# TEACHING

# AND

# LEARNING

Edited:
E. T. Ehiametalor
E. Ojeme
Mon. Nwadiani

# CHAPTER ELEVEN

## STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN IDEAL UNIVERSITY TEACHER

H. JOHNSON NENTY & MARGARET M. ESSIEN

UNIVERSITY OF CALABAR
CALABAR.

## INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Teacher related variables exert significant influences on learning. The system of formal education places the teacher at the hub of the teaching-learning process and gives him a lot of power over the direction and intensity of the child's growth and development. According to Withall and Lewis (1963:685) "the teacher is the primary ingredient in the learning process, and the characteristics of good teachers should be identified in order to provide more good teachers and fewer poor ones". Learning would be greatly enhanced if teachers who teach are those the learners see as their best or ideal ones. Studies conducted by Elliot, (1950); Brown (1976) Ferguson (1977) have showed low to moderate ($r = .20$ to $r = .43$) positive and significant correlation coefficient between students' rating of teachers' characteristics and their performance in the teachers' class.

As a guide to the evaluation of teacher effectiveness, Donovan and Rising (1967:368-369) identified five characteristics of a "successful teacher." These were:

(1) Competent in subject matter area;

(2) Skillful in communication;

(3) Inspiring in values and personality trait;

(4) Understanding and acceptance of students; and

(5) Competent in professional knowledge.

Working with a population of college students, Gadzella (1968) surveyed the views and ratings of an "ideal professor" from 427 students at Western Washington State University. He weighted their responses to each questionnaire item by an index of the frequency of favourable and unfavourable responses, and based on this identified:

(1) Knowledge of subject matter;

(2) Interest in the subject

(3) Flexibility;

(4) Daily and course preparation; and

(5) Vocabulary;

as the five most important criteria in describing an ideal professor.
The five least important characteristics of an ideal professor
as identified by the same study were:

(1) Writer;

(2) Participation in community;

(3) Researcher;

(4) Appearance and

(5) Punctuality.

Research on identification of the characteristics of an ideal
teacher is necessary for some very important reasons. In the first
place, it provides for teacher self evaluation and improvement.
The result of an experiment by Gage, Runhel, and Chattergie (1960)
indicated that sixth-grade teachers, who served as the sample,
when given feedback from students' rating on them changed significantly
in the direction of their pupils' ideal teacher. Secondly, it could
also provide input into teacher training programmes. Purposeful
attempt could be made during teacher training to develop, among
teachers trainees, those skills and characteristics that are
identifying good teachers for hiring and selection.

The purpose of this study was to identify factors that underlie
perceptions of an ideal university teacher by students in University
of Calabar. The research question was:

What are the generalizable characteristics of an ideal
university teacher as perceived by students?

The research hypothesis was:

There is a significant influence of subject matter area;
sex; academic level; and level of academic performance on
students' perception of the characteristics of an ideal
university teacher.

METHODOLOGY

The population of the study included all graduate and under-
graduate students of University of Calabar. A stratified random
sample, based on faculties, gave a sample of 411 subjects, 258
among whom were males. Three hundred and seven of these were
undergraduates. A 40-item Likert-type survey questionnaire, -
"College Students' Rating of an Ideal Professor" was adapted
from Gadzella (1968, pp. 89-96), modified and administered on the
sample. The questionnaire requested the respondents to rate
each of 40 characteristics (see Table 1) on a 9-point scale
ranging from "Very Very Important" through "Very Very Unimportant"
as a quality of an ideal University lecturer. For positive
characteristics, a response of "very very important" carried a
score of nine, while "very very unimportant" attracted a score
of one. The scoring was reversed for negative characteristics.

Demographic data including sex, area of study, academic level (graduate - undergraduate student); and cummulative grade point average (GPA) were also requested from the respondents. Names of respondents were not required, so all information were treated anonymously. Of the 411 subjects whose responses were used in the initial analysis, 16 of them did not have complete demographic data, hence they were not used in the second set of analysis.

The data collected were subjected to a principal component factor analysis[1] using varimax (orthogonal) rotation, and factors with eigenvalue greater than one were extracted and identified. Factor scores on each of these, for each respondent, were calculated and used in a series of analysis of variance, independent t-test to determine whether factors like subject matter area, sex, academic status, and level of academic performance significantly influence respondents' perceptions of the characteristics of an ideal university teacher. Factor scores were used instead of raw scores because they provide a "clearer" indication of the influence of each factor. Only factor loadings of .25 and above were considered significant and hence, reported.

The research study was basically both descriptive and inferential in nature. In the first place, it attempted to identify and describe possible factors that underlie the respondents' rating of an ideal university teacher.

RESULTS

Seven factors with eigenvalues more than one out of the possible 40 factors were identified (See Table 1) and these together accounted for a total of 57 percent of the total amount of variance of the responses to the 40 items. The inter-factor correlation ranged from - .054 to .004, none of which was significant, hence they could be said to be independent non-overlapping factors.

---

## TABLE 4

### Principal Component Factor Analysis (Varimax Rotation) of Respondents' View of An Ideal University Teacher
### (n = 411)

| Items | Factor Loadings[a] | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I[b] | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII |
| 1. Active in Community and Social Life. | | | | | | | .71 |
| 2. Shows sincere interest in teaching. | | | .79 | | | | |
| 3. Explains material clearly and presents it at level of students' comprehension. | .40 | | .63 | | | | |
| 4. Has definite standards, and is impartial in grading. | | .29 | .63 | | | | |
| 5. Is well-groomed and always appropriately dressed. | | | .28 | | .56 | .29 | .31 |
| 6. Encourages and respects students' opinion and accepts their constructive criticism. | .36 | .59 | | | | | |
| 7. Organizes and/or participates in research. | | .25 | .25 | .67 | | | |
| 8. Is friendly, has interest in students and is accessible in and out of class. | | .58 | .30 | | | .28 | |
| 9. Has deep interest and enthusiasm for subject matter. | | | .36 | .25 | | .47 | |
| 10. Contributes to the advancement of knowledge in his/her area through research and publications. | | | | .73 | | | |
| 11. Is always punctual for classes and appointments. | .27 | .29 | .58 | | .30 | | |
| 12. Shows respect for the students and has confidence in their ability. | | .48 | | | | .32 | |

| Items | Factor Loadings[a] | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I[b] | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII |
| 13. Encourages and gives opportunity for students to ask questions and answers them satisfactorily. | .57 | .33 | .32 | | | .33 | |
| 14. Has a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of subject matter. | | | .34 | .32 | | .53 | |
| 15. Gives a well-organized orderly lesson. | .48 | | .34 | | .36 | | |
| 16. Is prompt in returning tests and assignments. | .46 | .39 | .27 | | | | |
| 17. Exhibits a good knowledge of appropriate research design and analysis principles. | | | | .61 | | .30 | |
| 18. Presents material to meet students' insterest and needs. | .42 | .36 | | | | .28 | |
| 19. Maintains a good and cordial relationship with students and colleagues. | | .58 | | | | | |
| 20. Has a sense of humour and avoids irrelevant and/or distasteful jokes. | | .26 | | | .64 | | |
| 21. Speaks good English clearly and with good pronunciation. | | | | | .66 | | |
| 22. Contributes effectively towards the administration of his/her Department/ Faculty. | | | .52 | | .26 | | .44 |
| 23. Is pleasant in class, establishes a good rapport and maintains a relaxed atmosphere conducive to learning. | .25 | .57 | | | .26 | .28 | |
| 24. Presents lectures and/or lessons which are "meaty" in valuable content and intellectually challenging. | .30 | | | | | .62 | |

| Items | Factor Loadings[a] | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I[b] | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII |
| 25. Provides list of basic and supplementary references. | .35 | | .39 | .35 | | -.30 | |
| 26. Presents material in good pace to allow for note-taking in class. | .44 | | .33 | | .38 | | |
| 27. Gives examination, test, and assignment that are of high quality and lead to more understanding and learning of course material. | .45 | | .35 | .30 | .30 | | |
| 28. Uses varied and alternative approaches including teaching aids to present material. | .67 | | | | | | |
| 29. Shows concern about whether students have learned the material he/she has presented. | .57 | .25 | .28 | | | | .37 |
| 30. Presents clear lesson/course outline, direction and specific lesson/course objectives and expectations at the beginning of lesson/course. | .49 | | .32 | | .30 | | |
| 31. Is always willing and available to help when needed by the student. | | .59 | .44 | | | | |
| 32. Bases students' final evaluation on sufficient number of appropriate assignments and tests. | .47 | | .30 | | | | |
| 33. Covers a lot of material during a lesson. | .44 | | | .38 | | .44 | |
| 34. Uses examples and personal experiences to get points across in class. | .64 | | | | | | |
| 35. Stimulates and maintains class discussions. | .61 | | | .32 | | | |

| Items | Factor Loadings[a] | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I[b] | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII |
| 36. Encourages and motivates students to learn in the course of his/her lesson. | .65 | .27 | | .25 | | .32 | |
| 37. Is involved in professional activities like conferences, seminars, etc. | .25 | | .25 | .63 | | | |
| 38. Has ability to present difficult material in an easy, clear and simple way that leads to understanding by all students. | .50 | .42 | | | | .25 | |
| 39. Gives appropriate and constructive criticism of students' work. | .41 | | | .42 | | .34 | |
| 40. Shows respect and accommodation for other subject matter areas. | .38 | .34 | | .29 | .28 | .33 | |
| Eigenvalue | 13.84 | 2.08 | 1.93 | 1.53 | 1.28 | 1.10 | 1.04 |
| Percentage of total Variance | 34.6 | 5.20 | 4.80 | 3.80 | 3.20 | 2.80 | 2.60 |
| Percentage of explained variance | 61.1 | 9.10 | 8.40 | 6.70 | 5.20 | 4.90 | 4.60 |

[a] Factor loadings less than .25 are not reported.

[b] Factors are numbered as named in the text.

Based on an analysis of the pattern of factor loadings by each of the 40 items on each of the seven factors attempt was made to interpret these factors, and names were assigned to the factors as follows (See Table 1):

Factor I:    Effective Teaching Method;

Factor II:   Relationship with students;

Factor III:  Professional Commitment;

Factor IV:   Research-oriented skills;

Factor V:    Personality traits;

Factor VI:   Knowledge of Subject matter;

Factor VII:  Community Involvement.

The results of the analysis of variance done to determine whether there is a significant influence of subjects' area of study on their perception of the above factors as characteristics of an ideal university teacher showed a significant influence on their views, of effective teaching method $(F = 2.61, p < .05)$, and relationship with students $(F = 2.80, p < .05)$ as characteristics of an ideal university teacher (See Table 2). Students' area of discipline had no significant influence on their

## TABLE 2

### A Comparative Analysis of Differences in Factor Scores On Each Characteristics of An Ideal University Teacher across Respondents From Different Faculties

| | Arts (n = 120) | | Education (n= 137) | | Science (n = 65) | | Soc. Science (n = 38) | | Law (n= 15) | | Medicine (n = 20) | | Total (n = 395) | | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | x̄ | SD | x̄ | SD | x̄ | SD | x̄ | SD | x̄ | SD | x̄ | SD | x̄ | SD | |
| Effective teaching Method. | .05 | .98 | .19 | .98 | -.16 | 1.05 | -.15 | 1.01 | -.65 | .89 | -.07 | .95 | .006 | 1.02 | 2.61* |
| Relationship with student | -.13 | .96 | .18 | .89 | -.04 | 1.01 | -.22 | .81 | .01 | .88 | .01 | .93 | .023 | .98 | 2.80* |
| Professional Commitment | -.03 | 1.01 | .01 | .89 | -.02 | 1.09 | -.04 | 1.01 | .24 | .91 | .17 | .88 | .005 | .95 | .23 |
| Research Related Skill | -.08 | 1.05 | .10 | .82 | -.02 | 1.03 | .03 | .98 | .07 | 1.02 | -.21 | 1.10 | .002 | .99 | .65 |
| Personality Factor | -.02 | .91 | -.00 | 1.05 | .22 | .96 | -.26 | 1.05 | -.30 | .96 | -.10 | .94 | .008 | .99 | 1.49 |
| Knowledge of Subject matter. | .12 | .90 | -.05 | .38 | .17 | 1.04 | -.05 | 1.03 | .65 | .93 | .29 | .90 | -.004 | 1.01 | 1.46 |
| Community Involvement. | -.04 | .89 | .05 | .89 | .08 | 1.04 | -.01 | .97 | -.60 | .99 | -.12 | 1.02 | -.011 | 1.02 | .58 |

$P < .05$; df = 5,389; critical F = 2.29

perception of the other five factors. Those in education followed
by Arts compared to others had a significantly higher perception
of the exhibition of effective teaching method as a desirable
characteristics of a university teacher. Secondly, compared to
other groups, those in Law followed by education showed a significantly
higher perception of the possesion of desirable skill at relating
to students as a characteristics of an ideal university teacher.
A vertical inspection of the data across the faculties revealed
that while those in education tended to view  the possession of
effective teaching method followed by effective skill at relating
to students as the most desirable characteristic of an ideal
university teacher, respondents in Law, Medicine, Science and Arts
tended generally to believe that knowledge of subject matter is
the most desirable characteristic.

The result of an independent t-test analysis of sex influence
on respondents' view of the characteristics of an ideal university
teacher showed that there is a significant sex differences on
respondents' perception of skill at relating to students, research-
related skills and personality traits as desirable characteristics
of a university teacher (See Table 3). Females, significantly
more than male perceived skill at relating to students, and
personality traits as characteristics of an ideal

TABLE 3

Independent t-test Analysis Of Sex Influence On
Factors Scores For Each Characteristics Of An
Ideal University Teacher.

| Factor | Male (n = 248) | | Female (n = 147) | | Total (n = 395) | | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | |
| Effectiveness of Teaching Method. | .062 | .95 | -.089 | 1.10 | .006 | 1.02 | 1.44 |
| Relationship with Student | -.058 | 1.02 | .158 | .98 | .023 | .98 | -2.06* |
| Professional Commitment | -.007 | .92 | .026 | 1.07 | .005 | .95 | - .03 |
| Research-related skill. | .185 | .93 | -.306 | 1.07 | .002 | .99 | 4.79** |
| Personality Factor | -.132 | .99 | .201 | 1.01 | -.008 | .99 | -3.21** |
| Knowledge of Subject matter. | .037 | .99 | -.074 | 1.03 | -.004 | 1.01 | 1.05 |
| Community Involvement. | -.029 | 1.09 | .019 | .89 | -.011 | 1.02 | - .45 |

$*P < .05;$ $**P < .01;$ df = 393; critical $t_{05} = 1.96;$ $t_{01} = 2.58.$

university teacher, while on the other hand, males, significantly
more than females, tend to perceive the possession of research-
oriented skill as a characteristic of an ideal university teacher.

Generally, while females tended to perceive effective relationship skills, and personal traits as more desirable characteristics of a university teacher, male tended to believe that research-oriented skills, knowledge of subject matter, and effective teaching skills are the most important ones.

An analysis of the factor scores on each of the factors across academic status groups (See Table 4) showed that there is a significant influence of academic level on the respondents' perception of effective teaching method, professional commitment, research-oriented skill, personality trait, and knowledge of subject matter as characteristics that determine an ideal university teacher. Compared to graduate students, undergraduate students have a significantly higher perception of the possession of effective teaching method, admirable personality trait, and knowledge of subject matter as desirable characteristics of an ideal university teacher. The graduate students, on the other hand, compared to their undergraduate counterparts, showed a significantly higher perception of professional commitment and research-oriented skill as desirable characteristics of a university teacher.

## TABLE 4

Analysis of the Differences In Factor Scores On Each Characteristic of An Ideal University Teacher Across Respondents' Status.

| Factor | Undergraduate | | Graduate | | Total | | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | |
| Effectiveness of Teaching Method. | .08 | .99 | -.21 | 1.02 | .006 | 1.02 | 2.51* |
| Relationship with students | -.00 | .96 | .10 | 1.01 | .023 | .98 | -.89 |
| Professional Commitment | -.06 | .95 | .20 | .96 | .005 | .95 | -2.36** |
| Research-Oriented Skill | -.15 | .98 | .45 | .99 | .002 | .99 | -5.28** |
| Personality Trait | .06 | .99 | -.21 | 1.01 | -.008 | .99 | 2.34* |
| Knowledge of Subject Matter. | .06 | 1.01 | -.19 | .98 | -.004 | 1.01 | 2.17* |
| Community Involvement | .01 | 1.02 | -.17 | 1.01 | -.011 | 1.02 | .68 |

*P < .05;  **P < .01;  df = 393;  Critical $t_{.05}$ = 1.96;  $t_{.01}$ = 2.58

Generally, while undergraduate students perceived the possession of effective teaching method, admirable personality trait, and knowledge of subject matter as the most desirable characteristics

of an ideal university teacher, graduate students perceived the possession of research-oriented skills and professional commitment as the most ideal traits of an ideal university teacher.

Another analysis of the factor scores for the student respondents on the seven factors revealed that students with different level of performance differed significantly in their perception of skill at relating to students ($F = 9.73$, $p < .001$), professional commitment ($F = 4.73$, $p < .05$), and community involvement ($F = 3.62$, $p < .05$) as characteristic factors of an ideal university teacher (See Table 5). Low-performing students tended to place significantly higher values on community involvement as a characteristic of an ideal

TABLE 5

One-Way (ANOVA) Analysis of the Differences In Factor Scores On Each Characteristic of An Ideal University Teacher Across Students With Different Grade Point Average (GPA).

| | Low GPA (n = 23) | | Average GPA (n=231) | | High GPA (n = 141) | | Total (n = 395 | | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | $\bar{x}$ | SD | |
| Effective Teaching Method. | .30 | .95 | .10 | .98 | .15 | 1.04 | .13 | .99 | .11 |
| Relationship with students. | -.85 | .96 | -.14 | .99 | .31 | 1.01 | -.00 | .96 | 9.73** |
| Professional Commitment. | -.36 | .97 | -.22 | .96 | .24 | 1.02 | -.06 | .95 | 4.73** |
| Research-Oriented Skill. | -.58 | .96 | -.52 | .98 | .25 | .99 | -.25 | .98 | 1.21 |
| Personality Factor | .05 | .91 | .06 | .97 | .07 | 1.03 | .06 | .99 | .54 |
| Knowledge of Subject Matter. | .04 | .99 | .09 | 1.01 | .14 | 1.02 | .10 | 1.01 | 1.46 |
| Community Involvement | .27 | .95 | .05 | 1.01 | -.21 | .99 | .09 | 1.01 | 3.63* |

*$P < .05$;  **$P < .01$;  df = 2.392; Critical $F_{.05} = 3.03$; $F_{.01} = 4.67$

university teacher than high-performing students, while on the other hand, the latter group tended to place significantly higher premium on professional commitment and relationship with students as desirable characteristics of a university teacher. There was a significant correlation between students' GPA and their preception of the possession of good relationship-with-students skill ($r = .24$, $p < .001$), a high level of professional commitment ($r = .13$, $p < .05$), and

community involvement ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$).

## DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study differs from most of its kind, for example, Gadzella (1968), in that it uses factor, rather than raw scores, as indicator of the influence that underlied the respondents' rating of the ideal teacher given each item. The raw score that results from a given respondents' rating on one item might have been significantly influenced by more than one factor, hence that item might load siginificantly on more than one factor (for example, see items 4,5,6, etc., on Table 1). If raw scores are used to reflect the influence of one of any of these factors, some error is introduced, because the portion of this raw score that constitute an influence of the other factors is not removed. Factor scores, on the other hand, represents only the portion of each item (raw) score that is as a result of the influence of, or is accounted for by, that particular factor only. The use of factor scores here might account for the observed discrepangy in the finding of this study compared to others reviewed earlier.

The first factor by itself with an eigenvalue of 13.84, and accounting for a total of 34.6% of the total variance of the responses to the 40 items, stood out as an overwhelming main factor. It accounted for 60.1% of the amount of variance explained by the seven factors, and for six and half times as much variance as the next important factor. Thus it could be said to represent the general teaching ability factor. That is, the one single most important factor that determines an ideal university teacher is the possession of effective teaching method. This ability tends to underlie most of the other identified abilities. For example, one cannot be said to display effective method of teaching if he does not know what to teach in the first place, or possess some personality traits which makes it conducive for students to learn under him. This factor could be said to represent the overall teaching effectiveness of a teacher. Among teacher-related factors in students' rating of a course, Centra (1977) found this factor to correlate highest with end-of-course examination scores.

Teaching effectiveness involves ability to ensure efficient communication and to stimulate learning. Effectiveness in teaching is synonymous with effective classroom communication. This entails the use of varied media in presenting materials and appropriate language to make ideas meaningful and comprehensible to learners. The ability to explain materials clearly, encourage students' verbal participation, give them the opportunity to ask questions to which satisifactory answers are given, are related characteristics in teaching effectiveness. An efficient teacher does not only teach or lecture, be he ensures that learning actually takes place. He stimulates and facilitates learning, encourages and motivates students to learn what is presented.

Underlying the relationship-with-students dimension is the teacher's respect for students and interest in their progress,

interpersonal rapport, accessibility, and guidance. These involve openess and respect, on the part of the teacher, to students' ideas and input, flexibility, fairness, willingness and availability to meet with and help students by providing them the direction which would promote their progress, constructive criticism and reward for a work well done.

An ideal university teacher is seen by students to be a professionally committed person, who shows high interest in teaching and is proud to be a teacher. He is competent in professional knowledge and maintains the ethics of the profession especially in dealing with stuents as clients.

The main aim of a university is to create and disseminate knowledge, hence an ideal university teacher has the skill to create knowledge through research, and disseminate it through teaching and publication.

In the views of the students an ideal university teacher has inspiring and admirable personality trait. He is one the students look up to with admiration to emulate his sterling qualities. The teacher, as a person, has a dynamic personality that motivates the student to learn from him and encourages them to accept his guidance and authority.

A major characteristic of an ideal university teacher is mastery of subject matter. The possession of breadth and depth of knowledge is an essential ingredient of effective teaching. An ideal teacher is very resourceful has a thorough and comprehensive knowledge, both basic and current, of the subject he teaches.

The ideal university teacher shows a good evidence of community involvement. He is active in community and social life, and makes his expertise available for service to the society. He provides a means, through advice and consultation, for the implementation of his research findings in practical situations in the community. He therefore serves as resource person for community projects, and pilots the university's role of service to the community.

The type and order of the factors identified in this study differed with that of Donvan and Rising (1967), and Gadzella (1968). The first study based its findings on data from secondary school pupils whose perception of an ideal teacher is limited only to the teaching functions of the teacher. Besides teaching, the goals of the university, unlike the secondary school, include the creation, storage and dissemination of knowledge; and the pursuit of service to the community. Hence the roles, and the priority of these roles, of the university teacher is diiferent from that of secondary school teacher. The findings of the second study which used a similar population was based on mere frequency analysis of students' favourable or unfavourable ratings of each characteristics of an ideal teacher. Such analysis was based on the wrong assumption that each item reflected one, and only one, characteristic of an ideal lecturer, and nothing more. From the

result of the factor analysis it was seen that only one-eighth of the items met this assumption. Hence there was a flaw in the analysis, and the result could not have represented the true factor picture of the students' responses.

An analyses of the influence of some students' background variables on their perception of each of the seven factors as a characteristics of an ideal lecturer revealed some interesting results. To those in disciplines other than education, the possession of "what to teach" tends to be more important than the possession of the skill on "how to teach". This is not unexpected because most education students in the sample, unlike their colleagues in the other disciplines, have gone through some pedagogical training which they have found to be very necessary for effective teaching and hence the most important characteristic of an ideal teacher.

To the females, compared to males, admirable personality traits and a good interpersonal rapport with, and accessibility to the students are more important characteristics of an ideal university teacher, while, to the males a command of research design principle and statistical analysis methods is more important. These might stem from the fact that females are generally better at human relation and social skills, while males are more inclined, than females, to academic skill.

A trend similar to the above was observed when graduate and undergraduate students' factor scores were compared for each of the factor. Graduate students, had significantly higher view of research-oriented skill as a characteristic of an ideal university teacher than undergraduate students. Undergraduate students, on the other hand, had significantly higher views of the possession of effective teaching method, good personality traits, and knowledge of subject matter as characteristics of an ideal university teacher then graduate students. Similarly, while academically high-achieving students had a significantly higher rating of relationship with students, and professional commitment as desirable characteristics of a university teacher than their low-performing students, the latter group had a significantly more positive view of community involvement as a characteristic of an ideal university teacher than the high-achieving students. Hence students' rating of an ideal lecturer on each of these three factors was significantly related to their academic achievement.

Through factor analysis technique the study identified seven factors: effective teaching method, relationship with students, professional commitment, research-oriented skills, personality traits, knowledge of subject matter, and community involvement as dimensions of the behaviour of an ideal university teacher. It further found that student background variables like their area of study, sex, academic status and level of academic performance significantly influence students' ratings of an ideal university teacher.

# REFERENCES

Brown, D. L. (1976). Faculty Ratings and Student Grades: A University-wide multiple regression analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68 (5), 573 - 578.

Centra, J. A. (1977). Students Rating of Instruction and their relationship to student learning. American Educational Research Journal, 14 (1), 17-24.

Elliott, D. N. (1950). Characteristics and relationships of various criteria of college and university teaching. Purdue University Studies on Higher Education, 70, 5 - 61.

Ferguson, J. (1977). Personality characteristics, certain characteristics and academic ability as predictors of teaching performance. A paper presented at the first Oregon Conference on Research in Teacher Education, Oregon State University, November.

Gadzella, B. M. (1968). College Students' Views and Ratings of an Ideal Professor. College and University, 44 (1), 89 - 96.

Gage, N. L., Runkel, P. J. & Chatterjee, B. B. (1960). Equilibrium Theory and Behaviour Change: An Experiment in Feedback from Pupils, to Teachers. Urbana, Illinois: Bureau of Educational Resarch, University of Illinois (Mimeographed).

Johnson, D. A. & Rising, G. R. (1967). Guidelines for Teaching Mathematics, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Withall, J. & Lewis, W. W. (1963). Social Interaction in the Classroom. In N. L. Gage (Ed). Handbook of Resarch on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Whitely, S. E. & Doyle, K. O. (1976). Implicit theories in student ratings. Amercian Educational Research Journal, 13 (4), 241 - 253.