

**Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference  
on  
Private Higher Education  
Institutions (PHEIs) in Ethiopia**

***Major Theme: Private Higher Education in Ethiopia  
at the turn of the Ethiopian  
Millennium***

**Organized & Sponsored  
By  
St. Mary's University College  
August 25, 2007  
UN Conference Center  
Addis Ababa  
Ethiopia**

**A Comparative Study on the Impact of Instructor-Student Relationships, in Private and Government Higher Education Institutions on Students' Learning: The Cases of St. Mary's University College & Addis Ababa University, College of Commerce**

Aderajew Mihret, St. Mary's University College,  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

***Abstract***

*Instructor-student relationship is an important element in the teaching-learning process. An instructor not only teaches but also interacts with his/her students. Nor does a student learn as though he/she were receiving his/her information from a teaching machine. Each has feelings toward the other, and a significant number of studies show that positive instructor-student relationships facilitate the learning process while negative ones interfere in students' learning. However, the impact of relationships on learning do not appear to have been periodically documented. This study was specifically designed to examine the impact of Instructor-Student Relationships in Private and Government Higher Learning Institutions, on Students' Learning. The study examined the nature of relationships that exist between instructors and students in St. Mary's University College (SMUC) and Addis Ababa University College of Commerce AAUCC and identified the factors influencing such relationships. It also tried to assess the professional distance maintained by the instructors in both institutions. To be able to examine and compare the impact of Instructor-Student Relationships on Students' Learning, in the chosen institutions, in a questionnaire was administered to both prospective graduating students and senior instructors found in SMUC and AAUCC. The survey summarized all activities carried out the process followed? and recommends the most workable findings, which if appropriately addressed are believed to maximize students' participation in the teaching learning practices.*

-----

## **I. Introduction**

As many research papers show, instructor-student relationship is an important element in the teaching-learning process and such relationships start in the classroom. During class, instructors are able to identify students who are interested, enthusiastic, and determined to success. Accordingly, they need to work hard to maintain students' interest in learning. Classroom is a great place to develop relationships with instructors, but students also have opportunities to get to know their instructors out of classrooms. Students could meet their instructors at their offices by attending conferences where they present their research reports, book reviews, coordinate educational clubs and develop appropriate relationships with them. Such relationships help students to augment their classroom discussions.

### **2.1 Objectives of the study:**

The study is therefore an attempt to assess the extent of existing relationships inside and outside the classrooms between students and their instructors and the impact of such relationships on students' interest in learning. To this effect, how instructors were performing their tasks in line with the university college guidelines, procedures and/or principles as well as the way they maintained their professional distance were also examined as these variables were thought to bear impact on students' interest learning.

This study was specifically designed to:

- examine the nature of relationships that exist between instructors and students in SMUC and AAUCC;
- identify factors influencing such relationships;
- assess the professional distance maintained by the instructors in both institutions;
- analyze the impact of relationships on students' learning; and
- Possibly draw conclusions and recommendations on the basis of the findings.

### **I.3. Methodology**

A Significant number of studies show that positive instructor-student relationships facilitate the learning process while negative ones interfere. However, little inquiry has been made to compare as to how such relationships are made on the impacts they bring about in private and government institutions. This paper reports on a small scale comparative study done on the impact of student-instructor relationships on students' learning. It is a case study made in two purposefully selected institutions one private (St. Mary's University College (SMUC)) and the other is government (Addis Ababa University, College of Commerce (AAUCC)). 250 prospective graduates and 40 senior instructors took part in the study from both institutions. The study examined the interactions of students with their instructors both inside and outside the classroom, student's interest to learn and the motives for developing relationships with their instructors. The practice of instructors in line with the institutions' procedure and guidelines together with their professional distance were also addressed. Tabulated data is presented. Both qualitative and quantitative analyses have been carried out. Based on the findings of the study, conclusions and recommendation have been made.

### **2.2 Respondents**

- Prospective graduates from SMUC and AAUCC; and
- Senior instructors who had taught five years and above from SMUC and AAUCC.

### **2.3 Sampling technique**

- 115 students from SMUC and 135 students from AAUCC and 40 senior instructors (20 from each institution, who had taught five years and above were randomly selected for the study).

## **2.4 Instruments employed**

Two types of questionnaires, one for the students and the other for the instructors, were prepared and used in this study.

## **2.5 Data analysis**

Data obtained from sample students and instructors were tabulated based on sex, program and division of study (in the case of students) and in the case of instructors, data was compared to judge the awareness of instructors on the necessity of performing tasks in line with guidelines, procedures and principles of the university college and on the appropriate professional distance to be maintained in the teaching learning process.

## **Review of related literature**

“Much like other relationships, student-instructor relationships need to be built on communication, understanding and respect.” Many students are intimidated by instructors and are afraid that they will judge them; they will appear to other students to be a “teacher’s pet”, or become a bother to their instructors if they try to develop relationships. This couldn’t be far from the truth. In fact, if a student fails to develop relationships with his/her instructors, he/she will miss out opportunities to greatly aid his/her learning process and deepen his/her college and/or university experience. An instructor with whom a student has great relationship can serve as a mentor and offer her/his students advice on how to do better in class and in college in general; help in determining career goals; in getting recommendation letters and references and the like. Instructor-student relationships start in the classroom. During class time, instructors are able to identify students who are interested, enthusiastic, and committed to success.

Classrooms are great places to strengthen relationships with instructors, but students also have opportunities to get to know their instructors out of classrooms. Instructors are expected to perform their tasks transparently and plainly so that they can facilitate their students' learning.

According to Code of Ethics of Illinois State University, USA, 2005, in order to develop positive relationships with students instructors should: adhere to course content, clearly explain the objective of their courses, clearly explain methods of evaluation, regularly meet their assigned classes as scheduled, communicate to their students policy regarding attendance and consequences of non-compliance, Post and observe a reasonable number of regular office hours to consult students, not act to interfere with academic freedom of students, not utilize the services of the university college in pursuing non-academic concerns, make reasonable effort to create a climate which fosters honest academic conduct, grade students based on their academic performance, respect the confidential nature of their relationships with their students, should exploitation of students for their private advantages both inside and outside the classroom, etc.

While performing their tasks in line with these policies, procedures and guidelines of the college/university, instructors need to maintain a certain professional distance. It is a reserve maintained by the instructors to control the interaction between them and their students. Control is essential if the instructor wishes to insure his/her success in training each student to move on. The instructor must control not only the technical aspects of imparting knowledge, but also every element of teaching that can facilitate or interfere with the process. The relationship or personal interaction between instructor and student is one such element. An instructor may be friendly with each student or may develop such a close friendship that it interferes with the teaching/ learning process. If the relationship is too close, the instructor might not insist on performance standards he/she would expect from other students. He/she might not want to hurt the feelings of the student by telling

him/her that he/she is not doing well in a lesson. In addition, the student might be lax in carrying out instructions because a good friend would overlook mistakes.

The possibilities for teacher/student non-lesson contacts are endless. But whatever they are, they will add to the complexity of the relationships and consequent ability to control the interaction and with outsome control, the instruction process may suffer. It is, therefore, necessary that any instructor should do what he/she can to control anything that affects the relationship and the outcome of the training. Gower and Walters (1983) stated that instructors can promote instructor-students rapport by showing personal respect for the students, being interested in their progress, asking for comments in a class, having the right manner, knowing all students by name, ensuring that students know each other, allowing plenty of group work, using activities that students enjoy, etc. Though it is not the purpose of this paper, it is important to mention, here, what Jones and Jones (1990), suggest: “Teachers trying to foster good relations with students will also need to take steps to help students get along with classmates as such relationship encourage students to learn from each other” and “develops their attitudes toward the class and toward themselves” (Moscowitz, 1981).

### **III. Results and Discussion**

In the section that follows, responses obtained from the two groups are presented.

#### **Socio-demographic profile of the sample students and instructors**

As indicated in Table-1, among the sample students, female students are larger in number (56.5%) in SMUC while male students are larger in AAUCC. When we consider their program of study and division, about 65.2% are of diploma students. The rest 34.8% of the respondents are for degree students (SMUC) and all of the 135 students of AAUCC are degree students. Similarly, of the sample students, 52.2% are extension students while 47.8

% are regular students (SMUC) and for AAUCC, while 57 % are regular, 58% are extension students. Among the sample instructors, 90% are male and 10% female (in SMUC) and 20 of the sample instructors are male (in AAUCC). In this regard, the absence of female instructors in the sample did not mean that there were no female instructors in AAUCC; however, in both institutions their number is minimal and is serious in AAUCC. In both institutions, the larger number of service years is (5-10) (45 %) with 75 % to MA/MS.C/LLM level and none higher than that.

**Table-1:** Distribution of Socio- demographic profile of the sample students  
(N = 250) and sample instructors (N = 40)

Participants		SMUC	AAUCC	
<i>Students</i>	Sex	Male	50 (43.5%)	89 (66%)
		Female	65 (56.5%)	46 (34%)
		<b>Total</b>	<b>115 (100%)</b>	<b>135 (100%)</b>
	Program of study	Degree	40 (34.8%)	135 (100%)
		Diploma	75 (65.2%)	- (0 %)
		<b>Total</b>	<b>115 (100%)</b>	<b>135 (100%)</b>
	Division of study	Regular	55 (47.8%)	77 (57.0%)
		Extension	60 (52.2%)	58 (43.0 %)
		<b>Total</b>	<b>115 (100%)</b>	<b>135 (100%)</b>
<i>Instructors</i>	Sex	Male	18 (90%)	20 (100%)
		Female	2 (10%)	- (0%)
		<b>Total</b>	<b>20 (100%)</b>	<b>20 (100%)</b>
	Years services of	5-10	9 (45 %)	9 (45 %)
		11-15	7 (35 %)	5 (25 %)
		> 15	4 (20%)	6 (30%)
		<b>Total</b>	<b>20 (100%)</b>	<b>20 (100%)</b>
	Level education of	B.A/B.Sc./LLB	5 (25%)	3 (15%)
		M.A/M.Sc./LLM	15 (75 %)	17 (85 %)
		Ph.D. and above	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>20 (100%)</b>	<b>20 (100%)</b>	



### **3.2. Practices of students that foster and affect relationships with their instructors inside the classrooms**

This section presents how the sample students interacted with their instructors inside the classroom. Table-2 (refer to the annex) presents the findings were assessed against those assumed standard performances of students.

If one carefully observes Table 2, one can obtain the following information:

Both sexes from the two institutions responded that were asked questions freely, addressed their instructors properly and showed respect to their opinions, accepted instructors criticism without challenging them and asked for permission to perform every type of activity in the classroom. However, large number of female students from AAUCC responded that they didn't ask questions freely. Female students from both institutions sought constant permission from their instructors. Both female and male students of SMUC and a relatively larger number of female students of AAUCC said that they didn't see instructors' evaluation as punishment; however, nearly half of the male students of AAUCC saw it as venting negative feelings. A small number of SMUC students refused to accept their instructors' suggestions while a larger number of AAUCC students responded that they accepted any form of suggestion given by their instructors.

In relation to program of study, larger numbers of SMUC degree students responded they were free to ask questions, addressed their instructors properly, showed respect to their views, accepted their criticisms without resistance and asked for permission for any form of activity in class. AAUCC students also responded that they were relatively free to ask questions, addressed their instructors properly and with respect and showed respect to their opinions, accepted criticisms and asked for permission to perform classroom activities. But a reasonable number of AAUCC students (42.2%) refused to accept incorrect criticism. While 77.5% of SMUC degree students rejected the use of instructors' evaluation for punishment, nearly half of AAUCC degree students (48.1%) reflected that

this venting negative feelings. SMUC diploma students seemed to be acting in the same way as degree students; however, they related to baseless criticism and non-teaching suggestions. In relation to division of study, regular students of SMUC appeared feer to ask questions (87.3%) as compared to AAUCC students (only 57.1%). Students from both institutions responded that they addressed their instructors' with respect: Regular students from both institutions responded that they accepted criticisms; however, AAUC students seemed to react somewhat. While larger number of SMUC regular students rejected the use of teachers' evaluation as punishment, though not large, about 57.1% of regular students of AAUCC answered they did.

Extension students of both institutions responded that they were afraid of asking questions though not as serious in SMUC addressed their instructors properly, showed respect, and asked for permission for classroom activities.

They also didn't see evaluation as punishment AAUCC students seemed to embrace suggestions and groundless criticisms while SMUC students (51.7%) refused.

#### **Practices of students that tend to foster or affect their relationships with their instructors outside the classroom**

The sample students were also asked to provide their opinions on student/teacher interaction outside the classroom. Table-3 (refer to the annex) shows the responses of the sample respondents.

As it is indicated in Table 3, **in relation to sex**, both sexes were not making appointments with instructors for discussions during office hours. However, SMUC male students (59.6%) seemed to have done it. Both male and female students showed a relatively equal interest to meet their instructors right after class; however, larger number of SMUC female students (54%) insisted on it. Both sexes responded that they didn't participate in

instructor-led clubs. It was, however, serious in AAUCC. Only SMUC male students (59.6%) said that they participated in extracurricular events. Female students seemed to be better in trying to reverse negative attitudes of instructors by improving efforts to learning. A large number of male and female students said that they neither received nor insisted on invitations from their instructors. They also said they neither wanted to attack their instructors nor bothered if they came across instructors in recreational places. Female students from both institutions, however, said that instructors showed lack of interest to greet them outside of class.

**In relation to program of study**, degree students of both institutions responded that they didn't insist on meeting their instructors' right after the class, didn't participate in clubs, acted to improve negative attitudes of their instructors, didn't receive invitations from their instructors, didn't care if they met instructors in recreational places, didn't intend to challenge instructors who had given them a bad time during the learning process. While larger number of diploma students of SMUC (57, 5%) took appointments from instructors for tutorials, degree students of the two institutions seemed unable to take advantage of this. About 51.8% of degree students of AAUCC said that they came across instructors who were reluctant to greet them. 52.0% of SMUC diploma students of seemed to insist on meeting their instructors' right after classes. Larger number of students responded that they were participating in extracurricular events and came across instructors who refused to greet them.

**In relation to division of study**, larger number of regular students of both institutions responded equally that they didn't participate in clubs and extracurricular events, acted to improve negative attitudes, didn't receive nor insist to invitations from instructors, and didn't intend to challenge their instructors for wrong decisions. However, while 55.8% of AAUCC students were unable to take advantage of instructors office hours, 56.4 % of SMUC regular students used of it. Extension students of both institutions, though there was some differences, reflected that they didn't take appointments insisted neither to meet their

instructors' right after classes nor to be invited by their instructors and strongly deny the intention of attacking instructors for vendetta. 53.3% of SMUC extension students participated in clubs which were led by instructors and in extracurricular events while 77.6% of AAUCC students responded to have participated in clubs and extracurricular events.

### **3.3 Students' interest to learn**

Students were asked for their opinion on student/ instructor interaction. Table 4 (refer to annex)

As one can easily see in Table-4 (as shown at the annex), **in relation to sex**, relatively larger numbers of female and male students from both institutions had the following points in common: attend classes regularly and arrive for class as on time prepare well for assignments and/or projects show interest in courses, are punctual for tutorials (but 52.2% of AAUCC female students missed it) lose interest in learning when deprived of instructors' attention (serious for SMUC female students) show interest to learn despite negative attitudes of instructors, and work hard to please their instructors. However, participation of SMUC students in classes (82%) was higher than AAUCC (58.5%). Both female and male students of AAUCC seemed not to take advantage of their instructors' office hours for tutorials purposes. AAUCC students (larger number of both sexes) said they missed 'Laughty' instructors classes. However, only male students of SMUC (59.6%) said that they chose to miss such classes.

**In relation to the program of study**, degree students of both institutions answered the following. They almost equally attend classes regularly, arrive for classes on time participate in class discussion (higher in SMUC 82.5% and less in AAUCC, 57.8%) prepare well for assignments/projects show interest in their instructors courses are were punctual for tutorials; lose interest when deprived of attention of instructors; were interested in attending classes despite the negative mood of instructors; and work hard to

please their instructors. However, while 57.5% of SMUC degree students said that they took advantage of their instructors' office hours, 58.5% of AAUCC students said that they did not. Similarly, while 71.1% of AAUCC students missed classes of 'Laughty' instructors, only 57.5% of SMUC did. Despite missing classes of such instructors, diploma students of SMUC showed interest in learning.

**In relation to division of study**, regular students of both institutions said that they attended classes regularly and arrived for classes on time prepared well for assignments or projects; showed interest in courses; were punctual at meetings with instructors for tutorials (AAUCC students need to work harder to improve this); missed classes of 'Laughty' instructors; lost interest when not encouraged; showed interest in attending classes despite negative attitudes of instructors; and worked hard to please their instructors. AAUCC students, however, showed less interest in class participation while it was about 89.1% for SMUC students. Many showed interest in participating in class. Many AAUCC students failed to take advantage of their instructors' office hours (which was reflected only by 39%). In both institutions, extension students responded in the same way. They attended classes regularly and arrive on time (better for SMUC, 90%, and 60% for AAUCC); prepare well for assignments/projects; showed interest in instructors' courses; were punctual for academic consultations (better for SMUC students, 80% than AAUCC students, 65.5%); lose interest in the absence of attention from instructors; and work hard to please their instructors. However, 85% of SMUC students responded that they participated in class whilst it was only 57% of AAUCC students did the same. AAUCC students largely didn't take advantage of their instructors' office hours (only about 44.8%). 79.3% of AAUCC students missed classes with a large number of SMUC students being in dilemma.

### **3.4 Motives that encouraged student to foster relationships with their instructors**

In order to have a complete view of the impact of instructor-student relationships on the students' learning, the researcher believed that factors that drive students to foster relationships with instructors should be known or identified. Accordingly, the sample students were asked to give their opinions on motivation or other reasons that contributed to their relationships. Table-5 (shown in the annex), presents the responses of the sample students (in percentage) based on their sex, program and division of study.

As can be easily seen from Table-5, **in relation to sex**, with some slight differences in percentage of responses, both sexes from the two institutions responded that they need to foster relationships with their instructors to get appropriate guidance and counseling, get better grades (though it seemed not highly exaggerated by female students of SMUC), build trust with their instructors, are in fear of low grades (AAUCC female students were more concerned i.e., 76.1%), imitate best practices of instructors (higher in SMUC) get help in determining career goals, get recommendations/references for employment. Both sexes in AAUCC showed little interest in having love affairs while in SMUC, 71.2% of male students and 63.5% of female students. Economic support seemed to be the concern of SMUC students (both sexes).

**In relation to the program of study**, degree students of both institutions said that they needed to develop relationships with their instructors to get appropriate guidance and counseling get better grades; get trust from their instructors; to banish of law grades; imitate best practices of instructors (higher in SMUC, 87.5% than AAUCC, 72%); get help in determining career goals and recommendations and/or references for employment (higher in SMUC). Diploma students of SMUC reflected that they needed the relationships to take advantage of what degree students suggested but were less a lesser concerned with better grades, fear of law grading of grades and economic support.

**In relation to division of study**, regular students of both institutions responded equally (despite certain differences in their magnitude) that they needed the relationships to: get appropriate guidance and counseling; get better grades; get trust from their instructors; the fear inappropriate grading (highly concerns AAUCC regular students, 74% than SMUC, 63.6%); economic support ( a little higher in AAUCC regular students, 67.5%); imitate best practices of instructors; get help in determining career goals and recommendations and/or references for employment. SMUC regular students, however, said that they needed to establish a love affair with instructors (71.29%). Extension students of both institutions responded, despite the differences in the magnitudes): to get appropriate guidance and counseling and their instructors trust; get better grades (students of AAUCC had higher concern, 65.5% than SMUC, 58.3%). In both institutions, students showed the interest to imitate best practices of their instructors; the fear inappropriate grading; get help in determining career goals and recommendations and/or references for employment (however, SMUC extension students had a big interest in these issues). Both didn't show much interest in economic support and love affairs were given due attention by SMUC extension students, 63.3% while AAUCC extension students awarded it only 39.7%.

#### **Practices of the sample instructors in line with the university/college guidelines, procedures and principles**

As it was explained in the objectives of this study, the professional distance that instructors maintain in the learning process should be assessed as it was believed to have effects on their students' learning. Sample instructors were, hence, requested to provide their opinions on how they were performing their tasks in line with the university college guidelines, procedures and principles as well as what their professional distance looked like. Table-6 and Table-7 below present the responses of the sample instructors.

As it is clearly indicated in Table-6, the sample instructors from both institutions reflected almost equally, that: they adhere to the course content; regularly meet their classes as

scheduled; make every reasonable effort to be impartial to their students; maintain objectivity in assessing students' performance and respect the confidential nature of relationships with their students. While larger numbers of SMUC instructors (60%) tried to explain almost always what was expected of students (objectives of their courses), AAUCC instructors seemed to practice irregularly. And while larger numbers of AAUCC instructors (80%) tried to explain to students methods of evaluation almost always, SMUC instructors (60%) seemed to do so rarely. Though it seemed to be nearly identical in their

**Table-6:** Percentage distribution of the responses of the sample instructors (N = 40) on their practices in line with the university college guidelines, procedures etc

Assumed practices of instructors	Rated responses in % (based on institution)													
	SMUC							AAUC						
	5	4	3	2	1	0	total	5	4	3	2	1	0	total
Explain objectives of the courses	50	10	40	-	-	-	100	20	10	60	5	5	-	100
Adhere to the course content	65	35	-	-	-	-	100	60	35	5	-	-	-	100
Explain methods of evaluation	15	45	5	5	-	-	100	70	10	10	10	-	-	100
Return commented assignments/projects/exam papers for inspection	45	35	10	10	-	-	100	35	35	-	25	-	5	100
Regularly meet classes as scheduled	70	20	5	-	5	-	100	55	40	-	5	-	-	100
Communicate policies regarding attendance and its consequences	60	25	25	-	-	-	100	60	20	10	-	-	10	100
Post, announce office location and hours	20	35	25	10	-	10	100	30	35	15	20	-	-	100
Arrange time to augment formal classroom learning out of class	5	45	35	10	5	-	100	15	10	25	5	40	5	100
Make every effort	85	15	-	-	-	-	100	80	20	-	-	-	-	100



to be impartial to all students														
Maintain objectivity in assessing students' performance	75	20	-	5	-	-	100	65	30	-	5	-	-	100
Respect confidential nature of relationships with students	60	40	-	-	-	-	100	70	30	-	-	-	-	100

**Key:** 5 = always; 4 = often; 3 = sometimes; 2 = rarely; 1 = not at all; 0 = not applicable

**Table-7:** Percentage distribution of the responses of sample instructors (N = 40) on the professional distance they have maintained

<i>Assumed items showing instructors professional distance</i>	<i>Rated responses in % (based on institution)</i>											
	<i>SMUC</i>						<i>AAUC</i>					
	5	4	3	2	1	Total	5	4	3	2	1	Total
Controlling every element of teaching is necessary	30	40	30	-	-	100	65	20	15	-	-	100
Keeping away young female/male students who infatuate with instructors is appropriate	50	25	10	5	10	100	50	25	10	10	5	100
Developing close relationship with students contributes to lackadaisical manner on their learning	25	40	15	-	20	100	20	25	20	5	30	100
Close friendship makes students to be lax in carrying instructions	30	40	20	5	5	100	5	55	25	-	15	100
Friendliness to students positively interferes with their learning	40	36	15	-	-	100	25	40	30	-	5	100
Instructors should become totally formal in their interaction with students	20	30	45	5	-	100	50	30	20	-	-	100
Receiving invitations from students suffer the instruction process	20	35	25	10	10	100	50	20	30	-	-	100
Respecting students brings a respect to instructors	95	5	-	-	-	100	90	-	-	10	-	100

**Key:** 5 = agree; 4 = moderately agree; 3 = disagree; 2 = moderately disagree; 1 = neither agree nor disagree

(N = 40) on their practices and professional distance that they had respectively.

practices of returning commented assignments, projects and exams, SMUC instructors showed somewhat better performance. Regarding communicating to students policies concerning attendance and the consequences of the non-compliance to it, and arranging

extra time to support students' learning outside the classroom, SMUC instructors seemed to perform better but in posting and announcing office location and hours, AAUCC instructors performed better.

Similarly, Table -7 shows that larger number of instructor respondents almost equally reflected that they believed respecting students brings about respect to them; keeping at a distance young female/male students who could become infatuated with their instructors was found necessary; and close relationships with students contributes to lackadaisical manner to students' learning and to be lax in carrying instructions. However, while AAUCC instructors believed receiving invitations from students for a cup of coffee, tea, and a lunch or to a party would be detrimental to the instruction process and that instructors should be formal in their interaction with their students, SMUC instructors did not seem to take it seriously. It was also found that about 10 instructors were not in a position to say as to how close relationships with their students contributed to the carelessness of students in their learning.

#### **4. Conclusions and Recommendations**

In accordance with the objectives of the study, the main points were discussed in line with the accepted behaviors that the researcher identified. This section, hence, presents the major conclusions of the study.

##### **1) On student-instructor relationships in classrooms:**

###### **a) Based on sex**

Larger numbers of female students from the two institutions were found to interact with their instructors positively; however, quite large numbers of female students of AAUCC were not free to ask questions in the classroom. Reasonable numbers of male students from

AAUCC seemed to evaluate their instructors improperly while it seemed to be good at SMUC. About 55% of female and male students of AAUCC said they accepted any form of suggestions given by their instructors; in SMUC, about half of the sample students refused to do so.

**c) Based on program of study:**

Degree students (SMUC) were found to have good relationships with their instructors inside the classroom while in AAUCC students seemed to have poor classroom relationships as larger numbers of students were not free to ask questions, reasonable numbers of students refused to accept incorrect criticisms, and nearly half of the students used instructors evaluation to vent negative feelings. About 60% of AAUCC students also responded that they were afraid to asking questions. Diploma students (SMUC), however, were found to have very good relationships in classrooms

**d) Based on program of study:**

Regular students of SMUC were found to have very good relationships in classrooms while a reasonable number of AAUCC regular students reflected not to have been free to ask questions and saw instructors' evaluation as punishment. Except for the fact that extension students in both institutions were afraid of asking questions, AAUCC extension students seemed to have very good relationships while relationships in SMUC extension students seemed fair. The reasons behind this were the reactions of the students to incorrect criticism, and suggestions given by their instructors.

## **2) On student-instructor relationships out of classrooms**

### **a) Based on sex:**

Except for SMUC male students, in both institutions larger number of students did not take opportunities of instructors' office hours; and except for SMUC male students, larger number of students from both institutions did not participate in clubs and extracurricular events where instructors play certain roles. Both sexes did not want to attack their instructors, and larger number of female students said that they came across instructors who did not want to greet them outside the school. Female students of SMUC said that they insisted on meeting their instructors immediately after the class. Both sexes from the two institutions seemed not to have fun outside the school compound with their instructors. Except for male students of SMUC, both sexes of AAUCC and female students of SMUC seemed to have poor relationships with their instructors out of classrooms.

### **b) Based on program of study:**

Except for 57.5% of SMUC degree students, others missed the advantage of using instructors' office hours. In both institutions, students seemed not to take part in clubs and/or extracurricular events, they did not insist on meeting instructors right after the class, acted to improve negative attitudes that their instructors had about them. 51.8% of degree students of AAUCC said that they came across instructors who refused to greet them. Students seemed to fail to develop relationships with instructors except for SMUC, where 57.5% achieved this. However, students were seen as not insisting that they meet their instructors right after the class and trying to improve negative attitudes that their instructors had. Larger number of diploma students of SMUC, however, insisted on meeting their instructors' right after the class and took participation in clubs and extracurricular events.

c) **Based on division of study:**

Regular students of both institutions did not take advantage of clubs and extracurricular events (SMUC was a little better); acted to reverse the negative attitudes of instructors; AAUCC students did not take advantage of instructors' office hours. It could be said that SMUC regular students had somewhat better outside relationships. Extension students of both institutions did not take the advantage of instructors' office hours; showed no interest in meeting instructor's right after the class and neither receives nor insisted on inviting instructors when seeing them off the school compound. SMUC extension students seemed to participate in clubs and extracurricular events. Though one can say that SMUC extension students had somewhat better relationships out of classrooms, extension students of the two institutes failed to develop good external relationships.

3) **On students' interest to learning:**

a) **Based on sex:** both sexes of the two institutions seemed to attend classes regularly and arrive for class on time; prepare well for assignments, projects as well as homework; showed interest to their instructors' courses; lost interest in learning when deprived of attention of instructors; and did not want to miss classes despite negative attitudes of their instructors. However, classroom participations were seen to be less in AAUCC (58.5%) and higher in SMUC students (82%) and while 67.3% of SMUC male students took advantage of their instructors' office hours, female students of SMUC and both sexes of AAUCC students did not. Both sexes seemed to have positive interest to their learning except for classroom participation of AAUCC students and lack of taking advantage of office hours of instructors'.

b) **Based on program of study:** degree students of both institutions seemed to have positive interest in their learning; however, classroom participation and the habit of taking advantage of instructors' office hours were less in AAUCC degree students and while there seemed to be some in SMUC degree students of around (57.5%) of

the respondents. Diploma students showed higher interest to their learning but nearly half missed classes of arrogant instructors.

- c) **Based on division of study:** regular students of both institutions showed strong interest in their learning, however, AAUCC students seemed not to be punctual at appointments with their instructors, meant to augment their classroom learning, had poor classroom participation, and poor experience in using office hours of their instructors for learning. In comparison, extension students of SMUC showed higher interest in their learning, AAUCC extension students showed less classroom participation, failed to take advantage of instructors' office hours and largely missed classes of arrogant instructors. This could mean that extension students of AAUCC had relatively less interest in their learning.

**4) On the motives of students to develop relationships with their instructors:**

- a) **based on sex:** larger number of female and male students of both institutions seemed to develop relationships with their instructors for: appropriate guidance and counseling in their learning; better grades, trust, help in determining career goals, recommendations and references for employment, fear of low/inappropriate grades was found higher in AAUCC female students and to imitate best practices of instructors. Reasonable number of SMUC students of both sexes responded that they needed to develop love affair with their instructors. Both sexes seemed to be forced to develop relationships to obtain academic benefits with of course that large numbers of them reflecting that they needed better grades one way or the other and had fears of losing them.
- b) **Based on program of study:** degree students of both institutions needed the relationships for appropriate guidance and counseling in their learning, better grades, trust, and fear of low/inappropriate grades, to imitate best practices of instructors, help in determining career goals, recommendations and references for employment. However, large numbers of SMUC students seemed to look for economic support too

and have a love affair with their instructors. Except for fear low/inappropriate grades, the interest for better grades, and economic support, diploma students of SMUC showed positive attitudes toward educational advantages.

- c) **Based on division of study:** regular students of both institutions, nearly commonly, said that they needed the relationships for appropriate guidance and counseling in their learning, better grades, trust and the fear of inappropriate grading which is relatively high concern of AAUCC students, 74% to imitate best practices of instructors; recommendations and references for employment. However, regular students of SMUC reflected their relatively large interest to have a love affair with their instructors 71.29% while it was average in AAUCC regular students of around 50.7%. Largely regular students of the two institutions needed to develop relationships to generate educational advantages; however, they also mentioned that they were afraid of denial of better grades which might force them to look for it. Extension students of both institutions responded that they needed the relationships for appropriate guidance and counseling in their learning, better grades higher in AAUCC, trust, and the fear of low/inappropriate grading, recommendations and references for employment higher in SUMC. Here too, extension students needed to develop relationships to generate educational advantages. At the same time, they also mentioned that they wanted the relationships to avoid their fears of being denied better grades, which might falsely find.

**5) Performances of sample instructors in line with university college guidelines and principles:**

Sample Instructors of both institutions (SMUC and AAUCC) seemed to perform their tasks properly; however, SMUC instructors showed better practices in: explaining objectives of their courses to their students; returning commented assignments, projects and exam papers to students for inspection and discussion; communicating students on policies regarding attendance and consequences of non-compliance; arranging time to support students



outside classrooms and AAUCC instructors were better in posting but communicating locations and time for consultation of students.

**6) Professional distance maintained by sample instructors:**

Sample instructors of both institutions respected students, keeping infatuated students at a distance; not being so close to students was expected of instructors so that successful accomplishment of tasks could be achieved. However, while a large number of instructors from AAUCC believed that receiving invitations from their students adversely affected instruction process and their interactions should be formal, SMUC instructors (largely) did not take this seriously. About 10 instructors said nothing on how close relationships with students might contribute to a lackadaisical manner in students learning. AAUCC instructors (largely) seemed to have more distance from their students, while SMUC instructors (largely) seemed to be close and friendly to their.

**Recommendations**

Under the conclusion section of this report paper, the major findings were identified and brief conclusions were made for each behavior which was selected to address the objectives of the study. Recommendations would be forwarded and addressed by the responsible bodies.

As many research works show, student-instructor relationships affect students' learning either positively or negatively. Students could maintain their interest in learning if they have a conducive environment. One of the factors that contribute to students' interest in learning is their relationships with instructors both in and out of classrooms. Based on the findings, recommendations are forwarded as follows.

## **I. Concerning students:**

### **a) Relationships inside classrooms:**

- ✓ Female students of AAUCC, both in regular and extension divisions, should be encouraged to ask questions and participate in class discussions;
- ✓ Both female and male students of SMUC, in both divisions, ought to be guided to positively challenge their instructors' suggestions, opinions and views;
- ✓ Male students of AAUCC, in regular division, might be counseled as to how they evaluate their instructors' performance in the teaching learning process;
- ✓ Degree students of AAUCC, regular and extension, as well as diploma students of SMUC should be directed on how they could present correct ideas to instructors;

### **b) Relationships outside classrooms:**

- ✓ Both female and male students of AAUCC, in regular and extension divisions, and female students of SMUC, in regular and extension divisions, should be encouraged to take advantage of instructors' office hours to augment classroom learning;
- ✓ Female and male students of AAUCC, in regular and extension divisions, and female students of SMUC would need encouragement to participate in clubs led by instructors and in extracurricular events where instructors present research reports, book reviews and lead conferences;
- ✓ Female students of SMUC, in regular and extension divisions, should be advised when they are able to discuss points of interest with their instructors;
- ✓ Diploma students of SMUC should be advised to make appointments to discussion with instructors, to meet them using office hours and to be punctual for appointments;

**c) How and why students need to foster relationships with instructors:**

- ✓ Students of both institutions should be oriented, on a termly basis, on the rules and regulations of the university college;
- ✓ Students of both institutions should have corrected and commented exam papers, assignments and projects for inspection and discussion;
- ✓ Students of both institutions should be communicated with transparency, as to how grades were awarded;
- ✓ SMUC should design a mechanism for provision of economic support to the needy;
- ✓ SMUC should initiate a counseling service where students can confidentially discuss personal and learning issues.

**II. Concerning instructors:**

- ✓ AAUCC instructors would do better in explaining to their students the objectives of each and every courses thought; return corrected and commented exam papers, assignments and projects to their students for inspection and discussion; communicate to students policies regarding attendance and consequences of non-compliance to them; arrange more time to augment discussions in classrooms;
- ✓ SMUC instructors would do better in posting and announcing office locations and times for consultation and make use of them;
- ✓ SMUC instructors should give due attention to closeness to their students maintaining appropriate and personal relationships;
- ✓ SMUC instructors might think of formalizing their interactions with students;
- ✓ A large number of AAUCC instructors and some SMUC instructors might show interest in greeting their students off the school compound;

- ✓ Almost all AAUCC instructors and some SMUC instructors should encourage their students to attend to conferences where they present research papers, and to participate in clubs which they lead or coordinate;
- ✓ Instructors of the two institutions should understand the differences between being friendly becoming close to students;
- ✓ Those instructors who said nothing on the effect of close relationships with their students might contribute to lackadaisical manner of students in their learning should refer to research papers which address this issue and take advantage of it.

**References:**

1. Jack C. Richards (2003); *A Practicum in TESOL: Professional Development through Teaching*; Cambridge University Press, USA
2. Linda Darling-Hammond (1999); *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence*; University of Washington; USA
3. <http://news.search4careercolleges.com/06-2006/instructor-student-relationship-at-the-career-college-level/>.
4. Code of Ethics of Illinois State University, USA, 2005 *Life During College*