

379
N81d
NO. 3256

SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHING COMPETENCIES
AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENT-TEACHERS, INSTRUCTORS,
AND ADMINISTRATORS IN THAILAND

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Kamonkan Witayangkoon, B.A., M.S.S.

Denton, Texas

August, 1990

Witayangkoon, Kamonkan, Secondary Social Studies Teaching Competencies as Perceived by Student-Teachers, Instructors, and Administrators in Thailand. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), August, 1990, 195 pp., 26 tables, bibliography, 87 titles.

The major purpose of this study was to determine what differences exist among groups of social studies student-teachers, instructors, and administrators in eight teachers colleges in Northern Thailand regarding their perceptions of the importance of selected social studies teaching competencies. One hundred twenty-three student-teachers, 80 instructors, and 85 administrators completed questionnaires. One-way analysis of variance was used to test the differences among the three groups of participants. The Scheffe' method was employed following the one-way ANOVA when significant difference were found. Multiple regression analyses was used to determine whether independent variables influenced the perceptions of the three groups of participants in the importance of selected social studies teaching competencies. Means and standard deviation were used to average scores in each teaching competency as ranked by the three groups. For each group, competencies in each cluster were ranked according to the average mean score. The highest mean score was considered the most important, the lowest mean score least important.

The results from data analysis revealed that (a) there is no major significant difference among the perception of the three groups of participants regarding the nine clusters of social studies teaching competencies. However, when separate clusters of competencies were divided into individual items, there was significant difference between student-teachers and instructors and between student-teachers and administrators; (b) there were significant differences in student-teachers' perceptions of the importance of social studies teaching competencies. Independent variables that influenced their perception were gender, grade-point average, satisfaction with curriculum, and satisfaction with student-teachers' internship. For the group of instructors, the one independent variable that influenced their perception was highest degree earned. Independent variables that influence administrators' perceptions were age, years of teaching and/or administrative experience, highest degree earned, academic rank and level of satisfaction with job; and (c) competencies that were consistently perceived as the most important were ranked in the top fifteen by all of the three groups of participants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Research Questions	
Significance of the Study	
Definitions of Terms	
Limitations	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
Teaching Competencies in the United States	
Selected Teaching Competencies in	
Academic Subjects	
Social Studies and Competency Based	
Teacher Education	
Summary	
Teaching Competencies in Thailand	
Educational Background	
Historical Development of Social Studies	
Thai Social Studies Teaching Competencies	
Summary	
III. METHODOLOGY.	49
The Population	
Description of the Instrument	
Pilot Study	
Procedure for Collection of Data	
Treatment of the Data	
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.	57
General Characteristic of Respondents	
Rating of Secondary Social Studies	
Teaching Competencies	
Summary	

	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . .	111
Summary	
Summary of Findings	
Discussion	
Conclusions	
Implications and Recommendations for Further Research	
APPENDIX A.	132
APPENDIX B.	150
APPENDIX C.	155
APPENDIX D.	159
APPENDIX E.	170
APPENDIX F.	173
APPENDIX G.	176
APPENDIX H.	178
REFERENCE LIST.	185

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Questionnaires Distributed and Rate of Return	50
2. Demographic Characteristics and Satisfaction Level of Student-Teachers.	58
3. Demographic Characteristics and Satisfaction Level of Instructors	61
4. Demographic Characteristics and Satisfaction Level of Administrators	63
5. One-Way Analysis of Variance for Perception on Selected Teaching Competencies, in Clusters, Among the Three Groups.	67
6. One-Way Analysis of Variance for Perception on Selected Teaching Competencies Among the Three Groups	70
7. Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Planning Instruction as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	75
8. Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Objective as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	76
9. Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Concept Teaching as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	77
10. Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Class Discussion as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	78

Table	Page
11. Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Inquiry as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	79
12. Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Value Clarification as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	80
13. Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Humanization as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	81
14. Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Using Multimedia as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	82
15. Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Evaluation as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	83
16. Perceptions of Instructors on Planning Instruction as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	88
17. Perceptions of Administrators on Objective Teaching as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	91
18. Perceptions of Administrators on Concept Teaching as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	92
19. Perceptions of Administrators on Class Discussion as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	95
20. Perceptions of Administrators on Inquiry as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	96
21. Perceptions of Administrators on Humanization as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	98
22. Perceptions of Administrators on Multimedia as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.	100

Table		Page
23.	Rank Order of Competencies Rated by Student-Teachers	104
24.	Rank Order of Competencies Rated by Instructors.	105
25.	Rank Order of Competencies Rated by Administrators	106
26.	The Comparison of Important Competencies in Top Fifteen within the Three Groups	107

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Teaching and learning are the central processes in education. Moreover, teaching is considered to be the primary professional activity of faculty members. Several studies which examined faculty attitudes toward teaching have revealed that most faculty members consider teaching to be their central source of professional satisfaction (Miron, 1985; and SPAN Consultants and Staff, 1981).

Although teaching effectiveness is one of the critical problems in the process of teaching, there is still considerable disagreement concerning the criteria used to identify good teaching (Scott, 1980). However, based on previous research, the effectiveness of teaching is largely dependent upon the competency and quality of faculty members (Bergquist & Phillips, 1975). In addition, some suggest (Moses, 1985) that the effectiveness of teaching can be improved by helping faculty members to improve student opportunities by instilling an incentive to teach, and by developing students' learning skills.

It has become increasingly evident that some form of accountability of performance for teachers is needed. Educational institutions are expected to accept the full accountability for the achievement of students. The public

wants assurance that quality education is provided for students and are demanding clarity and precision about what is being taught and the measurement of the outcomes against identified criteria of performance. Dedicated instructors want assurance that they will have the opportunities and proper resources to provide positive effects on students. Concerned students want assurance that they will be recognized and dealt with as individuals.

In light of these problems, efforts to improve teaching effectiveness continue. Earlier educational researchers were motivated to investigate teachers' personal characteristics, instructional competencies, and behaviors as contributors to effective teaching performance (Frudden & Healy, 1986). With the emphasis on excellence, accountability, and effectiveness at the present time, however, numerous studies now are designed to investigate not only how to excel but also how to measure the effectiveness of teaching.

Since no single factor can entirely describe the qualities of a good teacher, lists of criteria have been developed which range from personality traits to teaching styles to alternative interaction strategies (Hanna & McGill, 1985). It is also important to remember that what works in some situations may not work in other situations, or other school settings with different subjects and students (Ornstein, 1985).

However, the concept of teaching competencies has gained the interest of many educators since the late 1920s (Charter & Waples, 1929). The effectiveness of teachers during the early years of education, who accepted the direct and identifiable responsibility for student performance in the classroom, set the stage for the movement in teaching competencies in teacher education. According to Kinney (1952), the term "competency" was first used in his study on measures of a good teacher in 1952 (Kinney, 1952). The term is most often used in its plural form in conjunction with teaching.

Cooper and Weber (1973) defined teacher competencies as attitudes, understandings, skills, and behaviors which a teacher must be able to facilitate effectively for the intellectual, social, and emotional growth of the learner. According to Shalock (1974), competencies may also be defined in terms of (a) the mastery of knowledge that pertains to teaching, and (b) simple teaching skills or complex skills demonstrated under simplified or simulated conditions, such as microteaching in simplified classroom conditions. However, according to Sharif (1972), competencies are all those learnings which include knowledges, skills, attitudes, and behaviors which enable teachers to successfully guide children's learning.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is teaching competencies in the social studies program in Thailand as perceived by student-teachers, instructors, and administrators.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether any differences exist among the groups of social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators in their perceptions of the importance of selected secondary social studies teaching competencies.

Research Questions

An attempt is made to answer the following research questions based on the analysis of responses to the Social Studies Teaching Competencies Questionnaire used in this study:

1. Is there a difference among social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators in their perceptions of the importance of social studies teaching competencies on the following clusters: planning instruction, objective, concept teaching, class discussion, inquiry, value clarification, humanization, use of multimedia, and evaluation?
2. Do gender, grade-point average, satisfaction with curriculum, satisfaction with practicum and internship, and satisfaction with instructors' methods of teaching of social

studies student-teachers influence their perceptions of the importance of selected teaching competencies in social studies?

3. Do age, gender, years of teaching experience, degree earned, academic rank, and job satisfaction influence the perceptions of social studies instructors regarding the importance of selected teaching competencies in social studies?

4. Do age, gender, years of teaching and/or administrative experience, degree earned, academic rank, and job satisfaction influence the perceptions of administrators regarding the importance of selected teaching competencies in social studies?

5. What are the most important teaching competencies as rated by social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators?

Significance of the Study

Since the success or failure of any educational program depends to some degree upon the ability and knowledge of its teachers, the quality of available teachers remains critical. Because the quality of education depends primarily upon the quality of the teaching staff, the importance of the teacher as a factor in the success or failure of the educational system cannot be overlooked. Moreover, it seems that every teacher education institution

and every school system should have an obligation to provide only the best teachers available.

In Thailand, the social studies program has been developed as an area in which Thai curriculum is necessary. Since social studies teachers play an important role in helping Thai students understand themselves, others, and the world, teachers should be effective and should have the ability to help students to gain a variety of social studies concepts and generalizations, social studies skills, and to develop constructive attitudes.

Thus, it is imperative that the identification of competencies which are characteristic of good teaching be made. Furthermore, if social studies programs are to be effective and meaningful, they should be based upon competencies that are perceived to be important for effective teaching and student learning. This study represents an attempt to determine the importance of selected teaching competencies in the Thai social studies program.

The problem is to identify specific competencies which make competent teachers. Such competencies may be perceived differently by various groups. Administrators, social studies instructors, and student-teachers may make decisions based on their roles, job description, and school policies. The administrator may look for particular competencies regarding school policies and job description.

Student-teachers who are ready to begin teaching in the near future may consider competencies which relate to the role of senior students and their semester of school teaching experience. Once instructors enters the classroom, however, they may discover that they have the mastery of the necessary competencies for some tasks and not for others. Thus, the social studies program cannot be truly effective if it is not based on the considerations and perceptions of all these groups which may be the key for good teacher preparation.

Since no previous research has been conducted to investigate the perceptions of social studies student-teachers, instructors, and administrators on the secondary social studies teaching competencies in Thailand teacher colleges before, this investigation is useful for the following reasons:

1. it fills a research gap by investigating the perceptions of three groups concerning teaching competencies in social studies, .

2. it provides information for the best understanding of social studies teaching competencies and also for the improvement of the social studies program in teacher colleges,

3. it is an attempt to provide guidelines for better performance of social studies instructors, and

4. it has implications for determining the best program of social studies curriculum in teacher colleges in Thailand.

Definition of Terms

For clarification of terminology used in this research, the following words and phrases are defined:

Academic rank refers to the classification of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

Administrator refers to the president, vice-president, dean, and chairpersons of Social Studies, History, Geography, and Economics Departments at teachers colleges.

A cluster of competencies is a compatible grouping of related competencies brought together for greater meaning and understanding.

Competencies are attitudes, understandings, behaviors, and consequence which a teacher must be able to facilitate effectively for the intellectual, social, and emotional growth of the learner (Cooper & Weber, 1973, p. 15).

Competency-Based Teacher Education (CBTE) is a program which seeks to develop teachers who possess the knowledge, skill, and attitudes which enable them to teach effectively (Houston & Hawsam, 1972, p. 3).

Department of Teacher Education is the department which has the direct responsibility to control and supervise eight divisions and thirty-six teachers colleges in Thailand.

Social studies are areas within the social sciences, particularly history, geography, economics, civics, government, sociology, and anthropology, which are regarded as suitable for study in elementary and secondary schools and are developed into courses of study.

A social studies instructor is an instructor who teaches courses in the social studies field in teachers colleges.

A social studies student-teacher is a student majoring in social studies who has at least one semester of internship experience in teaching secondary social studies in a secondary school.

Teachers colleges are public institutions in Thailand which offer two-year and four-year programs in education, with a higher certification and bachelor degree, respectively.

Limitation of the Study

This study is limited to social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators in eight teachers colleges located in Northern Thailand. The results of this study are limited to the perceptions of the respondents and the survey research approach to gathering data.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This review of literature and research on teaching competencies in social studies is divided into two major parts: teaching competencies in the United States, and teaching competencies in Thailand. The first part includes selected teaching competencies in academic subjects, and social studies teaching competencies. The second part includes educational background, historical development of social studies, and Thai social studies teaching competencies.

Teaching Competencies in the United States

Teaching Competencies in Academic Subjects

As early as 1929, Charters and Waples attempted to relate teacher traits to student achievement and teacher effectiveness. Desirable teacher traits were identified by interviewing administrators, teachers, parents, and students in an attempt to secure a master list of positive teacher traits at that time.

However, the term "competency" was first used in 1952 by Lucien Kenney in his study on measures of a good teacher (Kinney, 1952). His study was in cooperation with the California Council on Teacher Education.

In 1954, selected quantitative ratings, peer-ratings, self-ratings, systematic observations and student gains were summarized and synthesized by Morsh and Wilder (1954) as the criteria to determine the effectiveness of instruction.

Ten years later, the California Teaching Association (1964) attempted to define six areas of teaching competency. The competency roles considered were (a) training directors, (b) counselors, (c) staff members, (d) members of the profession, (e) cultural mediators, and (f) community link.

In the United States, perhaps no force has profoundly affected teacher education so dramatically as the competency-based movement. According to Cooper and Weber (1973), competency-based teacher education program (CBTE) was defined as a program which "specifies the competencies to be demonstrated by the student, makes explicit the criteria to be applied in assessing the student's competencies, and holds the student accountable for meeting those criteria" (p.14).

Many teacher education institutions in the United States are experimenting in one way or another with competency-based teacher education but few have employed the concept fully.

In 1968, the University of Georgia developed competency-based teacher education for the preparation of teachers. This program was based on three objectives; (a) to examine what students should learn and do and to

infer from that what teachers should know and do; (b) to translate course requirements into specific competencies; and (c) to provide speculation on what effective teachers do from teachers, students, and university personnel (Shearon & Johnson, 1973).

A year later, there was an attempt to implement a CBTE program at Weber State. Since that time, over half of the states in the United States have taken some type of action, ranging from the development of master plans to implementation of performance-based programs (Wilson & Curtis, 1973). The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has held several conferences devoted exclusively to the problem and has disseminated information about CBTE (Cornell, 1974). The National Commission on Performance-Based Teacher Education (PBTE) was formed to coordinate and integrate plans for PBTE. Goals of the commission are to identify competence, evaluate it, train for it, and manage a program of performance-based education and certification (McDonald, 1973).

The concept of CBTE has developed steadily over a number of years. Rosner and Kay (1974) noted that, because of increasing demands for accountability, relevance, and cost-effective schooling, the CBTE movement has become the catalyst for specifying what teachers should do. Another important factor in the development of the movement has been the technological readiness of the educational community.

This readiness has provided an incentive for professionals to address more fully the many problems in the classroom.

In addition to the CBTE movement, Rosner and Kay (1974) point out that:

The lack of a rigorous analytical and empirical orientation imposes a tremendous burden on the CBTE movement. If the educational community in general and teacher educators in particular do not fully understand and buy into the heavy analytical demands of CBTE, then CBTE will not be realized (p. 293).

Since the development of CBTE, there have been numerous research studies conducted concerning teaching competencies, both in academic subjects and vocational education.

In 1974, a profile of essential teaching competencies needed by a first-year teacher, was conducted by Starr (1974). Participants involved in the study were first asked to define in writing the most essential teaching competencies which a public school teacher should possess. These statements were collected and returned to the respondents, who were asked to rate how essential they believed each item to be. Next, the respondents were asked to select competency statements which should be included in a profile of a first-year teacher. The final profile of essential teaching competencies consisted of 23 items which were subdivided into the areas of knowledge, skills, and behavior.

Competencies, as descriptors of teaching success, were the focus of a study by Kennedy (1977), who attempted to generate a list of teacher competencies and to determine the

relative value of each competency. Kennedy's research concluded that competencies which were perceived to be important by elementary teachers were (a) teaching personality, (b) professionalism, (c) inquisitiveness, (d) teaching ability, and (e) dedication. Competencies perceived important by the secondary teachers' were the same except that the dedication factor was replaced by emphasis on leadership instead.

In 1979, the importance of actual and desirable teaching competencies of secondary school academic instructors in Northeast Texas was determined by Zukowski. His primary concern was the identification of competencies related to the age, gender, academic instructional area, and years of teaching experience of the participants. This survey research contained 92 competency statements associated with effective teaching, which were separated into four categories: planning instruction, instruction, evaluating instruction, and advisement. The conclusions of the study were that: (a) instructors generally are in agreement regarding the importance of actual teaching competencies which they perform when compared according to the age, gender, academic instructional area, and years of teaching experience of the participants; (b) minor differences were noted regarding the importance of teaching competencies which participants felt should be performed using the same four variables; and (c) relatively few

differences between actual and desirable ratings were disclosed according to the four variables.

Social Studies Teaching Competencies

It may be true that students cannot be expected to reach the ultimate goals of the social studies program without teachers whose preparation programs have adequately prepared them for such a unique role. Thus, teachers should be the key figure in making the developments possible, because they can create and sustain the intellectual and emotional climate needed in the classroom to achieve the goals of effective learning.

Regarding the need of competent social studies teachers, the National Council for the Social Studies (1967) states that:

The complexities of modern society make it imperative that social studies teachers devote much of their time helping students to acquire a better understanding of contemporary problems through free inquiry and critical thinking. Future citizens need to have training and practice in the knowledge and skills that will give them social competence. The success of our democratic society depends upon the extent to which the individual citizens are alert, informed, aware of their responsibilities and possessed of a social consciousness. They need to have concern for the welfare of others at the same time they are willing and able to assume individual rights and responsibilities. These insightful and important tasks should not be placed in the hands of those who are poorly qualified and in competent (p. 490).

In order to create good social studies teachers, it is important that standards for the preparation of social studies teachers should not be overlooked. To meet this

purpose, standards for social studies teachers have been developed in several states in the United States. The themes are similar and can be summarized as follows:

1. General studies. General studies should provide a broad background in the humanities, mathematics, sciences, and arts as well as education in reading, writing, listening and speaking, and critical thinking skills.

2. The social science disciplines. Coursework in the social science disciplines should constitute at least 40 percent of the baccalaureate studies for secondary social studies teachers. Beyond the basic introduction to all of the social sciences, secondary teachers need advanced studies in at least two of the social sciences commonly taught, as reflected in the current state social studies framework, including specialization with research experience in at least one. Coursework should support the teaching of world history and geography of the United States, civics, world cultures, and political, economic and social systems.

Secondary teachers need academic preparation that emphasizes the integrative aspects of knowledge about human behavior. Their study should emphasize and illustrate the connection of knowledge within and between academic disciplines. Knowledge of facts, concepts, and theories need to be taught in university social studies courses in such a way as to develop students who can think critically, solve problems, and create knowledge. Preparation should

include the research methods of the field of study and not just the product of inquiry. Academic study should (a) promote a world view, (b) provide knowledge of other cultures and various groups of our population including women, and (c) develop sensitive and knowledgeable individuals who will be able to teach others how to gain and use information in these ways. Prospective teachers need to understand the meaning of culture in society and the influence cultural values have on the expectations, beliefs, and behaviors of students, their parents, and others.

3. Professional study. Professional study should include content resulting in (a) understanding children and youth; (b) being aware of problems and opportunities associated with the social studies field; (c) gaining skills in social studies teaching; and (d) successful experiences in teaching social studies. Professional studies should introduce prospective teachers to the theory and practice of modern social studies education and should constitute 20-25 percent of the baccalaureate program or the equivalent number of units completed in the fifth year.

Furthermore, effective social studies teaching strategies should be modeled and taught. A laboratory course in instructional techniques should ideally form the bridge between theory and practice (The California Council for the Social Studies, 1982; The National Council for the Social Studies, 1967).

According to Ellenwood and Parker (1972), the needs of a well-educated social studies teacher are so complex that no pre-professional program for social studies teachers can ever meet all anticipated needs. They stated their opinion concerning effective social studies teachers as follows:

A teacher has more than the type of content coverage and exposure so typical of traditional academic course work. Besides having education in traditional content, the social studies teacher must understand the very structure of the social studies disciplines, have wide-ranging exposure to the literature of the field and have had ample opportunities for independent research, if he is to function most effectively (p. 66).

In addition, James (1968) highlighted the idea of classic social studies teachers in his article, "The Ideal Social Studies Teacher", as follows:

In order to have a really good teacher we need to find a man who is literally burning with the desire to impart what he knows to his students. We need a person who has dedicated his life to the ideal of education. We need a man who is more concerned with doing his job than with holding his job (p. 215).

Wisniewski (1974), concluded that teachers with deep commitment are essential in order to make curricula alive and relevant for students, and that good teaching involves working with students rather than merely transmitting information.

In 1973, Dante, the President of the National Council for the Social Studies also addressed the following important viewpoint:

It has been demonstrated many times that many students go through school without questioning or changing their basic beliefs or affiliations. We will not be able to

develop the critical skills that students need and the revolution in social studies will continue to elude us until we can build a profession in which social studies teachers are prepared with competencies which match their dedication (p. 194).

According to Dante, social studies have always been the most difficult subject in the school curriculum, because they have to be knowledgeable in regard to a half-dozen or more disciplines. They also have to deal with subject matter which has no fixed continuity or sequence, and have the problem of interesting students in concepts that are often abstractions.

Some of the problems of social studies that Dante (1973) mentioned above continued into the 1980s. SPAN Consultants and Staff (1981) indicated that among the weak points and problems of social studies in the United States is the fact that many students leave school without the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are important outcomes of social studies programs. In addition, many students do not value social studies as much as other subjects. The dominant methods of instruction in social studies are lecture and discussion/recitation based on textbooks. Most teachers assigns students a section of the text to read, followed by a recitation based on the reading, that involves students' answering questions, or has students complete written worksheets. Social studies instruction seldom engages students in using a variety of materials or participating in active experiences such as role plays,

action projects, or inquiry activities. King (1987) also reported how ill-prepared senior high school students are in the knowledge of geography. For example, young people are frequently oblivious, not only to where foreign countries are, but to where the United States is (King, 1987, p.4).

A report of efforts to develop performance for the social studies objectives in the State of Michigan was conducted by Trezise (1974). The objectives consisted of two parts: Part I contained elementary performance objectives, and Part II contained secondary performance objectives. In each case the objectives were stated in terms of skills and competencies that youngsters might be expected to have attained by the end of grades three, six and nine.

The Minnesota State Department of Education (1973) established certification guidelines for social studies teachers based on the CBTE program and an analysis of the regulations, including guidelines related to the specific areas of competencies to be developed. Their report included (a) a collection of selected pages from previous research which dealt with teaching competencies in the cognitive and affective areas; (b) a list of recommended competencies for social studies teachers; and (c) a sample program for evaluating progress toward one general competency area stated in the regulations.

Another report by the Minnesota Task Force (1973) presented a listing of the community, school, and professional competencies. It summarized teacher competencies related to goals for students-teachers' behavior in relation to school staff and professional competencies in order to improve competences as a teacher. The report also provided the goal for student attitudinal change. It included a list for specific teacher behavior that was indicative of desired outcomes and for representing teacher competence needed by teachers.

In 1974, the New York State Council for Social Studies developed a rationale and set up specific criteria which social studies teachers should demonstrate to achieve certification. An attempt was made to categorize the items into skills, knowledge, experience and personal characteristics as follows:

1. The certified teacher should be able to demonstrate the ability to use a variety of teaching techniques; utilize appropriate action-oriented and visual materials; identify components of instruction that are adaptable for appropriated groups, and individualized models of presentation; identify and employ appropriate evaluation devices designed to assess student performance and encourage student achievement; help students master key social science concepts and generalizations, and obtain systematic practice in the skills of social science inquiries; help students to

derive and clarify their own values; use research as the criterion for selecting appropriate content and instructional materials for students; construct objective test items and develop evaluative instruments for measuring critical thinking in the social studies; and demonstrate competency in applying psychological principles to classroom teaching.

2. The certified teacher should have knowledge of several of the social sciences, the methods and tools of the social sciences, the common characteristics of social science research, the major concepts and generalizations of social sciences, the analysis of curriculum projects and of a specific social studies project, the use of media in specific curriculum projects, and the prime research sources in social studies education.

3. The certified teacher should have some professional experiences such as attendance at workshops and conferences; experiences in writing curricula, travel, publishing, work with other cultures, and with work-related activities; and the establishment of criteria for self and group evaluation.

4. The certified teacher should have a desire to strive for self-analysis and self-improvement, and should have a positive attitude toward students.

Stewart (1976) investigated the perceived importance of selected teaching competencies for secondary social studies teachers to determine differences among four categories of

educators (secondary social studies teachers, secondary school principals, superintendents of schools, and college methods course teachers) in their perceptions of the importance of selected social studies teaching competencies. Stewart concluded that:

1. There was significant disagreement among the four categories of educators as to the importance of the total list of competencies. However, there was one exception, principals and social study methods instructors agreed in their ratings of the list of competencies.

2. All four categories of educators agreed upon the importance of (a) inquiry, (b) concept teaching, (c) value clarification, (d) role playing, and (e) humanization. However, they disagreed on the importance of (a) simulation, and (b) media. These educators perceived competencies relating to inquiry and humanization as being of greater importance, but perceived role playing of the least importance.

A study on teaching competencies and the social studies cooperating teacher was conducted by Henderson (1978). This study involved the development of a model of teaching competencies for North Louisiana social studies cooperating teachers in relation to the social studies curriculum. Teaching competencies were identified through an extensive review of literature. The recommendations from Henderson were that: (a) social studies student teachers should be

placed with cooperating teachers who had a major in social studies and who had demonstrated identified teaching competencies; and (b) universities should provide a regular inservice program for cooperating teachers relative to plans, goals, and philosophies of the teacher education program. Furthermore, the suggestions from Henderson's (1978) research highlight the idea that more cooperative teachers should be involved in the preservice program, and be responsible for the practical, how-to-do-it aspects of this instruction as a part of student teaching (p. 290).

In 1982, the California Council for the Social Studies suggested guidelines for the professional education of social studies teachers in California's colleges and universities. These guideline were an attempt to assist school boards and school administrators in setting standards for the social studies teachers in their schools. These guidelines were also designed for social studies teachers as they continually try to improve teaching performance in the social studies educational field. The guidelines consisted of four sections. The first section focused on the importance of a well-planned undergraduate program, careful screening of candidates of social studies teaching, and adequate preparation for professional study. Section 2 emphasized the creation of optimal conditions for teaching and learning which include employment and assignment, class load and size, academic freedom, and support for

professional improvement. Section 3 dealt with inservice professional development through academic and professional study and participation in and contributing to the profession. Section 4 provided a checklist of standards for social studies teachers.

Beginning in 1986, a study, "Improving Teaching and Learning in the Social Studies Classroom," was conducted by Kachaturoff (1986). In Kachaturoff's study, the major purpose of social studies education and the responsibilities of teachers were widely reviewed. The discussion consisted of several aspects which can be summarized as follows:

(a) the discussion of various approaches to citizen education. These included the verbalizing of perceived values at secondary level, the acquisition of decision-making skills, and the participation of students in community and school projects; (b) an overview of current educational issues such as declining enrollments, "back to basics" emphasis, discipline and related problems, lack of preparation time for teachers, and the need for creative and productive leadership in schools; (c) the topic of improving social studies instruction was discussed from the standpoints of teaching strategies, learning activities, and experience; (d) guidelines for appropriate learning activities, instructional objectives (including attitude, knowledge, and skills), curriculum development, and instructional methodology (scope and sequence), and

curriculum guides, inquiry based instruction, question types, and questioning techniques.

Also in 1986, Fair and Kachaturoff investigated the special competencies needed for teaching successfully in the field of social studies. Their theme can be summarized as follows:

1. Teachers need intense preparation in the social sciences, knowledge of modern scholarship in the disciplines, and an analytical grasp of current issues. Furthermore, teacher need an adequate supply of learning activities that allow students to carry out investigation in social science content.

2. In-service education in areas general to all teachers is valuable for social studies teachers. School districts need to provide leadership in planning in-service experiences that help teachers improve their classroom behavior and lead to more effective teaching. Teachers need to be knowledgeable about recent trends and innovations in social studies education.

King (1987) indicated in his article, "Delay Persists in Social Studies Reform, But Signs Point to Headway Just Ahead," that there were two currents of social studies reform. One involved the search for an appropriate social studies core and was spearheaded by state governments and scholarly organizations. The second reform movement involved the search for a social studies curriculum based on

urgent domestic issues and the realities of global interdependence. However, the cross-purposes of these two reforms was to contribute information about what should be taught, how, and why. He concluded the study of the significant theme of current social studies curriculum with the following six aspects: (a) a clear commitment to democratic values; (b) knowledge of and pride in local and national heritage; (c) interest in understanding the form and function of government and the economy, including the ability to compare different systems; (d) a need for youngsters to engage in more active civic participation; (e) a strong emphasis on active learning to replace the read-and-respond, lecture and textbook approach; and (f) cosmopolitan appreciation of other cultures and their value systems.

Summary

The competency-based movement in the United States has profoundly affected teacher education. Numerous studies have been conducted in an effort to determine the criteria essential for effective teaching. While many teacher education institutions in the United States have experimented with CBTE, however, few have employed the concept fully. Because social studies teachers must be able to provide students with the skills necessary for social competence, it is imperative that teachers be adequately prepared for their unique role. Standards for social

studies teachers have been developed utilizing themes of (a) general studies, (b) the social sciences discipline, and (c) professional study. There seems to be agreement among researchers that social studies teachers must understand the structure of the social studies discipline, enlarge their understanding by keeping up with modern scholarship in the disciplines, have ample opportunities to conduct independent research, and devote their time to helping students to realized the value of social studies and to helping them to acquire a better understanding of contemporary problems through methods of inquiry and critical thinking.

Teaching Competencies in Thailand

Educational Background

In Thailand, education has a high priority. It is often assumed by governmental leaders and others who shape national development efforts that increases in a nation's level of educational achievement correlate positively with increases in gross national product, productivity, and other indicators of economic growth (Arunee, 1980). In addition, it is believed that the spread of education to a nation's population assists in political stabilization; as education is utilized for political socialization, at the same time, increased schooling helps provide a good quality of life for the people.

Thai society has been rooted in traditional monastery education since the beginning of the kingdom. Education as a governmental function is relatively new in Thailand, dating only from the last part of the nineteenth century (Ketudat, Ketudat, Bovornsiri & Wongsatorn, 1977). Previously, education was offered by Buddhist monasteries, the Royal court and certain households. Memorization and chanting in unison were the only methods of teaching in earlier times.

In the early years of the Bangkok period, during the reign of King Mongkut (1851-1868), a small group in the noble class became aware of new trends in teaching and learning. The king and noble group provided their children's education by hiring English tutors to give instruction in the English language (Mahakhun, 1983).

During the reign of King Chulalongkorn (1868-1910), Thai society began to experience modernization. A modern school for the princess and nobles was established at that time in order to train them to be civil servants (Punnapobe, 1981). Moreover, King Chulalongkorn was very concerned about public education. He wanted education to lead citizens to intelligent thinking and proper behavior as well as to provide the skills necessary to earn a living. He believed that prior learning was essential for success in life, no matter what a person's career (Wyatt, 1975). Thus, in 1887, the Department of Education was founded (which became the

Ministry of Education in 1892) and the king's ideas were taken into consideration when all schools became the responsibility of the nation. The king stated in his command to the people:

The government will, for its part, lay down the framework of national education as the guideline to be announced later by officials of the Ministry of Education. The purpose of such education and training shall be to inculcate the following qualities: inquisitiveness for knowledge to what intelligence and capacity, good and righteous behavior, concern for family welfare, generosity to relatives, unity and harmony with spouses, faithfulness to friends, economy, kindness to others, regard for the public good, compliance with laws, willingly to serve the country with courage. (Wyatt, 1975, pp. 88-89)

In 1899, a school was founded with the purpose to train future officials for the Ministry of Interior. Three years later, the school strengthened and widened its syllabus by adding geography and history in the first and second year (Bunnag, 1977).

In 1917, the first university, Chulalongkorn University, was established in Bangkok by the amalgamation of the School of Civil Servants, and the medical school (Ketudat, Ketudat, Bovornsiri, & Wongsotorn, 1977). In 1921, primary education, four-year compulsory education (grades one to four), became compulsory. Vella (1978) states that "All schools whether supported by the government or private bodies were to adhere to standards set by the Ministry of Education for syllabus, length of term, textbooks, and the government schools were to be tuition free" (p. 165).

After 1932, when the constitution replaced absolute monarchy, greater emphasis was placed on primary education. During the late 1950s, economic and social development became very strong. The government realized that the educational system must be expanded and modernized in order to develop the country effectively. Thus, in 1954, the department of Teacher Education was established in the Ministry of Education. Its goal was to respond to the need and demand for qualified teachers, and also to set the stage for a major reorganization of the teacher training system (Ministry of Education, 1973).

In 1963, four-year compulsory education was extended to seven years of compulsory schooling, grades one to seven. The school system was in the proportion of a 4:3:3:2 model, which indicated seven years of primary education, and five years of secondary education. However, beginning in 1978, the school system was changed to the proportion of a 6:3:3 model, which indicated six years in primary education and the six years in secondary education (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, 1984a).

The first school of teacher education in Thailand began as early as 1892. In 1954 the Department of Teacher Training was established in the Ministry of Education (Ministry of Education, 1973) in response to the need for qualified teachers and to set the stage for a major reorganization of the teacher training system. The work

began with the expansion of teachers colleges already in existence and then with the establishment of new ones (Department of Teacher Education, 1980). At present, the department of teacher education has 36 teachers colleges. There are six colleges in Bangkok and the remainder are in the provinces. The distribution is such that there is at least one teacher college for every two adjacent provinces.

There are eight divisions in the organizational structure of the department of teacher education (Ministry of Education, 1985): (a) the office of the secretary to the department, (b) the planning division, (c) the personnel division, (d) the teacher education division, (e) the finance division, (f) the inservice teacher education division, (g) the physical plants division, and (h) the supervisory unit. Historically speaking, the department of teacher education has been prompt in recognizing that teacher training is a vital factor contributing to the development of the school curriculum, and the modernization of the education system as a whole.

It may be useful to provide information concerning the role of teacher education in universities in Thailand. There are several universities which offer teacher education leading to bachelors', masters', and doctors' degrees. For example, Chulalongkorn University, Chiangmai University, Prince of Songkla University, Ramkhamhaeng University, and Srinakarinwirot University are all under the jurisdiction of

the Office of University Affairs. However, these universities, except Srinakarinwirot University, produce a relatively small number of graduates, and their role in teacher education is relatively insignificant.

Srinakarinwirot University is an exception, however. It is the largest university that produces teachers. Chartered in 1954 with the name "College of Education", Srinakarinwirot University grants a diploma in education and bachelors', masters', and doctors' degrees in various areas of educational emphasis (Shaw & Buasri, 1968). However, at the present time, it expands its offer in programs leading to degrees in other fields beside education. Since 1955, the university has offered evening classes in order to allow teachers to pursue their education while employed. A large summer program has also added to the in-service potential of the evening class activity (Shaw & Buasri, 1968).

Because of its multi-campus system throughout the country, Srinakarinwirot helps the Thai government serve an important role in planning and expanding educational resources for Thai people. The academic programs are designed according to the national policy of higher education which emphasizes programs of study in fields related to the needs of the country and the specific regions. The primary roles of the university are: (a) to help provide higher education in the field of teacher education and other fields, (b) to contribute to the

provision of equal education opportunities for the people, (c) to effectively utilize community resources and realize their full potential, and (d) to ease the over-enrollment problem in universities in Bangkok (Hannarkin, 1983).

The Development of Social Studies

From the beginning of the Kingdom, education was primarily religious in nature. However, the Thai language was emphasized during the reign of King Chulalongkorn (Mahakhun, 1983). It was not until 1881 that geography was included in the Suankulap school curriculum, and in 1902 a school for future civil service officials added geography and history in the first and second syllabi.

In addition, Wyatt (1975) states that "New methods of teaching and academic courses were introduced; new courses in elementary mathematics and geography and specialized courses designed to meet the needs of modern civil servants" (p. 146).

After 1911, during the reign of King Rama VI, patriotism accompanied nationalism as educational goals which were emphasized in the curriculum and school activities. Until 1932, when the absolute monarchy was replaced by a constitutional monarchy, social studies education played an important role by preparing youth for new roles in a democratic society. In 1960, the National Council took responsibility for educational development, and required that the subjects encompassed in social studies

were civics, ethics, geography, and history. However, since 1977, the National Educational Scheme has outlined the subject matter of the social studies curriculum as consisting of geography, history, civics, ethics, sociology, population education and environment, and economics (Ministry of Education, 1978).

Social Studies Teacher Competencies

One of the questions confronting schools in teaching social studies in Thailand is how to provide an education that not only meets each student's personal needs, but also meets the needs for study of problematic areas of societies and the perpetuation of Thai democratic values as social studies curriculum in the secondary school focuses on the study of persistent social, economic, and political problems in Thai society and the world, it has come to play a significant role in school curriculum in order to help youngsters understand themselves, others, and the world.

The National Plan of Education was set up with the aim of meeting individual and social needs. The plan recognized principles of child development and equal opportunity. Social studies, which is taught throughout the Thai elementary and secondary schools, is regarded as having great potential for providing youth with a better understanding of themselves and their social roles in Thai society.

The Thai government realizes that teacher education has a special role to sustain the security of the country, and that the teacher is directly concerned with the development of good citizens. Therefore, teacher training institutions must select and train teachers with great care.

The government also expects youngsters to have an active role as intelligent citizens and decision-makers in the democratic society. Therefore, the method of teaching in school should provide students with the tools to become self-reliant, to think and reason logically and sensibly, and to make rational decisions.

Thus, teaching competency is one of the critical concerns in Thailand's educational system. Thai teachers are faced with conflicting opinions as to what should be taught and how and, thus, often feel ill-prepared and insecure in accepting teaching assignments in content areas they are inadequately prepared to teach. Teachers often rely heavily upon a single textbook, trying to keep one lesson ahead of the students. Therefore, in order to provide effective teaching and make decisions which will provide the best education for youngsters, a critical look into teacher performance and teacher competencies is necessary.

The Department of General Education (1977) points out three main functions which teachers must provide. They must (a) assist students to become knowledgeable and moral

persons who are able to cope with life effectively and contribute to their society, (b) sustain and transmit the national cultures to younger generations, and (c) bring new ideas and innovations to students. Consequently, competent teachers should be good citizens, serve as good models for students, and be willing to devote time to students and community affairs.

According to Pukkahut (1971), competent teachers should (a) behave like the students' parents; (b) treat each individual student equally; (c) be scholars with enough knowledge to teach effectively and confidently; (d) be patient, cheerful, and reasonable; and (e) be responsible for the job (Pukkahut, p. 17). In the article written by Panichsuk (1977), characteristics similar to those mentioned earlier were discussed and the following additional characteristics were proposed: (a) teachers should understand the philosophy of education and philosophy of life, and (b) they must believe in the democratic way of life.

Ruengsuwan (1976) concluded that prospective social studies teachers should have unique characteristics appropriate to the nature of social studies such as: (a) appreciate the subject and be proud to be social studies teachers; (b) use appropriate language to express ideas clearly; (c) understand the objectives of education, curriculum, and social studies; (d) be educational leaders,

and good decision-makers; (e) utilize a variety of instructional materials for each lesson; and (f) enjoy travel, reading, writing, and associating with different groups of people.

Chulalongkorn University (1976) investigated characteristics which selected groups of Thai people felt teachers should have. The study was carried out using a seminar process in two provinces in Thailand. The result of the study revealed that the opinions toward desired teacher characteristics found in the two provinces were similar. However, there were some characteristics which were added. They were as follows: (a) teachers must be loyal to the nation, religion, and the king; (b) they should have good teachers ethics; and (c) they must not be involved in any political action.

Shaw & Bausri (1968) indicated that although the requirements for completion of the secondary social studies teacher preparation program of the universities and teacher colleges are not exactly the same in every detail, the fundamental components of their programs are similar. However, the Ministry of Education (1985) categorized the fundamental components of secondary social studies in the following manner: (a) general education which provides courses aimed at preparing students to become good citizens, to be able to earn their living peacefully, and to be able to create jobs themselves; (b) professional education which

provides courses aimed at preparing students to become good teachers; (c) field of specialization (major and minor) which provides courses aimed at preparing students to become competent in specific areas; and (d) elective courses which extend students' skills and experience.

In 1978, the Ministry of Education stated the aims of social studies education which can be summarized as follows:

(a) to develop knowledge and understanding of the rights and duties of a citizen in a democratic constitutional monarchy; (b) to develop a sense of nationalism, the unity within the country and personal sacrifice made for public benefit, and to develop an appreciation for the distinguished work of Thais and the strength and virtue of the Thai culture; (c) to develop the ability to earn a living, to practice morality, and to develop behavior which is typified by the polite manners that are in accordance with Thai society; (d) to develop a knowledge and understanding of the basis of creativity and ways to solve the social, economic, and technology problems by humanistic and scientific methods; (e) to develop the roles of, responsibility for, and understanding of human relations among the members of a family, a local community, the country, and the international community; and (f) to develop good relations in the local community and thereby make conservative and constructive use of resources and the environment for the public.

However, in 1987 the department of teacher education indicated the specific objectives of secondary social studies program in teachers colleges as follows: (a) to provide sufficient knowledge, skills, and techniques so that students are able to teach social studies effectively; (b) to train students to think discretionally based on their knowledge, merit and reason; (c) to train students to learn and utilize knowledge to improve their private lives and that of the public; and (d) to train students to be active in their society and be able to participate in public activities, so that they can help maintain the major social institutions in the Thai society.

Since this study concerns secondary social studies in teachers colleges, it seems useful to explain the current secondary social studies program. Teachers colleges offer a program leading to baccalaureate degrees in secondary social studies. The program requires the completion of 143 credit hours: 40 credit hours in general education, 60 in the social studies field, 25 in professional education, 12 in practicum and internship, and 6 in elective courses (Department of Teacher Education, 1987). The details of each course are shown in Appendix B.

In 1972, a proposed social studies program for secondary schools in Thailand was conducted by Buatong. The result of research revealed that: (a) the majority of secondary school students perceive social studies as an

interesting subject which is useful to their everyday lives; (b) geography and history are major features of the secondary school social studies curriculum; (c) secondary school teachers and students agree that content is repetitious, making teaching and learning less effective; (d) there is insufficient emphasis on the contemporary world, and on comparative studies of subject areas such as economics and government; and (e) the content for the teaching of values is highly prescriptive--students usually do not have an opportunity to think critically and make decisions for themselves about what values are important.

Assessing the status of Thai social studies education, an area of formal education dealt with fostering individual and social development, was the aim of a study conducted by Sevatomorn (1975). This investigation included an examination of the educational opinions of social studies teachers, their views regarding present practices in social studies education, the students' attitudes toward social studies, and the nature of the official syllabi, curriculum guides, and social studies textbooks which are the chief printed materials available to teachers at the secondary level.

The results of Sevatomorn's research revealed that (a) social studies texts lacked diversity in dealing with current issues and controversial problems; (b) most teachers agreed that social studies curriculum needs to be

improved; (c) most students have positive attitudes toward social studies education. A number of students find certain content such as political institutions in civics boring, even though they feel that it is relevant to their lives.

In 1977, Koonmee conducted, a comparative study of the competency of prospective secondary social studies teachers in the United States and Thailand. The following were the results of Koonmee's research.

1. Thai literature placed emphasis on the personal characteristics desirable for prospective teachers. There were few statements pertinent to the competencies of prospective teachers in academic and professional areas available in written form in Thailand while the wealth of American professional literature placed emphasis on academic and professional areas.

2. Educators in the United States agreed that competent teachers should have research experience, be able to deal with controversial issues and values conflicts, and have a broad base of knowledge about human culture and society and social science concepts and generalizations.

3. The opinions of Thai educators concerning the competencies of prospective secondary social studies teachers that have been frequently identified in Thai professional literature are that they should: (a) serve as good models to students; (b) be moral, kind, polite, and generous; (c) devote time to students and the public; (d) be

patient, scrupulous and able to control their mind and behavior; (e) be curious, keep up to date, like to travel, read, and write; (f) be able to serve as good community leaders; (g) appreciate the subject being taught; (h) understand the philosophy of education, curriculum, and the objectives of the subject being taught; (i) believe in the democratic way of life; and (j) be loyal to the nation, religion, and the king.

Natrapalai (1979) studied the relationship between learning achievement and teaching competencies of social studies student teachers at the higher certificate of education level as well as the opinions of supervisors and cooperative teachers concerning student teachers in the Northeast of Thailand. The results of this research were:

1. There was no significant relationship between learning achievement and teaching competencies.

2. The college supervisors and school cooperative teachers agreed that good points concerning teacher competencies of most students were their alertness, intention, responsibility, punctuality and human relationship.

The findings from Handumronggul's study (1979) on the opinions concerning social studies teachers' competencies of social studies teacher producers, social studies teacher consumers and social studies teacher evaluators in Thailand reveal that:

1. The producers, the consumers, and the evaluators highly agreed that social studies teachers' competencies should include academic competency, professional competency, teaching competency, and human relationship competency.

2. The opinions concerning social studies teachers competencies of the producers and the consumers were not significantly different at the 0.01 level in the following aspects: knowledge of curriculum, knowledge of subject matter of particular courses, applications of knowledge to public service, student encouragement to develop themselves, ability to write and implement the teaching program, ability to organize teaching abilities and instructional materials, and ability to evaluate teaching.

The opinions of supervisors and social studies teachers were not significantly different on the 0.01 level on the following items: knowledge of the subject matter of particular courses, application of knowledge to public service, academic progression, student encouragement to perform teaching and learning activities, ability to use instructional materials, ability to apply psychology of learning to teaching including the ability to evaluate teaching.

Pumiputhavon (1983) studied the need for teaching competency improvement of social studies teachers in secondary schools in Thai Educational Region Four, concerning five categories: instructional skills;

co-curricular activities management; the method of improving teaching competency; and other factors effecting teaching competency such as personality, human relationship, and instructional guidance. The research revealed that:

(a) most social studies teachers needed improvement in teaching competency in the areas of instructional planning, and co-curricular activities management; (b) in instructional skills improvement, most of teachers in every school cluster expressed a high level of need for every skill, except Krabee cluster which expressed a low level of improving tutoring technique for good students; (c) in other factors affecting teaching competency improvement, most social studies teachers in every school cluster expressed their needs at a high level, except Krabee cluster which needed a low level in the method of appropriate self-controlled behaviors; and (d) in methods of improving teaching competency, most of the teachers expressed their needs for every method at a high level except those in Krabee and Trang school clusters which expressed their needs at the highest level in the following items: visitation and observation of curriculum leading school, inservice training participation, observation of social studies teaching demonstration and inservice training with emphasis on subject matter.

Mekhirunsiri's research (1986) compared the needs for teaching competency improvement between social studies

teachers in government and private secondary schools in five categories: (a) instructional planning, (b) co-curricular management, (c) the methods of improving teaching competency, (d) instructional skills, and (e) other factors affecting teaching competency. Results of the study revealed that the needs for teaching competency improvement in the first three categories were not significantly different at the 0.05 level. However, the needs for teaching competency improvement in instructional skills of both groups by separate items were significantly different in the following items: skills in development of students' study habits, skills in applying various methods of teaching appropriate to the subject content and the students' maturity, and the exploration of teaching technique for high achievement students. Again, there was statistical difference in the last categories in the following items: techniques of observation and study, students' differences in personality, intelligence, aptitudes, interest and attitudes, and techniques of analyzing students' problems and of students counseling concerning education and education planning in accordance with vocational aptitudes.

Summary

Like education, social studies has high priority in Thailand. The field of social studies is seen as holding great potential for providing youth with a better understanding of themselves and their social roles in Thai

society. How to provide an education that meets students' personal needs as well as the needs for study of Thai democratic values is a question faced by social studies teachers in Thailand. In an effort to fill this need, the National Education Scheme has outlined the subject matter of the social studies curriculum since 1977 as consisting of geography, history, civics, ethics, sociology, population education and environment, and economics.

In summary, both the United States' and Thailand's, standards for social studies teachers have been developed utilizing the themes of (a) general studies, (b) the social science discipline, (c) professional studies. Both countries face the problems that result because many students do not value social studies as much as other subjects. The dominant method of instruction is lecture based on a single textbook. Social studies instruction seldom engages students in using a variety of materials or participating in active experiences such as role playing, inquiry activities, and action projects. Furthermore, in Thailand, Thai teachers are confronted with conflicting opinions as to what should be taught and how. As a result, Thai teachers often feel ill-prepared and insecure in accepting teaching assignments in content areas they are inadequately prepared to teach. There is general agreement among researchers in both countries, however, that social studies teachers must devote their time to helping students

realize the value of social studies and helping them to acquire a better understanding of contemporary problems through methods of inquiry and critical thinking.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research procedures employed in this study. It provides a description of the population, instrument, pilot study, procedures for collection of data, and treatment of the data, respectively.

The Population

The population of this study consisted of all full-time social studies instructors, student-teachers, and administrators from eight teachers colleges located in the northern area of Thailand (Chiangmai Teachers College, Chiangrai Teachers College, Kampanget Teachers College, Lamphang Teachers College, Nakornsawan Teachers College, Petchboon Teachers College, Piboon Songkram Teachers College, and Utharadit Teachers College) during the 1989-1990 school year. This population consists of 151 student-teachers, 97 instructors, and 117 administrators.

Data presented in table 1 show the number of questionnaires distributed, the number returned, and the percentage of questionnaires returned from eight teachers colleges. The largest number returned were from respondents in the instructors' group (82.5%), and the smallest number were from the administrators' group (72.7%).

Table 1

Number of questionnaires distributed and rate of return

Population Group	Number	Returned	Percentage
Student-teacher	151	123	81.5
Instructor	97	80	82.5
Administrator	117	85	72.7
Total	365	288	78.9

Description of the Instrument

The data of the study were collected through the use of the Social Studies Teaching Competencies Questionnaire, a survey instrument developed by the researcher. The instrument was designed to investigate the perceptions of the importance of secondary social studies teaching competencies in teacher colleges in Thailand. It was developed for use in this study and was based on related literature, similar studies, and authoritative sources (Boonyaraksa, 1988; Pumiputhavon, 1983; Sevatamorn, 1975; Stewart, 1976; Zukowski, 1979). The following procedures were used for developing the instrument:

1. The researcher identified and collected pertinent material and subject matter which dealt with competencies that social studies teachers are likely to need. These materials were based on related literature mentioned earlier.

2. The researcher collected a list of eighty-eight competencies which were grouped into nine clusters and represented the basic outline of social studies curriculum. The instrument was designed to enable social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators to rate their perceptions of the importance of selected secondary social studies teaching competencies.

3. The list was submitted for content validity to a panel of experts made up of five chairpersons of social studies departments, and five instructors who taught instructional method courses in five teacher colleges in Northern Thailand.

4. The initial instrument was revised. Twenty-three items were eliminated by the panel of experts. The final revision consisted of sixty-five competencies.

5. The Thai version of the instrument was translated by the research assistant (Dean of Humanities and social science at Chiengrai teachers college) and then verified by the head of Thai language department at the same college for correct Thai language.

The context of the questionnaire consisted of two parts: demographic characteristics and satisfaction level of respondents, and social studies teaching competency ratings.

Part 1: Demographic characteristics and satisfaction level.--This portion of the questionnaire asked for demographic characteristics and the satisfaction level of

respondents in three groups: (a) student-teachers' gender, grade-point average (GPA), satisfaction with curriculum, satisfaction with practicum and internship, and satisfaction with instructor's method of teaching; (b) instructors' age, gender, total years of teaching experience, highest degree earned, academic rank, highest degree received from, and job satisfaction; and (c) administrators' age, gender, total years of teaching and/or administrative experience, highest degree earned, academic rank, highest degree received from, and job satisfaction.

Part 2: Social Studies Competency Ratings.--This portion was designed to enable respondents to rate their perceptions of the importance of selected secondary social studies teaching competencies. Sixty-five teaching competencies were grouped into nine clusters: planning instruction (P), objective (O), concept teaching (C), class discussion (D), inquiry (I), value clarification (V), humanization (H), using multimedia (U), and evaluation (E). A six point scale was used for the questionnaire. The scale is used to register the extent of agreement or disagreement with a particular statement of an attitude, belief, or judgement. The student-teachers, instructors, and administrators were asked to rate items according to their perceptions of the importance of selected social studies teaching competencies.

The responses to each of the items according to their perceptions of the importance of selected social studies teaching competencies were provided as follows: 1--indicates minimum importance, 2--indicates little importance, 3--indicates average importance, 4--indicates above average importance, 5--indicates maximum importance, and 0--indicates no opinion.

Pilot Study

In an effort to test the reliability of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted. The participants for the pilot study were ten social studies student-teachers, ten social studies instructors, and ten administrators at Bansomdej Chao Praya Teachers College, Bangkok, Thailand. The participants were asked to respond to each item and to provide comments regarding each teaching competency. Four weeks after answers to the first questionnaire were received the retest was administered to the same group using the same questionnaire. The test-retest with Spearman rank-order coefficient correlation method was employed to determine the reliability of the questionnaire. The results of analysis ranged from 0.92 to 0.77, as shown in Appendix C.

Procedure for Collection of Data

The data for this study were collected through the use of a self-rating questionnaire mailed to the research assistant (Dean of Faculty of Humanity and Social Science)

at Chiengrai Teachers College in Thailand. Copies of the questionnaire and two explanatory letters to the presidents of eight teacher colleges and to respondents were sent to the research assistant. The letters to the presidents were cosigned by the researcher's major professor.

Each potential respondent received a questionnaire packet containing a cover letter of explanation, a copy of the questionnaire, and a return envelope. The letter explained the purpose of the study and provided directions for responding. It informed the respondents that all data collected would be treated as confidential and that the data were used only for this study.

Since the rate of return of questionnaires was higher than the minimum goal (70%), a follow-up letter was not sent to non-respondents. The completed questionnaires were returned by mail from Thailand to the researcher at the University of North Texas.

Treatment of the Data

Each returned questionnaire was carefully examined by the researcher for accuracy of completion. It was determined that if a questionnaire contained seven or more unanswered items (approximately 10%), it would be considered invalid and, therefore, eliminated. However, none of the returned questionnaire had as many as seven unanswered items. Also, items to which respondents had no opinion were treated as missing data. Data from the usable

questionnaires were programmed and analyzed by computer using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) at the computing center of the University of North Texas. Basic statistical procedures were used to describe and summarize the data.

The following procedures were used in the analysis of research questions:

1. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used in order to determine whether any significant difference exists among scores that reflect perceptions of the three groups regarding the importance of selected social studies teaching competencies. The level of significance was set at 0.05 for each of the comparisons. The Scheffe' method was employed, following the one-way ANOVA, if significant differences were found in order to determine the significant pair (Ferguson, 1981).

2. Multiple regression analyses were used to determine whether gender, grade-point average, satisfaction with curriculum, satisfaction with practicum and internship, and satisfaction with instructor's method of teaching influenced the perceptions of social studies student-teachers regarding the importance of selected social studies teaching competencies.

3. Multiple regression analyses were used to determine whether gender, age, years of teaching experience, academic rank, academic degree, and job satisfaction influenced the

perceptions of social studies instructors regarding the importance of selected social studies teaching competencies.

4. Multiple regression analyses were used to determine whether gender, age, years of teaching and/or administrative experience, academic rank, academic degree, and job satisfaction influenced the perceptions of administrators regarding the importance of selected social studies teaching competencies.

5. Means and standard deviation were used to average scores in each teaching competency as ranked by the social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators. For each group, competencies in each cluster were ranked according to the average mean score. The highest mean score was considered most important, the lowest mean score least important.

After all computations were made, the data were entered into tables in which the results of statistical computations were shown. Tabular data were described and explained in relation to the purpose of the study.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present research findings generated from the analysis of questionnaire responses from the three groups of respondents from eight teachers colleges in Northern Thailand. All data were coded and analyzed by computer using the Statistic Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The findings are presented in two sections. The first section presents the general characteristics of the respondents by frequencies and percentages on the basis of demographic characteristics and satisfaction level of respondents. The second section presents and interprets the ratings of perceptions of respondents according to the instrument being employed.

General Characteristics of Respondents

This section provides general characteristics of the three groups of respondents: student-teachers, instructors, and administrators. Frequencies and percentages are presented on the basis of the demographic characteristics and satisfaction level of the respondents.

Table 2
Demographic Characteristics and Satisfaction Level
of Student-Teachers

Classification	Number (N=123)	Percentage
Gender:		
Male	30	24.4
Female	93	75.6
Grade Point Average:		
Below 2.00	3	2.4
2.00 - 2.50	53	43.1
2.51 - 3.00	51	43.1
Above 3.00	16	13.0
Satisfaction with Curriculum:		
Very Dissatisfied	1	0.8
Dissatisfied	9	7.3
Satisfied	50	40.7
Very Satisfied	47	38.2
Most Satisfied	16	13.0
Satisfaction with Internship:		
Very Dissatisfied	1	0.8
Dissatisfied	3	2.4
Satisfied	47	38.2
Very Satisfied	46	37.4
Most Satisfied	26	21.1
Satisfaction with Methods of Teaching:		
Very Dissatisfied	2	1.6
Dissatisfied	8	6.5
Satisfied	64	52.0
Very Satisfied	37	30.1
Most Satisfied	12	9.8

Characteristics of Student-teachers

The demographic characteristics of student-teachers are shown in Table 2. Discussions of these characteristics are presented below.

Gender and Grade Point Average

Of the 123 respondents, most (93 or 75.6%) were females. Only 30 (24.4%) were males. The grade-point averages (GPA) of 53 or 43.1% of the respondents were between 2.00 and 2.50, 51 or 41.5% were between 2.51 and 3.00, and only 16 (13.0%) were above 3.00. Three (2.4%) were below 2.00.

Level of Satisfaction with Social Studies Curriculum

Fifty of the respondents, or 40.7%, were satisfied with the curriculum and 47, or 38.2%, were very satisfied. Sixteen respondents, or 13.0%, were most satisfied. Only 9 respondents, or 7.3%, were dissatisfied.

Level of Satisfaction with Student Internship

Forty-seven respondents, or 38.2%, were satisfied with student internship, while 46, 37.4%, were very satisfied. Only 3 respondents, or 2.4%, were dissatisfied, and only 1 respondent, or 0.8%, was very dissatisfied.

Level of Satisfaction with Methods of Teaching by Instructors

Sixty-four respondents, or 52.0%, were satisfied, and 37, or 30.1%, were very satisfied. Only 8 respondents, or 6.5%, were dissatisfied.

Characteristics of Instructors

Table 3 contains the demographic characteristics and satisfaction levels of instructors and includes the following details.

Age and Gender

Fifty-five instructors (68.8%) were males, and 25 (31.3%) were females. Forty-four (55%) were in the range between 41 and 50 years and 23 (28.8%) were in the age range between 30 and 40. None were less than 30 years or more than 60 years of age.

Years of Teaching Experience

Twenty-seven of the instructors (34.2%) had 16 to 20 years of teaching experience, while 25 (31.6%) had more than 20 years. Only 5 instructors (6.3%) had 5 to 10 years of teaching experience.

Highest Degree Earned

Most of the instructors, 51 or 63.8%, held master's degrees, while 29 (36.3%) held bachelor's degrees. None had earned doctoral degrees or other kinds of degrees.

Academic Rank

Most of instructors, 68 or 85.0%, were classified as instructors, while 12 (15%) were assistant professors. None were classified as associate professors or professors.

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics and Satisfaction Level
of Instructors

Classification	Number (N=80)	Percentage
Gender:		
Male	55	68.8
Female	25	31.3
Age:		
Under 30	-	-
30 - 40	23	28.8
41 - 50	44	55.0
51 - 60	13	16.3
Over 60	-	-
Years of Teaching Experience:		
Less than 5 years	1	1.3
5 - 10	5	6.3
11 - 15	21	26.6
16 - 20	27	34.2
More than 20	25	31.6
Highest Degree Earned:		
Bachelor's	29	36.3
Master's	51	63.8
Doctorate	-	-
Others	-	-
Academic Rank:		
Instructor	68	85.0
Assistant Professor	12	15.0
Associate Professor	-	-
Professor	-	-
Highest Degree Received from:		
Thailand	72	90.0
Other Country	8	10.0
Satisfaction with Job:		
Very Dissatisfied	-	-
Dissatisfied	4	5.0
Satisfied	48	60.0
Very Satisfied	23	28.8
Most Satisfied	5	6.3

Highest Degree Received From

Almost all of the instructors (72 or 90.0%) received their highest degree from a Thailand institution. Only 8 respondents (10.0%) earned their highest degree from other countries.

Level of Satisfaction with Job

Over half of the instructors (48 or 60%) were satisfied with their job, while 23 (28.8%) were very satisfied. Only 4 respondents (5.0%) were dissatisfied with their job.

Characteristics of Administrators

The demographic characteristics and satisfaction level of administrators are shown in Table 4. The following details are also presented.

Age and Gender

Most administrators (69 or 81.2%) were males, while only 16 (18.8%) were females. More than half of the respondents (48 or 51.1%) were between 51 and 60 years of age, and 22 (26.2%) were between 30 and 40 years of age. Only 13 respondents (15.5%) were between 51 and 60 years of age and only 1 respondent, or 1.2%, was less than 30.

Years of Teaching/Working Experience

Thirty of the administrators (35.7%) had more than 20 years of experience, while 21 (25.0%) had between 11 and 15

Table 4

Demographic Characteristics and Satisfaction Level
of Administrators

Classification	Number (N=85)	Percentage
Gender:		
Male	69	81.2
Female	16	18.8
Age:		
Under 30	1	1.2
30 - 40	22	26.2
41 - 50	48	57.1
51 - 60	13	15.5
Over 60	-	-
Years of Teaching/Administrative Experience:		
Less than 5 years	4	4.8
5 - 10	12	14.3
11 - 15	21	25.0
16 - 20	17	20.2
More than 20	30	35.7
Highest Degree Earned:		
Bachelor's	17	20.2
Master's	60	71.4
Doctorate	7	8.3
Academic Rank:		
Instructor	68	81.0
Assistant Professor	13	15.5
Associate Professor	3	3.6
Professor	-	-
Highest Degree Received from:		
Thailand	68	81.0
Other Country	16	19.0
Satisfaction with Job:		
Very Dissatisfied	-	-
Dissatisfied	7	8.3
Satisfied	41	48.8
Very Satisfied	30	35.7
Most Satisfied	6	7.1

years. Twelve administrators (14.3%) had between 5 and 10 years, and only 4 of the respondents (4.8%) had less than 5 years.

Highest Degree Earned

Most administrators (60 or 71.4%) held master's degrees, while 17 (20.2%) held bachelor's degrees. Only 7 respondents (8.3%) held doctoral degrees.

Academic Rank

Most administrators (68 or 81.0%) were instructors, while 13 (15.5%) were assistant professors. Only 3 respondents (3.6%) were associate professors. None were professors.

Highest Degree Received From

Most of administrators (68 or 81.0%) received their highest degree from a Thailand institution. Only 16 respondents (19%) received their highest degree from other countries.

Level of Satisfaction with Job

About half of the administrators (41 or 48.8%) were satisfied with their jobs, and 30 (35.7%) were very satisfied. Only 7 respondents (8.3%) were dissatisfied.

Summary

The section provides general characteristics of the three groups of respondents: student-teachers, instructors, and administrators. Frequencies and percentages are presented on the basis of the demographic characteristics and satisfaction level of the respondents.

The majority of student-teachers responding to the research were females, with grade point average between 2.00 and 3.00. They were satisfied with the social studies curriculum. The major portion of the group were satisfied with methods of teaching by their instructors, and were satisfied with student-teachers' internship.

The majority of instructors responding to the research were male, were 41 to 50 years of age, and had 16 to 20 years of teaching experience. Most had earned master's degrees in Thailand. They were ranked as instructors and were satisfied with their job.

The majority of administrators responding to the research were male, were 41 to 50 years of age, and had more than 20 years of teaching and/or administrative experience. Most had earned master's degrees in Thailand. They were ranked as instructors and were satisfied with their job.

Rating of Secondary Social Studies Teaching Competencies

The data analysis and findings of the study based on the rating of teaching competencies of respondents are presented in this section. Tables which illustrate the findings are provided along with the research questions and an explanation of statistical results.

Testing Research Questions

Research Question 1

Is there a difference among social studies student-teachers, instructors, and administrators in their perceptions of the importance of social studies teaching competencies on the following clusters: Planning Instruction, Objective, Concept Teaching, Class Discussion, Inquiry, Value Clarification, Humanization, Using Multimedia, and Evaluation?

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether any significant difference existed among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents regarding the importance of selected teaching competencies (in clusters). The level of significance was set at 0.05.

The results of research question 1 are shown in Table 5. As indicated in Table 5, within the nine clusters, there were two clusters in which significance existed. They were inquiry, and using multimedia. Probability values were 0.02, and 0.03, respectively. The Scheffe' method was employed following the one-way ANOVA in order

Table 5

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Perception on Selected
Teaching Competencies, in Clusters, among the Three Groups

Competencies (Cluster)	(G1)	(G2)	(G3)	df	F P	Scheffe Test		
	X SD N	X SD N	X SD N			S ₁	S ₂	S ₃
Planning Instruction	4.05 0.41 112	3.95 0.50 74	4.03 0.47 78	2	1.260 0.286	-	-	-
Objective Teaching	4.16 0.52 111	4.11 0.55 74	4.11 0.66 78	2	2.070 0.763	-	-	-
Concept Teaching	3.91 0.53 112	4.02 0.57 74	4.02 0.69 78	2	1.090 0.338	-	-	-
Class Discussion	4.05 0.42 112	4.01 0.45 74	4.02 0.62 78	2	0.220 0.803	-	-	-
Inquiry	3.76 0.52 112	3.97 0.52 74	3.97 0.71 78	2	3.900 0.021*	-	-	-
Value Clarification	3.94 0.53 112	4.02 0.65 74	4.00 0.59 78	2	0.540 0.583	-	-	-
Humanization	4.10 0.47 112	4.07 0.55 74	4.10 0.68 78	2	0.050 0.955	-	-	-
Using Multimedia	4.23 0.56 112	4.03 0.61 74	4.04 0.57 78	2	3.500 0.031*	-	-	-

Table 5 (continued)

Competencies (Cluster)	(G1)	(G2)	(G3)	df	F p	Scheffe' Test			
	X	X	X			S ₁	S ₂	S ₃	
	SD	SD	SD						
	N	N	N						
Evaluation	4.09	3.94	3.95	2	1.610	-	-	-	
	0.58	0.62	0.68		0.201				
	112	74	78						

Note: * = significant at .05 level
 G1 = group 1 (student-teachers)
 G2 = group 2 (instructors)
 G3 = group 3 (administrators)
 S₁ = significant between group 1 and group 2
 S₂ = significant between group 1 and group 3
 S₃ = significant between group 2 and group 3
 - = no significant difference existed

to determine which pair was significant. The results, shown in Table 5, indicate that no statistically significant difference existed, even in the clusters of inquiry or using multimedia. The three groups of respondents agreed that every cluster of competencies is important. Average scores in the student-teacher group ranged from 4.23 to 3.76, while scores in the group of instructors were 4.11 to 3.94, and the administrators group scores were 4.11 to 3.95.

An effort was made to determine whether any significant difference existed among the perceptions of the three groups regarding the importance of teaching competencies in each item. To meet this purpose, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) along with Scheffe' method was employed.

The perceptions of the three groups of respondents (G1 or Group 1 = student-teachers, G2 or Group 2 = instructors, G3 or Group 3 = administrators), according to their perceptions in each competency are depicted in Table 6. Only competencies that were significant at the 0.05 level are presented. Other values associated with one-way analysis of variance are shown in Appendix E.

As shown in Table 6, the results from the Scheffe' method indicated that there were no significant differences between instructors and administrators. However, there were significant difference between student-teachers and instructors, and between student-teachers and administrators.

Items that showed significance on perceptions of student-teachers and instructors were as follows:

Planning 1: Use the teaching guides published by the Ministry of Education as guidelines to plan instruction;

Objective 2: Knowledge, abilities, valuing, and social participation are represented in the objectives of the programs;

Inquiry 3: Stimulate students to identify and develop hypotheses;

Value clarification 3: Guide students in weighing alternatives;

Table 6

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Perception on Selected
Teaching Competencies Among the Three Groups

Competencies	(G1)	(G2)	(G3)	df	F p	Scheffe Test		
	X	X	X			S ₁	S ₂	S ₃
	SD N	SD N	SD N					
Planning: item 1	3.93 0.91 123	3.45 1.00 78	3.76 0.99 44	283	5.930 0.003*	y	-	-
Objective: item 2	4.45 0.79 119	4.12 0.75 80	4.21 0.79 84	284	3.600 0.010*	y	-	-
item 3	3.89 0.76 121	4.03 0.75 80	4.19 0.84 84	284	3.600 0.028*	-	y	-
Concept Teaching: item 2	3.69 0.83 122	3.87 0.85 80	4.04 0.74 84	285	4.430 0.013*	-	y	-
Inquiry: item 2	4.04 0.76 123	4.13 0.64 80	4.30 0.71 84	286	3.250 0.040*	-	y	-
item 3	3.56 0.86 122	3.94 0.68 80	3.94 0.78 84	285	8.470 0.000*	y	y	-
item 5	3.58 0.77 122	3.83 0.71 80	3.93 0.71 83	284	6.010 0.003*	-	y	-
item 8	3.72 0.78 123	3.96 0.72 80	4.01 0.75 84	286	4.630 0.011*	-	y	-

Table 6 (continued)

Competencies	(G1)	(G2)	(G3)	df	F P	Scheffe' Test		
	X SD N	X SD N	X SD N			S ₁	S ₂	S ₃
item 9	3.59 0.82 121	3.86 0.76 77	3.95 0.76 84	281	6.010 0.003*	-	y	-
Value Clarification: item 3	3.67 0.79 123	3.98 0.75 79	4.00 0.79 85	286	6.030 0.003*	y	y	-
item 5	3.72 0.95 123	4.04 0.76 79	4.05 0.64 85	286	5.830 0.003*	y	y	-
Multimedia: item 1	4.41 0.72 123	4.11 0.80 80	4.22 0.75 85	287	3.960 0.020*	y	-	-
item 3	4.42 0.69 123	4.08 0.78 80	4.12 0.73 85	287	7.160 0.001*	y	y	-
item 5	4.24 0.74 123	3.98 0.75 79	3.96 0.77 84	285	4.430 0.013*	-	y	-
Evaluation: item 5	4.21 0.94 123	3.86 0.91 80	4.08 0.82 84	286	3.640 0.027*	y	-	-

Note: * = significant at .05 level
 G1 = group 1 (student-teachers)
 G2 = group 2 (instructors)
 G3 = group 3 (administrators)
 S₁ = significant between group 1 and group 2
 S₂ = significant between group 1 and group 3
 S₃ = significant between group 2 and group 3
 y = significant difference existed between these groups
 - = no significant difference existed between these group

Value clarification 5: Assist students in discovering, examining and identifying alternative behaviors and solutions;

Multimedia 1: Select appropriate multimedia to meet stated objectives;

Multimedia 3: Use appropriate multimedia for proper content, time, and place to give depth and dimension to events; and

Evaluation 5: Evaluation data are used for planning curricular improvement.

Items that showed significant difference on perceptions of student-teachers and administrators were as follows:

Objective 3: General statements of goals translated into specific objectives and conceived in terms of behavior and content;

Concept teaching 2: Structure activities by which students can form concepts and generalizations by the deductive approach;

Inquiry 2: Assist students in developing a solution to a problem;

Inquiry 3: Stimulate students to identify and develop hypotheses;

Inquiry 5: Guide students in evaluating hypotheses in terms of criterias;

Inquiry 8: Assist students in revising unsupported hypotheses for further research;

Inquiry 9: Stimulate students to analyze attitudes, biases, motives, and unstated assumptions;

Value clarification 3: Guide students in weighing alternatives;

Value clarification 5: Assist students in discovering, examining, and identifying alternative behaviors and solutions;

Multimedia 3: Use appropriate multimedia for proper content, time, and place to give depth and dimension to events, and

Multimedia 5: Guide students in using multimedia and interpreting special kinds of media such as maps, and atlases.

Research Question 2

Do gender, grade point average, satisfaction with curriculum, satisfaction with practicum and internship, and satisfaction with instructors' method of teaching of social studies influence student-teachers' perceptions of the importance of selected teaching competencies in social studies?

Dummy variable regression analysis was employed to determine whether the independent variables of student-teachers influenced their perceptions regarding the importance of teaching competencies.

In the procedure to analyze the regression analysis, the model below was employed:

Student-teacher Model:

$$P = a_0 + a_1SX_2 + a_2GP_2 + a_3GP_3 + a_4GP_4 + a_5SC_2 + a_6SC_3 + a_7SI_2 + a_8SI_3 + a_9SM_2 + a_{10}SM_3 + u$$

where: P = dependent variable
 a = regression constant or intercept
 SX₂ = female;
 GP₂ = GPA 2.00-2.50 ;
 GP₃ = GPA 2.51 - 3.00;
 GP₄ = GPA above 3.00;
 SC₂ = satisfied with curriculum content;
 SC₃ = very satisfied with curriculum content;
 SI₂ = satisfied with internship;
 SI₃ = very satisfied with internship;
 SM₂ = satisfied with instructor's method of teaching;
 SM₃ = very satisfied with instructor's method of teaching.
 u = error component

The perceptions of student-teachers as a function of demographic variables, using regression analysis, are shown in Tables 7 through 15. However, these tables present only competencies with significant differences at the .05 level. Details on parameter estimates in the Dummy variables regression analysis are shown in Appendix D.

The cluster of planning instruction is presented in Table 7. The competencies that showed significant differences were as follows:

Table 7

Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Planning Instruction as a
Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Planning 1: Use the teaching guides published by the
Ministry of Education as guidelines to
plan instruction.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	18.258	10	1.826	2.681	0.006*
Within Group	59.923	88	0.681		
Total	78.182	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.146
Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	0.00	3.08	2.34	0.75	4.07
p	0.99	0.03*	0.10	0.47	0.02*
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

Planning 4: Select and develop instructional content
for a lesson.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	9.891	10	0.989	2.190	0.025*
Within Group	39.745	88	0.452		
Total	49.636	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.108
Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	4.13	3.05	0.10	0.96	1.27
p	0.04*	0.03*	0.37	0.39	0.29
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

Planning 1: Use the teaching guides published by the Ministry of Education as guidelines to plan instruction. The independent variables that showed significant difference were GPA (p or probability value = 0.03), and level of satisfaction of method of teaching social studies instructors (p = 0.02).

Planning 4: Select and develop instructional content for a lesson. The independent variables that showed significant difference were gender (p = 0.04), and GPA.

Data in Table 8 represent the analysis in the cluster of objective. The competency that showed significant

Table 8

Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Objective as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Objective 3: General statements of goals translated into specific objectives are conceived in terms of behavior and content.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	10.908	10	1.091	2.246	0.022*
Within Group	42.729	88	0.486		
Total	53.636	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.113
Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	2.18	2.36	4.16	1.69	0.25
p	0.14	0.08	0.02*	0.19	0.78
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

difference was item 3: General statements of goals translated into specific objectives are conceived in terms of behavior and content. The independent variable that showed significant difference was level of satisfaction of content of social studies curriculum ($p = 0.02$).

Data in Table 9 represent the analysis in the cluster of concept teaching. The item that showed significant difference was item 5 : Guide students in recognizing the relationship of parts to the whole. The independent

Table 9

Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Concept Teaching as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Concept Teaching 5: Guide students in recognizing the relationship of parts to the whole.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	14.228	10	1.423	2.108	0.032*
Within Group	59.408	88	0.675		
Total	73.636	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.113
Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	0.73	2.24	3.52	0.49	0.71
p	0.39	0.09	0.03*	0.61	0.50
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

variable that showed significance was the level of satisfaction with the content of social studies curriculum.

The analysis in the cluster of class discussion is shown in Table 10. The item that was significantly different was item 4: Attempt to get feedback from students. The independent variables that showed significance were gender ($p = 0.01$), and GPA ($p = 0.03$).

Data in Table 11 represent the analysis in the cluster of inquiry. The item that was significantly different was item 7: Assist students in revising unsupported hypotheses for further research. The independent variable that showed significance was level of satisfaction with method of teaching ($p = 0.00$).

Table 10

Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Class Discussion as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Class Discussion 4: Attempt to get feedback from students.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	12.041	10	1.204	2.261	0.021*
Within Group	46.868	88	0.533		
Total	58.909	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.114
Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	6.88	3.08	0.31	1.18	1.46
p	0.01*	0.03*	0.74	0.31	0.24
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

Table 11

Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Inquiry as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Inquiry 7: Assist students in revising unsupported hypotheses for further research.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	13.609	10	1.361	2.011	0.041*
Within Group	59.563	88	0.677		
Total	73.172	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.094
Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	0.72	0.43	0.38	0.42	5.86
p	0.40	0.74	0.68	0.66	0.00*
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

Data in Table 12 represent the analysis in the cluster of value clarification. The items that showed significant difference were as follows:

Value clarification 1: Stimulate students by asking open-ended questions. The independent variable that showed significance was level of satisfaction with instructors ($p = 0.03$).

Value clarification 3: Guide students in weighing alternatives. The independent variable that showed significance was GPA ($p = 0.05$).

Table 12

Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Value Clarification as
a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression
Analysis.

Value Clarification 1: Stimulate students by asking
open-ended questions.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	16.550	10	1.655	3.707	0.000*
Within Group	39.288	88	0.446		
Total	55.838	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.094
Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	3.16	1.14	2.13	3.64	3.07
p	0.08	0.34	0.13	0.03*	0.05
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

Value Clarification 3: Guide students in weighing
alternatives.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	10.196	10	1.020	2.183	0.026*
Within Group	41.097	88	0.467		
Total	51.293	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.094
Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	2.15	2.69	1.37	0.04	1.56
p	0.15	0.05*	0.26	0.97	0.21
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

Data in Table 13 represent the analysis in the cluster of humanization. The item that was significantly different was item 4: Guide students in weighing individual action in terms of its benefit to other individuals, groups, and societies. The independent variable that showed significant was GPA ($p = 0.00$).

Table 13

Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Humanization as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Humanization 4: Guide students in weighing individual action in terms of its benefit to other individuals, groups, and societies.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	10.961	10	1.096	2.253	0.022*
Within Group	42.817	88	0.487		
Total	53.778	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.094
Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	0.76	4.88	0.96	0.20	1.98
p	0.38	0.00*	0.39	0.82	0.14
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

Data in Table 14 represent the analysis in the cluster of using multimedia. The item that showed significant difference was item 4: Explain the essential points before using multimedia. The independent variable that showed significance was level of satisfaction with instructors.

Table 14

Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Using Multimedia as a
Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Multimedia 4: Explain the essential points before
using multimedia.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	11.315	10	1.132	2.044	0.039*
Within Group	48.705	88	0.553		
Total	60.020	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.094

Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	1.43	0.96	0.17	4.32	0.10
p	0.23	0.41	0.84	0.02*	0.37
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

Data in Table 15 represent the analysis in the cluster of evaluation. The item that showed significant difference was item 2: Formulate a system of grading consistent with school policy. The independent variable that showed significance was level of satisfaction with method of teaching ($p = 0.00$).

For the overall results concerning independent variables that influenced students' perceptions, these

Table 15

Perceptions of Student-Teachers on Evaluation as a Function
of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Evaluation 2: Formulate a system of grading consistent
with school policy.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	13.670	10	1.367	2.491	0.011*
Within Group	48.289	88	0.549		
Total	61.959	98			
				Adj R-SQ	0.132

Indep. Variable	SEX	GPA	SC	SI	SM
Joint F-Test	0.96	1.23	2.24	0.21	7.49
p	0.33	0.30	0.11	0.81	0.00*
df: Numerator	1	3	2	2	2
Denominator	88	88	88	88	88

variables are as follows: (a) grade-point average in Planning 1, Planning 4, Class discussion 4, Value clarification 3, and Humanization 4; (b) satisfaction with method of teaching in Planning 1, Inquiry 7, Value clarification 1, and Evaluation 2; (c) gender in Planning 4, and Class discussion 4); (d) satisfaction with curriculum in Objective 2, and Concept teaching 5; and (e) satisfaction with internship in clusters of Value clarification 1, and Multimedia 4.

When one-way analysis of variance to test significant difference between the three groups of participants was employed the only items that showed significant difference between student-teachers and instructors, and between student-teacher and administrators were in clusters of Planning 1, Objective 2, and Value clarification 3. Therefore, explanation of independent variables that influenced student-teachers' perceptions is only provided for Planning 1, Objective 2, and Value clarification 3 with variables of grade-point average, satisfaction with method of teaching, and satisfaction with curriculum. In other items, even some independent variables influenced students' perceptions and showed a significant difference, however, there were still no significant difference among the perceptions of student-teachers, instructors, and administrators.

For students' achievement in general, grade-point average (GPA) might be an important independent variable for students. Previous research found GPA was one of the independent variables that predicted students' perceptions regarding teaching performance of instructors (Boonyaraksa, 1988).

For Planning 1, the independent variables that influenced student-teachers' perceptions were GPA and satisfaction with method of teaching. In this study, student-teachers who possessed high GPAs rated

the importance of this item lower than those who possessed low GPAs. Several comments from those who possessed high GPAs were: Using the teaching guides published by the Ministry of Education as guidelines to plan instruction is not necessary; The teaching guides are not revised in a reasonable period of time; and Knowledge and publications in the field of social studies change rapidly; therefore, some reference books recommended by the guidelines are not up-to-date. However, the group of student-teachers who possessed low GPAs rated the importance of this item relatively high. One of their comments was whether it is necessary to use and follow the teaching guides since student-teachers do not have enough experience in teaching.

The results of using one-way ANOVA showed that the average score in rating Planning 1 in the student-teachers' group was 3.93 while those in the instructors' group was 3.45. Interestingly enough, comments from instructors were similar to comments from student-teachers who possessed high GPAs. Therefore, further plausible explanations might be that the method of teaching of instructors influenced the perceptions of two groups of student-teachers: (a) satisfied with those methods, (b) dissatisfied with those methods.

For Value clarification 3: Guide students in weighing alternatives, the mean score for student-teachers was 3.67. However, the mean score for instructors was 3.97, and for administrators was 4.00.

It may be true that weighing alternatives is important in the process of inquiry, problem-solving and critical thinking. Weighing alternatives is required in daily life almost everyday. Student-teachers who possessed high GPAs rated the importance of this item higher than those who possessed low GPAs. The plausible explanation might be because they view this item to be important and required in their daily lives, especially in a democratic society like Thailand.

For Objective 2: Knowledge, abilities, valuing, and social participation are represented in the objectives of the program, the average score in the student-teachers' group was 4.45. The results from using regression analysis revealed that there was significant difference among the perceptions of student-teachers. The independent variable that provided influence was level of satisfaction with social studies curriculum (SC).

Student-teachers who were satisfied with the social studies curriculum rated this item very high while student-teachers who were dissatisfied with the social studies curriculum rated the importance of this item relatively low. The plausible explanation might be that student-teachers who were satisfied with the curriculum viewed it as necessary that knowledge, abilities, valuing, and social participation are represented in the objectives of the program while student-teachers who were dissatisfied

with the social studies curriculum rated the importance of this item relatively low because they felt dissatisfied with the content of the social studies curriculum and, therefore, do not desire knowledge be represented in the objectives of the program.

Research Question 3

Do age, gender, years of teaching experience, degree earned, academic rank, and job satisfaction influence the perceptions of social studies instructors regarding the importance of selected teaching competencies in social studies?

Dummy variable regression analysis was employed to determine whether the independent variables mentioned above influence perceptions of instructors regarding the importance of teaching competencies.

In the regression analysis procedure employed in this research question, the model below was used:

Instructor Model:

$$P = a_0 + a_1SX_2 + a_2AG_2 + a_3AG_3 + a_4YR_2 + a_5YR_3 + a_6YR_4 + a_7DE_2 + a_8DF_1 + a_9AC_1 + a_{10}SJ_2 + a_{11}SJ_3 + u$$

where: P = dependent variable
 a = regression constant or intercept
 SX₂ = female;
 AG₂ = age between 41-50
 AG₃ = age between 51-60
 YR₂ = year of teaching experience between 11-15
 YR₃ = year of teaching experience between 16-20
 YR₄ = year of teaching experience more than 20
 DE₂ = master's degree
 DF₁ = Thailand
 AC₁ = instructor
 SJ₂ = satisfied with job
 u = error component

The perceptions of instructors on the cluster of planning as a function of the demographic variable, using regression analysis are shown in Table 16. Only one of the 65 competencies that were perceived by social studies instructors showed a significant difference. It was Planning 6: Construct a lesson plan. The independent variable that showed a significant difference was the degree earned.

Table 16

Perceptions of Instructors on Planning Instruction as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Planning 6: Construct a lesson plan.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Group	11.247	11	1.022	2.306	0.026*
Within Group	18.624	42	0.443		
Total	29.870	53			
				Adj R-SQ	0.213

Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	0.08	0.05	1.53	6.36	2.02	1.46	2.11
p	0.92	0.83	0.22	0.02*	0.16	0.23	0.13
df: Numerator	2	-	1	1	1	1	2
Denominator	42	-	42	42	42	42	42

It was noticeable that there were only two categories of instructors who held earned degree: bachelor's and master's. Instructors who had master's degrees perceived the item mention above to be important and necessary, while

instructors who held earned bachelors' degrees perceived the importance of this item to be relatively low.

Research Question 4

Do age, gender, years of teaching and/or administrative experience, degree earned, academic rank, and job satisfaction influence the perceptions of administrators regarding the importance of selected teaching competencies in social studies?

Dummy variable regression analysis was employed to determine whether the independent variables of administrators influence their perceptions regarding the importance of teaching competencies.

In the procedure to analyze this regression analysis, the model below was employed:

Administrator Model:

$$P = a_0 + a_1SX_2 + a_2AG_2 + a_3AG_3 + a_4YR_2 + a_5YR_3 + a_6YR_4 + a_7DE_1 + a_8DE_2 + a_9DF_1 + a_{10}AC_1 + a_{11}AC_2 + a_{12}SJ_2 + a_{13}SJ_3 + u$$

where:

- P = dependent variable
- a = regression constant or intercept
- SX₂ = female;
- AG₂ = age between 41-50
- AG₃ = age between 51-60
- YR₂ = year of teaching experience between 11-15
- YR₃ = year of teaching experience between 16-20
- YR₄ = year of teaching experience more than 20
- DE₁ = bachelor's degree
- DE₂ = master's degree
- DF₁ = Thailand
- AC₁ = instructor
- AC₂ = assistant professor
- SJ₂ = satisfied with job
- SJ₃ = very satisfied with job
- u = error component

Shown in Tables 17 through 22 are the perceptions of administrators and the results from the regression analysis.

The results of analysis in the cluster of objective of teaching (O) are shown in Table 17. The items that showed significant difference were as follows:

Objective 1: Objectives are carefully selected and formulated. The independent variable that showed significance was the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$).

Objective 2: Knowledges, abilities, valuing, and social participation are represented in the objectives of the program. The independent variable that showed significance was the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$).

Data in Table 18 represent the analysis of perceptions of administrators on the cluster of concept teaching (C). The items that showed significant difference were as follows:

Concept teaching 1: Structure activities by which students can form concepts and generalizations by the inductive approach. The independent variable that showed significance was the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$).

Concept teaching 2: Structure activities by which students can form concepts and generalizations by the deductive approach. The independent variable that showed significance was the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$).

Table 17

Perceptions of Administrators on Objective Teaching as a
Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Objective 1: Objectives are carefully selected and formulated.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	12.953	13	0.996	2.347	0.015*		
Within Group	22.076	52	0.424				
Total	35.030	65					
				Adj R-SQ	0.212		
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	2.60	0.60	1.09	9.74	0.08	1.33	1.11
p	0.08	0.44	0.35	0.00*	0.76	0.27	0.33
df: Numerator	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
Denominator	52	52	52	52	52	52	52

Objective 2: Knowledges, abilities, valuing, and social participation are represented in the objectives of the program.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	12.722	13	0.978	1.934	0.047*		
Within Group	26.307	52	0.505				
Total	39.030	65					
				Adj R-SQ	0.158		
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	2.88	0.00	0.27	6.09	0.03	0.45	0.49
p	0.06	0.92	0.84	0.00*	0.86	0.63	0.61
df: Numerator	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
Denominator	52	52	52	52	52	52	52

Table 18

Perceptions of Administrators on Concept Teaching as a
Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Concept Teaching 1: Structure activities by which students can form concepts and generalizations by the inductive approach.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	15.838	13	1.218	2.622	0.007*		
Within Group	24.161	52	0.464				
Total	40.000	65				Adj R-SQ	0.245

Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	3.13	0.00	2.21	9.38	0.45	0.04	2.30
p	0.05	0.95	0.09	0.00*	0.50	0.96	0.10
df: Numerator	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
Denominator	52	52	52	52	52	52	52

Concept Teaching 2: Structure activities by which students can form concepts and generalizations by the deduction approach.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	14.056	13	1.081	2.971	0.002*		
Within Group	18.927	52	0.363				
Total	32.984	65				Adj R-SQ	0.282

Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	3.97	0.05	1.20	9.18	0.61	0.25	5.57
p	0.02*	0.81	0.31	0.00*	0.43	0.77	0.00*
df: Numerator	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
Denominator	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

Table 18 (continued)

Concept Teaching 4: Assist students in recognizing similarities and differences in elements.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	10.985	13	0.845	2.211	0.022*		
Within Group	19.878	52	0.382				
Total	30.863	65					
					Adj R-SQ 0.194		
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	2.17	1.09	0.42	7.99	2.24	1.43	2.51
p	0.12	0.29	0.73	0.00*	0.13	0.24	0.09
df: Numerator	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
Denominator	52	52	52	52	52	52	52

Concept Teaching 5: Guide students in recognizing the relationship of parts to the whole.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	22.607	13	1.739	3.596	0.000*		
Within Group	25.149	52	0.483				
Total	47.757	65					
					Adj R-SQ 0.341		
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	2.77	0.02	1.76	10.95	3.10	2.67	3.80
p	0.07	0.88	0.16	0.00*	0.08	0.07	0.02*
df: Numerator	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
Denominator	52	52	52	52	52	52	52

Table 18 (continued)

Concept Teaching 6: Guide students in applying the concept to different situations.							
Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	10.018	13	0.770	2.190	0.023*		
Within Group	18.299	52	0.351				
Total	28.318	65					
					Adj R-SQ	0.192	
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	6.19	0.00	0.65	5.66	2.79	1.24	0.49
p	0.00*	0.92	0.58	0.00*	0.10	0.29	0.61
df: Numerator	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
Denominator	52	52	52	52	52	52	52

Concept teaching 4: Assist students in recognizing similarities and difference in elements. The independent variable that showed significance was the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$).

Concept teaching 5: Guide students in recognizing the relationship of parts to whole. The independent variables that were significant were highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$), and level of satisfaction with job ($p = 0.02$).

Concept teaching 6: Guide students in applying the concept to different situations. The independent variables that were significant were age ($p = 0.00$), and the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$).

Data in Table 19 represent the analysis of administrators on the cluster of class discussion (D). The item that was significantly different was item 2: Answer students' questions satisfactorily. The independent variable that represented significance was level of job satisfaction ($p = 0.00$).

Table 19

Perceptions of Administrators on Class Discussion as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Class Discussion 2: Answer students' questions satisfactorily.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	13.012	13	1.000	2.956	0.002*		
Within Group	17.609	52	0.338				
Total	30.621	65					
				Adj R-SQ	0.281		
----- Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	2.84	1.22	0.08	0.32	1.79	1.24	10.01
p	0.06	0.27	0.96	0.72	0.18	0.29	0.00*
df: Numerator	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
Denominator	52	52	52	52	52	52	52

Illustrated in Table 20 is the analysis of administrators on the cluster of inquiry (I). The items that showed significant difference were as follows:

Inquiry 1: Guide students in a step-by-step procedure for finding, recognizing, and defining problems.

Independent variables that showed significance were the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$), and level of job satisfaction ($p = 0.00$).

Inquiry 2: Assist students in developing a solution to a problem. The independent variable that showed significance was the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$).

Table 20

Perceptions of Administrators on Inquiry as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Inquiry 1: Guide students in a step-by step procedure for finding, recognizing and defining problems.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	11.076	13	0.850	2.552	0.008*		
Within Group	17.363	52	0.333				
Total	28.439	65					
					Adj R-SQ	0.236	
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	1.76	0.96	1.26	9.37	1.35	1.03	3.02
p	0.18	0.33	0.29	0.00*	0.24	0.36	0.05*
df: Numerator	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
Denominator	52	52	52	52	52	52	52

Table 20 (continued)

Inquiry 2: Assist students in developing a solution to a problem.							
Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	9.591	11	0.871	2.275	0.026*		
Within Group	17.250	45	0.383				
Total	26.842	56					
					Adj R-SQ	0.200	
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	1.94	2.45	1.42	15.51	0.58	1.83	1.01
p	0.15	0.12	0.24	0.00*	0.44	0.18	0.37
df: Numerator	2	1	3	1	1	1	2
Denominator	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Inquiry 7: Assist students in revising unsupported hypotheses for further research.							
Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	16.774	11	1.524	3.769	0.000*		
Within Group	18.208	45	0.404				
Total	34.982	56					
					Adj R-SQ	0.352	
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	1.41	1.33	2.80	19.53	0.19	6.55	3.09
p	0.25	0.25	0.05	0.00*	0.66	0.01*	0.05
df: Numerator	2	1	3	1	1	1	2
Denominator	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

Inquiry 7: Assist students in revising unsupported hypotheses for further research. Independent variables that showed significance were the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$) and academic rank ($p = 0.01$).

The analysis of perceptions of administrators on the cluster of humanization (H) is shown in Table 21. Independent variables that were significant were as follows:

Humanization 2: Use students as resource person, giving students the opportunities to learn from each other.

Table 21

Perceptions of Administrators on Humanization as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Humanization 2: Use students as resource person, giving students the opportunities to learn from each other.							
Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	10.245	11	0.931	2.361	0.021*		
Within Group	17.754	45	0.394				
					Adj R-SQ	0.210	
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	0.51	0.18	1.53	9.75	1.44	4.02	2.24
p	0.60	0.67	0.21	0.00*	0.23	0.05	0.11
df: Numerator	2	1	3	1	1	1	2
Denominator	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

Table 21 (continued)

Humanization 4: Guide students in weighing individual action in terms of its benefit to other individuals, groups, and societies.							
Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	12.252	11	1.113	2.691	0.009*		
Within Group	18.624	45	0.413				
Total	30.877	56					
					Adj R-SQ	0.249	
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	3.29	0.15	1.16	17.26	0.70	4.18	1.44
p	0.04	0.69	0.33	0.00*	0.40	0.04*	0.24
df: Numerator	2	1	3	1	1	1	2
Denominator	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

The independent variable that showed significance was the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$).

Humanization 4: Guide students in weighing individual action in terms of its benefit to other individuals, groups, and societies. Independent variables that showed significance were the highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$), and level of job satisfaction ($p = 0.04$).

The analysis of perceptions of administrators on the cluster of using multimedia (U) is presented in Table 22. Independent variables that showed significance were as follows:

Multimedia 3: Use appropriate multimedia for proper content, time, and place to give depth and dimension to events. The independent variables that showed significance were years of teaching/and administrative experience ($p = 0.01$), highest degree earned ($p = 0.00$), and level of satisfaction with job ($p = 0.04$).

Table 22

Perceptions of Administrators on Using Multimedia as a Function of Demographic Variable, Using Regression Analysis.

Multimedia 3: Use appropriate multimedia for proper content, time, and place to give depth and dimension to events.

Sources of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	p		
Between Group	12.514	11	1.137	2.356	0.021*		
Within Group	21.731	45	0.482				
Total	34.245	56					
				Adj R-SQ	0.210		
Indep. Variable	AGE	SEX	YR	DE	DF	AC	SJ
Joint F-Test	0.62	1.65	3.89	8.55	0.19	1.93	3.34
p	0.54	0.20	0.01*	0.00*	0.65	0.17	0.04*
df: Numerator	2	1	3	1	1	1	2
Denominator	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

Results showed that independent variables that influenced administrators' perceptions were as follows: (a) age (Concept teaching 1, Concept teaching 2, Concept teaching 6, and Humanization 4); (b) years of teaching and/or administrative experience (Inquiry 7, and Multimedia 3); (c) academic rank (Inquiry 7, Humanization 2, and Humanization 4); (d) highest degree earned (Objective 1, Objective 2, Concept teaching 1, Concept teaching 2, Concept teaching 4, Concept teaching 5, Concept teaching 6, Class discussion 3, Inquiry 1, Inquiry 2, Inquiry 7, Humanization 2, and Multimedia 3); and (e) level of satisfaction with job (Concept teaching 2, Concept teaching 5, Class discussion 2, Class discussion 3, Inquiry 1, Inquiry 7, and Multimedia 3).

It was noticeable that "gender" and "highest degree received from" did not have any influence on administrators' and instructors' perceptions. Therefore, it may be concluded that even though it is an important perception of males or females, and those who earned highest degrees from universities in Thailand or other countries, the results are still the same. However, there were significant differences in five independent variables that influence administrators' perceptions. They were age, years of teaching and/or administrative experience (YRS), academic rank (AC), highest degree earned (DE), and level of satisfaction with job (SJ). However, even though those independent variables had statistical difference which influenced their perceptions,

the rating scores average is still the same. There is no significant difference among the perceptions of administrators and instructors regarding social studies teaching competencies. Those two groups perceived every cluster and every item of the competencies to be in agreement and very similar.

In addition, it may be useful to consider some Thai cultural patterns. In Thailand, most of those in the younger generation are expected to give respect to the older generation. Children are required to believe and respect their parents, older relatives, and teachers without any argument.

Because of this tradition, it is not surprising that AGE, YRS, AC, DE, and SJ have significant differences in some items of administrators' perception. Previous research (Thanagosai, 1989) indicates that in Thailand, age, work experience, academic rank, salary, and level of satisfaction with job are highly correlated. Furthermore, Wangphanich (1984) indicates that the conditions for academic promotion established by the Ministry of Education require that at least three years elapse before a faculty member can be promoted to any higher rank due to high competence, research publications, and academic service. Therefore, any faculty member with high academic rank is necessarily older, has more work experience, earns a higher salary, and has a high level of job satisfaction.

Research Question 5

What are the most important teaching competencies as rated by social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators?

For the analysis of the fifth research question, means and standard deviation were used to average scores in each teaching competency as ranked by the three groups. For each group, competencies in each cluster were ranked according to the average mean score. The highest mean score was considered most important, the lowest mean score was considered least important.

Data in Table 23 represent the top fifteen competencies rated by student-teachers (approximately 25% of the total list of competencies). The objective of teaching clusters was ranked as first and using multimedia was ranked as second and third. It is noticeable that none of the items in the clusters of inquiry and value clarification were ranked in the top fifteen by instructors. However, when clusters were ranked (see appendix G), the first, second, and third clusters were using multimedia ($X = 4.23$), objective teaching ($X = 4.16$), and humanization ($X = 4.10$), respectively. The cluster that was perceived to be least importance was inquiry ($X = 3.76$). However, none of the items in the cluster of inquiry were ranked in the top fifteen by this group.

Table 23

Rank Order of Competencies rated by Student-Teachers.

Rank Number	Competency	X	S.D.
1	Objective 2	4.45	0.79
2	Multimedia 3	4.42	0.69
3	Multimedia 1	4.41	0.72
4	Class discussion 1	4.39	0.81
5	Humanization 3	4.34	0.70
6	Objective 5	4.34	0.82
7	Planning 2	4.33	0.72
8	Concept teaching 6	4.31	0.83
9	Class discussion 3	4.30	0.69
10	Evaluation 6	4.30	0.76
11	Planning 4	4.27	0.73
12	Humanization 7	4.27	0.81
13	Planning 5	4.25	0.82
14	Humanization 5	4.24	0.78
15	Multimedia 5	4.24	0.74

Data in Table 24 represent the top fifteen competencies, as rated by instructors. The first ranked competency was in the cluster of humanization. It is noticeable that none of the items in clusters of inquiry and using multimedia were ranked in the top fifteen by administrators. However, when perceptions were considered by clusters (see appendix G), the clusters ranked in first, second, and third place were objective teaching ($X = 4.11$), humanization ($X = 4.08$), and using multimedia $X = 4.04$, respectively. The cluster that was perceived to be least importance was evaluation ($X = 3.94$).

Table 24

Rank Order of Competencies Rated by Instructors.

Rank Number	Competency	X	S.D.
1	Humanization 7	4.26	0.69
2	Humanization 3	4.24	0.75
3	Concept teaching 6	4.23	0.73
4	Humanization 5	4.21	0.72
5	Class discussion 3	4.20	0.75
6	Planning 2	4.20	0.70
7	Value clarification 2	4.18	0.80
8	Objective 5	4.16	0.75
9	Planning 4	4.15	0.75
10	Planning 6	4.15	0.76
11	Evaluation 6	4.14	0.69
12	Class discussion 6	4.14	0.76
13	Objective 1	4.13	0.70
14	Objective 2	4.13	0.75
15	Value clarification 6	4.13	0.87

Data in Table 25 represent the fifteen most important competencies as rated by administrators. The first ranked competency was in the cluster of humanization. It is noticeable that none of the items in the cluster of evaluation were ranked in the top fifteen by administrators. However, when perceptions were considered in clusters, the clusters ranked first, second, and third were objective teaching ($X = 4.11$), humanization ($X = 4.10$), and using multimedia ($X = 4.04$), respectively. The cluster that was perceived to be least important was evaluation ($X = 3.95$).

Table 25

Rank Order of Competencies Rated by Administrators.

Rank Number	Competency	X	S.D.
1	Humanization 5	4.37	0.71
2	Class discussion 3	4.35	0.74
3	Concept teaching 6	4.35	0.65
4	Humanization 3	4.32	0.71
5	Planning 4	4.32	0.71
6	Planning 2	4.32	0.74
7	Humanization 7	4.31	0.73
8	Planning 3	4.29	0.69
9	Inquiry 2	4.30	0.71
10	Value clarification 2	4.25	0.74
11	Multimedia 1	4.22	0.75
12	Objective 5	4.23	0.72
13	Class discussion 2	4.21	0.73
14	Objective 2	4.20	0.79
15	Objective 3	4.19	0.84

Data in Table 26 represent the comparison of important competencies ranked in the top fifteen within the three groups of participants. Competencies that were consistently perceived as most important in the top fifteen of the three groups were as follows:

Planning 2: Plan scope and sequence of the curriculum in relation to students' abilities and understanding;

Planning 4: Select and develop instructional content for a lesson;

Objective 2: Knowledge, abilities, valuing, and social

Table 26

The Comparison of Important Competencies in Top Fifteen
Within the Three Groups

Competencies	Student-teacher	Instructor	Administrator
Planning 2	*	*	*
Planning 3	-	-	*
Planning 4	*	*	*
Planning 5	*	-	-
Planning 6	-	*	-
Objective 1	-	*	-
Objective 2	*	*	*
Objective 3	-	-	*
Objective 5	*	*	*
Concept teaching 6	*	*	*
Class discussion 1	*	-	-
Class discussion 2	-	-	*
Class discussion 3	*	*	*
Class discussion 6	-	*	-
Inquiry 2	-	-	*
Value clarification 2	-	*	*
Value clarification 6	-	*	-
Humanization 3	*	*	*
Humanization 5	*	*	*
Humanization 7	*	*	*
Multimedia 1	*	-	*
Multimedia 3	*	-	-
Multimedia 5	*	-	-
Evaluation 6	*	*	-
Total	15	15	15

participation are represented in the objectives of the program;

Objective 5: Objectives are reconsidered and revised periodically;

Concept teaching 6: Guide students in applying the concept to different situations;

Class discussion 3: present up-to-date information and discussion recent development in the field;

Humanization 3: Guide students in identifying the contribution of all groups, people, and societies;

Humanization 5: Guide students in analyzing the importance of such ideas as "respect for others," "dignity and worth of the individual," and "respect and equality for all"; and

Humanization 7: Assist students in perceiving themselves in various roles (such as gender roles, family roles, social roles, etc.).

The competency that was perceived to be important by only student-teachers and instructors was Evaluation 6. The competency that was perceived to be important by instructors and administrators only was Value clarification 2. Competencies that were perceived to be important only by student-teachers were Planning 5, Class discussion 1, Multimedia 3, and Multimedia 5. Those that were perceived to be important only by instructors were Planning 6, Objective 1, Class discussion 6, and Value clarification 6. Those that were perceived to be important only by administrators were Planning 3, Objective 3, Class discussion 2, and Inquiry 2. For more information see Appendix E and Appendix F. Appendix E indicates the average

scores of the 65 competencies as rated by student-teachers, instructors, and administrators. Appendix F depicts a comparison of the 65 important teaching competencies as ranked by the three groups of respondents.

Summary

Descriptive and inferential statistical procedures were employed to analyze the data. Research question 1 was tested using a one-way analysis of variance. Research questions 2, 3, and 4 were tested using multiple regression analysis. Research question 5 was analyzed using means and standard deviation.

The overall results of the analysis can be summarized as follows: (a) There were no major differences among the three groups of participants. They agreed on the importance of all nine clusters of social studies teaching competencies. (b) Most of the significant differences between the perceptions of student-teachers and instructors and between student-teachers and administrators which were found fell into the clusters of inquiry, using multimedia, and value clarification. (c) Instructors and administrators were very much in agreement in their assessment of social studies teaching competencies, both in clusters and individual items. (d) The assessment of social studies teaching competencies in the group of instructors was very consistent. None of the independent variables, except highest degree earned, influenced their perceptions.

(e) Independent variables that influenced perceptions of student-teachers were gender, GPA, satisfaction with method of teaching of instructor, satisfaction with curriculum, and satisfaction with student-teachers' internship.

(f) Independent variables that influenced administrators' perceptions were age, years of teaching and/or administrative experience, highest degree earned, academic rank, and level of satisfaction with job. (g) The

student-teacher group perceived competencies in the cluster of using multimedia as being of greatest importance, and perceived the inquiry cluster as being of least importance.

(h) The instructor and administrator groups had very similar perceptions. They perceived objective of teaching, and humanization as being of greatest importance, and evaluation as least important. (i) Most of the competencies that were consistently perceived as most important by all three groups of respondents fell into the clusters of humanization and objective of teaching.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was an attempt to determine whether significant differences exist among the perceptions of social studies student-teachers, instructors, and administrators regarding the importance of selected secondary social studies teaching competencies. More specifically, an attempt was made to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference among social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators in their perceptions of the importance of social studies teaching competencies on the following clusters: planning instruction (P); objective teaching (O); concept teaching (C); class discussion (D); inquiry (I); value clarification (V); humanization (H); using multimedia (U); and evaluation (E)?

2. Do gender, grade-point average, satisfaction with curriculum, satisfaction with practicum and internship, and satisfaction with instructors' method of teaching of social studies student-teachers influence their perceptions of the importance of selected teaching competencies in social studies?

3. Do age, gender, years of teaching experience, degree earned, academic rank, and job satisfaction influence the perceptions of social studies instructors regarding the importance of selected teaching competencies in social studies?

4. Do age, gender, years of teaching and/or administrative experience, degree earned, academic rank, and job satisfaction influence the perceptions of administrators regarding the importance of selected teaching competencies in social studies?

5. What are the most important teaching competencies as rated by social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators?

The researcher constructed a survey instrument which was used for collecting data for this study. The instrument consisted of two parts. The first part contained demographic characteristics and the satisfaction level of the subjects. The second part contained 65 social studies teaching competencies which were grouped into nine clusters. The development of the questionnaire was based on related literature, similar studies, and renowned authorities (Boonyaraksa, 1988; Pumiputhavon, 1983; Sevatamorn, 1975; Stewart, 1976; and Zukowski, 1979). The questionnaire was then submitted to a panel of experts which consisted of five chairpersons of social studies departments and five instructors who teach instructional method courses in five

teachers college in Northern Thailand for revision and content validity. In order to test the reliability of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted. The test-retest with Spearman rank-order coefficient correlation method was employed. The results of analysis ranged from 0.77 to 0.92.

Permission was granted from the presidents of eight teachers colleges to conduct the study. Participants consisted of three groups: student-teachers, instructors, and administrators in eight teachers colleges in Northern Thailand. Each respondent received a questionnaire packet containing a cover letter of explanation, a copy of the questionnaire, and a return envelope.

The data obtained were analyzed to differentiate perceptions among the three groups of respondents. All respondents checked the following six point scales: 1--minimum importance, 2--little importance, 3--average importance, 4--above average importance, 5--maximum importance, and 0--no opinion.

The five research questions were tested. Significant difference was set at the .05 level. One-way analysis of variance along with Scheffe' statistical method was employed to test for significant difference among perceptions of student-teachers, instructors, and administrators. Dummy variable regression analysis was used to test the influence of independent variables on the perceptions of the three groups of respondents. Mean and standard deviation were

employed to determine the most important teaching competencies as rated by the three groups. The Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS) was used to analyze data at the University of North Texas Computer Center.

The analysis of the data is presented in Chapter 4. The following discussion of the results of the study is based upon the personal data, characteristics, and the perceptions of the three groups of participants regarding the selected social studies teaching competencies instrument being employed.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this research can be summarized as follows:

1. There is no significant difference among the perceptions of the three groups of respondents regarding the cluster of social studies teaching competencies. However, when these competencies are separated into individual items, there are significant differences between student-teachers and instructors, and student-teachers and administrators. For student-teachers and instructors, items that showed significance were Planning 1 (Use the teaching guides published by the Ministry of Education as guidelines to plan instruction), Objective 2 (Knowledge, abilities, valuing, and social participation are represented in the objectives of the program), Inquiry 3 (Stimulate students to identify and develop hypotheses), Value clarification 3 (Guide

students in weighting alternatives), Value clarification 5 (Assist students in discovering, examining and identifying alternative behaviors and solutions), Multimedia 1 (Select appropriate multimedia to meet stated objectives), Multimedia 3 (Use appropriate multimedia for proper content, time, and place to give depth and dimension to events), and Evaluation 5 (Evaluation data are used for planning curricular improvement). For student-teachers and administrators, items that showed significance were Objective 3 (General statements of goals translated into specific objectives are conceived in terms of behavior and content), Concept teaching 3 (Guide students in learning a concept by using questions, examples, non-examples, and problems), Inquiry 3 (Stimulate students to identify and develop hypotheses), Inquiry 5 (Guide students in evaluating hypotheses in terms of criterias), Inquiry 8 (Assist students in determining the implications of data and information), Inquiry 9 (Stimulate students to analyze attitudes, biases, and unstated assumptions), Value clarification 3 (Guide students in weighting alternatives), Value clarification 5 (Assist students in discovering, examining and identifying alternative behaviors and solutions), Multimedia 3 (Use appropriate multimedia for proper content, time, and place to give depth and dimension to events), and Multimedia 5 (Guide students in using multimedia and interpreting special kinds of media such as

maps, atlases). However, no significant difference was found between the perceptions of instructors and administrators.

2. Most of the independent variables that influenced perceptions of student-teachers fell into clusters of planning instruction and value clarification. However, some independent variables influenced student-teachers' perceptions in clusters of objective, concept teaching, class discussion, inquiry, humanization, using multimedia, and evaluation.

3. Only one independent variables, highest degree earned, showed a significant influence on the perception of instructors.

4. Most of the independent variables that influenced the administrators' perceptions were in clusters of concept teaching, and inquiry. However, there was one exception. There were some independent variables which influenced administrators' perceptions in clusters of objective, class discussion, humanization, and using multimedia.

5. The selected social studies competencies consistently perceived to be of relatively greater importance by the three groups of respondents were as follows:

A. Knowledge, abilities, valuing, and social participation are represented in the objectives of the program.

B. Use appropriate multimedia for proper content, time, and place to give depth and dimension to events.

C. Select appropriate multimedia to meet stated objectives.

D. Use correct Thai and appropriate language.

E. Guide students in identifying the contribution of all groups, people, and societies.

F. Objectives are reconsidered and revised periodically.

G. Plan scope and sequence of the curriculum in relation to students' abilities and understanding.

H. Guide students in applying the concept to different situations.

I. Present up-to-date information and discussion recent development in the field.

J. Assessment includes progress in knowledge, abilities, valuing, and participation.

Discussion

For clarity, the organization of this section corresponds to the five research questions.

1. The use of one-way analysis of variance to test significant difference among social studies student-teachers, instructors, and administrators revealed significance on the cluster of inquiry, and on the cluster of using multimedia. However, when Scheffe' method was employed to determine which pairs were significant, the

results indicated that there was no significant difference in any pairs of respondents. A reasonable explanation for this result is because Scheffe's method is the conservative test (Borg, 1983) which generally has a higher type II error rate for all pairwise comparisons. However, the Scheffe's test is employed in this study because it is appropriate for comparing groups of unequal numbers (Ferguson, 1981).

This finding is different from the findings of previous research. Stewart (1976) indicated that there were significant differences among perceptions of the groups of participants regarding the importance of social studies teaching competencies. However, there remained one exception. Stewart (1976) indicated that there was no significant difference between secondary school principals and college method course instructors. With the comparison of the finding from these two studies, the plausible explanation could be that the deviation from the two studies could be due to the difference of the populations. Stewart's subjects were secondary social studies teachers, secondary school principals, superintendents of schools, and method course teachers while subjects in this study were secondary social studies student-teachers, social studies instructors, and administrators in teachers colleges. Furthermore, it could be due to cultural backgrounds. Stewart's was in the United States while the subjects for this study were in Thailand.

According to the findings, a plausible explanation as to why the three groups of participants were very much in agreement that all of the nine clusters of competencies were important may be due to the fact that they share a need to improve the quality of the social studies program in order to be effective in the teaching and learning process. This research may provide a vehicle for the expression of participants's feelings that it is time to improve the social studies program. All nine clusters of competencies need to be involved, emphasized, and receive a lot of attention in order to achieve the highest quality of teaching in secondary social studies programs.

A review of the perceptions of the three groups of respondents regarding the importance of the total list of competencies indicated no significant difference between the perceptions of instructors and administrators. There was, however, a significant difference in the perceptions of student-teachers and instructors, and between student-teachers and administrators.

Therefore, it can be concluded that there was consistency across the groups of instructors and administrators in their assessment of social studies teaching competencies. The instructors and administrators perceived the level of importance of each item very similarly. One explanation may be the fact that in teachers colleges in Thailand, administrators often hold

administrative and instructor positions concurrently. Both administration and teaching are the primary task of administrators in Thailand. There is no clear separation between administrators and instructors. Besides, the most important thing is that administrators are elected from their colleagues and are required to serve in their administrative positions for a period of time (Department of Teachers Education, 1984). After their term expires, they must return to their faculty ranking. None are allowed to serve in administrative positions for more than two consecutive terms. It seems very hard to have a clear separation between instructors and administrators. Therefore, it is possible and reasonable that the perceptions of these two groups are very similar and generally in agreement because of this condition.

The student-teachers' perceptions were different from those of the other two groups. This may be because they have less experience in teaching than groups of administrators and instructors. Furthermore, as senior students, they may view those competencies from a student's perspective, which makes their status and role very different from the status of instructors and administrators.

It is noticeable that most of the items that showed significant difference in perceptions between student-teachers and instructors, and student-teachers and administrators fell into the clusters of inquiry, using

multimedia, and value clarification. A broad generalization is that student-teachers perceived the importance in inquiry and value clarification relatively low, while instructors and administrators perceived these clusters relatively high. A second generalization is that student-teachers' perception of the importance of the use of multimedia cluster competencies was higher than instructors' and administrators' perceptions of the competencies in this cluster.

Among the independent variables influencing the perceptions of student-teachers were gender, GPA, satisfaction with method of teaching of instructor, satisfaction with curriculum, and satisfaction with student-teachers' internship. The only independent variables that influenced the perceptions of instructors was highest degree earned. Independent variables that influenced the perceptions of administrators' were age, years of teaching and/or administrative experience, highest degree earned, academic rank, and level of satisfaction with job.

An interesting note concerning independent variables that influenced the perceptions of instructors and administrators was that instructors' perceptions regarding social studies teaching competencies were very consistent. None of the independent variables (except the highest degree earned) influenced their perceptions at all, while several

independent variables in the group of administrators influenced their perceptions regarding social studies teaching competencies.

However, even though in the group of instructors, independent variables rarely had an influence, and in the group of administrators they had a lot of influence, the results concerning their perceptions in social studies teaching competencies remained the same, both in clusters and in individual items. There was no significant difference between their perceptions.

Among the social studies teaching competencies which were perceived to be of greater importance by the three groups of respondents, student-teachers placed the most emphasis on the cluster of using multimedia. A plausible explanation might be that student-teachers have been taught to use media as an important aid to help in the process of teaching and learning. Another factor might be that use of media in teaching seems to make lessons more interesting and easier for students to understand.

Instructor and administrator groups both ranked the importance of this cluster relatively lower than student-teachers. A plausible explanation might be that, in a developing country like Thailand where resources are extremely limited, most secondary schools lack funds to provide adequate educational medias or supplies for classrooms. Furthermore, some kinds of media are too

expensive for schools. Therefore, instructors and administrators, who had the benefit of experience and greater exposure to multimedia, ranked the importance of the cluster of using multimedia lower than student-teachers did.

An examination of the highest mean scores in clusters of objective teaching and humanization as perceived by the three groups of respondents, can lead to the conclusion that the three groups of respondents agreed in the importance of cluster of objective teaching and clusters of humanization. This finding was similar to previous research. Stewart (1976) found that four groups of participants responding to the secondary social studies questionnaire perceived the cluster of humanization to be of most importance. There was one exception to this generalization, however. Stewart (1976) also indicated that the cluster of inquiry was also perceived as the most important as humanization cluster.

The findings from this research are different from the results from Pumiputhavon's (1983) study. The results of her study revealed that secondary social studies teachers in educational region four placed the greatest emphasis in the cluster of planning instruction, and instructional skills.

The cluster that was perceived to be of least importance by student-teachers, ranked ninth, was inquiry. This cluster was ranked seventh by instructors, and eighth by administrators.

This finding also supports the study by Sevatamorn (1975) which indicated that secondary social studies programs did not provide an adequate format that fostered inquiry or problem-solving for students. This finding also supports the work of Arunee (1980) on critical-thinking techniques for social studies education in Thailand. She indicated that the discussion and inquiry methods were rarely utilized in social studies classes and that lectures and note taking dominated the classroom.

In Thailand, according to the Thai cultural pattern, society has been rooted in the form and content of traditional monastery education. This seemed not to favor the method of inquiry in the process of teaching and learning. Memorization and chanting in unison were used as methods of teaching from the beginning of the kingdom in the thirteenth century (Wyatt, 1975, p.125). Students usually raised few questions, and did not provide feedback to teachers. However, after 1977, the Thai social studies curriculum was reformed. Inquiry techniques, including critical thinking and problem-solving skills, were implemented in the curriculum. Even in 1986, there still was an effort to emphasize the inquiry technique in the secondary social studies curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1986, p.9). However, the level of importance of this cluster found in this study was about the average level of satisfaction when compared with previous research.

The Meaning of the Research

Although mentioned earlier in the significance of this investigation, it may be useful to address the meaning of this research that had an impact on overall teacher education in Thailand. The findings of this research are important to teacher education as a whole in the following areas:

1. The study provides the idea to improve the method of teaching in the field of social studies. Some methods of teaching, such as lecture based on textbooks, memorization, and complete written worksheets, should be eliminated. Inquiry method should be emphasized and should be dominated in the classroom. Students should attempt to use the process of inquiry which includes critical thinking and problem-solving.

2. Because most students do not realize that the inquiry method is important in the process of teaching social studies, this research may motivate or arouse social studies instructors to emphasize and demonstrate the importance of this method.

3. The findings from this research indicate that consistency is important among the selected groups in the field of social studies. Therefore, this research provide guidelines or appropriate direction for emphasis in the process of teaching and learning in social studies programs.

4. In addition, the findings that this method of teaching is needed in social studies may lead to investigation in other field which will facilitate comparison of the results.

5. This investigation may challenge other researchers to conduct further research, thus improving the adequacy of research in social studies in Thailand. In doing so, this research will motivate the continuation of knowledge in social studies in Thailand.

6. This is the first research to provide clusters of social studies teaching competencies in humanization, inquiry, and value clarification, and is the first research to investigate perceptions of social studies student-teachers, instructors, and administrators regarding the importance of social studies teaching competencies in teachers colleges in Thailand; therefore, this research may serve as a pilot project to provide information and guidelines which can lead to further, more highly refined investigations.

7. Comments from some respondents, such as suggestions that teacher guides be published by the Ministry of Education, may lead to improvements and profound revisions by the Ministry of Education.

Conclusions

The review of literature conducted for this research indicates that teaching competencies in social studies are necessary and can be a means of initiating change in the process of teaching and learning. Competent teachers who function to the best of their capacities are necessary. Researchers in the United States and Thailand agree that teaching is the central most important element in helping students to learn. The teacher is the key figure in the process of creating and sustaining an environment for achieving effective social studies learning.

The results of this study generally indicate a high level of agreement among student-teachers, instructors, and administrators regarding their perceptions of the importance of social studies teaching competencies. This agreement may be due to the fact that all three groups feel a need to improve the quality of the social studies program is necessary in order to be effective in the teaching and learning process. This research may provide a vehicle for the expression of participants' feelings that it is time to improve the social studies program. All nine clusters of competencies should be involved and emphasized in order to achieve the highest quality of secondary social studies programs.

An interesting result of the study was the fact that the demographic variable "highest degree earned"

significantly affected the perceptions of instructors and administrators regarding the importance of social studies teaching competencies. This indicates that the highest degree earned, which varied among the participants, influenced their perceptions and, perhaps, that administrators in the department of teacher education should encourage and support instructors and administrators to earn advanced degrees.

Demographic variables regarding gender and whether the highest degree was received in Thailand or in another country were not significant but have interesting implications. The fact that gender had no significant influence on the perceptions of instructors and administrators regarding their perceptions of social studies teaching competencies indicated that Thailand has made major advancement in reaching equality for males and females. Another somewhat surprising discovery was that whether instructors' and administrators' highest degree was received in Thailand or another country did not significantly affect their perceptions regarding social studies teaching competencies. It was expected that instructors and administrators who received their highest degree in developed countries such as the United States would perceive the social studies teaching competencies differently from those whose highest degree was earned in the developing country of Thailand.

However, the findings of this study have some limitations. They apply only for the type of methodology employed in this study: survey research using the Social Studies Teaching Competencies Questionnaire. Additional research, concerning social studies teaching competencies, could determine possible variations of results due to differences in methodology.

Implications and Recommendations for Further Research

On the basis of the findings of this research, the following implications and recommendations for further study are made:

1. Since inadequate research has been conducted previously in the area of social studies in Thailand, it is recommended that more research in social studies teaching competencies be conducted in order to investigate variations of findings caused from differences in methodologies employed.

2. Social studies programs in teachers colleges in Thailand should be especially aware of all of the nine clusters of social studies teaching competencies.

3. Emphasis should be placed on the clusters of objective teaching and humanization which are consistently perceived as the most important clusters by all the three groups of participants. The competencies in those two clusters should be refined and further clarified.

4. Items consistently ranked by the three groups to be most important among the 15 competencies should receive greater priority in the classroom than other competencies. In addition, an effort should be made to determine if teachers having these competencies result in students who learn more effectively.

5. The inquiry technique, involved in the process of teaching and learning in social studies, is a particularly important competency in developed countries. Therefore, it should be recognized to be important by all three groups of respondents, particularly student-teachers.

6. The instrument developed for this study may be useful for applying the interview method in order to validate the opinions of the groups of respondents.

7. It is recommended that further research be conducted by providing participants the opportunity to make a definite value judgements, that is to say that one competency is more important than another. The participants could rank order the competencies.

8. In-service education in areas of social studies is valuable for teachers in the field. Therefore, in order to enhance effective teaching in social studies, it is recommended that educational institutions provide more leadership in planning in-service experiences to help teachers improve their classroom behavior, thus leading to more effective teaching and learning.

9. The Ministry of Education in Thailand should establish a task force to study programs leading to certification for secondary social studies teachers. This task force might use the information found in this study to establish a position paper on guidelines and standards for the preparation of secondary social studies teachers.

10. Since this study was limited in sample size by teachers colleges located in Northern Thailand, it would be worthwhile to replicate the study with all 36 teachers colleges in Thailand.

11. Finally, according to the findings from this research, it is recommended that further research should be extended to other samples, such as superintendents of schools districts, presidents and vice presidents (who work on administrative tasks only), and instructors who teach methods of teaching in social studies only.

APPENDIX A

THE SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHING COMPETENCIES QUESTIONNAIRE

THE SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHING COMPETENCIES QUESTIONNAIRE
(For Student-Teachers)

Part I: Demographic Data Sheet

Instruction: Please check the appropriate alternative that best describes or applies to you in each item.

1. Your sex:
 - (a) Male
 - (b) Female

2. Your GPA (Grade-point average)
 - (a) Below 2.00
 - (b) 2.00-2.50
 - (c) 2.51-3.00
 - (d) Above 3.00

3. Level of satisfaction with content of social studies curriculum (require course only)
 - (a) Very dissatisfied
 - (b) Dissatisfied
 - (c) Satisfied
 - (d) Very Satisfied
 - (e) Most satisfied

4. Level of satisfaction with your internship (student teaching in social studies in secondary school).
 - (a) Very dissatisfied
 - (b) Dissatisfied
 - (c) Satisfied
 - (d) Very Satisfied
 - (e) Most satisfied

5. Level of satisfaction with instructors' method of teaching (instructors who teach courses in professional education only)
 - (a) Very dissatisfied
 - (b) Dissatisfied
 - (c) Satisfied
 - (d) Very Satisfied
 - (e) Most satisfied

THE SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHING COMPETENCIES QUESTIONNAIRE
(For Instructors)

Part I: Demographic Data Sheet

Instruction: Please check the appropriate alternative that best describes or applies to you in each item.

1. Your age (years):
 - (a) Under 30
 - (b) 30-40
 - (c) 41-50
 - (d) 51-60
 - (e) Over 60

2. Your sex:
 - (a) Male
 - (b) Female

3. Years of teaching experience:
 - (a) Less than 5
 - (b) 5-10
 - (c) 11-15
 - (d) 16-20
 - (e) More than 20

4. Highest degree earned:
 - (a) Bachelor's
 - (b) Master's
 - (c) Doctorate
 - (d) Others

5. Academic rank:
 - (a) Instructor
 - (b) Assistant professor
 - (c) Associate professor
 - (d) Professor

6. Highest degree received from:
 - (a) Thailand
 - (b) Other country

7. Your job satisfaction (in general):
 - (a) Very dissatisfied
 - (b) Dissatisfied
 - (c) Satisfied
 - (d) Very Satisfied
 - (e) Most satisfied

THE SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHING COMPETENCIES QUESTIONNAIRE
(For Administrators)

Part I: Demographic Data Sheet

Instruction: Please check the appropriate alternative that best describes or applies to you in each item.

1. Your age (years):
 - (a) Under 30
 - (b) 30-40
 - (c) 41-50
 - (d) 51-60
 - (e) Over 60

2. Your sex:
 - (a) Male
 - (b) Female

3. Years of teaching and/or administrative experience:
 - (a) Less than 5
 - (b) 5-10
 - (c) 11-15
 - (d) 16-20
 - (e) More than 20

4. Highest degree earned:
 - (a) Bachelor's
 - (b) Master's
 - (c) Doctorate
 - (d) Others

5. Academic rank:
 - (a) Instructor
 - (b) Assistant professor
 - (c) Associate professor
 - (d) Professor

6. Highest degree received from:
 - (a) Thailand
 - (b) Other country

7. Your job satisfaction (in general):
 - (a) Very dissatisfied
 - (b) Dissatisfied
 - (c) Satisfied
 - (d) Very Satisfied
 - (e) Most satisfied

Part II: Competency Rating

Instruction: Below are listed competencies that are associated with teaching competencies in secondary social studies as based upon educational research. Please rate your perception concerning the relative importance of each competencies.

Please circle the number that most accurately describes your perceptions of the importance of selected teaching competencies in secondary social studies on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. A weight of 1 indicates minimum importance, a weight of 2 indicates little importance, a weight of 3 indicates average importance, a weight of 4 indicates above average importance, and a weight of 5 indicates maximum importance.

If you wish to make a comment on a particular item, please use the blank space following each item or use the back of the page for that purpose.

If you do not really have any opinion for a particular item, just circle the 0 scale, which indicates no opinion.

Scale Value:

- 1 = minimum importance 4 = above average importance
 2 = little importance 5 = maximum importance
 3 = average importance 0 = no opinion

Rating						Competencies
1	2	3	4	5	0	O2. Knowledge, abilities, valuing, and social participation are represented in the objectives of the program. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	O3. General statements of goals translated into specific objectives are conceived in terms of behavior and content. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	O4. Classroom instruction and materials based upon stated objectives. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	O5. Objectives are reconsidered and revised periodically. comments:----- ----- -----

Concept Teaching (C)

1	2	3	4	5	0	C1. Structure activities by which students can form concepts and generalizations by the inductive approach. comments:----- ----- -----
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Scale Value:

- 1 = minimum importance 4 = above average importance
 2 = little importance 5 = maximum importance
 3 = average importance 0 = no opinion

Rating						Competencies
1	2	3	4	5	0	C2. Structure activities by which students can form concepts and generalizations by the deductive approach. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	C3. Guide students in learning a concept by using questions, examples, non-examples, and problems. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	C4. Assist students in recognizing similarities and differences in elements. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	C5. Guide students in recognizing the relationship of parts to the whole. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	C6. Guide students in applying the concept to different situations. comments:----- ----- -----

Scale Value:

- 1 = minimum importance 4 = above average importance
 2 = little importance 5 = maximum importance
 3 = average importance 0 = no opinion

Rating							Competencies
Class Discussion (D)							
1	2	3	4	5	0	D1.	Use correct Thai and appropriate language.
							comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	D2.	Answer students' questions satisfactorily.
							comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	D3.	Present up-to-date information and discussion recent development in the field.
							comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	D4.	Attempt to get feedback from students.
							comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	D5.	Do not assume that students already know the subject.
							comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	D6.	Know when students are bored or confused.
							comments:-----

Scale Value:

1 = minimum importance 4 = above average importance
 2 = little importance 5 = maximum importance
 3 = average importance 0 = no opinion

Rating							Competencies
1	2	3	4	5	0	D7. Encourage students to do their best.	
comments:-----							

1	2	3	4	5	0	D8. Treat students with respect.	
comments:-----							

Inquiry (I)							
1	2	3	4	5	0	I1. Guide students in a step-by-step procedure for finding, recognizing and defining problems.	
comments:-----							

1	2	3	4	5	0	I2. Assist students in developing a solution to a problem.	
comments:-----							

1	2	3	4	5	0	I3. Stimulate students to identify and develop hypotheses.	
comments:-----							

1	2	3	4	5	0	I4. Stimulate students to differentiate between hypotheses, analytical statements, and definition of statements.	
comments:-----							

Scale Value:

1 = minimum importance 4 = above average importance
 2 = little importance 5 = maximum importance
 3 = average importance 0 = no opinion

Rating						Competencies
1	2	3	4	5	0	I5. Guide students in evaluating hypotheses in terms of criterias. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	I6. Guide students in distinguishing between and using primary and secondary sources. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	I7. Assist students in revising unsupported hypotheses for further research. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	I8. Assist students in determining the implications of data and information. comments:----- ----- -----
1	2	3	4	5	0	I9. Stimulate students to analyze attitudes, biases, motives and unstated assumptions. comments:----- ----- -----

Scale Value:

- 1 = minimum importance 4 = above average importance
- 2 = little importance 5 = maximum importance
- 3 = average importance 0 = no opinion

Rating						Competencies
--------	--	--	--	--	--	--------------

1 2 3 4 5 0 I10. Guide students in comparing and contrasting points of view, theories, generalizations, and facts.

comments:-----

1 2 3 4 5 0 I11. Guide students in applying principles and generalizations to different situations.

comments:-----

Value Clarification (V)

1 2 3 4 5 0 V1. Stimulate students by asking open-ended questions.

comments:-----

1 2 3 4 5 0 V2. Encourage students to make choices freely.

comments:-----

1 2 3 4 5 0 V3. Guide students in weighting alternatives.

comments:-----

Scale Value:

- 1 = minimum importance 4 = above average importance
- 2 = little importance 5 = maximum importance
- 3 = average importance 0 = no opinion

Rating						Competencies
--------	--	--	--	--	--	--------------

1	2	3	4	5	0	H2. Use students as resource persons, giving students the opportunity to learn from each other.
						comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	H3. Guide students in identifying the contribution of all groups, people and societies.
						comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	H4. Guide students in weighting individual action in terms of its benefit to other individuals, groups, and societies.
						comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	H5. Guide students in analyzing the importance of such ideas as "respect for others," "dignity and worth of the individual," and "respect and equality for all."
						comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	H6. Stimulate students by structuring activities which allow interaction with people who are different.
						comments:-----

Scale Value:

- 1 = minimum importance 4 = above average importance
- 2 = little importance 5 = maximum importance
- 3 = average importance 0 = no opinion

Rating						Competencies
--------	--	--	--	--	--	--------------

1	2	3	4	5	0	E5. Evaluation data are used for planning curricular improvement.
						comments:-----

1	2	3	4	5	0	E6. Assessment includes progress in knowledge, abilities, valuing, and participation.
						comments:-----

APPENDIX B

THAI SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

THAI SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM
Leading to Baccalaureate Degree

Program of Study

- I. General Education--40 credit hours
- II. General Core Requirements for Major--60 credit hours
 1. Required Courses--23 credit hours
 - 2672103--Ethics
 - 2681403--Principle of Sociology
 - 2684903--Seminar in Social Studies
 - 2681410--Introduction to Social Sciences
 - 2694402--History of Modern Europe
 - 2711101--Physical Geography
 - 2723104--Political & Economics Ideologies
 - 4611102--Principle of Economics
 2. Additional Courses--37 credit hours, selected from the following:
 - 2671101--Introduction to Philosophy
 - 2671102--Introduction to Logics
 - 2673105--Meditation
 - 2673106--Introduction to Political Economic and Social Philosophy
 - 2673110--Philosophy of Buddhism
 - 2671201--Buddhism Study
 - 2671202--Ethics and Lives
 - 2672205--Practical Religion
 - 2673209--Comparative Religion
 - 2673213--Religion Commandment II (Islamic)
 - 2674215--Culture and Society (Islamic)
 - 2674218--Islamic
 - 2674219--Critiques in Buddhism Studies
 - 2681101--Introduction to Anthropology
 - 2683201--Applied Anthropology in Community Development
 - 2683202--Medical Anthropology
 - 2682302--Foundation of Thai Culture
 - 2681401--Man and Society
 - 2681402--Introduction to Sociology
 - 2682404--Rural and Urban Sociology
 - 2683405--Social Problems
 - 2682406--Thai Culture and Society
 - 2683408--Social and Culture Change
 - 2682503--Population and life Quality Development
 - 2683504--Population Education
 - 2683505--Education Sociology
 - 2684513--Medical Sociology

2684514--Sociology of Administration
2684515--Sociology of Tourism
2684516--Sociology of Economic Development
2684517--Sociology of Government
2682601--Community Development
2684617--Appropriate Technology and Rural Life
2684618--Introduction to Social Research
2692106--Thai History III
2693107--Thai History IV
2693108--Local History
2691202--Present World Situations
2693208--History of Human Rights
2693209--History of Peace
2693210--History of Science and Technological
Development
2693211--Survey World History
2691301--History of Southeast Asia
2692305--History of East Asia
2692307--History of South Asia
2692308--History of China
2692309--History of Australia and New Zealand
2694310--History of Middle East and Islamic
Influence
2693401--History of Europe
2692405--History of the Soviet Union
2692504--History of the United States
2693603--History of Africa
2693701--Proseminar in History
2694705--Philosophy of Historical Study
2711107--Human Resource Geography
2711201--Economic Geography
2712206--Agricultural Geography
2713207--Political Geography
2713221--Geography of Man Settlement
2711216--Man and Environments
2711217--Conservation and Management of Natural
Resources
2712302--Thai Analytical Geography
2712303--Local Geography
2712304--Geography of Asia
2712305--Geography of South East Asia
2713307--Geography of the Soviet Union
2714310--Geography of Anglo-America
2714311--Geography of Latin America
2714312--Geography of Australia and Oceania
2714313--Geography of Africa
2711314--World Regional Geography
2711401--Map and Interpretation
2714402--Techniques and Geographical Study
2721102--Local Government
2722103--International Relations
2723105--Management of Local Organization

2724106--Political Development
 2723107--Problems in Thai Politics
 2721201--Introduction to Laws
 2722204--Agricultural Business Laws
 2722205--Legal Action and Contracts
 2722206--Co-operative Laws
 2722208--Introduction to Mass Communication Laws
 2723211--Constitution Laws and Laws in Daily
 Life
 4611105--History of Economic Ideology
 4612108--Agricultural Economics
 4612202--Thai Economy
 4612203--Structure of Thai Economy
 4614207--International Economics
 4613301--Introduction to Economic Analysis
 4613302--Economic and Social Development
 4631102--Principles of Co-operation
 4631103--Establishment and Operating Cooperation
 4632104--Co-operation Management
 4632105--Agricultural Co-operation

III. Professional Education Requirements--25 credit hours

1. Required Courses--19 credit hours
 - 2111108--Teaching Profession
 - 2111109--Thai Education
 - 2121207--Psychology of Teaching and Learning
 - 2132121--Evaluation and Test Construction
 - 2142305--Principles of Teaching
 - 2152113--Educational Technology
 - 2123623--Adolescence Psychology and Guidance
 - 2143208--Curriculum and Administration in
Secondary Education

2. Additional Courses--6 credit hours, selected from
the following:
 - 2111102--Media for Teacher
 - 2112105--Compulsory Education
 - 2113107--Nonformal Education
 - 2111201--Comparative Study
 - 2111203--Educational Psychology
 - 2113206--Community School Management
 - 2114207--Educational Activity for Community
 - 2111301--Principles of Educational
Administration
 - 2112304--Laws Education
 - 2114311--Educational Supervision
 - 2113319--Basic Skills for Career and Vocational
Education
 - 2113320--Vocational Education
 - 2112307--Educational Institution & Teaching
Professional Development

2112405--Career Education
 2123204--Psychology and Teaching Techniques for
 Nonformal Student
 2123302--Theory and Practice of Social
 Psychology
 2123303--Community Psychology
 2122506--Human Relations for Teachers
 2124510--Mental Hygiene
 2131301--Educational Statistics
 2133404--Introduction to Educational Research
 2141201--Elementary Curriculum and Curriculum
 Materials
 2143202--Co-curriculum Activities
 2143206--Secondary Curriculum and Curriculum
 Materials
 2141209--Social Studies Textbooks Analysis
 2143302--Skill and Techniques of Instructions
 2151204--Educational Medias
 2152305--Medias for Teaching Geography
 2152306--Medias for Teaching Social Studies
 2162442--Fundamental Recreations for Teachers
 2173304--Legend & Puppets for Early Childhood
 2173502--Administration and Management of
 Kindergarten and Nursery Schools
 2173304--Creativity
 2181101--Basic Knowledge of Special Education
 2633502--Children's Literature

- IV. Practicum & Internship--12 credit hours
- 2143608--Teaching Behaviors in Social Studies
 - 2101803--Field Observation I
 - 2102805--Participation I
 - 2143808--Pre-student Teaching Internship
 - 2104811--Student Teaching in Secondary School
- V. Elective Courses--6 credit hours

APPENDIX C

THE RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

THE RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT OF THE INSTRUMENT
USING SPEARMAN RANK ORDER

Competencies	Group 1 R (N = 10)	Group 2 R (N = 10)	Group 3 R (N = 10)
P 1	0.92	0.85	0.87
P 2	0.81	0.90	0.85
P 3	0.87	0.89	0.89
P 4	0.80	0.87	0.79
P 5	0.79	0.90	0.80
P 6	0.82	0.88	0.79
P 7	0.90	0.90	0.92
P 8	0.86	0.86	0.84
P 9	0.87	0.84	0.79
P 10	0.85	0.83	0.88
O 1	0.80	0.89	0.85
O 2	0.90	0.81	0.88
O 3	0.82	0.79	0.82
O 4	0.82	0.81	0.80
O 5	0.77	0.80	0.79
C 1	0.81	0.87	0.85
C 2	0.86	0.89	0.88
C 3	0.81	0.86	0.84
C 4	0.77	0.78	0.79
C 5	0.84	0.80	0.79
C 6	0.86	0.89	0.86
D 1	0.91	0.81	0.86
D 2	0.84	0.78	0.79
D 3	0.85	0.79	0.81
D 4	0.79	0.81	0.78
D 5	0.92	0.90	0.89
D 6	0.87	0.91	0.89
D 7	0.85	0.88	0.86
D 8	0.84	0.89	0.88
I 1	0.90	0.92	0.89
I 2	0.91	0.90	0.90
I 3	0.85	0.88	0.89
I 4	0.80	0.87	0.88
I 5	0.83	0.87	0.84
I 6	0.86	0.79	0.78
I 7	0.88	0.79	0.81
I 8	0.78	0.83	0.80
I 9	0.81	0.88	0.79

I 10	0.84	0.87	0.85
I 11	0.80	0.78	0.79
V 1	0.77	0.80	0.81
V 2	0.85	0.81	0.79
V 3	0.86	0.89	0.85
V 4	0.81	0.80	0.84
V 5	0.84	0.82	0.84
V 6	0.85	0.83	0.81
V 7	0.80	0.84	0.85
H 1	0.81	0.87	0.86
H 2	0.80	0.83	0.79
H 3	0.83	0.81	0.79
H 4	0.77	0.82	0.82
H 5	0.82	0.85	0.86
H 6	0.78	0.80	0.84
H 7	0.79	0.83	0.81
U 1	0.88	0.79	0.78
U 2	0.77	0.80	0.83
U 3	0.85	0.83	0.81
U 4	0.83	0.79	0.78
U 5	0.82	0.89	0.84
E 1	0.81	0.88	0.82
E 2	0.81	0.83	0.84
E 3	0.85	0.89	0.85
E 4	0.84	0.86	0.84
E 5	0.78	0.80	0.81
E 6	0.80	0.91	0.88

Note: $p = .0001$
 Group 1 = Student-teachers
 Group 2 = Instructors
 Group 3 = Administrators

PILOT STUDYNUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED AND RATE OF RETURN

	Number	Returned	Percentage
Student-teachers	10	10	100
Instructors	10	10	100
Administrators	10	10	100
Total	30	30	100

APPENDIX D

DETAILED PARAMETER ESTIMATES IN DUMMY VARIABLE
REGRESSION ANALYSIS

DETAILED PARAMETER ESTIMATES IN THE DUMMY VARIABLE
REGRESSION ANALYSES

I. Student-teacher Group

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: P1

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	2.941537	0.706141	4.166	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.116005	0.200807	-0.578	0.5647
GP2	1	0.057114	0.714092	0.080	0.9364
GP3	1	0.140096	0.718554	0.195	0.8458
GP4	1	-0.483396	0.734937	-0.658	0.5121
SC2	1	0.827367	0.341439	2.423	0.0371
SC3	1	0.764974	0.343705	2.226	0.0481
SI2	1	-0.511000	0.605385	-0.844	0.4005
SI3	1	-0.337618	0.605171	-0.558	0.5781
SM2	1	0.689568	0.326282	2.113	0.0369
SM3	1	0.893308	0.335277	2.664	0.0089

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: P4

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	5.091278	0.572699	8.890	0.0001
SX2	1	0.386207	0.162860	2.371	0.0495
GP2	1	-0.881507	0.579147	-1.522	0.1309
GP3	1	-1.098638	0.582766	-1.885	0.0621
GP4	1	-0.779833	0.596053	-1.308	0.1936
SC2	1	-0.123095	0.276916	-0.445	0.6576
SC3	1	-0.071768	0.278754	-0.257	0.7973
SI2	1	-0.187257	0.490984	-0.381	0.7037
SI3	1	0.006408	0.490810	-0.013	0.9896
SM2	1	-0.104380	0.264623	-0.394	0.6940
SM3	1	0.074694	0.271919	0.275	0.7841

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: O3

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.929301	0.599134	6.558	0.0001
SX2	1	0.241671	0.170377	1.418	0.1590
GP2	1	-1.061400	0.605880	-1.752	0.0247
GP3	1	-0.938634	0.609666	-1.540	0.0666

GP4	1	-1.103835	0.623567	-1.770	0.0331
SC2	1	0.136265	0.289698	0.470	0.6390
SC3	1	0.547020	0.291621	1.876	0.0634
SI2	1	0.289863	0.513647	0.564	0.5737
SI3	1	0.478719	0.513465	0.932	0.3533
SM2	1	0.115656	0.276838	0.418	0.6769
SM3	1	-0.060717	0.284470	-0.213	0.8314

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: C5

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.770541	0.671299	5.617	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.040695	0.190899	-0.213	0.8316
GP2	1	-0.113054	0.678857	-0.167	0.8680
GP3	1	-0.483919	0.683099	-0.708	0.4802
GP4	1	0.121261	0.698674	0.174	0.8625
SC2	1	0.309833	0.324592	0.955	0.3420
SC3	1	0.711619	0.326746	2.178	0.0316
SI2	1	-0.522269	0.575514	-0.907	0.3662
SI3	1	-0.602682	0.575311	-1.048	0.2972
SM2	1	0.349979	0.310182	1.128	0.2617
SM3	1	0.260126	0.318734	0.816	0.4162

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: D4

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.870868	0.622957	6.214	0.0001
SX2	1	0.370417	0.177151	2.091	0.0389
GP2	1	-0.529021	0.629970	-0.840	0.4029
GP3	1	-0.470176	0.633907	-0.742	0.4599
GP4	1	0.176272	0.648360	0.272	0.7862
SC2	1	-0.063773	0.301217	-0.212	0.8327
SC3	1	0.008277	0.303216	0.027	0.9783
SI2	1	0.079543	0.534070	0.149	0.8819
SI3	1	0.252975	0.533881	0.474	0.6366
SM2	1	0.002989	0.287845	-0.010	0.9917
SM3	1	0.172011	0.295781	0.582	0.5621

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: I7

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.997439	0.686717	5.821	0.0001
SX2	1	0.009445	0.195283	-0.048	0.9615
GP2	1	-0.429183	0.694449	-0.618	0.5379
GP3	1	-0.634235	0.698788	-0.908	0.3661
GP4	1	-0.278763	0.714721	-0.390	0.6973

SC2	1	0.368697	0.332047	1.110	0.2693
SC3	1	0.388471	0.334250	1.162	0.2477
SI2	1	-0.336968	0.588733	-0.572	0.5683
SI3	1	-0.165366	0.588525	-0.281	0.7793
SM2	1	-0.217983	0.317307	-0.687	0.4936
SM3	1	0.334853	0.326055	1.027	0.3067

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: V1

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.244840	0.651527	6.515	0.0001
SX2	1	0.187252	0.185276	1.011	0.3145
GP2	1	0.094022	0.658862	0.143	0.8868
GP3	1	0.227309	0.662979	0.343	0.7324
GP4	1	0.666451	0.678096	0.983	0.3279
SC2	1	0.070147	0.315032	0.223	0.8242
SC3	1	0.469570	0.317122	1.481	0.1416
SI2	1	-1.328716	0.558564	-2.379	0.0191
SI3	1	-1.179561	0.558366	-2.113	0.0370
SM2	1	0.220309	0.301047	0.732	0.4659
SM3	1	0.346859	0.309346	1.121	0.2647

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: V3

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.771716	0.614574	7.764	0.0001
SX2	1	0.132126	0.174768	0.756	0.4513
GP2	1	-1.471245	0.621494	-2.367	0.0197
GP3	1	-1.635808	0.625377	-2.616	0.0102
GP4	1	-1.406097	0.639636	-2.198	0.0301
SC2	1	-0.209360	0.297164	-0.705	0.4826
SC3	1	0.283791	0.299136	0.949	0.3449
SI2	1	0.252842	0.526884	0.480	0.6323
SI3	1	0.168059	0.526697	0.319	0.7503
SM2	1	0.004716	0.283972	0.017	0.9868
SM3	1	0.081014	0.291801	0.278	0.7818

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: H4

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.334143	0.570268	7.600	0.0001
SX2	1	0.169876	0.162168	1.048	0.2972
GP2	1	-0.763305	0.576688	-1.324	0.1885
GP3	1	-1.352356	0.580292	-2.330	0.0217
GP4	1	-1.202009	0.593523	-2.025	0.0453
SC2	1	-0.114034	0.275740	-0.414	0.6800

SC3	1	-0.342152	0.277570	-1.233	0.2204
SI2	1	0.302810	0.488899	0.619	0.5370
SI3	1	0.352103	0.488726	0.720	0.4728
SM2	1	0.321760	0.263500	1.221	0.2247
SM3	1	0.676679	0.270764	2.499	0.0140

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: U4

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.756108	0.611069	6.147	0.0001
SX2	1	0.144631	0.173771	0.832	0.4071
GP2	1	0.624564	0.617949	1.011	0.3144
GP3	1	0.570889	0.621810	0.918	0.3606
GP4	1	0.924590	0.635988	1.454	0.1489
SC2	1	-0.102840	0.295469	-0.348	0.7285
SC3	1	0.003028	0.297429	0.010	0.9919
SI2	1	-1.130523	0.523878	-2.158	0.0332
SI3	1	-0.811988	0.523693	-1.551	0.1240
SM2	1	0.296742	0.282352	1.051	0.2956
SM3	1	0.422996	0.290137	1.458	0.1478

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: E2

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.349386	0.597776	5.603	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.122692	0.169991	-0.722	0.4720
GP2	1	-0.782616	0.604506	-1.295	0.1982
GP3	1	-0.607997	0.608283	-1.000	0.3198
GP4	1	-0.432327	0.622152	-0.695	0.4886
SC2	1	-0.359027	0.289041	-1.242	0.2169
SC3	1	-0.147762	0.290959	-0.508	0.6126
SI2	1	0.991644	0.512482	1.935	0.0556
SI3	1	0.929012	0.512301	1.813	0.0726
SM2	1	0.519977	0.276210	1.883	0.0625
SM3	1	0.930362	0.283825	3.278	0.0014

II. Instructor Group

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: P6

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.044139	0.637365	6.345	0.0001
SX2	1	0.144877	0.186063	0.779	0.4389
AG2	1	-0.223584	0.222429	-1.005	0.3184
AG3	1	-0.244927	0.356013	-0.688	0.4938

YR2	1	0.633766	0.337849	1.876	0.1650
YR3	1	0.890629	0.344501	2.585	0.1119
YR4	1	0.523527	0.390503	1.341	0.1846
DE2	1	0.213076	0.193775	1.100	0.0154
DF1	1	0.342366	0.307180	1.115	0.2690
AC1	1	-0.172061	0.242328	-0.710	0.4801
SJ2	1	-0.883120	0.387539	-2.279	0.1259
SJ3	1	-0.523751	0.410182	-1.277	0.2061

III. Administrator Group

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: O1

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.385703	0.606616	7.230	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.211603	0.200609	-1.055	0.2954
AG2	1	-0.340770	0.217520	-1.567	0.0413
AG3	1	-0.065552	0.305289	-0.215	0.8307
YR2	1	0.367888	0.244365	1.505	0.1370
YR3	1	0.122646	0.276068	0.444	0.6583
YR4	1	0.237444	0.263045	0.903	0.3700
DE1	1	-0.346239	0.399817	-0.866	0.3897
DE2	1	0.451434	0.356768	1.265	0.2103
DF1	1	-0.126640	0.263396	-0.481	0.6323
AC1	1	-0.503865	0.413866	-1.217	0.2278
AC2	1	-0.532281	0.445811	-1.194	0.2368
SJ2	1	0.143476	0.312987	0.458	0.6482
SJ3	1	0.299428	0.301712	0.992	0.3247

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: O2

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.372079	0.692330	6.315	0.0001
SX2	1	0.077578	0.228955	0.339	0.7358
AG2	1	-0.166456	0.248255	-0.671	0.5049
AG3	1	0.426203	0.348426	1.223	0.2257
YR2	1	-0.096419	0.278894	-0.346	0.7307
YR3	1	-0.060415	0.315075	-0.192	0.8485
YR4	1	0.015959	0.300212	0.053	0.9578
DE1	1	-0.440216	0.456310	-0.965	0.1901
DE2	1	0.167570	0.407179	0.412	0.6820
DF1	1	-0.020991	0.300613	-0.070	0.9445
AC1	1	-0.393526	0.472344	-0.833	0.4078
AC2	1	-0.195299	0.508803	-0.384	0.7023
SJ2	1	0.141382	0.357211	0.396	0.6936
SJ3	1	0.384443	0.344344	1.116	0.2683

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: C1

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.776290	0.649169	5.817	0.0001
SX2	1	0.198053	0.214682	0.923	0.3597
AG2	1	-0.402458	0.232778	-1.729	0.0886
AG3	1	-0.081136	0.326704	-0.248	0.8046
YR2	1	0.528255	0.261507	2.020	0.0475
YR3	1	0.295489	0.295433	1.000	0.3209
YR4	1	0.344692	0.281497	1.224	0.2252
DE1	1	-0.616222	0.427863	-1.440	0.1546
DE2	1	0.267075	0.381795	0.700	0.4867
DF1	1	0.230062	0.281873	0.816	0.4174
AC1	1	0.119475	0.442898	0.270	0.7882
AC2	1	0.221965	0.477084	0.465	0.6433
SJ2	1	-0.402788	0.334942	-1.203	0.2335
SJ3	1	-0.024176	0.322877	-0.075	0.9405

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: C2

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.992409	0.580770	6.874	0.0001
SX2	1	0.168936	0.192062	0.880	0.3823
AG2	1	-0.192252	0.208252	-0.923	0.3593
AG3	1	0.244150	0.292281	0.835	0.4066
YR2	1	0.204514	0.233953	0.874	0.3852
YR3	1	0.122197	0.264305	0.462	0.6454
YR4	1	-0.013373	0.251837	-0.053	0.9578
DE1	1	-0.796035	0.382781	-2.080	0.0415
DE2	1	0.040100	0.341567	0.117	0.9069
DF1	1	0.257845	0.252173	1.022	0.3103
AC1	1	0.233157	0.396232	0.588	0.5583
AC2	1	0.236024	0.426816	0.553	0.5822
SJ2	1	-0.489232	0.299651	-1.633	0.0130
SJ3	1	-0.041421	0.288857	-0.143	0.2599

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: C4

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.035821	0.579911	6.959	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.274242	0.191778	-1.430	0.1575
AG2	1	-0.167826	0.207944	-0.807	0.4226
AG3	1	0.062327	0.291849	0.214	0.8316
YR2	1	0.008393	0.233607	-0.036	0.9714
YR3	1	-0.016100	0.263914	-0.061	0.9515
YR4	1	0.210461	0.251465	0.837	0.4057

DE1	1	-0.885463	0.382215	-2.317	0.0237
DE2	1	-0.136139	0.341062	-0.399	0.6911
DF1	1	0.406922	0.251800	1.616	0.1109
AC1	1	0.153264	0.395646	0.387	0.6997
AC2	1	-0.022394	0.426185	-0.053	0.9583
SJ2	1	-0.304106	0.299208	-1.016	0.3132
SJ3	1	-0.016173	0.288430	-0.056	0.9555

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: C5

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.025209	0.704610	5.713	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.238310	0.233016	-1.023	0.3102
AG2	1	-0.187271	0.252658	-0.741	0.4612
AG3	1	0.305977	0.354606	0.863	0.3914
YR2	1	-0.039042	0.283840	-0.138	0.8910
YR3	1	0.369109	0.320664	1.151	0.2539
YR4	1	0.108031	0.305537	0.354	0.7248
DE1	1	-0.753528	0.464403	-1.623	0.0390
DE2	1	0.014496	0.414401	0.035	0.8422
DF1	1	0.464013	0.305945	1.517	0.1342
AC1	1	-0.022971	0.480722	-0.048	0.9620
AC2	1	-0.308702	0.517828	-0.596	0.5531
SJ2	1	-0.362269	0.363547	-0.996	0.0167
SJ3	1	0.087048	0.350451	0.248	0.1356

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: C6

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.010570	0.536305	7.478	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.027885	0.177357	-0.157	0.8756
AG2	1	-0.394428	0.192307	-2.051	0.0443
AG3	1	0.112376	0.269903	0.416	0.6785
YR2	1	0.012149	0.216041	0.056	0.9553
YR3	1	0.105307	0.244069	0.431	0.6676
YR4	1	0.249949	0.232556	1.075	0.2864
DE1	1	-0.494400	0.353474	-1.399	0.1667
DE2	1	0.128600	0.315416	0.408	0.6848
DF1	1	0.439535	0.232866	1.887	0.0636
AC1	1	0.103288	0.365895	0.282	0.7786
AC2	1	-0.092783	0.394138	-0.235	0.8146
SJ2	1	0.030197	0.276709	0.109	0.9134
SJ3	1	0.044799	0.266741	0.168	0.8671

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: D2

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
----------	----	--------------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------

INTERCEP	1	4.154445	0.556125	7.470	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.302144	0.183912	-1.643	0.1052
AG2	1	0.471051	0.199414	2.362	0.0212
AG3	1	0.121112	0.279878	0.433	0.6666
YR2	1	-0.160847	0.224026	-0.718	0.4753
YR3	1	-0.129751	0.253089	-0.513	0.6099
YR4	1	-0.056720	0.241150	-0.235	0.8148
DE1	1	0.420926	0.366538	1.148	0.2550
DE2	1	0.356990	0.327073	1.091	0.2791
DF1	1	-0.306529	0.241472	-1.269	0.2088
AC1	1	-0.173781	0.379418	-0.458	0.6485
AC2	1	-0.254547	0.408704	-0.623	0.5356
SJ2	1	-0.311469	0.286936	-1.086	0.0467
SJ3	1	0.386105	0.276599	1.396	0.1675

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: D3

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	5.100047	0.659754	7.730	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.116475	0.218182	-0.534	0.5953
AG2	1	-0.320706	0.236574	-1.356	0.1799
AG3	1	-0.155830	0.332031	-0.469	0.6404
YR2	1	-0.045897	0.265771	-0.173	0.8634
YR3	1	0.000150	0.300250	0.001	0.9996
YR4	1	0.081005	0.286087	0.283	0.7780
DE1	1	-0.586352	0.434839	-1.348	0.0268
DE2	1	-0.035890	0.388020	-0.092	0.5226
DF1	1	0.250682	0.286469	0.875	0.3848
AC1	1	-0.628026	0.450119	-1.395	0.1677
AC2	1	-0.407691	0.484863	-0.841	0.4035
SJ2	1	-0.177285	0.340404	-0.521	0.6043
SJ3	1	0.115101	0.328141	0.351	0.7269

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: I1

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.772170	0.606728	6.217	0.0001
SX2	1	0.044309	0.200646	0.221	0.8259
AG2	1	-0.157555	0.217560	-0.724	0.4715
AG3	1	-0.148569	0.305345	-0.487	0.6282
YR2	1	0.237499	0.244410	0.972	0.3348
YR3	1	0.256155	0.276118	0.928	0.3570
YR4	1	0.335848	0.263093	1.277	0.2063
DE1	1	0.145773	0.399890	0.365	0.7166
DE2	1	0.639777	0.356834	1.793	0.0225
DF1	1	-0.331263	0.263445	-1.257	0.2131
AC1	1	-0.347795	0.413942	-0.840	0.4039
AC2	1	-0.545355	0.445893	-1.223	0.2257

SJ2	1	0.407211	0.313045	1.301	0.1979
SJ3	1	0.593546	0.301768	1.967	0.0535

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: I2

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.777539	0.616295	6.129	0.0001
SX2	1	0.139419	0.203810	0.684	0.4964
AG2	1	-0.324150	0.220990	-1.467	0.1473
AG3	1	-0.320707	0.310160	-1.034	0.3050
YR2	1	0.231416	0.248264	0.932	0.3547
YR3	1	0.330019	0.280472	1.177	0.2436
YR4	1	0.414714	0.267242	1.552	0.1256
DE1	1	0.271414	0.406196	0.668	0.5064
DE2	1	0.902140	0.362460	2.489	0.0154
DF1	1	-0.431204	0.267598	-1.611	0.1119
AC1	1	-0.216326	0.420469	-0.514	0.6087
AC2	1	-0.547893	0.452924	-1.210	0.2308
SJ2	1	0.442091	0.317981	1.390	0.1692
SJ3	1	0.450388	0.306526	1.469	0.1466

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: I7

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.475599	0.673160	5.163	0.0001
SX2	1	0.025617	0.222615	0.115	0.9087
AG2	1	0.029073	0.241380	0.120	0.9045
AG3	1	0.296897	0.338778	0.876	0.3841
YR2	1	0.390620	0.271171	1.440	0.1545
YR3	1	0.453395	0.306351	1.480	0.1437
YR4	1	0.173462	0.291899	0.594	0.5544
DE1	1	-0.515380	0.443675	-1.162	0.2496
DE2	1	0.166077	0.395904	0.419	0.6762
DF1	1	0.052607	0.292289	0.180	0.8577
AC1	1	0.164970	0.459265	0.359	0.7206
AC2	1	-0.093202	0.494714	-0.188	0.8512
SJ2	1	-0.070701	0.347320	-0.204	0.8393
SJ3	1	0.124075	0.334809	0.371	0.7122

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: H2

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	4.285556	0.601392	7.126	0.0001
SX2	1	-0.033477	0.198881	-0.168	0.8668
AG2	1	-0.055584	0.215646	-0.258	0.7974
AG3	1	0.143676	0.302660	0.475	0.6366

YR2	1	0.107906	0.242261	0.445	0.6575
YR3	1	0.137692	0.273690	0.503	0.6166
YR4	1	0.305325	0.260779	1.171	0.2459
DE1	1	-0.447667	0.396373	-1.129	0.2629
DE2	1	0.189470	0.353695	0.536	0.5940
DF1	1	-0.256376	0.261127	-0.982	0.3298
AC1	1	-0.209934	0.410301	-0.512	0.6106
AC2	1	-0.337788	0.441971	-0.764	0.4475
SJ2	1	-0.153037	0.310291	-0.493	0.6235
SJ3	1	0.127148	0.299114	0.425	0.6722

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: H4

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.874448	0.691021	5.607	0.0001
SX2	1	0.052367	0.228522	0.229	0.8195
AG2	1	-0.379976	0.247785	-1.533	0.0066
AG3	1	-0.162939	0.347767	-0.469	0.1410
YR2	1	0.160833	0.278366	0.578	0.5654
YR3	1	0.235382	0.314479	0.748	0.4569
YR4	1	0.207721	0.299645	0.693	0.4906
DE1	1	-0.347098	0.455447	-0.762	0.3488
DE2	1	0.298674	0.406409	0.735	0.2350
DF1	1	0.031248	0.300045	0.104	0.9174
AC1	1	-0.039556	0.471451	-0.084	0.9334
AC2	1	-0.314008	0.507841	-0.618	0.5385
SJ2	1	0.245714	0.356536	0.689	0.4932
SJ3	1	0.392814	0.343692	1.143	0.2573

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: U3

VARIABLE	DF	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	T FOR H0: PARAMETER=0	PROB>T
INTERCEP	1	3.038232	0.633617	4.795	0.0001
SX2	1	0.176345	0.209539	0.842	0.4031
AG2	1	0.169697	0.227201	0.747	0.4578
AG3	1	0.368583	0.318878	1.156	0.2520
YR2	1	0.526454	0.255242	2.063	0.0432
YR3	1	0.002687	0.288356	0.009	0.9926
YR4	1	0.100038	0.274753	0.364	0.7170
DE1	1	0.309569	0.417613	0.741	0.4612
DE2	1	0.750395	0.372648	2.014	0.0482
DF1	1	-0.058451	0.275120	-0.212	0.8324
AC1	1	-0.052753	0.432287	-0.122	0.9032
AC2	1	-0.055625	0.465654	-0.119	0.9053
SJ2	1	0.077897	0.326918	0.238	0.8124
SJ3	1	0.471705	0.315142	1.497	0.1393

APPENDIX E

AVERAGE SCORES OF THE 65 COMPETENCIES AS RATED BY
STUDENT-TEACHERS, INSTRUCTORS, AND ADMINISTRATORS

AVERAGE SCORES OF THE 65 COMPETENCIES AS RATED BY
STUDENT-TEACHERS, INSTRUCTORS, AND ADMINISTRATORS

Competency	(G1)		(G2)		(G3)	
	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
P 1	3.93	0.91	3.45	1.00	3.76	0.99
P 2	4.33	0.72	4.20	0.70	4.32	0.74
P 3	4.14	0.82	4.00	0.81	4.29	0.69
P 4	4.27	0.73	4.15	0.75	4.32	0.71
P 5	4.25	0.82	4.00	0.84	4.04	0.75
P 6	4.14	0.82	4.15	0.76	4.15	0.75
P 7	3.97	0.85	3.95	0.71	4.06	0.78
P 8	4.13	0.76	4.04	0.78	4.11	0.62
P 9	3.84	0.91	3.70	0.83	3.88	0.75
P 10	3.42	0.89	3.60	0.83	3.48	0.89
O 1	4.12	0.72	4.13	0.70	4.13	0.77
O 2	4.45	0.79	4.13	0.75	4.20	0.79
O 3	3.89	0.76	4.02	0.75	4.19	0.84
O 4	4.07	0.82	4.00	0.71	4.06	0.75
O 5	4.34	0.82	4.16	0.75	4.23	0.72
C 1	3.79	0.89	3.97	0.84	4.02	0.81
C 2	3.70	0.83	3.88	0.85	4.04	0.74
C 3	4.07	0.82	4.09	0.72	4.10	0.75
C 4	3.84	0.86	3.90	0.73	3.99	0.69
C 5	3.75	0.89	3.96	0.72	4.02	0.86
C 6	4.31	0.83	4.23	0.73	4.35	0.65
D 1	4.39	0.81	4.03	0.80	4.15	0.85
D 2	4.22	0.73	4.09	0.75	4.21	0.73
D 3	4.30	0.69	4.20	0.75	4.35	0.74
D 4	3.99	0.79	4.00	0.75	4.14	0.76
D 5	3.25	1.08	3.39	1.00	3.48	0.85
D 6	4.20	0.86	4.14	0.76	4.11	0.83
D 7	4.19	0.77	4.24	0.66	4.19	0.75
D 8	3.89	0.93	3.99	0.70	4.06	0.71
I 1	4.01	0.74	4.10	0.76	4.18	0.68
I 2	4.04	0.76	4.13	0.64	4.30	0.71
I 3	3.55	0.86	3.94	0.68	3.94	0.78
I 4	3.76	0.85	3.94	0.77	4.00	0.77
I 5	3.58	0.77	3.82	0.71	3.93	0.71
I 6	3.69	0.74	3.88	0.70	3.94	0.78
I 7	3.69	0.88	3.72	0.78	3.93	0.79
I 8	3.72	0.78	3.96	0.72	4.01	0.75
I 9	3.59	0.82	3.86	0.76	3.95	0.76
I 10	3.91	0.82	3.94	0.77	4.12	0.78
I 11	3.93	0.78	4.05	0.81	4.18	0.71
V 1	3.93	0.85	3.96	0.78	3.93	0.70
V 2	4.23	0.74	4.18	0.80	4.25	0.74

V 3	3.67	0.79	3.97	0.75	4.00	0.79
V 4	3.92	0.94	3.86	0.76	4.02	0.74
V 5	3.72	0.95	4.04	0.76	4.06	0.64
V 6	4.11	0.89	4.13	0.87	4.05	0.73
V 7	4.04	0.81	4.05	0.91	4.07	0.79
H 1	4.01	0.74	3.89	0.78	4.01	0.61
H 2	4.02	0.76	3.92	0.82	4.04	0.70
H 3	4.34	0.70	4.24	0.75	4.32	0.71
H 4	3.96	0.78	4.01	0.74	4.18	0.76
H 5	4.24	0.78	4.21	0.72	4.37	0.71
H 6	3.98	0.79	3.84	0.77	4.00	0.69
H 7	4.27	0.81	4.26	0.69	4.31	0.73
U 1	4.41	0.72	4.11	0.80	4.22	0.75
U 2	4.17	0.82	3.96	0.72	4.08	0.69
U 3	4.42	0.69	4.07	0.78	4.12	0.73
U 4	3.88	0.79	3.97	0.71	3.98	0.71
U 5	4.24	0.74	3.97	0.75	3.96	0.77
E 1	4.06	0.89	4.01	0.75	4.02	0.74
E 2	3.95	0.79	3.79	0.86	3.93	0.71
E 3	4.04	0.81	3.91	0.80	4.13	0.74
E 4	3.98	0.90	3.77	0.87	3.87	0.79
E 5	4.21	0.94	3.86	0.91	4.08	0.82
E 6	4.30	0.76	4.14	0.69	4.18	0.75

Note:

G1=Student-teachers

G2=Instructors

G3=Administrators

APPENDIX F

THE COMPARISON OF THE 65 IMPORTANT TEACHING COMPETENCIES AS
RANKED BY STUDENT-TEACHERS, INSTRUCTORS, AND ADMINISTRATORS

THE COMPARISON OF THE 65 IMPORTANT TEACHING COMPETENCIES AS
RANKED BY STUDENT-TEACHERS, INSTRUCTORS, AND ADMINISTRATORS

Competency (Rank number)	G1 (X)	G2 (X)	G3 (X)
1	O2 (4.45)	H7 (4.26)	H5 (4.37)
2	U3 (4.42)	H3 (4.24)	C6 (4.35)
3	U1 (4.41)	C6 (4.23)	D3 (4.35)
4	D1 (4.39)	H5 (4.21)	P2 (4.32)
5	H3 (4.34)	P2 (4.20)	P4 (4.32)
6	O5 (4.34)	D3 (4.20)	H3 (4.32)
7	P2 (4.33)	V2 (4.18)	H7 (4.31)
8	C6 (4.31)	O5 (4.16)	I2 (4.30)
9	E6 (4.30)	P4 (4.15)	P3 (4.29)
10	D3 (4.30)	P6 (4.15)	V3 (4.25)
11	H7 (4.27)	E6 (4.14)	O5 (4.23)
12	P4 (4.27)	D6 (4.14)	U1 (4.22)
13	P5 (4.25)	O1 (4.13)	D2 (4.21)
14	H5 (4.24)	O2 (4.13)	O2 (4.20)
15	U5 (4.24)	V6 (4.13)	O3 (4.19)
16	V2 (4.23)	I2 (4.13)	D7 (4.19)
17	D2 (4.22)	D7 (4.12)	H4 (4.18)
18	E5 (4.21)	U1 (4.11)	E6 (4.18)
19	D6 (4.20)	I1 (4.10)	I11(4.18)
20	D7 (4.19)	D2 (4.09)	I1 (4.18)
21	U2 (4.17)	C3 (4.09)	P6 (4.15)
22	P3 (4.14)	U3 (4.07)	D1 (4.15)
23	P6 (4.14)	I11(4.05)	D4 (4.14)
24	P8 (4.13)	V7 (4.05)	O1 (4.13)
25	O1 (4.12)	P8 (4.04)	E3 (4.13)
26	V6 (4.11)	V5 (4.04)	I10(4.12)
27	O4 (4.07)	D1 (4.03)	U3 (4.12)
28	C3 (4.07)	O3 (4.02)	D6 (4.11)
29	E1 (4.06)	H4 (4.01)	P8 (4.11)
30	V7 (4.04)	E1 (4.01)	C3 (4.10)
31	E3 (4.04)	P3 (4.00)	U2 (4.08)
32	I2 (4.04)	P5 (4.00)	E5 (4.08)
33	H2 (4.02)	O4 (4.00)	V7 (4.07)
34	I1 (4.01)	D4 (4.00)	P7 (4.06)
35	H1 (4.01)	D8 (3.99)	O4 (4.06)
36	D4 (3.99)	C1 (3.97)	D8 (4.06)
37	E4 (3.98)	V3 (3.97)	V5 (4.06)
38	H6 (3.98)	U4 (3.97)	V6 (4.05)
39	P7 (3.97)	U5 (3.97)	P5 (4.04)
40	H4 (3.96)	C5 (3.96)	C2 (4.04)
41	E2 (3.95)	I8 (3.96)	H2 (4.04)

42	P1 (3.93)	V1 (3.96)	C1 (4.02)
43	V1 (3.93)	U2 (3.96)	C5 (4.02)
44	I11(3.93)	P7 (3.95)	V4 (4.02)
45	V4 (3.92)	I3 (3.94)	I1 (4.02)
46	I10(3.91)	I4 (3.94)	I8 (4.01)
47	O3 (3.89)	I10(3.94)	H1 (4.01)
48	D8 (3.89)	H2 (3.92)	I4 (4.00)
49	U4 (3.88)	E3 (3.91)	H6 (4.00)
50	P9 (3.84)	C4 (3.90)	V3 (4.00)
51	C4 (3.84)	H1 (3.89)	C4 (3.99)
52	C1 (3.79)	I6 (3.88)	U4 (3.98)
53	I4 (3.76)	C2 (3.88)	U5 (3.96)
54	C5 (3.75)	V4 (3.86)	I9 (3.95)
55	I8 (3.72)	E5 (3.86)	I3 (3.94)
56	V5 (3.72)	I9 (3.86)	I6 (3.94)
57	C2 (3.70)	H6 (3.84)	I5 (3.93)
58	I6 (3.69)	I5 (3.82)	I7 (3.93)
59	I7 (3.69)	E2 (3.79)	V1 (3.93)
60	V3 (3.67)	E4 (3.77)	E2 (3.93)
61	I9 (3.59)	I7 (3.72)	P9 (3.88)
62	I5 (3.58)	P9 (3.70)	E4 (3.87)
63	I3 (3.55)	P10(3.60)	P1 (3.76)
64	P10(3.42)	P1 (3.45)	P10(3.48)
65	D5 (3.25)	D5 (3.39)	D5 (3.48)

Note:

G1=Student-teachers

G2=Instructors

G3=Administrators

X =Mean

APPENDIX G

THE COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTANT TEACHING COMPETENCIES
(IN CLUSTERS) AS RANKED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

THE COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTANT TEACHING COMPETENCIES
(IN CLUSTERS) AS RANKED BY THE THREE GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

Ranked Number	G1 (X)	G2 (X)	G3 (X)
1	U (4.23)	O (4.11)	O (4.11)
2	O (4.16)	H (4.08)	H (4.10)
3	H (4.10)	U (4.04)	U (4.04)
4	E (4.09)	V (4.03)	P (4.03)
5	P (4.06)	C (4.02)	D (4.02)
6	D (4.05)	D (4.01)	C (4.01)
7	V (3.94)	I (3.97)	V (4.00)
8	C (3.91)	P (3.95)	I (3.97)
9	I (3.76)	E (3.94)	E (3.95)

Note:

G1=Student-teachers

G2=Instructors

G3=Administrators

X =Average score

APPENDIX H

LETTERS TO PRESIDENTS, DEANS, AND ADMINISTRATORS,
INSTRUCTORS, AND STUDENT TEACHERS

LETTERS TO PRESIDENTS, DEANS, AND ADMINISTRATORS,
INSTRUCTORS, AND STUDENT TEACHERS

Letter to Dean of Faculty of Humanity
and Social Sciences at Chiengrai Teachers College

2001 W. Hickory # 103
Denton, TX 76201
U.S.A

May 20, 1989.

Dean of Faculty of Humanity
and Social Sciences
Chiengrai Teachers College
Chiengrai, Thailand

Dear

I am writing to request your assistance in securing data for my doctoral dissertation. This study is being conducted to fulfill a requirement for the completion of doctoral studies in the College of Education at University of North Texas. My topic is Secondary Social Studies Teaching Competencies as Perceived by Student-teachers, Instructors, and Administrators in Thailand.

I am asking your assistance in administering a research questionnaire to administrators, social studies instructors, and social studies student-teachers at your college. If you agree to assist me in my research I will mail you questionnaire packets for distribution to those three groups mentioned above. I will also request that you collect the completed questionnaires and mail them to me as soon as possible. I have schedule one month to complete the survey. Additional instructors will be enclosed with the packets if you agree to assist my project.

Again, thank you for your time and consideration of my request. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Kamonkan Witayangkoon
Researcher
Dr. Howard W. Smith, Professor
Major Advisor

Letter to Presidents

2001 W. Hickory # 103
Denton, TX 76201
U.S.A

May 20, 1989.

President of _____ Teachers Colleges
_____ Teachers College
_____, Thailand

Dear _____:

I am writing to request your assistance in securing data for my doctoral dissertation. This study is being conducted to fulfill a requirement for the completion of doctoral studies in the College of Education at University of North Texas. My topic is Secondary Social Studies Teaching Competencies as Perceived by Student-teachers, Instructors, and Administrators in Thailand.

I wish to obtain your permission to distribute a questionnaire to administrators, social studies instructors, and social studies student-teachers at your college. I anticipate that the time necessary to complete the questionnaire will be no more than one month.

I appreciate the colleges' support and your assistance.

Sincerely,

Kamonkan Witayangkoon
Researcher
Dr. Howard W. Smith, Professor
Major Advisor

Letter to Instructors, Administrators,
and Student-teachers

2001 W. Hickory # 103
Denton, TX 76201
U.S.A

May 20, 1989.

(Instructors or Administrators
or Student Teachers)

Teachers College
_____, Thailand

Dear _____:

I am a faculty member in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Chiengrai Teachers College. I am asking your assistance in doing a research study entitled Secondary Social Studies Teaching Competencies as Perceived by Student-teachers, Instructors, and Administrators in Thailand. This study is being conducted to fulfill a requirement for the completion of doctoral studies in the College of Education at University of North Texas.

The result of this research may be useful in better understanding social studies teaching competencies as perceived by student-teachers, instructors, and administrators. Also, it may be useful in social studies curriculum development and in the evaluation of teaching performance of social studies instructors.

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire. In it you will be asked for your perceptions regarding the relative importance of social studies teaching competencies.

Will you please complete the enclosed questionnaire, which should take you no longer than twenty minutes, and return it to the Dean of Faculty of Humanity and Social Sciences at your college. I need your response as soon as possible. I also have enclosed a self-addressed envelop for your convenience.

To obtain candid data, all responses must be anonymous; therefore, please do not sign your name on the questionnaire. Data collected with this questionnaire will be used only for this research project.

I greatly appreciate your assistance in this study.

Sincerely,

Kamonkan Witayangkoon
Researcher
Dr. Howard W. Smith, Professor
Major Advisor

Follow-up Letter to Instructors, Administrators,
and Student-teachers

2001 W. Hickory # 103
Denton, TX 76201
U.S.A

May 20, 1989.

(Instructors or Administrators
or Student Teachers)

Teachers College
_____, Thailand

Dear _____:

Recently you received a Secondary Social Studies Teaching Competencies questionnaire from Dean of Humanity and Social Sciences Faculty at your college. The response to the first request has been good. Some questionnaires, however, have not been received.

Enclosed is another questionnaire. If you have not completed the questionnaire, please take a few minutes and complete this questionnaire so that I can begin analysis of the data. Your input to this project is vitally important.

Thank you for your help and cooperation in this endeavor. I look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Kamonkan Witayangkoon
Researcher
Dr. Howard W. Smith, Professor
Major Advisor

REFERENCE LIST

- Arunee, W. (1980). Critical-thinking techniques for social studies education in Thailand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania.
- Bergquist, W. H. & Phillips, S. R. (1975). Components of effective faculty development program. Journal of Higher Education. 36(2), 118-127.
- Boonyaraksa, C. (1988). An analysis of the perceptions of physics teaching effectiveness as viewed by students, and physics instructors in universities in Thailand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Texas.
- Bohrnstedt, W. G. & Knoke, D. (1982). Statistics for Social Data Analysis. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock publishers, Inc.
- Borg, W. R. (1983). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.
- Buatong, P. (1972). A proposal social studies program for secondary schools in Thailand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Indiana.
- Bunnag, T. (1977). The provincial administration of Siam, 1892-1915: The Ministry of Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanuphab. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Burke, C. (1972). Competency-based system for teacher education at Weber State College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 063 276) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 239 958).
- Charter, W. & Waples, D. (1929). The common wealth teacher-training study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chulalongkorn University. (1976). The reports of the results of researches and the collection of opinions for the curriculum development of four-year teacher education. Bangkok, Thailand: Chulalongkorn University.

- Cooper, J. & Weber, W. (1973). A system approach to program design. Berkley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp.
- Cornell, A. (1974). Professional associations play a part in competency movements. Educational Leadership, 31(4), 350-354.
- Dante, L. H. (1973). Social studies education: Dilemma, divisions and direction. Social Education, 38(2), 187-194.
- Department of Educational Techniques. (1986). The assessment of curriculum implementation at lower secondary level: Social studies. Bangkok, Thailand: Karnsasana Press.
- Department of General Education. (1977). A guideline for teacher behavior. Bangkok, Thailand: Chongchroen Karnpim.
- Department of Teacher Education. (1987). Teacher Education Curriculum. Bangkok, Thailand: Karnsasana Press.
- _____. (1980). An introduction to the Department of Teacher Education. Bangkok, Thailand: Department of Teacher Education.
- _____. (1984). Act of department of teacher education (1984). Bangkok, Thailand: Department of Teacher Education.
- Ellenwood, E. S. & Parker, T. E. (1972). Development in the preparation of social studies teacher. Journal of Education, 155(1), 61-68.
- Ferguson, G. A. (1981). Statistic analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Fair, J. & Kachaturoff, G. (1986). Recommendations for improving secondary social studies curriculum and instructional programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 577).
- Frudden, S. J. & Healy, H. A. (1986). Effective teaching research: Its application to special education teacher training. Contemporary Education, 57(3), 150-53.
- Gage, N. L. (1984). What do they know about teaching effectiveness? Phi Delta Kappan, 66(2), 87-93.

- Government of Thailand. (1977). The fourth national economic and social development plan (1977-1981). Bangkok: Office of the Prime Minister.
- Handumrongul, U. (1979). Opinions concerning social studies teachers' competencies. Unpublished master thesis. Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Hanna, S. J. & McGill, L. T. (1985). A nurturing environment and effective teaching. College Teaching, 33(4), 177-180.
- Hannarkin, P. (1983). Development plan Srinakharinwirot University northern campus at Phitsanulok. Bangkok, Thailand: Pikkaness Press.
- Henderson, M. V. (1978). Teaching competencies and the social studies cooperating teacher. Dissertation Abstract International, 39(6), 3524A.
- Houston, W. R. (1973). Designing competency-based instructional systems. Journal of Teacher Education, 24(3), 200-204.
- Houston, W. R. (1972). Strategies and resources for developing a competency-based teacher education program. New York: New York State Education Department.
- Houston, W. R. & Hawsam, R. B. (1972). Competency-based teacher education: Progress, problems, and prospects. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc.
- James, W. G. (1968). The ideal social studies teacher. The Social Studies, 59(5), 214-216.
- Kachaturoff, G. (1986). Improving teaching and Learning in the social studies classroom. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 600).
- Ketudat, S., Ketudat, E., Bovornsiri, V. & Wongsotorn, T. (1977). Higher Education in Thailand. Bangkok, Thailand: Office of the National Education Commission.
- Kennedy, G. J. (1977). Competencies of successful teachers as perceived by school administrators in Connecticut and teacher educators at the University of Connecticut. Dissertation Abstract International, 38, 6070A.
- Kenworthy, S. L. (1973). Guide to social studies teaching. Belmont: Wardworth Publishing Company, Inc.

- King, D. C. (1987). Delay persists in social studies reform, but signs point to headway. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 772).
- Kinney, L. B. (1952). Measures a good teacher, Burlingame, California: California Teacher Association.
- Koonme, C. (1977). A comparative study of the competencies of prospective secondary social studies teachers in the United States and Thailand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, Ohio.
- Lemmerman, J. W. (1978). An analysis of faculty and administrator perceptions of selected teaching competencies in Ohio's two-year, postsecondary institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Ohio.
- Lowe, T. W. & Corbin, W. (1970). Learning to teach the social studies: What do teachers recommend? Social Education, 34(3), 286-290.
- Mahakhun, P. (1983). Modern Thai history. Bangkok, Thailand: Silapabunnakarn Press.
- McDonald, F. (1973). The National Commission on Performance-Based Education (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED 076 596)
- Mekhirunsiri, W. (1986). A comparison of needs for teaching competency improvement between the social studies teachers in government and private secondary schools. Unpublished Master Thesis, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Ministry of Education. (1985). Department of Teacher Education, Bangkok, Thailand: Kurusapa Press.
- _____. (1983). 200 years of Thai education. Bangkok, Thailand: Kurusapa Press.
- _____. (1981). Educational statistics. Bangkok, Thailand: Aksornsawan Press.
- _____. (1978). Syllabus for social studies education. Bangkok, Thailand: Kurusapa Press.

- Ministry of Education. (1986). The assessment of curriculums in secondary school: Social studies. Bangkok, Thailand: Karnsasana Press.
- _____. (1977). The fourth social and economical plan of the nation 1977-1978. Bangkok, Thailand: Kurusapa Press.
- _____. (1973). The Department of Teacher Training: its work and organization. Bangkok, Thailand: Karnsasana Press.
- Miron, M. (1985). The good professor perceived by university instructors. Higher Education, 14(2), 211-215.
- Morsh, J. & Wilder, E. (1954). Identifying the effective instructor: A review of the quantative studies, 1900-1952. Illinois: Air Force Personnel and Training Center.
- Moses, I. (1985). Academic development units and the improvement of teaching. Higher Education, 14(1), 75-100.
- Natrapalai, P. (1979). Relationship between learning achievement and teaching competencies of social studies students at the higher certificate of education level. Unpublished master's thesis. Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Ornstein, A. C. (1985). Research on teaching: Issues and trends. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(6), 27-31.
- Panichsuk, N. (1977). The development of teacher personal characteristics. Ramkhamhaeng Newsletter, 35, 5-7.
- Pukkahut, O. (1971). A teacher needed by children. Wittayasarn, 41, 17.
- Pumiputhavon, R. (1983). Needs for teaching competency improvement of secondary school social studies teachers in the educational region four. Unpublished master's thesis, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Punnapobe, S. (1981). History and Thai philosophy. Bangkok, Thailand: Odean Store Press.

- Rosner, B. & Kay, P. M. (1974). Will the promises of C/PBTE be fulfilled? Phi Delta Kappan, 55, 290-295.
- Ruengsuwan, U. (1976). Principle of teaching. Bangkok, Thailand: Educational Association of Thailand.
- Sevatamorn, S. (1975). The status of secondary social studies curriculum and instruction in Thailand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, Connecticut.
- Scott, R. L. (1980). The relationships among the teaching characteristics of college teachers and the effectiveness of college teachers as perceived by students and colleges at a predominantly black college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, South Carolina.
- Shalock, H. D. (1974). Impact of definition on teacher preparation. Educational Leadership, 31(4), 318-321.
- Sharif, M. H. (1972). Developing a Competency-Based Elementary Teacher Education program at Norfolk State College based on implications study of the comprehensive elementary teacher education model. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 065 489).
- Shaw, A. B. & Buasri, T. (1968). Teachers in Thailand's universities: an analysis and forecast. Bangkok, Thailand: Thai Watana Panich.
- Shearon, G. & Johnson, C. (1973). A Competency-based Teacher Education program in action: University of Georgia. Journal of Teacher Education, 24,(3), 187-193.
- SPAN Consultants and Staff (1981). Social studies in the 1980s: A report of project SPAN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 449).
- SPSS (1986). SPSS user's guide. Chicago: SPSS Inc.
- Starr, W. W. (1974). A study to determine the profile of essential teaching competencies for secondary social studies teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, Michigan.
- Stewart, M. M. (1976). The perceived importance of selected teaching competencies for secondary social studies teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, Missouri.

- Thanagosai, S. (1989). Job satisfaction among faculty members at six metropolitan area teachers colleges in Bangkok, Thailand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Texas.
- The California Council for the Social Studies (1982). Standard for social studies teachers in the state of California.
- The California Teaching Association. (1964). Six areas of teaching competencies. Burlingame, California: California Teaching Association.
- The Minnesota State Department of Education. (1973). A competency-based program for certification of social studies teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 081 667).
- The Minnesota State Task Force to Study Programs Leading to Certification for Teachers in the area of Social Studies. (1973). Social studies teacher competencies: The affective area. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 081 669).
- The National Council for the Social Studies. (1967). Guidelines for the preparation of social studies teachers. Social Education, 31,(6), 490-491.
- The National Council for the Social Studies. (1971). Standards for social studies teacher. Social Education, 35,(8), 848-852.
- The New York State Council for the Social Studies. (1974). Suggested criteria for certification of social studies teacher. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 100 730).
- Trezise, R. (1974). Developing performance objectives in social studies in Michigan. Social Education, 38,(1), 24-29.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (1984a). Bulletin of the Unesco Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific, 25, 361-383.
- Vella, W. F. (1978). Chaiyo!: King Vajiravudh and the development of Thai nationalism. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

- Wangphanich, P. (1984). Job satisfaction of faculty members at Srinakharinwirot university, Thailand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Kansas.
- Wilson, A. P. & Curtis, W. (1973). The state mandate PBTE. Phi Delta Kappan, 55(5), 187-193.
- Wisniewski, R. (1974). A new breed of social studies teacher or new school system? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 109 043).
- Wyatt, D. (1975). Education and the modernization of Thai society, in William G. Skinner & Thomas A. Kirsch, (Eds.), Change and persistence in Thai society. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Zukowski, J. (1979). The identification and analysis of actual and desirable teaching competencies of secondary school instructors of academic subjects. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, Texas.