are communities of researchers and teachers (Gilliot, Overlaet, & Verdin, 2002). Lecturers are therefore, higher education's most important asset and questions related to the internal structure and organization of the academic profession are more and more on the agenda of policy-making as well as of research on higher education (Enders, 1997). The aim of the government is to provide a "world-class" quality education system. The Malaysian government's effort to see higher education flourish is indicated by the largest allocation for the education sector in the 2005 budget, which is RM21.5 billion or about one fourth of the total budget for 2005. The education sector also received the highest budget in 2006 budget whereby RM29 billion or one fifth is allocated for the sector. The Ninth Malaysia Plan also see that education and training sector received the biggest percentage of the allocation, at 20.6 percent, in line with the government's resolve to enhance the quality of human capital (Ninth Malaysia Plan, 2006-2010). During the Ninth Plan period,

human capital development will be one of the main thrusts as envisaged in the National Mission. Among the ministries that will be undertaken the development of human capital is Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE). MOHE is responsible for increasing access to quality tertiary education. Measures will also be intensified to promote Malaysia as a regional center of excellence for tertiary education. The quality of lecturer will be improved through more staff development programmes.

In the past decade, it was learned that research universities often the most criticized for paying inadequate attention to undergraduate teaching (Bok, 1992). Therefore, research on teaching effectiveness at higher learning institutions in the Malaysian context is timely because a report by the Star (14 June, 2000) revealed that by the year 2020, Malaysia will be preparing to build more public universities in order to provide higher education opportunities to at least 55% of Malaysians in the 17-23 age group. It was then been realized when the prime minister announced the Universiti Darul Iman in Terengganu, Universiti Darul Naim in Kelantan and a number of polytechnics will be constructed in the Ninth Malaysia Plan.

The challenge is to find qualified and suitable people for the academic positions. A university's reputation is highly dependent on its lecturers that can bring academic glory to the institution. Moreover, the quality of a university is generally seen as a function of the quality of its staff (Eustace, 1988). This is the major challenge as it takes many years to mould a new graduate to become an effective lecturer and there are many who simply do not qualify. While those who do qualify, later leave for other opportunities outside the education sector (Lee, 1996). Recently, the Minister of Higher Education stressed that the quality

of lecturers should be emphasized in order to ensure that higher education institutions produce quality graduates (Utusan Malaysia, 3 April, 2006).

Because of the growing demand for higher education institutions to be accountable and to adapt to the rapid change of technologies, higher education democratization reduces funds and other, the question of quality of university teaching has been stressed (Ledic, Rafajac & Kovac, 1999). Several conceptualizations played their role in attempts to improve quality in higher education. Although many factors influence the quality of higher education, the key role of lecturer in the improvement of higher education teaching is widely recognized. Harvey and Knight (1996) argue that the key to quality improvement lies in empowering academic to undertake a process of continuous quality improvement in relation to student learning.

Issues of educational quality, rather than mass production, need to move to the forefront of the educational agenda of policy makers at this level of education. Considering this huge public and private investment in higher education, there is an urgent need to evaluate how effectively this investment is being utilized by examining teaching effectiveness. Unfortunately, many lecturers in higher education institutions received little or no formal training in how to teach effectively (Arreola, 2000). Currently, the only dimension in widespread use for evaluating lecturer is scholarship, that is, the number of publications in refereed journals (Ngware & Ndirangu, 2005). However, it is necessary to develop a comprehensive system for evaluating teaching effectiveness by establishing criteria and benchmarks for effective teaching at an appropriate level of academic rigor (Zakrajsek, 2002).

1.2 National Higher Education Action Plan

The National Mission and Ninth Malaysian Plan have stipulated the development of first-class human capital as one of the five national development thrusts. The success of human capital development agenda rests in large part on the quality of the national education system. Therefore, the Malaysian government aims to spearhead an effort to transform the national education system at all levels. This is particularly so, as institutions of higher learning play a central role in generating the necessary human capital with first-class mentality needed to transform Malaysia into a developed nation. MOHE is intended to bring Malaysian Higher Education to the next level by strengthening five key institutional pillars, namely: governance, leadership, academia, teaching and learning, and research and development (National Higher Education Action Plan, 2007-2010).

As for teaching and learning thrust, while the curriculum is important, its delivery is equally critical. HEI academic staffs are today expected to be leaders in the field of teaching. While reformed administrative procedures and excellent curricula form the frontline of this transformation and must focus on innovative delivery of curricula. Evaluation is an important aspect of pedagogy, the skills of which must be acquired by all academic staff. Good teaching must be followed by good evaluation. The aim of evaluation is to obtain information regarding the level of mastery of a subject that the student has learned and grasped. In line with this, the Malaysian government will formulate a policy to encourage the acquisition and demonstration of teaching skills for all Higher Education Institution's academic staff. As a first step, MOHE will draw up in-service programmes for university lecturers and professors to undergo enrichment

programmes in the science and methodology of pedagogy. As an additional effort, the Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF) has been set up to benchmark the quality of higher education. The MQF gives emphasis to educational outcomes. To implement the MQF, the government has set up the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) to replace the National Accreditation Board (LAN). Finally, the desired outcome from the teaching and learning thrust is that all lecturers are expected to demonstrate scholarship in their fields of specialization, and to demonstrate professionalism and competence in their ability to teach.

1.3 Problem Statement

Performance indicators for lecturers in higher education institutions have focused mainly on research outputs. They have largely ignored the teaching function of universities (Ramsden, 1991). The subject of teaching effectiveness has received much attention in research literature (Marsh, 1987). Defining and measuring teaching effectiveness plays an important role in many of the decisions made in higher education. Why is measuring teaching effectiveness so important? Because the evidence produced is used for major decisions about lecturer's future in academic world namely formative decision, which uses evidence to improve and shape the quality of lecturer's teaching (Berk, 2005). It was due to the fact that today's lecturer's works in a climate of expanding given intervention. The use of overt measures of performance, including numerical indicators of research output and the appraisal of lecturer, has become part of higher education policy (Ramsden, 1992).

In evaluating the performance of lecturer, higher education institutions usually focus on research productivity, teaching effectiveness and administrative or service contributions. While, it is argued that research output can be measured adequately by the quantity and quality of publications and administrative contributions can be documented by committee assignments and other administrative appointments, the evaluation of teaching presents unique problems. Lecturers also are occupied with a constant stream of demands to produce more research papers, to attract more external money, to conform to exacting criteria for performance appraisal, and also to supervise more graduate students. Therefore it is a little exaggeration to say that these changes taken together mean that the average university lecturer is now expected to be an excellent teacher. Nowadays, higher education institutions are requested to reevaluate their commitment to teaching in response to new accreditation guidelines and pressures from stakeholders who contribute to the budgets of higher education, and calls for a renewed emphasis on teaching by many professors and lecturer. Lecturer's self-image and personal/professional satisfaction is also based on effective teaching. Proper evaluation of teaching effectiveness also establishes a climate that communicates a commitment to professional improvement and a statement that is expected that each lecturer will make a valuable contribution to the achievement of the goals of the university (Hoyt & Pallet, 1999).

One aspect that makes evaluation difficult is that lecturers are used to working in isolation from one another with respect to actual teaching practices. In an effort to provide feedback of acceptable practice and to advance knowledge, lecturers are accustomed to public critique of their disciplinary

scholarship. Teaching has failed to embrace this same orientation and has therefore failed to both gain the recognition that disciplinary research has received and to advance teaching the same way that traditional scholarly research has advanced knowledge of various disciplines. The time has come, however, when higher education institutions are being held accountable for all aspects of academic life, including teaching. Currently, the only dimension in widespread use for evaluating lecturer is scholarship, which is the number of publications in refereed journals (Ngware & Ndirangu, 2005). Therefore, it is necessary to develop a comprehensive system for evaluating teaching effectiveness by establishing criteria and benchmarks for effective teaching at an appropriate level of academic rigor (Zakrajsek, 2002).

Research pertaining to organizational effectiveness notes that effective organizations value what they are able to measure and consistently find methods to evaluate those valued items. To claim that something is important, yet not measurable is no longer acceptable in business organizations. Higher educational organizations have had a difficult time developing systems of evaluation of teaching effectiveness that are acceptable to either themselves or to outside constituents. The major issue now is the need to develop widely accepted, reliable, valid, and useful methods by which teaching can be measured. However, the measurement of lecturer's teaching effectiveness in Malaysia is seldom discussed. Virtually all universities use students evaluation of lecturer as a measure of instructor performance (Magner, 1997), therefore, such student evaluations have a significant impact on tenure and promotion (Centra, 1979; Ehie & Karathanos, 1994). Moreover, feedback from students may help lecturer to improve their teaching performance (Marsh, 1991).

Many studies indicate that personality has been related to teaching effectiveness. Studies by Feldman (1984), Murray (1975), Murray, Rushton, and Paunonen (1990) and Tomasco (1980) have shown that personality traits taken collectively can account for up to 75 percent of teaching effectiveness. The job characteristics also related to teaching effectiveness. Specific job characteristics like skill variety and task significance will lead to positive psychological states such as feeling of meaningfulness and responsibility, which in turn lead to effectiveness (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). As a consequence it is timely and necessary to conduct an investigation on personality, job characteristics, and teaching effectiveness. The role of work experience also being investigated as a moderating variable. Work experience has been examined almost exclusively at the individual level of analysis (Tesluk & Jacobs, 1998). Researchers have proposed that the effects of experience on teaching effectiveness are not direct. For example, Centra (1978) found that less experienced lecturers receive lower ratings of teaching effectiveness than those who are more experienced, whereas Feldman (1983) found that there is no significant relationship between experience and teaching effectiveness. Thus, this study is trying to examine the relationship between personality, job characteristics and teaching effectiveness with the moderating effect of work experience.

1.4 Research Objectives

The research objectives of this study are:

- To examine the relationship between personality and teaching effectiveness
- To analyze the relationship between job characteristics and teaching effectiveness
- To analyze the moderating effect of work experience on teaching effectiveness

1.5 Research Questions

The study aimed at examining the relationship between personality, job characteristics, work experience and teaching effectiveness by answering the following questions:

- Does personality influence teaching effectiveness?
- Do job characteristics influence teaching effectiveness?
- Does work experience moderate the relationship between personality, job characteristics and teaching effectiveness?

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

1.6.1 Teaching effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness is defined as teaching behavior that includes the dimension of delivery of information, feedback and fair treatment, and meaningful interaction with students (Ansari, Achoui, & Ansari, 2000). In this study, teaching effectiveness refers to effectiveness in tertiary education or in higher education institutions.

1.6.2 Personality

Personality is defined as enduring emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles that explain behavior in different situations (McCrae & Costa, 1989). "Big 5" personality dimensions are describe by McCrae and Costa (1985) as follows:

Agreeableness: The extent to which one seeks to please and support others

Conscientiousness: The extent to which one persists at tasks, pursues goals, and takes an organized approach to assignments

Extraversion: The extent to which one enjoys the company of others, and prefers influencing or persuading others

Openness to experience: The extent to which one enjoys thinking about and analyzing a variety of topics, coming up with new ideas, and trying new things

Emotional Stability: The extent to which one remains even-tempered and retains a positive attitude, even in difficult circumstances

1.6.3 Job Characteristics

Job characteristics is defined as the attributes of jobs that can have motivational function for employees (Chiu & Chen, 2005). Five core job characteristics as described by Hackman and Oldham (1980) are as follows:

Skill variety: The extent to which an employee can use different skill in doing work

Job identity: The extent to which an employee can complete the whole or identifiable piece of work

Job significance: The extent of the significant impact of job on others

Autonomy: The extent of freedom, independence, and discretion of an employee to plan his/her work pace and method

Feedback: The extent to which an employee knows his/her own job performance from the job itself, colleagues, supervisor, or customers

1.6.4 Lecturer

A Lecturer is described as someone who gives instruction, guidance, and support to students (Koster, Brekelmans, Korthagen, & Wubbels, 2004). In addition, they multitask as teacher, researcher, consultant, and do social work for the community (Crittenden, 1997). For this study, lecturer includes tutor, lecturer, senior lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

1.7 Significance of the Study

An interest in evaluating teaching effectiveness has increased over time and acceptance of the need to evaluate teaching has continued to grow. It was due to the fact that teaching is an art and it should be judged for the passion and beauty of the performance and the meaningfulness of the message conveyed (Fitzpatrick, 2004). Researchers investigate dimensions like delivery of information, fair treatment and interaction with students because they were considered to be important variables that have impact for teaching effectiveness and job re-design (Frase & Heck, 1992; Korthagen, 2001; Lowyck, 1994; Marsh & Hattie, 2002; Tigelaar et al., 2004). Practically, understanding teaching effectiveness is crucial for formative evaluation. Formative evaluation refers to information that is gathered for the purpose of improving teaching. Student's ratings provide feedback that academic staffs can use to make positive changes in their teaching practice. The importance of teaching effectiveness is reflected by many researchers whereby its effectiveness is related to student learning and motivation (Abrami, Apollonia & Cohen, 1990; Braskamp, Brandenburg & Oty, 1984; Madsen & Cassidy, 2005).

Theoretically, in spite of the perennial interest in teaching effectiveness, many of the existing research and models on this subject has been based on western samples like United States of America and Australia. Previously, some of the theories have been used in limited studies on job re-design and personality traits. For example, previous studies have tested the applicability of teaching effectiveness in Australia (Marsh, 1987; Marsh & Hattie, 2002), United States of America (Aleamoni, 1989; Cashin, 1990) and Iran (Salsali, 2005), Although their findings may be taken to be support the Western models,

Eastern countries like Malaysia have different histories and at different stages of development. Furthermore, in the Malaysian context, there has not been much research done in terms of teaching effectiveness with related to personality and job characteristics. This study will also expand the range of the Job Characteristic theory by incorporating work experience as a moderating variable. Generally, in terms of teaching effectiveness research, the common variables tested cover several aspects like student motivation, gender, level of course, student workload, lecturer's ideology and values. Hence, this research intends to contribute to the study of teaching effectiveness by selecting and adding variables that rarely have been tested as exogenous latent variables or independent variables like Big Five personality traits and Job Characteristics variables. The samples would comprise of academic staff and students in public university in Malaysia. This research hopes to further explore and understand the impact of personality and job characteristics of academic staff in relation to tertiary teaching effectiveness

1.8 Organization of Thesis

This research comprises five different chapters. The above sections elaborate on the background of the study, its problem and objectives and also the significance of the study. The organization of the remaining four chapters is as follows: Chapter 2 presents a review of the existing literature, related to the variables considered in this study including personality, job characteristics, work experience and their relationship with teaching effectiveness.

Chapter 3 describes and justifies the methodology. This includes the framework and hypotheses, research design, population and sample, variable measures, questionnaire design, methods of data analysis and appropriate statistical techniques used.

Chapter 4 presents the analysis of the collected data. Here the research findings that are relevant are examined, interpreted and reported. This includes the profile of respondents, test of non-response bias, goodness of measure, and the result of hypotheses tested.

Finally, chapter 5 evaluates the research findings from chapter 4. It presents the discussion and recapitulation of the whole study. Included here is a brief review of findings in relation to research questions to be answered, implications of the study, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

Research on teaching effectiveness consists of thousands of studies. It dates back to the 1920s and the pioneering work of Remmers (1928, 1930), Brandenburg and Remmers (1927), and Remmers and Brandenburg (1927). Teaching effectiveness is a complex area of study supported by an extensive body of empirical research. Developing effective teaching behaviors is a part of every teacher pays much attention in the research literature (Butler, 2001; Hancock, 2003). With the surge in public demand for accountability in higher education and the growing concern for quality of university teaching, the practice of collecting student ratings of teaching has been widely adopted by universities all over the world as part of their quality assurance system. Very often, the ratings collected are used for both judgmental and developmental purposes. In many universities, student ratings are used as one measure of teaching effectiveness. Evaluating teaching effectiveness is a very important function in all universities. Important administrative decisions are based on these evaluations. A lecturer's image and personal/professional satisfaction are also based on teaching effectiveness (Zakrajsek, 2002). Proper evaluation of teaching effectiveness establishes a climate that communicates a commitment to professional improvement and a statement that is expected that each lecturer will make a valuable contribution to the achievement of the goals of the university (Hoyt & Pallet, 1999).

This chapter discusses teaching effectiveness with the focus of lecturer the underlying theories of teaching effectiveness, antecedents of teaching effectiveness, variables relating to this study, and also the framework proposed for this study.

2.1 Conceptualization of Teaching Effectiveness

The concept of effectiveness has been discussed extensively since 1927. Reviews on literature have divided effectiveness into two categories namely, organization and individual. Organizational effectiveness is widely discussed in the literature. The earliest and still the dominant one is the goal model of effectiveness, which sees organizations as purposeful and coordinated agents. Effectiveness here is measured in terms of an organization's achievements of its stated official goal (Georgopoulous & Tannenbaum, 1971). Another view is the system model whereby effectiveness is measured in terms of an organization's ability to survive, adapt, and to secure the needed resources from the environment (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Finally, the human relations approach which focuses effective organization is one that provides opportunities for the fullest development of the capabilities of its human resources. Employee effectiveness, on the other hand, is rarely discussed especially on lecturer's teaching effectiveness. Therefore, this study will explore higher education teaching effectiveness. An overview of recent literature on teaching effectiveness reveals no standard, commonly agreed upon definition or list of effective teaching qualities. Most studies tend to emphasize qualities such as knowledge and organization of the subject matter, skills in instruction, and personal qualities and attitudes that are useful when working with students (Braskamp,

Brandenburg & Ory, 1984; Cashin, 1995). Many researchers also have studied the multidimensional, multitrait concept of effective teaching (Centra, 1977, 1979, 1993; Frey, 1973; Marsh, 1984, 1991; Marsh & Overall, 1981; Seldin, 1990), but it is difficult to locate a precise definition. There is consensus concerning some of the outcomes that should be derived from it. Effective teaching should stimulate student curiosity and active learning, encourage student analytical, logical, and creative thinking, and increase both their desire and capacity for future learning (Baker, 1990; Kullberg, 1989).

According to Crittenden (1997), the major responsibilities of lecturers in the modern higher education institutions are teaching and research as well, to lesser extents, administration and community service. Indeed, some consider that one of the defining characteristics of a higher education institution is that all academics are expected to be active researchers and active teachers. Leinster-Mackay (1978) stressed that the origins of higher education institutions came from the transmission of knowledge, culture, and values that is from a teaching role, and it was only much later that this transmission was enhanced by the pursuit of research.

Hornback (1993) emphasized that teaching will be the primary mission for higher education institution. However many institutions are considering a more balanced route between teaching and research especially to tenure university professors. Lecturer duties are public and are well known by the community and other sectors, however, the activities carried out beyond teaching, named research, are kept away from the students' knowledge. Clearly some institutions value research over teaching while others favor teaching. Society had recognized

the value of knowledge in creating wealth, and higher education had been correlated it with prosperity (Grogono, 1994). On the other hand, policy makers have also recognized the importance of research in generating new knowledge and have also correlated it with prosperity. Starting from the concept that teaching and research are not opposed to each other, instead that they are complementary and a part of this dynamic process, one can envision that as knowledge is generated, it requires to be passed on. Therefore, both activities are central and necessary to the very existence of the higher education institutions.

A study about teaching effectiveness by Buskist (2002) revealed three dimensions of effective lecturer. First, they love the subject matter, the craft of teaching, and students. Second, they are proactive in their striving to become better teacher, and finally, they emphasize interaction between students and teacher. Feldens and Duncans (1986) reported that effective lecturers have dimensions as student participation, classroom organization and management, clarity, acceptance of students, punctuality, and systematization. In light of the research on effective teaching and in an effort to provide focus for efforts to improve university teaching, these factors were further clustered under three foci for staff development namely improving interpersonal relationships, improving organization, management and evaluation and enhancing knowledge and understanding. Further, the way lecturers allocate time to their teaching and research roles is the focus of much debate as higher education policy-makers and administrators seek to improve lecturer productivity (Jacobson, 1992; Mingle, 1993). Many scholars and administrators also believe that the achievement of teaching and research goals requires lecturer to engage in separate and distinct

activities (Barnett, 1992). Prior research shows that joint production of teaching and research can be efficient and cost effective for colleges and universities (Hopkins, 1990; Cohn, Rhine, & Santos, 1989). Similarly, lecturers may improve their efficiency if they sometimes allocate time to activities that achieve both teaching and research goals (Becker, 1975). Traditional forms of higher education teaching include project work, assignments, tutorial discussions and practical work, all of which involve students in developing their personal understanding of the phenomena of their study (Brew, 1999). High quality teaching in higher education is generally identified with the promotion of effective learning opportunities for students (Broder & Dorfman, 1994).

The aim of teaching is to make student learning possible (Ramsden, 1992). There are many ways in which this general aim might be accomplished across the range of disciplines and teaching contexts within tertiary institutions. According to Ballantyne, Bain and Packer (1999) effective lecturers use widely different techniques and creative variations in teaching methodologies. Early study on lecturer effectiveness by Feldman (1976) identifies twenty categories of effective teacher. The categories are then subdivided into three dimensions named as presenter, facilitator, and manager. Braskamp et al. (1979) then revealed ten traits for teacher effectiveness. Those traits are then factorized into two dimensions called empathy and professional maturity. The first dimension is related to the characteristics of teacher, while the second dimension is related to subject matter. Further, Ansari et al. (2000) summarized the teacher effectiveness into five dimensions called mastery or knowledge of subject, preparation and organization of lectures, clarity of presentation or communication, enthusiasm, and ability to

stimulate students thought and interest. For the purpose of their study, they have included another dimension called Islamic orientation. Ellington (2000) highlighted seven golden rules for becoming an excellent tertiary-level teacher as follows: find out how your student learn, set appropriate learning targets, use appropriate teaching/learning methods, use appropriate assessment methods, monitor and evaluate your teaching, always try to improve your performance, and finally to keep yourself up-to-date. Attempts to establish metrics for teaching effectiveness have assumed many forms but normally have focused on student responses to written questions. Despite some strong opposition to incorporating such student ratings in university evaluation, they are widely used. A number of student questionnaires have been developed with the difference arising primarily because of the intent of the questionnaire (Ansari et al., 2000; Centra, 1979; McBean & Al-Nassri, 1982).

Student's evaluation is commonly believed to serve functions like to help improve the lecturer, to assist the administration in making better employee decisions, to assist students in choosing appropriate courses, and to establish general criteria on teaching effectiveness (Knapper et al., 1977). It was found that students are generally willing to do evaluations and to provide feedback, and have no particular fear of repercussions. Students view teaching and advising as the most important roles that should be played by lecturer, yet project that research also important to lecturer (Spencer & Schmelkin, 2002). Research is the creation or discovery of a body of knowledge which is detached or separated off from the people who developed it is (Brew, 1999). The individual researcher or research team works within the academic tradition in an organizational and social context. When we look at academic practice we see that research and teaching are not so

distinct in academics' minds. While the products of research in terms of publications, citations, numbers of research grants and the like may in the future provide ideas, material for reflection and interpretation, thereby adding to socially accepted knowledge, the process of discovery resides in an individual's and / or a group's attempt to make sense of a phenomenon or a problem in their subject domain. It has been suggested that teaching and research are related through the common activity of scholarship (Elton, 1986, 1992; Neumann, 1993; Westergaard, 1991). Elton defines scholarship as the interpretation of what is already known; the primary work that feeds into all the other things academics are supposed to do, while Neumann (1993) suggests that the concept of scholarship also includes the idea of a quality describing the way in which inquiry should be made. Westergaard (1991) prefers the concept of critical inquiry that insists research and academic teaching are indivisible. Some researchers argue that research performance, unlike teaching performance, offers an objective means of evaluating lecturers effort (Kasten, 1984) and provide the most efficient manner of ascertaining the quality of their teaching (Paul & Rubin, 1984). However, these arguments are not universally accepted as true due to the coverage of audience. Boyes, Happel, and Hogan (1984) suggest that the audience for published research extends beyond the campus, and sometimes beyond the nation, however teaching seldom extends beyond the classroom.

Ramsden and Moses (1992) describe results of an empirical investigation of the relationship between research and teaching in higher education. The results revealed typically no relation or a negative relation between teaching and research at the level of the individual and at the level of the department, across all subject

areas. Further analysis by staff self-rating of academic quality shows that there existed one group of staff, mainly in the universities, who were committed to teaching and highly active researchers. However, the data did not support a causal interpretation of the association. It is concluded that there is no evidence in these results to indicate the existence of a simple functional association between high research output and the effectiveness of teaching. However, a study by Kane et al. (2004) attempts to understand better the complex nature of tertiary teaching by identifying and investigating the attributes of a group of excellent lecturers of the university. Their findings revealed that there is a strong link between the teaching practice and research commitment of the excellent lecturer; as well as the key roles played by interpersonal relationships and the personality of the lecturer.

Therefore, if higher education institutions want to improve both teaching and research effectiveness, they need to select, retain, promote, and support academics who are good at both teaching and research (Marsh & Hattie, 2002). Marsh and Hattie further emphasize that if higher education institutions want to improve either their teaching or research, they need not select, retain, promote, and reward lecturer who are poor at both teaching and research. What is a good teaching? There is presently a great deal of research related to effective teaching. Researchers and practitioners agree that teaching is a complex activity of multiples dimensions like clarity, interactions with students, organization, and enthusiasm (Abrami & D'Appolonia, 1991; Cashin & Downey, 1992; Feldman, 1997; Marsh & Roche, 1993). Teaching effectiveness can also be discussed in terms of teacher expertise (Smith, article in press). There seems to be general agreement among researchers that the expertise relates to subject matter knowledge, knowing how to

teach the subject matter to others (didactical knowledge), self-awareness and social skills (Fish, 1995; Beijaard & Verloop, 1996; Day, 1999), and organizational competence (Day, 1999; Christic, 2003). In other study, Koster et al., (article in press) used the concept of profession and professional profile to develop tasks and competencies for lecturer. A professional profile is made up of a task profile and a competence profile (Moerkamp & Onstenk, 1991). The task profile sets out the tasks the teacher has to do currently and in the future, while the competence profile sets out the competencies that they should possess now and in the future.

2.1.1 Rating of Teaching Effectiveness

Early reviews of the literatures and studies looked into the usefulness of student ratings to improve university teaching (Rotem & Glasman, 1979; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975; Miller, 1971). Much research has been conducted over the past 50 years to examine student evaluations of teaching (SET) as a method of assessing teacher performance. Because students are one of the consumer group interested in the product of higher education, students opinion are consider a vital source of information concerning the quality of instruction at universities (Wright, 2006). In addition, teaching effectiveness literatures have shown that there is a relationship between teaching effectiveness and student learning and achievement (Abrami, Apollonia & Cohen, 1990; Braskamp, Brandenburg & Ory, 1984; Cohen, 1981; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975; McMillan, Wergin, Forsyth & Brown, 1986; Marsh & Dunkin, 1992). Hence, student's opinion is considered valuable and suitable for teaching effectiveness.

After nearly seven decades of research on the use of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, it can be summarized that the majority of researchers believe that student ratings are a valid, reliable, and worthwhile means of evaluating teaching (Centra, 1977; Cohen, 1981; Koon & Murray, 1995; Marsh, 1984, 1987; marsh & Dunkin, 1992; McKeachie, 1990; Murray et al., 1990; Ramsden, 1991; Seldin, 1984). In addition, Marsh (1987) contends that student evaluations are the only indicator of teaching effectiveness whose validity has been thoroughly and rigorously established. Further arguments supporting the use of student ratings include that feedback from student rating can help to improve instruction (Cohen, 1980; Marsh & Roche, 1993; Menges, 1991; Overall & Marsh, 1979), the use of student rating increases the likelihood that excellence in teaching will be recognized and rewarded (Aleamoni, 1981; McKeachie, 1979), student ratings have been shown to be positively correlated with student learning and achievement (Aleamoni & Hexner, 1980; Centra, 1977; Cohen, 1981), students and academics generally agree on what are the component of effective teaching and their relative importance (Feldman, 1976, 1988). According to Aleamoni (1987) and Arreola (1995), well developed, tested, student rating are both reliable and valid. Reliability indicates how consistent a set of items measures a particular construct or set of constructs. This can refer to consistency across rater's time, and items. In short, reliability provides information on the extent to which a given measurement will give similar information in different contexts or times of measurement.