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The purpose of this study is to compare and analyze the teaching of history in teachers colleges in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand. Variables examined in this study include the following: salary, teaching experience, degrees held, the number of graduate credit hours in history, the number of graduate credit hours in education, attendance at professional meetings, the number of publications, membership in professional organizations, the number of hours devoted to course preparations, teaching load, and teaching behaviors. The comparison is based on geographical location of the teachers colleges by region.

The survey instrument, after intensive review and validation by selected faculty both in Thailand and the United States, was distributed to the 180 history instructors in the teachers colleges in the six major regions of Thailand. The total number of responses was 138, or 76.7 per cent. The statistical procedures used in the analyses of data include frequency and percentage of responses, a chi square test of independence, t test, the Yates' correction for continuity, and Fisher's Exact Probability Test (2-tailed).
The data findings from this study indicate that there is a high degree of similarity between the respondents from the Metropolitan region and other regions' history instructors in Thai teachers colleges with respect to the majority of the criteria. Although some significant differences were found, it would be difficult to state that there is a difference between history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions groups. Recommendations are made for the history instruction programs in Thailand based on the responses from both groups and the information gathered from a review of the literature.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There is little or no information about the current teaching of history in teachers colleges in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand. Since history occupies a position of curricular eminence in higher education, history instructors unquestionably play an important role in Thailand.

The word history is a new word in the Thai language. It was defined in Thai dictionaries for the first time in the 1930s. Throughout the period of the absolute monarch, beginning in 1267 and lasting until 1932, the writings of Thai history centered upon the court. Kings, princes, nobles and high ranking monks were the authorities of the Thai past. Thai history that was studied in schools consisted primarily of a series of accounts (dtum-nan), and annals of members of a line, dynasty or kingdom (pong-sava-darn). When world history became a part of the official curriculum in school in 1891, there was no formal provision for historical

1Chalerm Malila, Techniques of Teaching History (Bangkok, 1980), p. 42.


3Malila, Techniques of Teaching History, p. 42.
instruction. Although history was taught in a few schools in Bangkok by 1897, there was little national encouragement to teach Thai history before 1960.\(^4\) Moreover, Thai history was often taught in connection with general knowledge about Thailand and Thai grammar. As a result of a major reform of curricula in 1960, Thai history is now taught in social studies classes in the elementary school. At the junior high school level, history is integrated with geography. History is a required subject at the high school, college, and university levels. History, as a discrete subject, has emerged slowly during the last two decades in Thailand.\(^5\)

In the past, history was taught only in a few prestigious secondary schools in Bangkok. History as a course of study is now offered in the curricula of almost all institutions of higher learning in Thailand. In teachers colleges, curricular offerings in history are generally limited to survey courses in Thai History, South East Asian History, and World History. There are thirty-six teachers colleges in Thailand, all controlled by the Department of Teacher Education. The thirty-six campuses are located geographically throughout the country. Therefore, differences in the


\(^5\)Malila, *Techniques of Teaching History*, p. 42.
status of history instruction in the Metropolitan region and other regions in this unique Thai higher educational system needs to be investigated.

Previous studies such as those done by Jintarax in 1978 and Tanasilangoon in 1983 have concentrated on general instruction, or on fields other than history. No research has been done on the differences in the teaching of history in teacher colleges in the Metropolitan region and other regions. An investigation of history instruction would therefore add to the body of knowledge in this area and provide additional input for decisions concerning the improvement of instruction.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study concerns the teaching of history in the teachers colleges of the Metropolitan region and of the other regions in Thailand.

Purposes of the Study

The major purpose of this study is to compare and analyze the teaching of history in teachers colleges in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand.

---

The sub-purposes of the study are to determine if there are significant differences:

1. Between history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by salary, teaching experience, and degrees held;

2. In the academic preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand, as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in history;

3. In the professional preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in education;

4. In the professional achievements of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by attendance at professional meetings, the number of publications, and membership in professional organizations;

5. In the teaching assignments of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of hours they devoted to course preparations and teaching load; and,

6. In the classroom teaching strategies of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by their teaching behaviors.
Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant differences between history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by (a) salary, (b) teaching experience, and (c) degrees held.

2. There will be no significant difference in the academic preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand, as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in history.

3. There will be no significant difference in the professional preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in education.

4. There will be no significant differences in the professional achievements of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by (a) attendance at professional meetings, (b) the number of publications, and (c) membership in professional organizations.

5. There will be no significant difference in the teaching assignments of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by (a) the number of hours they devoted to course preparations and (b) teaching load.

6. There will be no significant difference in the classroom teaching strategies of history instructors in the
Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by their teaching behaviors.

Definition of Terms

For the specific purpose of this study, the following terms have been defined.

**Department of Teacher Education** is a sub-division in the Ministry of Education in Thailand, which is in charge of preparing teachers.

**Teachers Colleges** are institutions of higher education under direct administrative control of the Department of Teacher Education in Thailand.

**Teachers Colleges in the Metropolitan Region** are the six teachers colleges located in the capital (Bangkok Metropolis) of Thailand.

**Teachers Colleges in Other Regions** include the thirty teachers colleges located outside of the capital (Bangkok Metropolis) of Thailand.

**History Instructors** are the persons who are appointed to history departments, and are responsible for delivering instruction to students on a course-by-course basis in teachers colleges.

Delimitation and Limitations of the Study

This study is delimited to the history instructors in the teachers colleges in Thailand.
The following limitations are inherent in the study.

1. This study is subject to all the limitations recognized in collecting data by mailed questionnaires.

2. Since the survey is voluntary, the findings may become biased on the basis of those who choose to return, or not to return, the questionnaire.

3. This study is subject to the limitations of administration of instruments, since the survey will be printed and distributed by research assistants in Thailand.

Background of the Study

Thailand is approximately the size of France or Texas, an area of about 200,000 square miles. Bangkok Metropolis is the capital, with nearly five million inhabitants, which is more than ten per cent of the entire population, and that is fifty-two times larger than the next most populous city, Chiangmai.7

Bangkok Metropolis is not only the vital center of government and commerce, it also provides the educational facilities that are essential for the production and recruitment of business people and bureaucrats alike. Half of all government secondary schools are in the Bangkok Metropolis and provinces around Bangkok. About one-third of all private schools, too, are in the Bangkok Metropolis. The majority of Thailand's universities, and the most prestigious, are in

Bangkok. Ten out of the eleven private degree colleges are also located in the capital.  

A survey sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation and the National Science Foundation in 1974 revealed the educational advantages of Bangkok. The study was to list "Thailand's 153 Leading Intellectuals." The researchers found that of 153 persons, only two make their home in the North, two in the Northeast, and one in the South. More than half of the 153 persons were born and reared outside of Bangkok, and had come to the capital for further education. They finally settled in Bangkok because it is the major center of intellectual excitement. 

The most striking feature of contemporary Thai society is the persistent drive for education by an increasingly large segment of the population. Many families have shown a willingness to go to great lengths to provide their children with an opportunity to advance to as high a level as possible in the formal school system.

In the past, Thai education was a relatively simple affair, a limited activity that took place largely in the

---


home. Parents would pass on to their children whatever skills and knowledge they had acquired during their lifetime. As the country developed, society's needs grew more complex, and formal education became institutionalized. The first schools were associated with the village temples, or "wats." This formal system of education conducted by the Buddhist Order was able to preserve and transmit its traditions from the Sukhothai period (1257-1377) through the early reigns of the Chakri Dynasty (1782-1865). During this period, schools functioned both to transmit knowledge, and to transmit codes of moral behavior, as well as to teach literacy and mathematical skills.\(^{11}\) Buddhist monasteries became centers of learning, and monks were forced to master all subjects taught to princes and to peasants. Monks were adept in grammar and the fine arts, law and medicine, arithmetic and astronomy. Some monasteries during the period functioned in a manner similar to the church universities in Europe during the Middle Ages.\(^{12}\)

During the forty-two years of the reign of King Chulalongkorn (Rama V 1868-1910) came the definite break between old Siam and new Thailand.\(^{13}\) In this period, formal schooling took on an important additional dimension. Reforms undertaken during the reign of King Chulalongkorn

\(^{11}\) Ibid., p. 33.

\(^{12}\) Wyatt, The Political of Reform, p. 5.

\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 376.
oriented the schooling process to the preparation of an intellectual elite for government service. In 1887, King Chulalongkorn created the Department of Education, and charged it with the responsibility of cultural and religious matters, as well as the administration of the educational system. In 1892 its name was changed to the Ministry of Education.\(^{14}\) When Chulalongkorn University achieved its status as a university, by Royal Decree, in 1917, it had already existed since the end of previous century in a series of experimental forms, such as the Royal Pages' School and the Civil Service College.\(^{15}\)

The revolution of 1932 transformed Thailand from a monarchy to a democracy. This change in the political structure brought about the need for a new form of training that was necessary to produce a new type of political leader and civil servant. Several universities were founded to provide such needs, and it was not until the late 1960s and early 1970s that higher education in Thailand was organized for other areas of learning. Many institutions organized their curriculums to satisfy manpower requirements.\(^{16}\)

The history of modern teacher education in Thailand dates back to 1892, when the Ministry of Education established the

---


\(^{15}\) Wichit Srisa-an, "Thailand," Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia and Pacific, 24 (September, 1983), 88.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., pp. 88-89.
first formal school of teacher education in Bangkok. The school was under the responsibility of the Teacher Education Section, which was attached to the Education Department in the Ministry of Education. Its purpose was to offer programs to students which would enable them to become certified to teach in elementary and secondary schools. Seven years later, the first school for elementary teachers' education for rural students was set up. In 1940 the Teacher Education Section was elevated to division status, and transferred to the Department of Primary Education. Other fields, such as arts, engineering, law, medicine, and science, were elevated to the bachelor's degree level in 1930. Even though Chulalongkorn University started offering courses in secondary teacher education at the diploma level as early as 1928, it was only in 1954 that it first awarded the degree of Bachelor of Education.

As a result of the elevation of the Teacher Education Division to the Department of Teacher Education in 1954, teachers colleges already in existence were expanded, and new institutions were established. Some small teachers colleges were either closed down, or merged. Colleges of Education,

17 Department of Teacher Education, An Introduction to the Department of Teacher Education (Bangkok, 1980), p. 2.

authorized to grant bachelor degrees, were also set up to prepare teachers for senior high schools.\textsuperscript{19}

Today, in 1986, there are thirty-six teachers colleges (see Appendix A) under the Department of Teacher Education. The distribution is such that there is at least one teachers college for every two adjacent provinces. Six of the colleges are in the Metropolitan region; five in the Middle region; eight in the Northern region; eight in the Northeastern region; four in the Western region; and five in the Southern region.\textsuperscript{20}

As required by the Mandated Curriculum of 1983, the current curriculum offers grade twelve graduates a two year program for the Higher Certificate of Education and a four years program for the Bachelor of Education degrees. It also offers higher certificate holders a two year program for the Bachelor of Education degree. In general, the curriculum is composed of four parts; namely, general courses, professional courses, major and minor subject courses, and elective courses. The curriculum at the higher certificate level consists of seventy-four semester credit hours: twenty-four credits in general education courses; twenty-four credits in professional education courses; sixteen credits in major subject courses; and ten credits in minor subject courses. The two year curriculum for the higher certificate holder at the bachelor's degree

\textsuperscript{19}Department of Teacher Education, \textit{An Introduction}, p. 3.

level consists of seventy semester credit hours: fourteen credits in general education courses; eighteen credits in professional education courses; twenty-two credits in major subject courses; ten credits in minor subject courses; and six credits in electives. A four year curriculum for the Bachelor of Education degree includes a combination of the above.  

The above courses are taught by the 5632 teachers on the faculty of the teachers colleges (see Appendix A). The teaching faculty's promotion, or progress in their teaching field, may be achieved through two separate routes. First, the Civil Service Act regulates all promotions and annual increases in salary, further studies for better education, department or institutional competitive examinations for a higher grade, and appointments to a higher post. Second, the University Commission and the Teacher's Institute govern all the academic strata of teaching faculty of all teachers colleges, including professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and lecturers.

The overall teacher/student ratio in teachers colleges is approximately one to eleven. In this respect, Thai teachers

---


colleges appear to have a rather optimal teacher/student ratio. However, when all factors are scrutinized in detail, the overall ratio does not give a true picture of the work load of individual instructors because it has long been a practice in Thai system of higher education for an instructor spend many hours with students in the instructional programs. Also, the teacher has to perform other clerical and administrative duties since clerical and administrative positions are usually not approved by the Budget Bureau.25

Out of a total 5632 teaching faculty, there are 180 history instructors in teachers colleges. History is part of the general requirements for the bachelor degree. In some teachers colleges, students can study history as their major or minor subject.26

Significance of the Study

In the past, much of the educational budget was used to finance the establishment of physical facilities in order to increase enrollments and to promote equality of education.27 Since 1977, the policy of the government has been to minimize


26 Department of Teacher Education, A Report on Educational Statistic, p. 11, and Department of Teacher Education, Curriculum, pp. 91-92.

the differences in educational quality between the urban and rural areas. The quality improvement in education is expected to decrease the flow of students to the Metropolitan region, while at the same time cultivating attachment to their own regions.²⁸

Teachers colleges are among the institutions of higher learning in Thailand which involve themselves in the process of cultural and social development. Since the 36 teacher colleges are expected to play a positive role in the development of their regional societies, the basis of social science instruction in different regions is designed to enhance the specific characteristics of each geographical area as well as the nation.

Various authors have proposed new approaches to teaching history to enliven students' interest in the subject and to increase student learning.²⁹ Any attempt, however, by curriculum planners, practitioners, or others to draft plans, or devise innovative techniques to help improve the quality of instruction for social development in different regions requires some pertinent data about history instructors. There has been relatively little research adequately describing teacher college instructors, their training, or their

²⁸"Thailand" (author not given) Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia and Oceania, 20 (June, 1979), 260.

²⁹Malila, Techniques of Teaching History; and Ladawal Malayawong, Status of Teaching and Learning of the History at Higher Certificate Level (Bangkok, 1975).
attitudes. There has been little or no previous attempt to investigate the differences in the teaching of history and history instructors in teachers colleges in the Metropolitan region and other regions.

History is not only important in teacher preparation, but it is becoming increasingly important in the educational system of the society. The findings of this study could be a vital component for developing effective teacher education programs as well as the social development of Thai youth.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter I includes the problem, purposes, background and significance of the study. Chapter II presents a review of the related literature concerning the teaching of history. Chapter III discusses the research design, population of the study, instrumentation, and data collection. Chapter IV provides the data analyses and interpretation of the collected data. Chapter V summarizes the study, identifies the findings, and also contains the conclusions, implications and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of the literature on the teaching of history in institutions of higher education. The review is divided into three sections. The first section includes an historical overview of the teaching of history in higher education institutions in America. The second section reviews research studies on the teaching of history in the United States. The last section focuses on the teaching of history in Thailand.

Background of the Teaching of History in the Higher Education Institutions in America

Although the evidence is sparse, it does not appear that history played a major role in higher education curriculum in the early American colonial colleges. In the first Harvard curriculum in 1642, history was given only one hour on Saturday afternoon in the winter term. History did not appear in later statements of the curriculum until after the middle of the eighteenth century.¹

It was Benjamin Franklin who suggested in his "Proposals Relating to the Education of the Youth in Pennsylvania," in 1749, that history should be included among the subjects to be

offered in the Academy in Philadelphia. The Academy was expanded into a college, and Preceptor Le Cler's "Copends of History" was included in the curriculum. Before the end of the eighteenth century, a number of prominent Americans of the Revolutionary and early National period were making much the same point, which Benjamin Franklin had stressed, that the existing college curriculum was too heavily classical. They were William Smith, Francis Hopkinson, Jonathan Trumbull, and Benjamin Rush, and the most important person was Thomas Jefferson. Dissatisfied with the reorganization of William and Mary College in 1779, Jefferson concentrated all his energies during his last years on seeking the establishment of a great state university which would more adequately embody his ideas.

Jefferson proposed to have eight broad divisions of study: the ancient languages, the modern languages, mathematics, natural philosophy and natural history, anatomy and medicine, history, law and government, and moral philosophy. The Virginia legislature authorized the set of the college in 1825.

---


5 Brubacher, Higher, p. 100
It was Columbia College which was the first American institution of higher education to recognize history as a worthwhile subject. History was taught in what was then a unique way for America. Rev. John Daniel Gross, a professor of German and geography from 1784 to 1795, taught a sophomore course three times a week. The course was characterized as a description of the Globe in respect of all general matters. Rise, extent, and fall of ancient empires; chronology as low as the fall of the Roman Empire; present state of the world; origin of the present States and Kingdoms— their extent, power, commerce, religion, and customs; modern chronology.

The American college curricula before the Civil War consisted chiefly of studies in Latin, Greek, mathematics, logic, and moral philosophy, with occasional smatterings of Hebrew and rather elementary physics and astronomy. The "Yale Report" in 1828 was probably the most influential publication in the whole history of American higher education between the Revolution and Civil War. It was a thorough defense of the traditional American liberal arts college, and it gave support to academic conservatives. The elective system was slowed considerably by the report. It declared that a prescribed curriculum, featuring the thorough study of

---

6 A History of Columbia University 1754-1904 (author not given) (London, 1904), p. 70

the ancient languages, was the only proper system for a college. It has frequently been asserted, and is generally believed, that history (and American history) was not offered as a separate subject before 1815. During much of the nineteenth century, educators frequently thought of history as a part of something, rather than as a distinct and separate discipline. But when Richard Heigh was elected Professor of History and Humanity at William and Mary College in 1821, he gave three lectures a week in history. Textbooks used were Hume's History of England and Ramsey's History of the United States. Yale may have emphasized history as a distinct subject in 1822, while most colleges were including it in other areas.

It is generally agreed that Jared Sparks was the first recognized professor of history in any American college. He was appointed the McLean Professor of History at Harvard in 1839. In his first term, he gave a series of lectures on the American Revolution, covering the period from 1763 to 1783. This appointment of Sparks represented the

8 Brubacher, Higher, pp. 102-103.
9 L. G. Tyler, "History in William and Mary College," Nation, 75 (November, 1902), 399.
recognition of the idea of the importance of history. This led the way to the recognition of history as worthy of an independent chair in most of the higher institutions of learning.\(^{12}\) The influence of Sparks, who had a deep interest in the colonial and revolutionary periods, affected the writers of school texts. At least one hundred American history textbooks were published in 255 editions in the years between the close of the War of 1812 and the beginning of the Civil War.\(^ {13}\)

When history gradually became accepted as a separate subject, the courses had not yet become definitely standardized by the middle to late nineteenth century. The various colleges offered universal or general, ancient, medieval, or modern history, Biblical antiquities, history of England, France, or the United States, and sometimes the state’s history. Although diversity long continued to characterize the history program, the two courses that were becoming increasingly prevalent were general history and United States history.\(^ {14}\)

\(^{12}\) Adams, Study, p. 17.


Numerous historians made an effort to emphasize the need to study history in the later nineteenth century. However, in 1880 there were only eleven professors of history in the United States. In the same year, President Eliot of Harvard refused Edward Channing's request to teach American history. Eliot explained, "you know how elementary the teaching on that subject is in American schools." 

Before Andrew White became president of Cornell University in 1866, he placed history at the forefront of studies in the University of Michigan. To White, history and political science were the most directly useful subjects in the curriculum. He determined that Cornell should have its professor as soon as circumstances would permit. In 1881, White appointed Moses Coit Tyler to the first professorship of American history in America.

In the nineteenth century, the election system was the central educational battle in America. The key issue was "should the American college remain predominantly religious in orientation and a broad liberal culture; or should it become essentially secular, serving the interests of utilitarianism, 

---


social efficiency, and scholarly research?" 19 The most dramatic development of the elective curriculum in the immediate post-Civil War period came at Harvard. In 1869, Charles William Eliot was elected president of Harvard. By the academic year of 1874-75, all Harvard required courses were limited to the freshman year, with the exception of rhetoric, philosophy, history, and political science. The only restriction on election was that elementary courses had to be taken before advanced ones. Electives were extended to freshmen in 1883-1884, covering three-fifths of their work. 20

The principle of the elective system made it possible to expand and broaden the American college curriculum. 21 It enabled colleges to become universities by expanding curricula to include the natural sciences and later the social sciences, and by ordering the whole spectrum of knowledge into convenient departments. At the end of the nineteenth century, the subject of history was firmly established as a proper academic study in American colleges, but its primary concern was with the political and military history of the ancient world, Europe, and American. 22

19 Brubacher, Higher, p. 98.  
20 Ibid., pp. 110-111.  
21 Ibid., p. 115.  
The development of history curricula during the late decades of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth show tremendous growth in the course offerings. In 1868, Columbia offered two courses to sophomores; Roman and Greek history, and Medieval and Modern History of the Eighteenth Century. However, all candidates for the Bachelor of Arts degree were required to take Epochs of Ancient, Medieval, and Modern History, plus sixteen courses in Medieval and Modern History and the history of certain countries, as well as eight courses in American History, in 1898. The catalogue of 1916-1917 named twenty history professors, instructors, associate professors, and assistants. Six pages were devoted to more than one hundred history courses offered. Among them there were twenty-seven in European History, and twenty-three in American History. 23

In 1878, Harvard offered three prescribed courses and eight electives in history. The prescribed courses were Freeman's Outline of General History, Flander's Exposition of the Constitution of the United States, and Ewald's "The Crown and its Advisers." There were six courses in European history and only two courses in United States history. The 1914-1915 catalogue listed seventy-seven history courses, and the 1917-1918 catalogue named seventeen professors in history, and contained nine pages of history course listings. 24

---

23 Edith M. Clark, "The History Curriculum since 1850," The Historical Outlook, 11 (February, 1920), 62-63.
24 Ibid., p. 63-64.
In the early twentieth century, American history had not yet become a required course. Most colleges had a general introductory course as a prescribed course in the college curriculum, and it was taken in the sophomore year. It dealt primarily with the story of European civilization, emphasizing Christianity and the heritage of Greece and Rome. It attempted to explain "how we have come about." 25

Since 1900, American history has come to be taught in at least three cycles in almost all school systems. Colleges have been forced to expand their emphasis upon American history for better teacher preparation. One of the phenomena of the first four decades of this century has been the public interest in American history teaching. Patriotic societies, minority groups, economic organizations, and others have exerted influence on the curriculum. 26 A study of fifty traditional four-year colleges accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1930 showed that every institution in the study offered a number of history courses. Forty-seven of them offered at least ten


courses. A total of 830 courses in history were offered, for an average of almost seventeen per college.\(^{27}\)

The war in Europe was also a factor which encouraged interest in history. The most striking increase of effort after 1917 occurred in recent history, in the areas outside of western Europe and American, and in the numerous interdisciplinary interests. At Columbia College, in 1919, a course was named Contemporary Civilization. It emphasized recent history and the spread of European influences throughout the world. It brought the multiplicity of modern knowledge within a unifying historical perspective. A new course that embodied those objectives, a course usually entitled History of Western Civilization, became the staple of historical instruction between the two world wars.\(^{28}\)

During the early years of World War II, a widespread dissatisfaction with a criticism of the teaching of American history in the schools and colleges was voiced. The criticism was headed by a survey on college study of United States history, which was reported by Benjamin Fine in June 21, 1942, in the *New York Times*. The survey showed that thirteen


per cent of 135 professional and technical schools and 448 colleges and universities required American history for graduation. Among 292 teacher colleges, forty-eight per cent of them also required American history for graduation. The study also reported that almost seventy per cent of these 690 institutions thought that United States history should be made compulsory.  

The New York Times, on April 4, 1943, published the results of its history test, which revealed that a large majority of the college freshmen had no knowledge of elementary aspects of American history. They could not identify such names as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, or Theodore Roosevelt, and they had little conception of the significant trends that have made the United States the nation as it was then.

Referring to the New York Times test, James A.V. Buckley argued that it was not the students who had taken the test who had failed, but the teachers. He explained that the teachers did not fail in history, but they did fail in education: "They failed not because they did not know and did not use the approved methods, but because the approved methods and the objective to be reached by those methods are incorrect. They


have worked on the principles that anything more than a year old is antique and outmoded, and the only good things are brand new things."  

Such appraisal enabled the schools and colleges to reconsider their purpose and rechart their courses. The American Historical Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the National Council for Social Studies, in April 1943, jointly sponsored the Committee on American History in the Schools and Colleges to prepare a report and recommendations regarding the teaching of American History in schools and colleges. The committee concluded in October, 1943, that the number of courses in American history in the schools and colleges was sufficient. Their study of the catalogues of sixty-two colleges and universities and thirty-one teacher colleges showed that every one of them offered courses in American History, ranging in number from six to ninety-three. Every institution gave a general course in American history; forty-five listed courses in Latin American History, thirty-two in the Westward movement, twenty-eight in the diplomatic history of the United States, and twenty-six in American economic or social history, or the two in combination. The types of special courses in teacher colleges were similar to those in the colleges and universities.  

31 James A. V. Buckley, "History as it is Not Taught," America, 71 (April, 1943), 46.  
departments of fifty-six colleges and universities showed that only fourteen per cent of the total student body was enrolled in American history courses. The committee recommended that efforts should be made to raise that number.\textsuperscript{33}

The committee explained that how well Americans knew their history depended upon the standard by which their knowledge was measured. Any useful, practical, and reasonable standard of achievement in American history must be derived, not from what a group of enthusiasts thought should be the standard, but from the records of what selected groups actually achieved. The committee administered the \textit{Test of Understanding of the United States History} during August and September, 1943. The results of its test confirmed that Americans must repeatedly be exposed to their own history in school, in college, and in adult life. The committee was convinced that the student must have an understanding of geography, economics, sociology, government, and particularly world history, if Americans were to approach an understanding of their own history. The committee did not believe that it was possible to prescribe the magic formula by which teachers can fix the content of American history in the minds of their pupils for all time. It did not recommend increased requirements or additional offerings.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 42-43.

\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 2, 4, 6, 12-13.
Some of their findings were that the committee believed in the value of research and publication, but the committee deplored any tendency to stress research at the expense of good teaching. Social studies teachers should take more undergraduate and graduate courses in the other social sciences as well as in history, but it should not be construed as a disparagement of courses in other fields. The departments of history and education needed to cooperate in the development of better courses for the training of history teachers.\(^\text{35}\)

History, as taught, was severely criticized for being dull and painful when it was little more than memorization of dates and trivial facts.\(^\text{36}\) Unfortunately, teachers and writers of history knew why the events were important, and they expected their students to accept without question the statement that they are important: "There still are courses in history in which students memorize long list of facts without ever receiving an explanation of the significance of the facts."

Students might as well be asked to learn the geography and economic activities of their town by memorizing the telephone directory.\(^\text{37}\)

The public schools were ahead of the colleges in matching methods with objectives, and it was believed that changes

\(^\text{35}\) Ibid., pp. 119-120.


\(^\text{37}\) Wesley, American, pp. 20-21.
might be forced on the college teachers by the students who
came to them for innovative schools, "students who will no
longer sit still for the old history." History as taught in
the higher institutions of learning has borne little relation
to the objectives, at least in the minds of the instructors.
The majority of college teachers concentrated their teaching
efforts on history majors, rather than on the vast majority of
students whose only opportunities for historical learning were
in the freshmen and sophomore courses.  

During the Second World War, when it became apparent that
American education needed re-evaluation, James Bryant Conant,
President of Harvard, called upon his faculty to consider the
problem of general education and Harvard's policy toward
it. In the publication of the Harvard Report in 1945,
under the title General Education in a Free Society, the
role of history appeared. Conant explained his concern for
the continuation of the "liberal and humane tradition as basic
to civilization" in the American system of mass or universal
education.  

38 Charles G. Sellers, "Is history on the Way Out of the
School and Do Historians Care?" Social Education, 33 (May,
1969), 510, 515.

39 Richard Hofstadter and Willson Smith, American Higher
954.

40 James B. Crooks, "History's Role in General Education,"
The Journal of General Education, 31 (Summer, 1979), 111.
As a result of the task handed to the history departments by theorists in general education, much effort was expended by historians. They organized lecture and discussion groups with the utmost care for efficiency in instruction. They helped to produce textbooks, syllabi, visual aids, and workbooks at a bewildering rate, in order that no student of any college or university would be stamped "educated" until he had learned history.  

By the late 1940s, history was a fundamental component of the undergraduate curriculum. History was no longer simply "past politics" or mere memorization of facts, dates and events. Instead, it incorporated interdisciplinary insights into the examination of American institutions, or stressed the intellectual achievements of Western civilization. Faculty thought about what students should know about their heritage and realized "the dangers of playing God with students' curricula".

In 1958-1959, American history or American civilization, was a requirement of 39 per cent of the colleges, or more than twice as many as in 1942. The history of non-Western areas in the colleges looked much stronger in terms of courses added than in terms of enrollment increases. Courses arranged by

---


topics rather than by periods or areas became increasingly common.  

General education leveled off in the 1950s and appeared to hit bottom in late sixties and early seventies. History no longer was considered integral to general education or even, perhaps, to the university. Historians contributed in part to the decline of their discipline by preferring to teach their specialties rather than interdisciplinary or introductory general education courses. 

A Louis Harris Poll conducted in 1969 showed that of the twenty-one subjects in their curriculum, American high school students regarded history as the "most irrelevant." Survey courses tried to cover too much material, and history teachers expected their students to comprehend 6,000 years of development covered in a 101 history class: "Because of the manner in which it is taught, history is not learned and the subject is becoming increasingly irrelevant to contemporary man." 

In a search for the cause of the decline of the popularity of history, in the spring of 1973 the Organization of American Historians created the Ad Hoc Committee on the }

---

46 Billy Rojas "The End of History," The Social Studies, 72 (March, 1972), 118-120.
Status of History in School to study whether history was in
crisis and to gather the facts needed as a base for effective
action. The committee's first report in 1975 indicated that a
substantial number of respondents reported enrollment in
history courses in colleges and universities had dropped
sharply in most parts of the country during the early
seventies. A change in requirements was not the only cause of
decline. Other factors were an overall decline in college
enrollment, and a sharp drop in job opportunities for his-
torians. College students of the sixties and early seventies
tended to regard history as irrelevant, and to desire more
practical courses than history.47

In 1967, the New York Times conducted a second national
evaluation of knowledge of American history and concluded
that Americans were uninformed about their past. The New
York Times test showed little difference between the 1967
scores and 1943 scores, although both were acknowledged to
be low.48

Historians and history teachers pointed out that students
disliked history and did not learn it because of the manner in
which it was taught: the use of the traditional approach of

47 Richard S. Kirkendall, "The Status of History in the
Schools," The Journal of American History, 62 (September,
1975), 557-568.

48 "Times Test of College Freshmen," New York Times, May 2,
pp. 1, 43.
the lecture-examination methods, and a failure to involve the
student in the learning process.49

Research Studies Related to the Study of History Instructors
in Higher Education Institutions in the United States

Despite the many calls for new teaching techniques,
little research has been directed toward ideal modes of in-
struction for the teaching of history. The most fundamental
need is to move inside classrooms, recasting teachers and
researchers in new and different roles. More thorough
research, combining both objective and subjective measures,
will be necessary to describe more fully the status of history
and to recreate more fully the complexities of the modern
classroom.50

A study on The Education of Historians in the United
States, under the auspices of American Historical Association,
and a grant by the Carnegie Corporation, described the char-
acter of history instructors at the bachelor degree level.
The study relied upon letters from 134 college executives,
and questionnaires completed by the chairmen of history de-
partments in 126 "better-than-average" four-year colleges,
376 "typical" colleges, and fifty-one junior colleges randomly
selected from various types of institutions as tabulated by

49 Eugene Hinkston, "Involving History Students,"
Improving College and University Teaching, 11 (Autumn, 1963),
222.

50 George L. Mehaffy, "History as Subject Matter,"
p. 806.
the U.S. Office of Education in 1958. None of them was offering the Doctor of Philosophy in history. The study found that the 126 better colleges reported an average of 8.8 historians per college. The 376 four-year colleges reported an average of 4.9 historians per college, and the junior colleges reported an average of 3.8 per institution. Two-thirds of the history instructors in the junior colleges held a master degree as the highest degree. No less than 58 per cent of the faculty members in the history departments of typical colleges, and 71 per cent of instructors of better colleges held the Doctor of Philosophy.

Lecture remained the basic form of instruction in which history courses were most commonly taught. Only 2 per cent suggested that they used television, and less than 1 per cent encouraged independent study by students. In the better colleges, the normal load was twelve hours of teaching per week. The national average size of Introduction to American history classes were thirty-six students, and of advanced undergraduate American History classes were twenty-four students. Four-fifths of the better colleges reported that teaching and other duties consumed so much time that they interfered with the development of history teachers as research scholars.

---

51 Perkins, The Education of, pp. 61, 213.
52 Ibid., pp. 65-66.
53 Ibid., pp. 69-71, 79-81.
United States history was offered by all the colleges and junior colleges. One-third of junior colleges offered courses in Western civilization. More than nine-tenths of the four-year colleges taught courses in modern European history or World history. The libraries of American colleges were hampered by financial limitations, and libraries are of direct concern to teachers of history. Library holdings are especially inadequate in the history of foreign areas.54

In 1976, a survey was done by a group of scholars from four institutions to study teaching and curricula on four different levels: the university, the liberal arts college, the two-year and community colleges, and the continuing education programs. They found that many traditional requirements, such as Western or World civilization, had been eliminated at the university and liberal arts college levels as a response to student demand for more "relevance." Over 60 per cent of the two-year and community colleges require history for an associate's degree. The lecture and the lecture-discussion method, combined with a substantial amount of texts and collateral reading, remain the predominant modes of teaching at all levels. History instructors in all levels of higher education had made a great use of audio-visual aids in their teaching.55

54 Ibid., pp. 68, 75-77.

In a study by Franklin Pruitt in 1978, he points out that the discipline of history is in a struggle for survival in the curriculum. In order to make history more relevant, local and regional history should be emphasized. The professional organization of history teachers and of other historians should take a lead in forming task forces with the responsibility of determining ways of improving the discipline and of making needed recommendations.\textsuperscript{56}

Since World War II, higher education in the United States has moved from elitism to education for all. The returning of the G.I. flooded the college campus. As a number took advantage of the G.I. Bill, a significant portion of them came from families which had never thought of college careers before.\textsuperscript{57} Community colleges eventually became "the primary vehicle for social and economic advancement for the lower two-thirds of the population."\textsuperscript{58}

Some characteristics of the junior college history instructor have also been studied by many researchers. In a national study on the role of the humanities instructors in two-year colleges, conducted by the Center for the Study of


\textsuperscript{57} Brubacher, \textit{Higher}, p. 263.

Community Colleges under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, in 1977 the study surveyed 1,493 humanities instructors in 156 two-year colleges. The findings revealed that nearly half of the faculty members in two year colleges taught in two or more subject areas. Many humanities instructors read no academic journals, and were not involved in national professional or disciplinary organizations; twenty-three per cent were not members of any professional group; fifty-five per cent had not attended a regional or national meeting in the past three years; and 90 per cent had not presented a paper.59

A report on the opinions of eight specialists in the social sciences area in junior college level show that the majority gave high ratings to six methods of teaching social science: the lecture, textbook, objective exam, written exam, discussion, and audio-visual aid. They gave lower ratings to independent study, student performance, field trip, conference, oral exam, observation, and television. The instructors considered the following to be major disadvantages of the teaching process: (a) lack of time for scholarship, (b) inadequacies of library materials, and (c) the need to teach many different courses. They suggested that new teachers should have an appreciation and knowledge of the humanities, prepare lectures well in advance, be enthusiastic

In teaching, avoid the dry and dull facts and dates in history, stay abreast of current development in the field, read constantly, and communicate meaningfully to students.\textsuperscript{60}

In the more recent study of history instructors in the publicly supported junior and community colleges in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' accrediting region, Maumusu obtained data from 230 history instructors in 88 publicly supported community, junior, and technical colleges randomly selected throughout the eleven states comprising the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' accrediting region. He found that over 80 per cent of the participants were males. The master's degree was the highest degree reported by more than three instructors out of five. Approximately one in three held the doctorate. About 70 per cent of those with a bachelor's degree, 79 per cent of those with a master's degree, and nearly 84 per cent of those with a doctor's degree had earned their degrees in history.\textsuperscript{61}

Over 50 per cent of the history faculty had teaching assignments in another discipline. The teaching loads of nearly two-thirds of the instructors were between thirteen and fifteen semester hours per term. The lecture and textbook

\textsuperscript{60}Win Kelley and Leslie Wibur, \textit{Teaching in the Community-Junior College} (New York, 1970), pp. 80-82.

method of teaching history was the method favored by an impressive 97.2 per cent of the instructors. About 40 per cent of the teachers utilized the inquiry method. Over 80 per cent of the respondents were not currently working on a higher degree. About half of the respondents had completed high school in the state in which they were then residing; approximately the same percentage had graduated from college and had earned advanced degrees in the state in which they were currently teaching. Almost one-third of the instructors had earned more than 60 semester hours of graduate credit, approximately one-fifth had between fifty-one and sixty hours, more than one-seventh reported from forty-one to fifty hours, and less than one-tenth claimed fewer than twenty-one graduate hours. One-third of the instructors reported no graduate credit in professional education, and a little over 25 per cent of the respondents had earned from one to ten semester hours in education.\(^\text{62}\)

Most instructors had not published books, but four in ten had published one or more articles. However, almost nine out of ten received support from their institutions to attend professional meetings. The history faculty is also an experienced group with ten or more years of teaching experience. Most of them, prior to coming to their present position had previously taught in a high school or in a four-year college or university. The master's degree in

\(^{62}\)Ibid., pp. 108-111.
history, supplemented by advanced study in education, apparently affords adequate preparation for junior college teaching. The major portion of history instructors' time was spent in teaching. Research activities and writings received low priority in time. Besides, few instructors attended national professional meetings.63

Issues Related to the Teaching of History in Thailand

As has been explained, the word history is a new word in the Thai language. The purpose of the new term is to replace the old tradition of studying history, which was confined to the study of the annals of members of a line, dynasty, or kingdom (pong-sava-darn). It was hoped that the new term would offer a greater meaning to the subject.64

When Chulalongkorn University achieved its status as the first university in Thailand in 1917, history was recognized as part of the curriculum for the first time in 1923 in the Department of Arts and Science. The teaching of history at the early Thai university was very limited because the major goal of the university was to offer programs for science majors. It was in 1933 that the Department of Arts and Science began to expand its course offerings of history for students who would become history teachers. Then, the subject

63 Ibid., pp. 112-113.

64 Sukit Nimanheminda, "The Usefulness and the Capability to Use History in Thailand," The Philosophy of History, edited by Chanwit Kasetsiri (Bangkok, 1976), pp. 209-211.
of history was firmly established in the institution. The development of history during the early university period until the revolution of 1932 showed a tremendous transformation from a subject only for the nobles and high ranking monks, to courses offered in the higher education institutions.  

When the second university, Thamasat University, was established in 1934, history played a minor role in the university curriculum because the purpose of the university was to teach law. In 1962, Thamasat University began to offer history as a major subject in the Department of Liberal Arts. Besides these two universities, Srinakarinwirote University at Prasanmitr has offered history as a part of the curriculum since 1954. Srinakarinwirote University began to offer history as a major subject in 1963. Until then, history had not been offered as a major subject in any higher education institution. It is notable that, even today, none of the Thai higher educational institutions has recognized history as a separate department.

In the same respect, the development of historical organizations has been very slow. The Siam Society, organized in 1940, has had some interest in the history of literature and language. The Society has published its own journal in

---


66 Ibid., pp. 7-8.
English twice a year. Today, there is only one historical society in Thailand, which was established in 1979. The purpose of the Thai Historical Society is to be the center for research, study, and exchange of ideas for the historians, and others, who are interested in history.

The reasons for such slow development after 1932, as previously indicated, are not difficult to recognize. Thai people do not like to openly express ideas about the history of their own country; it is a custom of the Thais to be modest and not to speak much about themselves to outsiders. They also do not want to state their criticisms in writing, because they do not want to be called a traitor. Thai society would react negatively to people who discuss improper stories about Thailand to foreigners. Sometimes, the government itself would show a dissatisfied reaction toward those people.

There are two reasons which prevent change in the study of Thai history. After Prince Damrong Rajanubhap, the greatest Thai historian, died in 1944, no historian has had a significant impact on the content of history, and the majority of history textbooks have not been revised since the reform of the Ministry of Education in 1892.

---

69 Nimanheminda, "The Usefulness," pp. 219-221.
70 Kachorn Sookpanich, "The History Subject and Thai History," The Philosophy of History, edited by Chanwit Kasetsiri (Bangkok, 1976), pp. 245-246.
Traditionally, Thai culture is partly based on Buddhism. In the Buddhist philosophy of education, the role of the teacher has been considered as akin to a ferry boat which takes individuals from one bank of a river to the other, and returns for more passengers. His real satisfaction should come from having the inner conviction to perform service for humanity. Wealth, renown, and personal achievements are but vanities to the true teacher. There should be several methods of teaching for teachers to select and employ in various learning situations. Chief among these are dialectics, debate, and lecturing. Tapingkae, define the methods of teaching that it should lead to the following steps of learning:

1. Finding the right aim, or locating the exact problem.

2. Setting up hypotheses that may lead to the solution (making guesses as to the various ways which may solve the problem).

3. Experimenting or trying them out, and gathering the data.

4. Analyzing the data and coming to a conclusion regarding the way in which the problem can be solved.

The principles of the teacher education curriculum in teachers colleges in Thailand aim at producing prospective

---


Ibid., pp. 16-17.
teachers with sufficient knowledge, ability, and skills to take roles that fit them in to their social and economic surroundings. The social and economic situations of the rural and urban areas are considered to be basic in the teacher education curriculum. One major objective in the curriculum is an appreciation of the needs which are required to maintain the national identity and culture as well as other culture besides their own.73

According to the outline of the teacher education curriculum, the objectives of the subject of history in the teachers colleges are as follows:

1. To acquire a good knowledge and understanding of Thai history, and to acquire a sufficient degree of knowledge of foreign history.

2. To understand the continuity of history, civilization and technological progress created and accumulated by mankind; to understand the attempt to live together peacefully among nations.

3. To teach history analytically and critically, using evidence and reasons with creativity.

4. To realize the value of national development, of the preservation of independence, and of national heritage, and to promote the feeling of love, concern and the preservation of them.

5. To form the habit of interest in world events, politics, economics, and social situations in general.

74 Ibid., p. 93.
As has already been indicated, history is a relatively new subject in Thailand and, therefore, research studies on the teaching of history have been few in number. In citing some unique characteristics of teaching and learning in Thailand, Malila, in 1980, listed the following points: (1) history teaching and learning in Thailand does not include a discussion about the philosophy of history and the methodology of history; (2) textbooks on Thai history are scarce because, traditionally, Thai people do not like to write about themselves; (3) students and teachers do not have pride in the discipline of history, and there is a great deal of misunderstanding of the objectives of history; and (4) students' interest in history is dissipated by irrelevant information, when the emphasis is on presenting a body of facts to the student, and then examining how many facts they have memorized.  

Songsiri's 1976 survey of forty-five World history teachers and 460 students in ten junior high schools in Bangkok showed that a majority of teachers had a bachelor degree, with six to seven years of teaching experience. Teachers preferred to use the lecture technique, which was disliked by students. The most critical problems that teachers found in their teaching were in the areas of syllabi, textbooks, and teaching aids. Teachers and students agreed on the point that

examinations should measure students' ability to think, rather than the ability to memorize.\textsuperscript{76}

In 1975, the Department of Teacher Education published a survey study on the conditions of teaching and learning history at the Higher Certificate in Education degree level. Data was from ninety-four history instructors in twenty-five teachers colleges. In reporting on the attitudes of teachers toward history, 31.5 per cent of the history instructors felt that history enabled the teacher to keep abreast of the times; that is, to be aware of, and to understand, contemporary issues. Twenty-nine per cent indicated that history is interesting to students, and 29 per cent of the instructors believed that it was a subject relevant to students' daily life. On an item inquiring about students' interest in history, the study found that nearly 70 per cent of the instructors felt that the students showed adequate interest and understanding of the importance of history, and nearly two-fifths of them believed that students had great interest in, and an understanding of, the importance of history. This study also showed that 28.4 per cent of the instructors considered a lack of learning resource centers for the teachers to use for the improvement of their teaching to be their main problem, and nearly two-fifths of the instructors complained about insufficient

time allotted for teaching their course content in accordance with the syllabus. 77

Another study, in 1976, was done on the teaching methods, activities, and the use of equipment in the teaching of history at the Higher Certificate of Education level. The study was based on 181 return questionnaires from history instructors in twenty-nine teachers colleges. With respect to teaching methods, activities, and the use of equipment, no significant differences were found among history instructors who have different educational backgrounds and academic preparation. The majority of history instructors, especially those with limited experience, were found to use the lecture method. The most important problems were the limited number of history books in the library, and the insufficient periods per week in the semester for teaching the content of the syllabus. 78

Udomvech did an experimental study in 1981, using traditional and inquiry techniques, at Petchaburi Vidyalongkorn Teachers College, to find the desirable techniques for teaching history in teachers colleges. He found that there were no significant differences in student

77Ladawal Malayawong, Status of Teaching and Learning of History at Higher Certificate Level (Bangkok, 1975), pp. 40, 45, 49.

performance between the experimental group and control group, but, he concluded that the inquiry technique encouraged below average students to have greater interest in the subject. 79

Jintarax conducted a study to determine teaching methods and techniques at the undergraduate level in Thailand. The data presented in his study were from questionnaires returned from fifty-two history instructors from eight universities in Bangkok as respondents, and from interviews with fifty-six Thai graduate students from three universities in the United States. Of the fifty-two instructors who responded, six held doctoral degrees, thirty-eight held master's degrees, and eight held bachelor degrees. Exactly half of the instructors had taken courses on methods of teaching history. The majority of the respondents spent most of their class period lecturing, while less than one-fifth of them believed the lecture was the most effective method; however, 63 per cent of them believed that a combination of lecture, discussion, and independent study was the most effective teaching technique. A large number of teachers presented their material by choosing only topics they felt important and relevant to contemporary situations. All of the instructors believed that maintaining a good relationship with students could have a

positive influence on their effectiveness, and more than eight-tenths of them engaged in informal discussion with students in class.  

The instructors indicated the major problems they had to encounter were an inadequate supply of teaching aids, a lack of student interest, an inadequate supplies of books, especially those in the Thai language; library books were often dated; there was a lack of skills among the instructors, and official red tape. Several of them thought that history syllabi in Thailand needed to be revised in order to be relevant to the present day situation in Thailand. Over-crowded classrooms did not appear to be a great problem, since only one-fourth of the respondents indicated having more than forty students per class. The government of Thailand does not seem to have given enough support to research and teaching at the university.  

Meesing, in her work "Social Studies in Thailand," in Social Studies in Other Nations, explains the methods of teaching social studies in Thailand. Social studies teachers depend too heavily upon lectures and textbooks. They do little to encourage thinking or active involvement in learning. Students sense the power teachers have over them.

---


81 Ibid., pp. 45, 89.
and do not experience close and friendly relationships. Teachers are asked to employ new methods and approaches in the new curriculum program, but Thai teachers have not been trained according to the new expectations. New teachers in this field have shown no greater competence in the new teaching approaches than the older teachers. Perhaps this is because many student-teachers must enroll in only one course in teaching methods while they must take more than seven courses in their subject specialties. Student-teachers do not learn good instructional models because many of the courses in teachers colleges employ lectures almost exclusively.  

Science instructors have likewise been the subject of a comprehensive study. In one investigation, Tanasilangcoo surveyed eighty-two science instructors in 1984 in eight teachers colleges in Northeastern regions in Thailand. Data obtained in this study showed that 85 per cent of the instructors were under thirty-five years of age, with approximately 20 per cent below twenty-five. Master's degrees were held by 64.6 per cent of the respondents, and 35.4 held the bachelor's degree. More than 80 per cent of the science instructors taught in only one field, and nearly 54 per cent of the instructors reported a teaching load of more than ten semester credits per term. Nearly 46 per cent of the science instructors had less than three years of teaching experience, and more

---

than one-half of the instructors indicated that they did not have any experience in a seminar on teaching science.83

It is generally agreed that students should know something about history and geography of the world, but they should also know about current developments and past traditions of their own locality. Relatively little has been taught about Thailand, and often students are not aware of the history of their own province. The higher education institutions must develop a program of training that would provide prospective teachers with opportunities to apply what they have learned at the institutions in an actual rural setting. The provincial branches of the college should be a major source of knowledge about the regions where they are located. It was anticipated that the college would be able to work with the central educational authorities to develop a more diversified curriculum, which would not be based entirely on the particular circumstances and traditions of the more advanced central region.84

Wilairat conducted a study in 1978 on the problems of the teaching process as it relates to the social studies program at the Bachelor's degree level in teachers colleges. She

83 Sawangchit Tanasilangoon, Status and Problems in Teaching Science at Bachelor's Degree Level in Teachers Colleges in Northeastern Region (Übol Rajathani, Thailand, 1983), pp. 11, 16.

concluded that the majority of social studies instructors from regional areas appear to get better cooperation from their colleagues than those in the metropolitan area. Almost all instructors from both groups want to attend seminars in teaching; the metropolitan group needs it for improving their teaching, while the regional group needs it for the subject-matter knowledge. About half of both groups organize their presentations by following a written syllabus. The majority of both groups evaluate their students twice each semester. According to Wilairat, most of the instructors in the metropolitan area evaluate their students as required by the institution, while most of the instructors in the regional areas evaluate their students for the purpose of developing teaching and learning processes.85

Institutions of higher learning have attempted to involve themselves more in the process of rural development in recent years. This attempt is still considered to be in the beginning stage. A majority of the processes are said to be unsystematically organized.86 Suthasupa and the Chaisorns did a research study, in 1982, on the trends and current emphasis of rural development in Thailand. The study was


designed to find out if there were any differences between metropolitan and regional higher education institutions in the areas of achievements, problems and effects of the programs. Some of the programs involved only a group of faculties, a group of students, or a joint involvement of students and teachers in the institutions. The data from this study showed that most of the academic staff hold masters' degrees. However, in the metropolitan institutions, all of the faculty hold master's degree or higher. The faculty in the metropolitan institutions tended to have a better academic background than those in regional institutions and they also had better support from their superiors. All institutions have emphasized agricultural production and the neglected social issues. Suthasupa and the Chaisorns suggest that institutions of higher education need to focus more on the social and cultural problems in rural areas. In solving the problems, the government tends to offer actual assistance, or to do things for people, rather than help the people learn how to do things for themselves. This kind of development did not originate within the rural society and this tends to create many social conflicts, which leads away from self-sufficiency.

87 Ibid., pp. 55, 60.
88 Ibid., p. 85.
Summary

This review of the literature concerns the teaching of history in the institutions of higher learning. History was not accepted as a separate subject in the American college curriculum before the early nineteenth century. Even though it was established as a proper subject in American colleges, its primary concern was with the political and military history of the ancient world, Europe, and American. The two World Wars increased public interest in history. Non-Western World and courses arranged by topics rather than by periods history courses became increasingly common during the 1950s. In order to make history more relevant to college students, local and regional history was given a greater emphasis.

In America, the lecture method and the use of audio-visual aids become the basic techniques used in history courses. Lecture is a way of alerting students quickly to conflicting historical interpretations, and thus stimulating critical thought. From the students perspective, however, history has been criticized as being dull and painful because it has emphasized the memorization of dates and trivial facts, and in addition, it also covers too much material. Although college students have elected to take practical courses in history, history instructors prefer to teach their specialties rather than introductory courses.

Six years after the establishment of Chulalongkorn University, the first university in Thailand, history was
recognized as a part of the curriculum in the Department of Arts and Science. It took almost four decades for the higher institutions in Thailand to offer history as a major subject. Now, every institution requires history as a part of the general requirements, including the teachers colleges. History instructors in Thai teachers college also use the lecture method in most of their classes, even though they believe that a combination of lecture, discussion, and independent study is the most effective teaching method. Little has been taught about current developments and past traditions of the regional areas in Thailand. Any policy from the central government tends to create social conflicts; however, knowledge based on local settings would be more applicable. In general, Thai educators believe that there is a need to focus more on the social and cultural issues in rural areas.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter provides the comprehensive details of the methods and procedures employed in the data collection and analyses of this study. These include the instrumentation, population of the study, procedures for the collection of data, and techniques for analyzing the data.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this study is a written questionnaire which was designed to elicit information from history instructors in the teachers colleges in Thailand. It was modified from the following three questionnaires: 1. "The Teaching of History at the University Level in Thailand: Methods and Problems" by Anukul Jintarax in 1979, 2. "A Study of History Instructors in the Junior and Community Colleges in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Accrediting Region" study by Raymond Norman Maumusu in 1982.

---


and 3. The Status and Problems in Teaching Science at Bachelor's Degree Level in Teachers Colleges in Northeastern Region of Thailand by Swangchit Tanasilangoon in 1983. The questionnaire was revised with the help of many suggestions from faculty members, with more than ten years of teaching experiences, from Thai teachers college in different regions of Thailand, who are now doctoral students at North Texas State University.

A pilot questionnaire was submitted to three selected faculty members from the College of Education, and two selected faculty members from the Department of History at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. Each selected faculty member was asked for comments and suggestions on the questionnaire as being appropriate or inappropriate to history instructors. Much useful advice was also gained from discussions with the selected faculty members. Upon comments and suggestions of responses to the pilot questionnaire, certain questionnaire items were revised, others deleted, and others inserted.

The revised questionnaire contained fifty-three questions and one comment space to elicit information from the teacher college history instructors. The survey instrument consisted of two sections: Section I was designed to obtain the

---

3 Swangchit Tanasilangoon, Status and Problems in Teaching Science at Bachelor's Degree Level in Teachers Colleges in Northeastern Region (Ubol Rajathani, Thailand, 1983), pp. 102-111.
information from the respondents regarding demographic, academic, professional preparation, professional achievements, and teaching assignments. Section II concerned the behaviors and problem associated with teaching.

In addition, because this questionnaire was used in this study with history instructors in teachers colleges in Thailand, the content validity was established by submitting the revised questionnaire to a jury of seven persons with experience and background in history teaching as well as in the educational system in Thai teachers colleges. The jury consisted of three history instructors, three college instructors, and one educational officer in the Thai Department of Teacher Education. The jury was asked to check and modify each item of the questionnaire with respect to the teaching environment of history in the teachers colleges. The jury also lent specific expertise in the content area and questionnaire design for Thai respondents. Each item which four or more of the jury wished to modify or delete was changed or deleted. All modifications or new items suggested from the jury were sent to them again for a final validation. The final draft of the questionnaire contained fifty-two questions and one comment space to elicit additional information from the teacher college history instructors (see Appendix B). After the validation, the researcher translated the questionnaire from English to the Thai language (see Appendix C). The Thai version was then carefully checked.
and verified by three Thai doctoral students at North Texas State University.

Population of the Study

The Department of Teacher Education operates thirty-six teachers colleges throughout Thailand. Six colleges are in the Metropolitan region; five, in the Middle region; eight, in the Northern region; four, in the Western region; and five, in the Southern region (see Appendix C). According to the statistics of the Department of Teacher Education, there are 180 history instructors in the thirty-six teachers colleges and this study includes all of them. The data in Table I show the total population of history instructors by region and the degrees which they hold.

Procedure for Collection of Data

In August 1965, the 180 questionnaires concerning the teaching of history, and a cover letter explaining the purposes of the study were either hand-delivered to each history instructor by research assistants or were mailed when hand delivery was not possible. A return stamped envelope was attached to each questionnaire in order to enhance the return rate. Twenty days after the first distribution of questionnaires, follow-up letters and additional questionnaires were sent to those history teachers who had not responded.

### TABLE I

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS OF HISTORY INSTRUCTORS IN THE TEACHERS COLLEGES IN DIFFERENT REGIONS IN THAILAND DURING ACADEMIC YEAR OF 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Specialized Subject*</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Specialized Subject Certificate is a one-year graduate program in education offered to the bachelor's degree holder.

The total number of returned questionnaires was 141, which represented a 78.3 per cent return. Each questionnaire was checked carefully and three questionnaires were rejected from this study because the majority of the items were not answered. One hundred and thirty-eight questionnaires, or 76.7 per cent of the questionnaires originally sent, were used in this study (see Appendix D). This surpasses the 70 per cent anticipated return as proposed for this study. The data in Table II show the total number and percentage of completed questionnaire received from each region.
TABLE II
REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF HISTORY INSTRUCTOR RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Instructors Per Region</th>
<th>Actual Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the Data

After the data on the questionnaires were examined for errors and missing information, the data were transposed into numerical values and coded. The data, then, were manually keyboarded into a computer at the North Texas State University Computing Center. Finally, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program was used to analyze the data.5

In order to deal with the problem of this study as presented in Chapter I, the following research hypotheses were stated in the null form for testing.

1. There will be no significant differences between history instructors in the Metropolitan region (hereafter referred to as MR) and other regions (hereafter refer to as

OR) in Thailand as measured by (a) salary, (b) teaching experience, and (c) degrees held.

2. There will be no significant differences in the academic preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region (MR) and other regions (OR) in Thailand, as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in history.

3. There will be no significant differences in the professional preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region (MR) and other regions (OR) in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in education.

4. There will be no significant differences in the professional achievements of history instructors in the Metropolitan region (MR) and other regions (OR) in Thailand as measured by (a) attendance at professional meetings, (b) the number of publications, and (c) membership in professional organizations.

5. There will be no significant differences in the teaching assignments of history instructors in the Metropolitan region (MR) and other regions (OR) in Thailand as measured by (a) the number of hours they devoted to course preparations and (b) teaching load.

6. There will be no significant differences in the classroom teaching strategies of history instructors in the Metropolitan region (MR) and other regions (OR) in Thailand as measured by their teaching behaviors.
The questionnaire provided the respondent with an opportunity to select an appropriate answer or to fill in a blank. Some items were labeled "PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY", and the respondent checked more than one answer on these items.

In order to compare and analyze the teaching of history in teachers colleges in the Metropolitan region (MR) and other regions (OR) in Thailand, the following statistics were utilized in the analyses of data:

1. All information in both sections of the questionnaire were classified and compiled. The frequency and percentage of respondents were calculated.

2. The chi square test of independence was used to determine if significant difference existed at the 0.05 level or greater between the responses of history instructors in the MR and OR groups. The Yates' correction for continuity was used with 2 x 2 tables when any frequencies were less than 5. Fisher's Exact Probability Test (2-tailed) was used with very small tables where a chi square could not be calculated.

3. The t test of difference was used to determine if significant difference existed at the 0.05 level or greater between the responses of the MR and OR instructors for the item in which the Likert type scale was applied.
Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide the comprehensive details of the methods and procedures employed in the data collection and analyses of this study. The population of this study consists of the 180 practicing history instructors in the Teachers Colleges in all regions of Thailand. The survey instrument consists of fifty-two questions designed to elicit information from the respondents concerning their level of preparation for teaching their syllabi, their academic attainments, professional achievements, teaching assignments, and necessary demographic data. The survey instrument is also designed to elicit information concerning the problems and behaviors the respondents encounter during their teaching activities.

The questionnaires, after intensive review and correction by selected faculty both in Thailand and the United States, were distributed to the 180 practicing history instructors in the six major regions of Thailand by research assistants in Thailand. The data obtained from the returned questionnaires were examined and analyzed. The statistical procedures used in this study were the chi square test of independence, t test, the Yates' correction for continuity, when necessary, and Fisher's Exact Probability Test (2-tailed), when necessary.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data results of this investigation, which is to compare and analyze the teaching of history in teachers colleges in the Metropolitan region (hereafter referred to as MR) and other regions (hereafter referred to as OR) in Thailand, are presented in this chapter. The findings are the results of a survey questionnaire, the items of which were designed to provide data to test the six major research hypotheses presented in Chapter I.

As indicated in Table II of Chapter III, the questionnaires were sent to 42 history instructors in the MR group and 138 history instructors in the OR group in Thai teachers colleges. After the second follow-up letter, the number of returned questionnaires were 41 from the MR group and 100 from the OR group. Of 100 returned questionnaires from the OR group, three are rejected from this study because there is no response to a majority of the items. Forty-one returned questionnaires (97.6 per cent) from the MR group and 97 returned questionnaires (70.3 per cent) from the OR group are usable in this study. The total responses, then, are 138, or 76.7 per cent, of the total population (see Appendix D).

The obtained data are then submitted for keyboarding and computer analysis at the North Texas State University
Computing Center. From the computer-generated statistical analysis, statistical presentations are constructed for this study.

This presentation of data is divided into two subdivisions that include demographic results and six major research hypotheses. From the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), the chi square test of independence is used to determine if differences exist between the responses of history instructors in the MR group and in the OR group. A correction, Yates' correction for continuity, is used with 2 x 2 tables when any frequencies are less than 5. Fisher's Exact Probability Test is used with very small tables where chi square cannot be calculated. The t test of difference is used to determine if significant differences exist between the responses of the MR and the OR instructors for the items in which the Likert type scale is used. On the basis of this testing, each null hypothesis is either accepted or rejected. Following the presentation and discussion of the findings that result from hypotheses testing, a summary of the major data findings conclude the chapter.

Demographic Data

In the first item in Section I of the questionnaire, the history instructors are asked to provide information about the names of their institutions. The responses are coded according to the institutions' names. For the purpose of this
study, the responses are also grouped as the MR group and the OR group. The analyses of the following data, therefore, are based upon the groups according to the respondents' location. The distribution of the data is presented in Table III.

### TABLE III
**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Number of Instructors</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Others</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 2 and 3 of Section I solicit information on such descriptive data as sex and age category. The data in Tables IV and V show the distribution of respondents by sex and by age.

### TABLE IV
**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overwhelming majority of history instructors in Thai teachers colleges are female. There is a higher percentage of female history instructors in the MR group than in the OR group. Of the 41 respondents from the MR group, 34 or 82.9
per cent are female. Of the 97 respondents from the OR group, 59 or 60.8 per cent are also female. It is recognized in Thailand that teaching is one of the most popular occupations for females to enter into.

TABLE V
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or under</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age of the respondents is reported in Table V. A majority of the MR history instructors (56.1 per cent) are over the age of 40 years. Of those reporting, 39.6 per cent of the OR instructors and 39 per cent of the MR instructors are between the ages of 36 and 40. However, there is only one OR instructor who is between 26 to 30 years of age, and none is under 26 years. This is the effect of the policy from the Department of Teacher Education that limits the number of new instructors in almost every subject area.
Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one states that there will be no significant differences between history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by (a) salary, (b) teaching experience, and (c) degrees held. To test this hypothesis, the responses to Section I, items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, and 17, of the questionnaire, from the two groups, are tabulated to determine the total number and percentage of respondents. A chi square test is used to determine if significant differences exist between the responses of MR instructors and the OR instructors.

Table VI presents the number, percentage, and differences between history instructors in the MR group and in the OR group in relation to their salary. The salary range shown in Table VI is in Thai currency (27 baht = $1).

TABLE VI
MONTHLY SALARIES REPORTED BY HISTORY INSTRUCTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41 %</td>
<td>N=97 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2765-4945</td>
<td>3 7.3</td>
<td>11 11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4946-6935</td>
<td>17 41.5</td>
<td>64 66.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6936-8475</td>
<td>6 14.6</td>
<td>16 16.5</td>
<td>21.279</td>
<td>0.0003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8476-9385</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 9385</td>
<td>8 19.5</td>
<td>4 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
The chi square analysis indicates that a significant difference exists between the two groups of instructors (MR and OR) with respect to their monthly salary. This point is illustrated by the highest percentage of respondents, 66 per cent of the OR group, and 41.5 per cent of the OR group, reporting salaries ranging from 4946 to 6935 baht. In the MR group, 7.3 per cent of the instructors report salaries of only 2765 to 4945 baht, while 2.1 per cent of the OR instructors report their income to be from 8476 to 9385 baht. For the respondents from the MR group, 14.6 per cent report salaries from 6936 to 8475 baht; 16.5 per cent of the OR group reported salaries in this range. In the MR group, 19.5 per cent of the instructors and the 4.1 per cent of the OR instructors earn their monthly salaries of more than 9385 baht. Department of Teacher Education policies tend to randomly assign beginning instructors to the OR area, therefore, the OR instructors earn lower monthly salaries.

Instructors are asked to indicate their experience in teaching history. Table VII presents the data regarding their teaching experience in history in teachers colleges.

The data in Table VII show that the majority of the respondents, 78 per cent of the MR instructors, and 78.4 per cent of the OR instructors, have 7 or more years of teaching
TABLE VII
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING HISTORY
AT TEACHERS COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41 %</td>
<td>N=97 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>4 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 Years</td>
<td>5 12.2</td>
<td>15 15.5</td>
<td>2.635</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years or more</td>
<td>32 78.0</td>
<td>76 78.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

experience in teachers colleges. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 12.2 per cent of the MR instructors and 15.5 per cent of the OR instructors, report experience in teaching of 4 to 6 years. In the MR group, 9.8 per cent of the instructors report 1 to 3 years of teaching experience, as compared to 4.1 per cent of the OR instructors. In the OR group, only 2.1 per cent of the history instructors have taught history for less than one year; none of the MR group report having taught for less than one year. No significant differences exist between the instructors in the MR and OR groups according to their teaching experience in history at Thai teachers colleges. Since the number of courses in general education has declined, the need for new instructors to teach those courses is limited.

The instructors were also asked to provide their past teaching experience at elementary schools, junior high schools, high schools, technical colleges, and four-year colleges. The data presented in Table VIII indicate the
number and percentage of instructors in each group who have taught in other educational institutions.

**TABLE VIII**

**NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF HISTORY INSTRUCTORS WHO HAVE TAUGHT IN OTHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>3 7.3</td>
<td>28 28.9</td>
<td>7.684</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>25 25.7</td>
<td>10.295</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>6 14.6</td>
<td>18 18.6</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical College</td>
<td>5 12.2</td>
<td>5 5.1</td>
<td>4.121</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year College</td>
<td>6 14.7</td>
<td>6 10.3</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level

**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.**

A small number of history instructors from both groups report teaching experience in other institutions. The results indicate that 7.3 per cent of the MR history instructors and 28.9 per cent of the OR history instructors have taught in elementary schools, 2.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 25.7 per cent of the OR instructors have taught in junior high schools, 14.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 18.6 per cent of the OR instructors have taught in high schools, 12.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 5.1 per cent of the OR instructors have taught in technical colleges, and 14.7 per cent of the MR instructors and 10.3 per cent of the OR instructors have taught in four-year colleges. Chi square tests reveal that there are two significant differences
between the MR and the OR instructors. The data indicate that significantly more OR instructors transfer from the elementary schools and junior high schools to the teachers colleges, while more MR instructors move from the technical or four-year colleges to the teachers colleges.

In addition to the above teaching experience, the teachers colleges' history instructors were also asked to indicate their academic rank. Responses to the inquiry to determine the academic rank of the teachers colleges' history instructors in Thailand are presented in Table IX.

**TABLE IX**

**ACADEMIC RANK HELD BY HISTORY INSTRUCTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>39 95.1</td>
<td>92 94.8</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
<td>5 5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents, 95.1 per cent of the MR history instructors and 94.8 per cent of the OR instructors indicate their academic rank as that of a lecturer. Only 4.9 per cent of the MR instructors, and 5.2 per cent of the OR instructors hold the rank of assistant professor in Thai teachers colleges. The data in Table IX indicates that no significant difference exists between the two groups of instructors (MR
and OR) as related to their academic rank. Although the Department of Teacher Education has offered the academic rank of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor for instructors for some years, the MR and OR instructors have not applied for the upper two ranks.

A formal education is an important criterion for assessing the preparation of history instructors in Thai teachers colleges. The level of academic preparation of history instructors is presented in Table X.

### TABLE X

**LEVEL OF ACADEMIC PREPARATION OF HISTORY INSTRUCTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest degree held</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41 %</td>
<td>N=97 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Subject*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Specialized Subject Certificate is a one-year graduate program in education offered to the bachelor's degree holder.

The results of the survey indicate that all 138 responding history instructors hold the bachelor's degree or higher. The highest percentage of the respondents, 63.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 57.7 per cent of the OR instructors hold the master's degree. Only 4.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 1 per cent of the OR instructors hold a special subject certificate. Only 3 of the respondents have
an earned doctoral degree. None of the MR history instructors hold such a degree. No significant difference was found between the two groups with respect to the level of academic preparation of Thai teachers colleges' history instructors. The minimum requirements for the instructors in Thai teachers college is the bachelor's degree, but more than half of the history instructors in the MR and OR groups have a master's degree.

The respondents were asked to indicate the discipline in which their degrees were earned. These data are presented in Tables XI, XII, XIII, XIV, and XV. Data regarding the discipline in which the higher certificate was earned are reported in Table XI.

**TABLE XI**

SUBJECT IN WHICH THE HIGHER CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION* IS HELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Certificate</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Education</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 66.7</td>
<td>11 29.7</td>
<td>3.993</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Higher Certificate of Education is a two year program which is offered to grade 12 graduates.

No MR faculty-member held a Higher Certificate in history. Only 32.4 per cent of the OR instructors held a certificate in history. The response from the OR group
indicates that 37.8 per cent of the certificates are in other subject areas, such as the social sciences, and 29.7 per cent are in education. This is compared to 33.3 per cent of the responding MR instructors who hold certificates in other fields, and 66.7 per cent in education. No significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups, according to the subject in which they hold their higher certificate of education.

As previously noted, the bachelor's degree is held by all 138 instructors. The data relating to the subject area of the instructors with bachelor's degrees are presented in Table XII.

**TABLE XII**

SUBJECT IN WHICH THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE IS HELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Degree</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven of the 138 instructors in the survey did not respond to this item. Of the 131 persons responding to this question, the bachelor's degree in history is held by 52.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 59.1 per cent of the OR instructors. In the MR group, 31.6 per cent of the respondents
and 26.9 per cent of the OR respondents hold a degree in education. Some 15.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 14 per cent of the OR instructors hold degrees in other fields such as the social sciences and philosophy. Chi square tests reveal that there is no significant difference between the MR and the OR instructors as related to the subject in which they hold their bachelor's degrees.

The specialized subject certificate is a one-year graduate program in education offered to bachelor's degree holders. The subject areas in which the specialized subject certificates were earned are shown in Table XIII.

**TABLE XIII**

**SUBJECT IN WHICH THE SPECIALIZED SUBJECT CERTIFICATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Certificate</th>
<th>Metro. Region (N=41)</th>
<th>Other Regions (N=97)</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>8 80.0</td>
<td>2 28.6</td>
<td>7.642</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>4 57.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 20.0</td>
<td>1 14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level

**The Specialized Subject Certificate is a one-year graduate program in education offered to the bachelor's degree holder.**

As the data in Table XIII indicate, 80 per cent of the MR instructors and 28.6 per cent of the OR instructors hold a Specialized Subject Certificate in history. In the MR group, 20 per cent of instructors and 14.3 per cent of the OR group...
hold this certificate in other subject areas such as the social sciences. However, in the OR group, 57.1 per cent of the instructors have earned a Specialized Subject Certificate in education. None of the MR instructors hold such a certificate. There is a significant difference between the MR and the OR instructors with respect to the subject in which they hold their specialized subject certificate.

As indicated in Table X, the master's degree was cited as the highest level of educational achievement by a majority of the instructors queried. The distribution of respondents by subject areas in which the master's degree was earned is reported in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV
SUBJECT IN WHICH THE MASTER'S DEGREE IS HELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Degree</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the respondents from the MR group, 55.2 per cent of the instructors hold their master's degrees in history, while 60 per cent of the MR instructors hold their master's degrees in education. Only 4 per cent of the MR instructors and 3.4 per cent of the OR instructors have an earned master's degree in another discipline, such as social sciences. Chi square
analysis indicates that no significant difference exists between the MR and the OR instructors in relation to the subject in which they hold their master's degrees. Table XV is a tabulation of the responses to a question regarding the major subject of the doctoral degree.

As previously indicated, only 3 of the respondents have an earned doctoral degree. All of the three faculty members who hold doctoral degrees, one in history and the other two in education, are from the OR group. Since no MR instructors responded to this survey question, it is not possible to apply the chi square statistical procedure.

**TABLE XV**

**SUBJECT IN WHICH THE DOCTORAL DEGREE IS HELD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Degree</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is not possible to apply the chi square statistical procedure since no MR instructor responds to this question.

History instructors in Thai teachers colleges are not required to have a degree in history in order to be assigned to teach history. Therefore, the degrees reported by them in this study are in history, in education with a minor in history, or in other fields such as social sciences and philosophy.
Respondents are asked to indicate their status in graduate work. Table XVI summarizes the percentage of instructors who are working toward advanced degrees.

**TABLE XVI**

**HISTORY INSTRUCTORS WHO ARE PRESENTLY PURSUING OTHER DEGREES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Being Sought</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Subject</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large number of the instructors, 97.6 per cent of history instructors and 95.9 per cent of the OR instructors, are not seeking any degree beyond the bachelor's. Among those instructors, only 2.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 4.1 per cent of the OR instructors are pursuing the master's degree. A chi square test of difference indicates no statistically significant difference between the MR and OR history instructors in relation to the degree they are pursuing. Very few instructors are working toward an advanced degree, because the Department of Teacher Education's regulations do not allow them to teach while studying toward an advanced degree.
TABLE XVII
THE NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE COMPLETION OF MOST RECENT GRADUATE WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41 %</td>
<td>N=97 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not taken</td>
<td>15 36.6</td>
<td>38 39.2</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>1 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>3 7.3</td>
<td>7 7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>8 19.5</td>
<td>20 20.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years or more</td>
<td>15 36.6</td>
<td>31 32.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of years since completion of most recent graduate work is summarized in Table XVII. More than half of the respondents, 56.1 per cent of the MR history instructors and 52.6 per cent of the OR instructors completed their master's degrees more than three years ago. In the MR group, 7.3 per cent of instructors and 7.2 per cent of the OR instructors finished their graduate work within 1 to 3 years. In the OR group, only 1 per cent of the history instructors have taken graduate work for less than 1 year; none of the history instructors have taken graduate work for less than 1 year. No significant difference is found between the two groups (MR and OR) with respect to the number of years of most recent graduate work completed. The instructors are allowed to take a leave of absence for studying, but only a few instructors take advantage of this opportunity to improve their knowledge and experience.
The history instructors are asked to indicate the province or country from which they received their education at each level. The responses are coded according to six educational regions of the teachers colleges, and the foreign countries which the responses indicated. The data are then analyzed to compare the locations of their education with their present working regions as presented in Table XVIII.

It is interesting to note that a majority of respondents from the MR group cited the completion of education at the high school level (64.9 per cent), higher certificate level (100 per cent), bachelor's level (90.0 per cent), specialized subject certificate level (100 per cent), and master's level (76.0 per cent), in the regions where they are presently working. On the other hand, a majority of history instructors in the OR group completed their high school (54.3 per cent), higher certificate (65.5 per cent), bachelor's (84.5 per cent), specialized subject certificate (100 per cent), and master's (89.7 per cent) outside their present working region. All three doctoral respondents, who completed their degrees from outside their present working regions (33.3 per cent) and from foreign countries (66.7 per cent), are OR instructors. Only a few instructors earn the bachelor's and master's degrees from foreign countries, such as the United States of America, India, and the Philippines. Significant differences are found when comparing the MR and OR groups' responses with
TABLE XVIII

LOCATION OF INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH HISTORY INSTRUCTORS COMPLETE THEIR EDUCATION AS RELATED TO THEIR PRESENT WORKING REGIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education and Location</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Region</td>
<td>24 64.9%</td>
<td>43 45.7%</td>
<td>3.664</td>
<td>0.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Region</td>
<td>13 35.1%</td>
<td>51 54.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4 --</td>
<td>3 --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Certificate:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Region</td>
<td>19 100.0%</td>
<td>20 34.5%</td>
<td>24.577</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Region</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>36 65.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>22 --</td>
<td>39 --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor's Degree:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Region</td>
<td>36 90.0%</td>
<td>14 14.4%</td>
<td>71.821</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Region</td>
<td>3 7.5%</td>
<td>62 84.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Countries</td>
<td>1 2.5%</td>
<td>1 1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 --</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialized Subject:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Region</td>
<td>12 100.0%</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Region</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>8 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>29 --</td>
<td>89 --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's Degree:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Region</td>
<td>19 76.0%</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>68.747</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Region</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>52 89.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Countries</td>
<td>6 24.0%</td>
<td>6 10.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>16 --</td>
<td>39 --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Region</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>1 33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Countries</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>2 66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>41 --</td>
<td>94 --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level

**As the number of respondents was small, Fisher's Exact Probability Test is used to determine if difference exist.

***It was not possible to apply the chi square statistical procedure since no MK instructor respond to this question.
regard to the location of institutions in which the instructors complete their high school, higher certificate, bachelor's, specialized subject, and master's degree.

Since very few institutions have an opportunity to hire their own instructors, the admission to the teaching profession and the institutions assigned are administered by the central authority. The Department of Teacher Education randomly assigns instructors to institutions without considering their previous location of education.

Conclusion

Hypothesis one states that there will be no significant differences between history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by (a) salary, (b) teaching experience, and (c) degrees held. The hypothesis is rejected with respect to:

(a) **Salary.**—MR instructors are more likely to have higher monthly salaries than OR instructors.

This hypothesis is accepted with respect to:

(b) **Teaching experience.**—This experience was broken down into teaching experience at a teachers college, or at a high school, or at a technical college, and at a four-year college; academic rank. For these items, there is no significant difference between the MR and OR history instructors. However, significantly more OR instructors than MR instructors report having teaching experience at the elementary school and at the junior high school.
Degrees held.—The level of academic preparation; subject in which the higher certificate, the bachelor's degree, and the master's degree are held; other degrees being sought; and completion of most recent graduate work. For these items, there is no significant difference between the MR and OR history instructors. However, significantly more MR than OR instructors have earned a specialized subject certificate in history, and more MR instructors than OR instructors cited the completion of all levels of their education in the regions where they are presently working.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two states that there will be no significant difference in the academic preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours they have earned in history. The data gathered for this hypothesis are in items number 11 and 13 in Section I of the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The total number and percentage of respondents from the two groups are tabulated, and a chi square test is used to determine if significant differences exist between the responses of MR instructors and OR instructors. The number of graduate credit hours in history earned by history instructors is reported in Table XIX.
The data in Table XIX show that less than half of the respondents, 31.7 per cent of the MR instructors and 42.3 per cent of the OR instructors, have no graduate credit hours in history. The highest percentage of the respondents, 22 per cent of the MR instructors and 16.5 per cent of the OR instructors, report earning 31 to 40 graduate credit hours in history. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 17.1 per cent of the MR group, report earning 51 or more graduate credit hours in history, and 15.5 per cent of the OR instructors report earning from 1 to 5 graduate credit hours in history. In the MR group, the reporting of graduate credit hours in history earned for 16 to 30 credits is 14.6 per cent; 13.4 per cent is indicated by the OR group. Only 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 3.2 per cent of the OR instructors earn 41 to 50 graduate credit hours in history. No significant difference exists between instructors in the MR and OR groups on the basis of their graduate credit earned
in history. Even though instructors in Thai teachers colleges are required to hold only a bachelor's degree, several history instructors in the MR and OR groups have earned graduate credit hours in history.

Respondents are also asked to provide their educational experience, relative to the teaching of history, while studying at the undergraduate level. Replies are summarized in Table XX.

**TABLE XX**

**EXPERIENCES AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%**</td>
<td>%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A course</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A seminar</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An apprenticeship</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

The three categories of experience are a course in the methods of teaching history, a seminar in teaching taught by a history professor, and an apprenticeship with a history professor. The highest percentage of the respondents, 70.7 per cent of the MR instructors and 86.6 per cent of the OR instructors, had a course in the methods of teaching history. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 53.7 per
cent of the MR instructors and 41.2 per cent of the OR instructors, had a seminar in teaching taught by a history professor. Some 22 per cent of the MR instructors and 17.5 per cent of the OR instructors had an apprenticeship with a history professor. Chi square test reveals that there is only one significant difference between the MR and the OR instructors as related to their experience in a course in the methods of teaching history. The OR instructors have more experience in a course in the methods of teaching history than the MR instructors.

Hypothesis two states that there will be no significant differences in the academic preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours they have earned in history. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to the number of graduate credit hours earned in history, and experience in a seminar in teaching taught by a history professor, and an apprenticeship with a history professor. For these items, there is no significant difference between the MR and OR history instructors. However, significantly more OR than MR instructors had a course in the methods of teaching history.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three states that there will be no significant difference in the professional preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in
Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in education. To test this hypothesis, the data responses to the questionnaire in Section I, item 12 (see Appendix B) from the two groups are tabulated to determine the total number and percentage of the respondents. A chi square test is used to determine if a significant difference exists between the responses of MR and the OR history instructors. The replies are summarized in Table XXI.

**TABLE XXI**

**SEMESTER HOURS OF GRADUATE CREDIT EARNED IN EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
<th>Metro, Region N=41</th>
<th>Other Regions N=97</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21 51.2</td>
<td>57 58.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
<td>10 10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>8 19.5</td>
<td>11 11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
<td>10 10.3</td>
<td>8.891</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>3 7.3</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7 7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the respondents, 51.2 per cent of the MR history instructors and 58.8 per cent of the OR history instructors, report that they have earned no graduate credit hours in education. Of the remaining categories, the highest percentage of the respondents, 19.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 11.3 per cent of the OR instructors, have earned 16 to 30 graduate credit hours in education. In the next highest percentage of the respondents, 17.1 per cent of the
MR instructors and 10.3 per cent of the OR instructors, report 1 to 15 graduate credit hours in education, while only 4.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 10.3 per cent of the OR instructors earned 31 to 40 credit hours in education. Only 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 2.1 per cent of the OR instructors earned 41 to 50 credit hours in education. In the OR group, 7.2 per cent of the history instructors earned 51 or more credit hours in education; none of the MR instructors reported having earned 51 or more credit hours in education.

No significant difference exists between instructors in the MR and OR groups according to the number of graduate credit hours earned in education. It is interesting to note that more than half of the history instructors in the MR group and OR group have not earned graduate credit hours in education.

Hypothesis three states that there will be no significant difference in the professional preparation of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in education. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to the number of graduate credit hours earned in education. This item is not found to be significantly different between the MR and the OR history instructors.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis four states that there will be no significant differences in the professional achievements of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in
Thailand as measured by their (a) attendance at professional meetings, (b) publications, and (c) membership in professional organizations. To test this hypothesis, the responses of the questionnaire, Section I, items 14, 15, 18, 19, and 20, from the two groups, are tabulated to determine the total number and percentage of respondents. A chi square test is used to determine if significant differences exist between the responses of MR instructors and OR instructors.

Instructors are asked to indicate whether or not their institutions provide released time to attend professional meetings or to conduct research. Replies are summarized in Table XXII.

### TABLE XXII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large number of the respondents, 80.5 per cent of the MR history instructors, and 87.6 per cent of the OR instructors, indicate that their institutions provide released time to attend professional meetings or to conduct research. Among those instructors, only 19.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 12.4 per cent of the OR instructors, indicate
that their institutions do not provide released time. A chi-
square test of difference indicates no statistically sig-
nificant difference between the MR and OR history instructors
in relation to the released time that their institutions
provide for them to attend professional meetings or to conduct
research. Even though the Department of Teacher Education's
regulations do not allow instructors to study while teaching,
a large number of MR and OR institutions provide released time
for instructors to attend professional meetings or to conduct
research.

The instructors are also asked to provide the number of
seminars in teaching history which they attended during the
past five years. Responses are summarized in Table XXIII.

### TABLE XXIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Seminars Attended</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13 31.7%</td>
<td>35 36.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>8 19.5%</td>
<td>13 13.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>3 7.3%</td>
<td>3 3.1%</td>
<td>2.631</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two</td>
<td>17 41.5%</td>
<td>46 47.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest percentage of the respondents, 41.5 per cent
of the MR instructors and 47.4 per cent of the OR instructors,
report their attendance at more than two seminars during the
last five years. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 31.7 per cent of MR instructors and 36.1 per cent of the OR instructors, did not attend any seminars. The third highest percentage of the respondents, 19.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 13.4 per cent of the OR instructors, report attending one seminar in the last five years. In the MR group, the reporting of the attendance of two seminars in the past five years is 7.3 per cent, and 3.1 per cent as reported by the OR group. Chi square tests reveal that there is no significant difference between the MR and the OR instructors as related to the number of seminars in teaching history they attended in the last five years. The above data indicate that MR and OR instructors are interested in attending seminars on the teaching of history.

The respondents are asked to indicate the types of historical writings which they have published. These data are presented in Table XXIV.

**TABLE XXIV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Publication</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Handbook</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.*
The data in Table XXIV show that the smallest percentage of the respondents, 1 per cent of the MR instructors and 12.4 per cent of the OR instructors, never publish any type of historical writings. The highest percentage of the respondents, 65.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 78.4 per cent of the OR instructors, publish instructional handbooks. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 24.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 30.9 per cent of the OR instructors, publish articles. In the MR group, 19.5 per cent of the history instructors publish books; 24.7 per cent are indicated by the OR instructors. No significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups according to the types of historical writings which they have published. Instructors in teachers colleges in Thailand are not required to publish to be promoted, yet several history instructors have published some kind of historical writings.

In addition to the above experience, the history instructors were asked to indicate the type of professional journals, and their location, which they are currently reading on a regular basis. The responses are presented in Table XXV.

The results indicate that a high percentage of the respondents, 90.2 per cent of the MR instructors and 87.6 per cent of the OR instructors, read a national historical journal. Some 31.7 per cent of the MR, and 19.6 per cent of the OR instructors read historical journals from abroad. A small percentage of the instructors, 29.3 per cent of the MR group and 36.1 per cent of the OR instructors, read national
educational journals. Only 2.4 per cent of the MR and 8.2 per cent of the OR instructors read education journals from abroad. More than half of the groups, 53.7 per cent of the MR instructors and 56.7 per cent of the OR instructors, read national social science journals. In the MR group, the percentage of those reporting they read social science journals from abroad is 12.2, whereas 16.5 per cent of the OR group reported they read such journals. The data in Table XXV indicate that no significant difference exists between the two groups of instructors (MR and OR) as related to the type of professional journal, and their location, which they are currently reading on a regular basis. As has already been explained in Chapter II, there are very few historical
journals in Thailand; however, a high percentage of history instructors in Thai teachers colleges read national historical journals and national social science journals.

To determine the kind of professional associations in which history instructors hold membership, respondents are requested to check the type of professional organization to which they belonged. The responses are presented in Table XXVI.

**TABLE XXVI**

**TYPE OF ORGANIZATION TO WHICH HISTORY INSTRUCTORS BELONG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organizations</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>S**</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>S**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level

**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.**

The data in Table XXVI show that almost half of the respondents, 46.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 47.4 per cent of the OR instructors, belong to historical organizations. The second highest percentage of the instructors, 9.3 per cent of the MR group and 29.9 per cent of the OR group, are members of a social science organization. In the MR group, only 7.3 per cent of the history instructors belong to an educational organization; 2.3 per cent are
indicated by the OR instructors. Chi square tests reveal that there is a significant difference between the MR and the OR instructors as related to their membership in a social science organization. As has already been explained in Chapter II, there is only one historical organization in Thailand, and almost half of all history instructors hold membership in that historical organization. Social science organizations are more popular in the OR group than the MR group.

Conclusion

Hypothesis four states that there will be no significant differences in the professional achievements of history instructors in the metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand, as measured by (a) attendance at professional meetings, (b) the type of publications, and (c) membership in professional organizations. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to:

(a) Attendance at professional meetings.--Respondents indicated the number of seminars they attended in the last five years. For these items, there is no significant difference between the MR and OR instructors.

(b) The type of publications.--Respondents indicated that they had published books or articles or other. No significant difference between the MR group and OR group exists on this item.
(c) Membership in professional organizations.--The type of professional journals, and their location, which history instructors are currently reading on a regular basis, were some of the questions asked of the respondents. As regards to the above items, there is no significant difference between the MR and OR history instructors. However, more OR than MR instructors belong to a social science organization. This item is found to be significantly different between the history instructors in the MR group and in the OR group.

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis five states that there will be no significant differences in the teaching assignments of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by (a) the number of hours they devoted to course preparations and (b) teaching load. To test this hypothesis, the responses of the two groups to the questionnaire in Section I, items 21 to 26, are tabulated to determine the total number and percentage of respondents. A chi square is used to determine if statistically significant differences exist between the responses of the MR instructors and OR instructors.

History instructors are requested to indicate the average number of hours per week, they spend, in preparation for class presentation. The median number of hours per week which instructors devote to preparation for class presentation is presented in Table XXVII.
The majority of the respondents, 46.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 55.7 per cent of the OR instructors, spend 10 hours per week or more preparing for class presentations. The next highest percentage of the respondents, 39 per cent of the MR instructors and 41.2 per cent of the OR instructors, report spending 1 to 9 hours per week on preparation for class presentations. Some 14.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 3.1 per cent of the OR instructors do not spend any time preparing for class presentations. The chi square analysis indicates that a significant difference exists between the two groups of instructors (MR and OR) with respect to the average number of hours per week devoted to preparation for class presentations. The above data indicate that a higher percentage of the OR than MR instructors spend more hours per week on preparation for class presentations.

Respondents are further asked to indicate the amount of time spent in seven selected areas which are generally
accepted as part of a teacher's responsibility. The median number of hours per week which instructors devote to teaching-related activities is presented in Table XXVIII.

The data in Table XXVIII show that 51.2 per cent of the MR group report spending no time in grading students, as compared to 42.3 per cent of the OR group which report spending 3 hours or more. In the MR group, 17.1 per cent report spending 1 to 2 hours on grading students, and 40.2 per cent of the OR group report spending a similar amount of time.

More than half of the respondents, 53.7 per cent of the MR instructors and 57.7 per cent of the OR instructors, do not spend any time on supervision of student teaching. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 24.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 23.7 per cent of the OR instructors, spend 6 hours or more on supervision of student teaching. Some 22 per cent of the MR group and 16.6 per cent of the OR group spend 1 to 5 hours per week on supervision of student teaching.

As the data in Table XXVIII indicate, 61 per cent of the MR instructors and 37.1 per cent of the OR instructors, do not spend any time on student consultations. For the respondents from the MR group, 31.7 per cent spend 3 hours or more per week on student consultations, while 32 per cent of the OR group spend as much as 3 hours. In the MR group, those reporting they spend 1 to 2 hours per week on student consultations is 7.3 per cent; 30.9 per cent is indicated by the OR group.
TABLE XXVIII

HOURS PER WEEK DEVOTED TO TEACHING-RELATED ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours per week</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading students:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 hours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours or more</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student consultations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meetings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9 hours</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours or more</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conducting research:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 hours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teach other field:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
The data in Table XXVIII show that the majority of the respondents, 70.7 per cent of the MR instructors and 70.1 per cent of the OR instructors, do not spend any time attending faculty committee meetings. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 19.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 13.4 per cent of the OR instructors, spend 5 hours or more per week attending faculty committee meetings. Some 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 16.5 per cent of the OR instructors spend 1 to 4 hours per week attending faculty committee meetings.

For the respondents from the MR group, 34.1 per cent report spending 10 hours or more per week reading professional publications while only 49.5 per cent of the OR group report the same. In the MR group, 43.9 per cent of the instructors, and in the OR group, 40.2 per cent, spend 1 to 9 hours per week reading professional publications. Some 22 per cent of the MR instructors and 10.3 per cent of the OR instructors do not spend any time reading professional publications.

The highest percentage of the respondents, 78 per cent of the MR instructors and 80.4 per cent of the OR instructors, do not spend any time conducting research. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 17.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 11.3 per cent of the OR instructors, spend 1 to 5 hours per week conducting research. Only 4.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 8.2 per cent of the OR instructors spend 6 hours or more per week conducting research.
More than half of the respondents, 66.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 67 per cent of the OR instructors, do not teach in a field other than history. The results indicate that 19.5 per cent of the MR history instructors and 19.6 of the OR instructors have to teach in other fields such as social sciences and philosophy for 1 to 4 hours per week, and 12.2 per cent of the MR instructors and 13.4 per cent of the OR instructors have to teach in other fields for 5 hours or more.

Chi square tests reveal that there are two significant differences between the MR and the OR instructors as related to the number of hours per week instructors spend, on the average, preparing for class presentation and the supervision of student teaching. The above data indicate that more OR instructors devote time to teaching-related activities than do MR instructors.

Since the instructors have to perform other administrative and clerical duties, the history instructors were also asked whether or not they have responsibilities other than teaching at their institutions. Data regarding the other duties are report in Table XXIX.
TABLE XXIX
OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES OF HISTORY INSTRUCTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative duty</td>
<td>9 22.0</td>
<td>43 44.3</td>
<td>6.145</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic duty</td>
<td>12 29.3</td>
<td>29 29.9</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student service</td>
<td>5 12.2</td>
<td>14 14.3</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical duty</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>17 17.5</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration duty</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>6 6.2</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>20 48.3</td>
<td>47 48.5</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>4 4.1</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level

**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

Table XXIX shows that the highest percentage of the respondents, 48.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 48.5 per cent of the OR instructors, have advising responsibilities. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 29.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 29.9 per cent of the OR instructors, report having academic duties. In the MR group, 22 per cent of the instructors have administrative duties, as compared to 44.3 per cent of the OR instructors. The results also indicate that 12.2 per cent of MR history instructors and 14.8 per cent of the OR history instructors have student service responsibilities; 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 17.5 per cent of the OR instructors have clerical duties; 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 6.2 per cent of the OR instructors have registration duties, and 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 4.1 per cent of the OR instructors have
counselor responsibilities. Chi square test reveals that there is only one significant difference between the MR instructors and the OR instructors as related to their responsibilities for administrative duties. It may be assumed that the MR group and OR group have similar responsibilities other than teaching at their institutions. However, MR instructors have more administrative responsibilities than OR instructors.

In addition to the amount of time spent fulfilling teaching responsibilities, history instructors are asked to indicate the periods per week they teach. The number of periods taught per week is presented in Table XXX.

| TABLE XXX |
| NUMBER OF PERIODS TAUGHT PER WEEK |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods Taught Per Week</th>
<th>Metro Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table XXX show that more than half of the respondents, 56.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 64.9 per cent of the OR instructors, teach 5 to 10 periods per week. In the MR group, 12.2 per cent of the instructors, and 19.6 per cent of the OR instructors, report teaching less than 5
periods per week, while 19.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 11.3 per cent of the OR instructors teach 11 to 15 periods per week. Only 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 2.1 per cent of the OR instructors teach over 15 periods per week. No statistically significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups in the number of periods taught per week. It may be noted that the difference in location of institutions in which instructors teach has no effect on the number of periods per week they have to teach.

Instructors were also asked to provide the approximate number of students in their classes. Responses are summarized in Table XXXI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Student</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 20</td>
<td>1 2.5%</td>
<td>3 3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>9 22.5%</td>
<td>33 34.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>17 42.5%</td>
<td>49 50.5%</td>
<td>8.362</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>11 27.5%</td>
<td>9 9.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest percentage of the respondents, 42.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 50.5 per cent of the OR instructors, have 31 to 40 students in their class. In the MR group, 27.5 per cent of instructors report having over 40 students in class, while 34 per cent of the OR instructors report 20 to
30 students in their classes. Only 2.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 3.1 per cent of the OR instructors have less than 20 students in class. No significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups in the number of students in class. The data reveal that the MR and OR history instructors have almost equal numbers of students in their classes, generally, because the Department of Teacher Education, has a limitation on the number of students in a class.

History instructors at the teachers colleges may often be required to teach in more than one area. The information on the areas of history in which instructors teach are provided in Table XXXII.

**TABLE XXXII**

**AREAS OF HISTORY IN WHICH INSTRUCTORS TAUGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of History</th>
<th>Metro Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%**</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai History</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local History</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian History</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian History</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian History</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Western Civ.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.
The data in Table XXXII indicate that the highest percentage of the respondents, 78 per cent of the MR instructors and 72.2 per cent of the OR instructors, teach Thai History. In the MR group, 48.8 per cent of the instructors teach Southeast Asian History, while 66 per cent of the OR instructors teach History of Western Civilization. In the MR group, 43.9 per cent of the instructors teach History of Western Civilization, while 60.3 per cent of the OR instructors teach European History. The results also indicate that 29.3 per cent of the MR history instructors and 39.2 per cent of the OR history instructors teach East Asian History; 22 per cent of the MR instructors and 21.6 per cent of the OR instructors teach World History; 14.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 12.4 per cent of the OR instructors teach South Asian History; 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 22.7 per cent of the OR instructors teach American History, and 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 13.4 per cent of the OR instructors teach Local History. Some 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 22.7 per cent of the OR instructors teach other areas such as Eastern Civilization, Russian History, Current World Situations, and Methods of Teaching History. Chi square tests reveal that there are two significant differences in the courses taught by MR and OR instructors. The MR instructors teach as many areas of history as OR instructors but the OR instructors teach more courses in European History and History of Western Civilization.
Conclusion

Hypothesis five states that there will be no significant differences in the teaching assignments of history instructors in the MR and the OR in Thailand as measured by (a) the number of hours they devoted to course preparations and (b) teaching load. This hypothesis is rejected with respect to:

(a) The number of hours devoted to course presentation.--OR instructors spend more hours per week than MR instructors in the preparation for class presentations.

This hypothesis is accepted with respect to:

(b) Teaching load.--The amount of time spent on supervision of student teaching, faculty committee meetings, reading professional publications, conducting research, teaching in fields other than history were some of the time consuming duties of the respondents that effected their overall teaching load. Other aspects of the teaching load included student service responsibilities, clerical duties, registration duties, advising responsibilities, counselor responsibilities, number of periods taught per week, number of students in class; areas of teaching in Thai history, local history, Southeast Asian history, East Asian history, South Asian history, American history, and world history. As regards to the above items, there is no significant differences between the MR and OR history instructors. However,
OR instructors spend significantly more time on grading students, and student consultations than the MR instructors; more OR instructors than MR instructors report having administrative duties, and more OR instructors than MR instructors report teaching European history and the history of Western Civilization.

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis six states that there will be no significant differences in the classroom teaching strategies of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by their teaching behaviors. The data gathered for this hypothesis are 27 items in section II of the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The total number and percentage of respondents from the two groups are tabulated, and the chi square test and t test of differences are used to determine if significant differences exist between the responses of the MR instructors and OR instructors. The responses to the category of the various problems instructors might have when they teach history courses are presented in Table XXXIII.

The data in Table XXXIII show that the highest percentage of the respondents, 78 per cent of the MR instructors and 76.3 per cent of the OR instructors, indicate instructors might
**TABLE XXXIII**

THE PROBLEMS INSTRUCTORS MIGHT HAVE WHEN THEY TEACH HISTORY COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code**</th>
<th>Metro Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. a.</td>
<td>16 39.0</td>
<td>34 35.1</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. b.</td>
<td>18 43.9</td>
<td>43 44.3</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. c.</td>
<td>23 56.1</td>
<td>52 53.6</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. d.</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
<td>30 30.9</td>
<td>2.819</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. e.</td>
<td>25 61.0</td>
<td>57 58.8</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. f.</td>
<td>32 78.0</td>
<td>74 76.3</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. g.</td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
<td>10 10.3</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. h.</td>
<td>3 7.3</td>
<td>18 18.6</td>
<td>2.018</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. i.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>3 3.1</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

**20.--Do any of the following categories contribute to the problems instructors might have when they teach history courses? a. teaching technique, b. students, c. syllabi and time to teach, d. classroom condition, e. inadequate classroom supplies and equipment, f. inadequate textbooks and reading material, g. testing and evaluation, h. colleagues and administration in your institution, i. other.

have problems with inadequate textbooks and reading material. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 61 per cent of the MR instructors and 53.8 per cent of the OR instructors, indicate problems with inadequate classroom supplies and equipment. The third highest percentage of the respondents, 56.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 53.6 per cent of the OR instructors, indicate problems with syllabi and time to teach. The results also indicate that 43.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 44.3 per cent of the OR instructors think
history instructors might have problems with students; 39 per cent of the OR instructors and 35.1 per cent of the MR instructors think instructors might have problems with teaching technique; 17.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 30.9 per cent of the OR instructors think instructors might have problems with classroom conditions; 4.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 10.3 per cent of the OR instructors think instructors might have problems with testing and evaluation, and 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 18.6 per cent of the OR instructors think instructors might have problems with colleagues and administration in their institutions. In the OR group only 3.1 per cent of the instructors indicate that instructors might have problems with other difficulties such as a lack of funds and a lack of support for their programs from another agency outside the institution; none is indicated by the MR instructors. No significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups according to the problems instructors might have when they teach history courses. It may be assumed that the location of institutions in which instructors teach has no effect on their opinions about the problems instructors might have when they teach history courses.

The following items in Section II of the questionnaire were asked in order to draw information about history instructors' teaching techniques. Item 1, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to indicate the
techniques which they use most often in teaching their classes. Each respondent is asked to rate the frequency (on a scale of most frequently to rarely) of each technique(s) used. The \( t \) test of differences in mean scores for responses by MR instructors and OR instructors is presented in Table XXXIV.

**TABLE XXXIV**

**THE TECHNIQUES INSTRUCTORS USE MOST OFTEN IN TEACHING THEIR CLASSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items &amp; Code**</th>
<th>Metro Region</th>
<th>Other Region</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( N=41 )</td>
<td>( N=97 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

**1—which of the following techniques do you use most often in teaching your classes? a. lecture, b. discussion, c. independent study, d. inquiry, e. historical analysis, f. historical concept, g. problem solving, h. combination of the above, i. other methods.

The data in Table XXXIV present the mean scores of each technique. All mean scores for lecture, discussion, independent study, historical analysis, historical concept, and combination of the above, are above 3.0, which suggests that MR and OR history instructors have used these techniques successfully. The analysis of the \( t \) test as shown in Table XXXIV...
indicates no significant differences at, or greater than, the .05 level between the mean scores of responding MR instructors and the mean scores of responding OR instructors toward lecture, discussion, independent study, inquiry, historical analysis, historical concept, problem solving, and combination of the above. Only 3 MR history instructors use other methods such as self-study and seminars. None of the MR instructors use other methods. The data reveal that the MR instructors seem to use these techniques as often as do OR instructors.

Item 2, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to indicate the process of their lecture method if they use a lecture technique. The data are presented in Table XXXV.

**TABLE XXXV**

**THE PROCESS OF THEIR LECTURE METHOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items &amp; Code***</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%**</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 a.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level

**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

***2--If you use the lecture method do you: a. lecture for the entire period?, b. allow students to ask questions at the end of each topic of discussion? c. spend the first half period in lecture, then answer questions or allow class discussion for the remain of the period?, d. alternate your lectures with asking individual students questions? e. arrange some time for open discussion on topics or issues.
The results show that 14.6 per cent of the MR group and 22.7 per cent of the OR group lecture for the entire period; 53.5 per cent of the MR group and 72.2 per cent of OR group allow students to ask questions at the end of each topic of discussion; 61 per cent of the MR group and 69.1 per cent of the OR group spend the first half period in lecture, then answer questions or allow class discussion for the remainder of the period; 41.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 62.8 per cent of the OR instructors alternate their lecture with asking individual students questions, and 34.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 47.4 per cent of the OR instructors arrange some time for open discussion on topics or issues. Chi square tests reveal that there is one significant difference between the MR and the OR instructors in the process they use in their lectures. The MR and OR instructors both use the lecture method, but more OR instructors seem to alternate their lecture by asking individual students questions.

Item 4, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to indicate how frequently instructors feel that lecture notes or lesson plans should be revised. Replies to this question are seen in Table XXXVI.
### TABLE XXXVI

**How Frequently Do Instructors Feel That Lecture Notes Or Lesson Plans Should Be Revised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code*</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>22 53.7</td>
<td>37 38.5</td>
<td>3.529</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>8 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>18 43.9</td>
<td>51 53.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*4—How frequently do you feel that lecture notes or lesson plans should be revised: a. once a semester, b. once a year, c. once in a while, depending on necessity or circumstance.

The highest percentage of the respondents, 53.7 per cent of the MR instructors, feel that lecture notes or lesson plans should be revised once a semester, while 53.1 per cent of the OR instructors feel that lecture notes or lesson plans should be revised once in a while, depending on necessity or circumstance. Only 2.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 3.3 per cent of the OR instructors feel that lecture notes or lesson plans should be revised once a year. Chi-square analysis indicates that no significant difference exists between the MR and the OR groups in relation to their opinion on how frequently lecture notes or lesson plans should be revised.

Item 5, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to indicate why they have not changed their lecture notes or lesson plans. Responses are presented in Table XXXVII.
TABLE XXXVII

THE REASONS INSTRUCTORS HAVE NOT CHANGED THEIR LECTURE NOTES OR LESSON PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code**</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

**5--If you have not changed your lecture notes or lesson plans, what are your reasons? a. history is not a subject requiring frequent changes or adjustments in teaching, b. there are no new data or reliable evidence available to you which would make you feel the need for change, c. lack of funds, d. college-wide syllabuses make the change difficult, e. lack of time, f. social and/or political reasons discourage the change, g. other reasons.

The highest percentage of respondents, 26.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 24.7 per cent of the OR instructors, have not changed their lecture notes or lesson plans, because there are no new data or reliable evidence available to them which would make them feel the need for change. The second highest percentage of instructors, 19.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 16.5 per cent of the OR instructors, have not changed their lecture notes or lesson plans because of a lack of time. The results also indicate that 4.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 7.2 per cent of the OR instructors have not changed their lecture notes or lesson plans because history is
not a subject requiring frequent changes or adjustment in teaching; 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 8.2 per cent of the OR instructors have not changed their lecture notes because of a lack of funds; 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 9.3 per cent of the OR instructors have not changed their lecture notes because college-wide syllabuses makes the change difficult, and 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 5.2 per cent of the OR instructors have not changed their lecture notes because social and/or political reasons discourage the change. Some 2.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 5.2 per cent of the OR instructors have not changed their lecture notes or lesson plans because of other reasons, such as institutional policy which make change difficult, or too many responsibilities. Chi square tests reveal that there is no significant difference between MR and OR instructors as related to their reasons why they have not changed their lecture notes or lesson plans. It may be noted that different locations of schools in which they teach has little or no effect on their reasons for not changing their lecture notes or lesson plans.

Item 3, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to indicate the activities they use in their classes. Responses are shown in Table XXXVIII.
TABLE XXXVIII

THE ACTIVITIES INSTRUCTORS USE IN THEIR CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items i and Code**</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Region</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>N=97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.
**The following do you use in your classes?
1. case studies, 2. games and simulations, 3. audio-visual usage, 4. special presentation by qualified guest lecturers, 5. student panel discussions, 6. field trips, 7. other.

In the MR group, 75.6 per cent of instructors report using student panel discussions, while 76.4 per cent of the OR instructors report audio-visual usage. Among the respondents from the MR group, 46.3 per cent use case studies while 46.5 per cent of the OR instructors use case studies; 9.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 7.2 per cent of the OR instructors use games and simulations; 36.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 35.1 per cent of the OR instructors use special presentations by qualified guest lecturers, and 61 per cent of the MR instructors and 56.7 per cent of the OR instructors use field trips. Only 2.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 4.1 per cent of the OR instructors use other activities, such as group projects and centers for studying.
history. No significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups according to the activities they use in their classes. The data reveal that instructors in the MR and OR groups use similar activities in their classes.

Item 21, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks instructors to indicate problems they encounter while preparing class presentations. These data are presented in Table XXXIX.

TABLE XXXIX
THE PROBLEMS WHILE PREPARING CLASS PRESENTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code**</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

**21—Have you ever encountered any of the following problems while preparing class presentations? a. teach too many subjects, b. too much work on other duties, c. lack of books for research, d. inadequate place and facility for doing research, e. cannot find the right techniques and activities, f. tired of preparing for class presentation, g. other.

The data in Table XXXIX show that the highest percentage of the respondents, 36.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 51.5 per cent of the OR instructors, indicate a lack of books for research as a problem while preparing class presentations.
The second highest percentage of the respondents, 34.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 50.5 per cent of the OR instructors, report inadequate places and facilities for doing research. Of the remaining categories, 24.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 36.1 per cent of the OR instructors report teaching too many subjects; 26.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 33 per cent of the OR instructors report too much work and other duties; 14.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 17.5 per cent of the OR instructors report not finding the right techniques and activities, and 2.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 2.1 per cent of the OR instructors report being tired of preparing for class presentations. In the OR group, 2.1 per cent of the history instructors have other problems, such as some of the required class activities being impractical, or having little or no time in advance to prepare for a new class; none is indicated by the MR instructors. No significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups according to the problems which they encounter while preparing class presentations. As reported in Table XXXIX, both MR and OR groups have encountered similar problem while preparing class presentations.

Item 6, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks instructors to indicate how early they prepare for class presentations. The data are given in Table XL.
As the data in Table XL indicate, 39 per cent of the MR instructors cannot say exactly how much time they spend on preparing for class presentation because the amount of time they spend varies depending on the subject and on the time available. While 44.3 per cent of the OR instructors, the highest percentage, report that they prepare a week in advance for class presentations. Some 22 per cent of the OR instructors prepare a month in advance; 4.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 10.3 per cent of the OR instructors prepare a day in advance. In the OR group, 2.1 per cent of the history instructors prepare a few hours before class; none of the MR instructors spend as little time as "a few hours before class." In the OR group 5.2 per cent of the history instructors prepare a semester in advance, and they also take into account how students progress...
in each class. A chi square test of difference indicates no statistically significant difference between the MR and OR history instructors in relation to how early they prepare for class presentations. According to the above data, location of the institution does not have an influence upon how much time instructors take to prepare for class presentations.

Item 7, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks instructors to indicate how they organize their presentations. Responses are summarized in Table XLI.

**TABLE XLI**

HOW INSTRUCTORS ORGANIZE THEIR PRESENTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items % and Code**</th>
<th>Metro. Region N=41 %*</th>
<th>Other Regions N=97 %*</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. a.</td>
<td>30 73.2</td>
<td>78 80.4</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>17 41.5</td>
<td>56 57.7</td>
<td>3.061</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>9 22.0</td>
<td>32 33.0</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>22 53.7</td>
<td>58 59.8</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>4 4.1</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

**7**—How do you organize your presentation? a. followed a written syllabus, b. use chronological approach, c. teach backward, starting from present situation to the past, d. choose the topics in the past which you feel important and relevant to present events, e. other.

The highest percentage of the respondents, 73.2 per cent of the MR instructors and 80.4 per cent of the OR instructors, organize their class presentations by following a written syllabus. The second highest percentage of the respondents,
53.7 per cent of the MR instructors and 59.8 per cent of the OR instructors, organize their presentations by choosing the topics from the past which they feel important and relevant to present events. The next highest percentage of the respondents, 41.5 per cent of MR instructors and 57.7 per cent of the OR instructors, organize their class presentations by using a chronological approach. In the MR group, 22 per cent use the chronological approach and in the OR group, 33 per cent. In the OR group, only 4.1 per cent of the history instructors use other approaches, such as choosing the event, then comparing it with other events, or organizing their class presentations to fit their students' background in history; none of the MR instructors use these other approaches. The data in Table XLI indicates that no significant difference exists between the two groups of instructors (MR and OR) as related to how they organize their presentations. From the above data, it may be assumed that the MR instructors organize their class presentations like the OR instructors.

Item 8 in Section II of the questionnaire asks instructors to provide the purposes of their presentation. The data are presented in Table XLII.
TABLE XLII

PURPOSES OF CLASS PRESENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code***</th>
<th>Metro. Region N=41</th>
<th>Other Regions N=97</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>32 78.0</td>
<td>81 83.5</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>12 29.3</td>
<td>25 25.8</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>17 41.5</td>
<td>32 33.0</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
<td>16 16.5</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>9 22.0</td>
<td>51 52.6</td>
<td>10.999</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>21 51.2</td>
<td>63 64.9</td>
<td>2.281</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>6 14.6</td>
<td>10 10.3</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.
***8--What is the purpose(s) of your presentation? a. applicable to current social, economic, and politics, b. as needed for history major students, c. as needed for other social science major students, d. as needed for general requirement of the syllabus, e. perpetuate the Thai culture and civic responsibility, f. add more content on text assignments or supplemental information, g. other.

The data in Table XLII show that, the highest percentage of the respondents, 78 per cent of the MR instructors and 83.5 per cent of the OR instructors, report the purpose of their class presentations as applicable to current social, economic, and political affairs. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 51.2 per cent of the MR instructors and 64.9 per cent of the OR instructors, use their class presentations to add more content to text assignments or supplemental information. Only 22 per cent of the MR instructors use their class presentations to perpetuate the Thai culture and civic responsibility as compared to 52.6 per cent of the OR
instructors. Of the remaining categories, 29.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 25.8 per cent of the OR instructors use their class presentations for history majors; 41.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 33 per cent of the OR instructors use their class presentations for other social science majors, and 17.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 16.5 per cent of the OR instructors use their class presentations to meet the general requirements of the syllabus. Only 14.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 10.3 per cent of the OR instructors use their class presentations for other purposes, such as developing students' thinking skills, to know their responsibility as students and as teachers, and to love their country. Chi square test reveals that there is only one significant difference between the MR and OR instructors, as related to the purpose of their presentations. It may be assumed that the MR instructors and OR instructors have a slight disagreement on the purposes of their presentations. OR instructors make more of an effort than MR instructors to perpetuate Thai culture and civic responsibility.

In addition to the above teaching techniques, the following items in Section II of the questionnaire were asked in order to gather information concerning their students. Item 9, in Section II of the questionnaire asks instructors to indicate if a good relationship with their students affects their teaching effectiveness. The responses are presented in Table XLIII.
**TABLE XLIII**

**HOW DOES A GOOD RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENTS EFFECT INSTRUCTORS' TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code*</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level

**9---Do you think maintaining a good relationship with your students affects your teaching effectiveness? a. could definitely have a very positive effect, b. could have some positive effect, c. have no effect whatever, d. would probably cause negative effect, d. would definitely cause very negative effect.

The majority of the respondents, 78 per cent of the MR instructors and 85.4 per cent the OR instructors, think a good relationship with their students could definitely have a very positive effect on their teaching effectiveness. The second highest number of respondents, 22 per cent of the MR instructors and 12.5 per cent of the OR instructors, think a good relationship with their students could have some positive effect toward their teaching effectiveness. In the OR group only 2.1 per cent of the history instructors think maintaining a good relationship with students would probably have a negative effect on their teaching effectiveness; however none of the MR instructors indicated that they were against having a good relationship with their students. No significant
difference was found between the two groups (MR and OR) with respect to their thinking about a good relationship with their students. The MR instructors and OR instructors seem to agree that a good relationship with their students influences their teaching effectiveness.

Item 10, in Section II of the questionnaire asks instructors to indicate how often they talk informally with their students during the class period. The replies are shown in Table XLIV.

**TABLE XLIV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code*</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41 %</td>
<td>N=97 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>10 10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>22 53.7</td>
<td>45 46.9</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>15 36.6</td>
<td>37 38.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*10—How often do you talk with your students, during the class period, about things which you feel are beneficial to students in addition to the syllabus which you are teaching? a. never, b. once in a while, c. whenever students ask for your opinion, d. every time when something important or interesting happens, e. regularly, during almost every teaching period.

The result indicates that, a majority of the respondents, 53.7 per cent of the MR instructors and 46.9 per cent of the OR instructors, talk with their students during the class period, about things, in addition to their syllabi, which
they feel are beneficial to students. Some 36.7 per cent of
the MR instructors and 38.5 of the OR instructors talk with
their students regularly, during almost every teaching period.
A small percentage of the respondents, 9.8 per cent of the MR
instructors and 10.4 per cent of the OR instructors, talk with
their students once in a while. In the OR group only 2.1 per
cent of the history instructors never talk with their students
and another 2.1 per cent talk to their students whenever
students ask for their opinions. No significant difference
exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups ac-
cording to how often instructors talk with their students
during the class period about things which they feel are
beneficial to students in addition to the syllabus being
presented. As indicated earlier, a majority of the in-
structors think that maintaining a good relationship with
their students can have a very positive effect on their
teaching effectiveness, and MR instructors seem to talk
informally with their students as much as OR instructors
during the class period.

Item 11, in Section II of the questionnaire asks
instructors to indicate the types of things they have
discussed in addition to the content. The distribution of
the data is presented in Table XLV.
TABLE XLV

THE TYPES OF THINGS INSTRUCTORS DISCUSSED DURING CLASS PERIOD IN ADDITION TO THE CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code**</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a.</td>
<td>33 60.5</td>
<td>87 89.7</td>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b.</td>
<td>31 75.6</td>
<td>80 82.5</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c.</td>
<td>22 53.7</td>
<td>54 66.0</td>
<td>1.863</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d.</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
<td>23 23.7</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

**11--During the class period, what types of things have you discussed in addition to the content? a. social problems, b. political problems, c. educational problems, d. other

The data in Table XLV show that the highest percentage of the respondents, 60.5 per cent of the MR instructors and 89.7 per cent of the OR instructors, discuss social problems in addition to the course content during class periods. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 75.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 82.5 per cent of the OR instructors, discuss political problems. In the MR group, the discussion of educational problems is 53.7 per cent; 66 per cent is indicated by the data from the OR group. In the MR group, 17.1 per cent of the instructors and 23.7 per cent of the OR instructors also discuss other problems such as economic problems, teaching problems, Thai culture, and civic responsibility. No significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups according to the types of things they discuss during the class period in addition to the
content. Even though most of the content in the syllabi are prescribed by the Department of Teachers Education, several history instructors in the MR and OR groups discuss some problems in addition to the content.

Item 22, in Section II of the questionnaire asks instructors to describe the characteristics of their students. The replies are summarized in Table XLVI.

### TABLE XLVI

**THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items and Code***</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 22.</td>
<td>n=41</td>
<td>n=97</td>
<td>5.751</td>
<td>0.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>25 61.0</td>
<td>73 80.4</td>
<td>5.011</td>
<td>0.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>32 78.0</td>
<td>89 91.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>8 8.2</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>25 61.0</td>
<td>52 53.6</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>23 56.1</td>
<td>48 49.5</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

***22--Do any of the following apply to your students?
a. inadequate background in history, b. lack of ability to search for more knowledge, c. cannot adjust themselves to the teaching and learning process in teacher colleges, d. lack of interest in history, e. inadequate preparation of class assignments, f. other.

The results of the survey indicate that the highest percentage of the respondents, 78 per cent of MR instructors and 91.8 per cent of the OR instructors, report a lack of ability to search for more knowledge as a characteristic of their students. The next highest percentage of the
respondents, 61 per cent of the MR instructors and 80.4 per cent of the OR instructors, report that their students have inadequate backgrounds in history. About 61 per cent of the MR instructors and 53.6 per cent of the OR instructors indicate that their students have a lack of interest in history. The results also indicate that 56.1 per cent of the MR history instructors and 49.5 per cent of the OR history instructors think their students inadequately prepare their class assignments. Some 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 8.2 per cent of the OR instructors report that their students cannot adjust themselves to the teaching and learning process in teachers colleges. Only 3.1 per cent of the history instructors in the OR group report other characteristics such as a lack of interest in searching for more knowledge, or the student only wanting to memorize facts, and some students are in school without any definite goal. Chi square tests reveal that there are two significant differences between the MR and OR instructors. The OR group more frequently report that their students have inadequate backgrounds in history and lack the ability to search for more knowledge.

Item 12, in Section II, of the questionnaire asks history instructors to indicate how students behave in their classes. The data are present in Table XLVII.
TABLE XLVII

HOW STUDENTS BEHAVE IN CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code***</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%**</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.
***12--Which, if any, of the following behaviors do students display in your class? a. eager to study, b. willing to discuss class content and present situation, c. only listen and believe their instructors, d. hesitate to ask questions and express their ideas, e. lack of attention, f. reluctant to accept other people ideas, g. cooperate poorly when working together, h. other.

The data in Table XLVII show that the highest percentage of the respondents, 82.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 69.1 per cent of the OR instructors, report that their students are willing to discuss the subject matter, or content of what they are being taught and willing to discuss contemporary situations in class. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 34.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 32 per cent of the OR instructors, indicate that their students are eager to study. In the MR group, 31.4 per cent of the instructors report that their students do not participate in class but only listen and believe, while 15.5 per cent of the
OR group respond that way. The data also indicate that 12.2 per cent of the MR instructors and 23.7 per cent of the OR instructors report that their students hesitate to ask questions and hesitate to express their ideas, 26.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 21.6 per cent of the OR instructors report that their students are inattentive, and 7.3 of the MR instructors and 10.3 per cent of the OR instructors report that their students cooperate poorly when working together. There is only one OR instructor who indicates that students are reluctant to accept other people's ideas, and none of the MR instructors reported that choice. Some 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 5.2 per cent of the OR instructors report their students behave in other ways, such as a willingness to know more about history, but not liking to read the books, and only coming to class for grades but not for knowledge, and hesitating to ask questions, especially female students. Chi square tests reveal that there is one significant difference between the MR and OR instructors as related to the number of history instructors who think their students only listen, and believe their instructors. From the above data, it can be argued that MR instructors and OR instructors agree on how their students behave, except that more MR instructors report that their students only listen to and believe their instructors.

The following items in Section II of the questionnaire were asked of the respondents in order to draw information
related to the syllabi such as whether or not they are contemporary enough, or how do the instructors feel about the adequacy of the syllabi. Item 13 in Section II of the questionnaire asks history instructors to provide their thinking about the content of the history syllabi. The replies to this question are seen in Table XLVIII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code***</th>
<th>Metro. Region N=41 %**</th>
<th>Other Regions N=97 %**</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>15 36.6</td>
<td>31 32.0</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
<td>6 6.2</td>
<td>4.004</td>
<td>0.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>3 7.3</td>
<td>26 26.8</td>
<td>5.472</td>
<td>0.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>12 29.3</td>
<td>49 50.5</td>
<td>5.275</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>21 21.6</td>
<td>2.005</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
<td>21 21.6</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.
***13--What do you think about the content of the history syllabi? a. is efficient, b. is too hard, c. is not agreeable with objectives, d. has not kept up with contemporary trends in history, e. is not applicable to future usage, f. is not clearly stated, g. Limited freedom to organize your own course content

The history instructors from both groups think that the content of history syllabi are in agreement with stated objectives. In the MR group, 36.6 per cent of the instructors report that the syllabi are efficient, while 50.5 per cent of the OR instructors report that the syllabi are not
applicable for future usage. The results indicate that 17.1 per cent of the MR history instructors and 6.2 per cent of the OR history instructors report the syllabi are too difficult, while 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 26.8 per cent of the OR instructors report that the syllabi are not current with contemporary trends in history; 9.8 per cent of the OR instructors and 21.6 per cent of the MR instructors report the syllabi are not clearly stated, and 17.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 21.6 per cent of the OR instructors report that the syllabi limit their freedom to organize course content. Chi square tests reveal that there are three significant differences between the MR and the OR instructors.

As indicated in Chapter II, a major goal of the teacher education curriculum is to produce prospective teachers that can fit into their social and economic surroundings, and the above data indicate that more OR instructors think history syllabi are not current with contemporary trends in history and are not applicable for the future, while more MR instructors think history syllabi are too difficult.

Item 14 in Section II of the questionnaire asks instructors to indicate their thinking about the amount of time they have to teach their history course. The responses from the history instructors are presented in Table II.
### TABLE II

**THE AMOUNT OF TIME INSTRUCTORS HAVE TO TEACH THEIR HISTORY COURSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code**</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=47</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>n=97</td>
<td>%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. a.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

**14.--What do you think about the amount of time you have to teach your history course? a. time is adequate, b. insufficient periods/week in the semester for teaching the content of the syllabus, c. the extra-curricular activities influence time to teach, d. each class period is too short, e. each class period is too long, f. other.

The highest percentage of the respondents, 56.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 56.7 per cent of the OR instructors, reply that the number of periods per week in the semester is insufficient for teaching the content of the syllabus. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 36.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 34 per cent of the OR instructors, think that the amount of time to teach history courses is adequate. Only 24.4 per cent of the MR history instructors, and 30.9 per cent of their colleagues in the OR group think that extra-curricular activities influence the amount of time they have to teach; 17.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 17.5 per cent of the OR instructors indicate that each class
period is too short, and only 2.4 per cent of MR instructors and 5.2 per cent of the OR instructors indicate that they think each class period is too long. Only 2 of the respondents from the OR group indicate other reasons effecting the amount of time they have, such as some of the content of the syllabus as being too long, and some class periods being too long. The data in Table IL indicate that no significant difference exists between the two groups of instructors (MR and OR) as related to the amount of time instructors have to teach their history courses. The data reveals that instructors in the MR and OR groups agree on the amount of time they have to teach their history courses.

The following items in Section II of the questionnaire were used to gather information on textbooks and reading sources for research study. Item 15 in Section II of the questionnaire asks history instructors to indicate the adequacy of textbooks for their history classes. The data are presented in Table L.

The highest percentage of the respondents, 56.1 per cent of the MR history instructors and 63.9 per cent of the OR history instructors, indicate that there is a shortage of textbooks for students. In the OR group, 61.9 per cent of the instructors report that some classes do not have textbooks, as compared to 36.6 per cent of the MR instructors. Table L also indicates that 17.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 15.5 per cent of the OR instructors report present textbooks are
TABLE L
THE TEXTBOOKS FOR HISTORY CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code***</th>
<th>Metro. Region N=41</th>
<th>Other Regions N=97</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
<td>15 15.5</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>23 56.1</td>
<td>62 63.9</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>15 36.6</td>
<td>51 52.6</td>
<td>2.954</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>22 22.7</td>
<td>2.360</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>13 31.7</td>
<td>35 36.1</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>15 36.6</td>
<td>60 61.9</td>
<td>7.417</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.
***15--Please indicate the present adequacy of textbooks for your history classes. a. present textbooks are adequate, b. there is shortage of textbooks for students, c. there is a lack of good Thai language history textbooks, d. present textbooks do not coincide with syllabi, e. present textbooks are out-dated, f. some classes do not have a textbook, g. other.

Adequate; 36.6 per cent of the MR instructors and 52.6 per cent of the OR instructors report there is a lack of good Thai language history textbooks; 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 22.7 per cent of the OR instructors indicate that the present textbooks do not coincide with syllabi, and 31.7 per cent of the MR instructors and 36.1 per cent of the OR instructors indicate present textbooks are out-dated. Only 2.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 2.1 per cent of the OR instructors indicate other reasons, such as some textbooks being too expensive and some textbooks being too difficult for
Chi square tests reveal that one significant difference exists between the MR and the OR instructors. The data indicate that more OR than MR instructors report that some of their history classes do not have textbooks.

Item 16, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks instructors to indicate the present adequacy of reading sources for research study and reading assignments. These data are presented in Table LI.

**TABLE LI**

THE PRESENT READING SOURCES FOR RESEARCH STUDY AND READING ASSIGNMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code***</th>
<th>Metro, Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>N=41 %**</td>
<td>N=97 %**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.115 0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>1.527 0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>4.636 0.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>0.702 0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>0.047 0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.907 0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.965 0.326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

16—Please indicate the present adequacy of reading sources for research study and reading assignments. a. amount of books are adequate and suitable, b. need of history books in Thai language, c. need of historical journals, d. limited number of history books in the library, e. history books available in the library are out-dated, f. instructors have no part in book selection in the library, g. other.

The data in Table LI show that the highest percentage of the respondents, 78 per cent of the MR instructors and 71.1
per cent of the OR instructors, report there are a limited number of history books in the library. In the MR group, 53.7 of the instructors report that the history books available in the library are out-dated, while 66 per cent of the OR instructors report that there is a need for history journals. The data in Table LI also show that 4.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 6.2 per cent of the OR instructors report that the amount of books is adequate and suitable; 39 per cent of the MR instructors and 50.5 per cent of the OR instructors report there is a need for history books in Thai language; 29.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 16.5 per cent of the OR instructors report that instructors have no part in the selection of books placed in the library. In the OR group, 5.2 per cent of the history instructors report other reasons such as a lack of funds to buy history books, and the fact that the books are not suitable sources for their students special reading for European History classes; none of the MR instructors indicated those problems. Significant differences are found when comparing the MR and OR group responses with regard to the history journals available for research study, and reading assignments. A significantly higher percentage of the OR instructors than OR instructors agree that the number of history books in the library is limited, while more OR instructors report the need for historical journals.

The following items in section II of the questionnaire were asked in order to draw information about how and when
history instructors evaluate their students. Item 17, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to provide the objectives of their evaluations. The data are presented in Table LII.

**TABLE LII**

THE HISTORY INSTRUCTORS' OBJECTIVE WHEN THEY EVALUATE THEIR STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code**</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

**17--What is your objective when you evaluate your students? a. to get students' grades as required by the institution, b. to evaluate students' work, c. to group students according to their ability, d. to develop your teaching skill, e. to see if a student developed according to objective, f. other.

The results indicate that the highest percentage of the respondents, 73.2 per cent of the MR history instructors and 69.1 per cent of the OR history instructors, report that the purpose of student evaluation is to help them to develop their teaching skills. In the OR group, 66 per cent of the instructors, the second highest percentage, report that the purpose of their evaluation is to evaluate their students' work, while 63.4 per cent of the MR instructors report that
their major purpose is to determine whether or not a student has achieved the stated objectives. The results also indicate that 56.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 57.7 per cent of the OR instructors indicate that the objective of their evaluations is to determine students' grades as required by the institutions; 4.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 16.5 per cent of the OR instructors report that the objective of their evaluations is to group students according to their ability. In the OR group, only 6.2 per cent of the history instructors evaluate their students for other objectives, such as to see if students know how to express themselves or to encourage students to study. No significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups according to their objectives when they evaluate their students. The data reveal that the MR and OR history instructors who teach in different regions have similar objectives when they evaluate their students.

Item 18, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks instructors to indicate how they evaluate their students. The responses are presented in Table LIII.

The data in Table LIII show that, in the MR group, 75.6 per cent of the instructors report that they evaluate their students through classroom observations, while 84.5 per cent of the MR instructors report that they evaluate their students by grading their written projects. In the OR group, 70.1 per cent of the instructors report the second highest percentage
**TABLE LIII**

HOW INSTRUCTORS EVALUATE THEIR STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items and Code***</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%**</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. a.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.
***10—How do you evaluate your students? a. observe students' development in classes, b. grade their exercises after each chapter, c. grade students written projects, d. grade students' oral presentations, e. use objective tests, f. use essay tests, g. use combinations of objective and essay tests, h. other.

of evaluation when they indicate that they use combinations of objective and essay tests, while 65.9 per cent of the OR instructors report the second highest percentage of evaluation when they indicate that they evaluate their students by grading students' written projects. The results also indicate that 29.3 per cent of the MR history instructors and 20.6 per cent of the OR instructors evaluate by grading their students' exercises after each chapter; 56.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 59.8 per cent of the OR instructors evaluate by grading students' oral presentations; 51.2 per cent of the MR instructors and 52.6 per cent of the OR instructors evaluate by using objective tests, and 46.3 per cent of the MR...
instructors and 56.7 per cent of the OR instructors evaluate by using essay tests. Some 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 4.1 per cent of the OR instructors evaluate in other ways, such as inside, and outside class group projects. Chi square tests reveal that there is one significant difference between the MR and the OR instructors. Although the MR instructors evaluate their students in as many ways as do OR instructors, OR instructors are more likely than MR instructors to evaluate their students' written projects.

Item 19, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to identify how often they evaluate their students. The results are shown in Table LIV.

**TABLE LIV**

**HOW OFTEN INSTRUCTORS EVALUATE THEIR STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code*</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. a.</td>
<td>6  14.6  5  5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. b.</td>
<td>14  34.1  40  41.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. c.</td>
<td>3  7.3  6  6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. d.</td>
<td>2  4.9  17  17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. e.</td>
<td>15  36.6  26  27.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. f.</td>
<td>1  2.4  3  3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*19—How often do you evaluate your students? a. at the end of each semester, b. twice each semester, c. once a month, d. at the end of each chapter, e. only upon reaching a proper time, f. other.

The data in Table LIV show that 36.6 per cent of the MR instructors report that they evaluate their students only at appropriate times, while 47.7 per cent of the OR instructors
report that they evaluate their students twice each semester. Of the remaining categories, 14.6 per cent of the AN instructors and 5.2 per cent of the OR instructors evaluate their students at the end of each semester; 7.3 per cent of the AN instructors and 6.3 per cent of the OR instructors evaluate once a month, and 4.9 per cent of the AN instructors and 17.7 per cent of the OR instructors evaluate at the end of each chapter. Some 2.4 per cent of the AN instructors and 3.1 per cent of the OR instructors evaluate their students at other times, such as when students are ready, when there are different groups of students or different contents of subjects, or upon students' choices of projects. Chi square tests reveal that there is no significant difference between the AN and the OR instructors with respect to the frequency of student evaluation.

Item 24, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to indicate the difficulties they encounter in evaluating students. Responses are presented in Table LV.

The data in Table LV show that 53.7 per cent of the AN instructors report having a lack of skills to develop good test instruments, while 39.2 per cent of the OR instructors report having a lack of skills to develop good test instruments and a lack of time to develop good tests. Those were the highest percentage of responses. In the AN group, 17.1 per cent of the instructors encounter difficulties with
### Table LV

**HISTORY INSTRUCTORS' DIFFICULTIES IN EVALUATING STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items &amp; Code***</th>
<th>Metro Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. a.</td>
<td>N=41 53.7</td>
<td>N=97 39.2</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. b.</td>
<td>9 22.0</td>
<td>36 39.2</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. c.</td>
<td>7 17.1</td>
<td>5 5.2</td>
<td>5.156</td>
<td>0.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. d.</td>
<td>6 14.6</td>
<td>9 9.3</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. e.</td>
<td>3 7.3</td>
<td>6 6.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. f.</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>11 11.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

| 24. — Do you encounter any of the following difficulties in evaluating students? a. lack of skill to develop good test instruments, b. lack of time to develop good tests, c. test was designed for different objectives, d. lack of proper way to score and grade, e. too many people decide on the score and grade, f. other.

Tests that are designed for different objectives, while 5.2 per cent of the OR instructors encounter similar difficulties. The results also indicate that 14.6 per cent of the MR history instructors and 9.3 per cent of the OR instructors lack a proper way to score and grade tests, and 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 6.2 per cent of the OR instructors report that too many people decide on the score and grade. Some 9.8 per cent of the MR instructors and 11.3 per cent of the OR instructors encounter other difficulties, such as students having a lack of skills to answer essay tests, or a lack of skills to grade students, or the instructors lack of time to grade their students between final examinations and time to.
turn in final grades. Chi square tests reveal that there is one significant difference between the IR and the OR instructors. Although IR and OR instructors encounter similar difficulties in evaluating students, the IR instructors encounter more difficulty with tests which are designed for different objectives.

The following items in Section II of the questionnaire were asked in order to obtain information from history instructors about classroom supplies, equipment, and colleagues, and administrations in their institutions. Item 23, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to indicate the problems concerning teaching aids. The responses are presented in Table LVI.

**Table LVI**

**THE PROBLEMS CONCERNING TEACHING AIDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items # and Code***</th>
<th>Metro. Region N=41</th>
<th>Other Regions N=97</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level

**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

***23—Please indicate the problems concerning teaching aids. a. instructors do not know how to use equipment, b. inadequate supply of audio-visual material, c. present teaching aids are not suitable for classes, d. lack of funds to buy teaching aids, e. teaching aids in the market are hard to find, f. other.
The highest percentage of the respondents, 63.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 70.1 per cent of the OR instructors, indicate that they have problems because of a lack of funds to buy teaching aids. The second highest percentage of the respondents, 43.9 per cent of the MR instructors and 63.9 per cent of the OR instructors, have an inadequate supply of audio-visual materials. The next highest percentage of the respondents, 34.1 per cent of the MR instructors and 46.4 per cent of the OR instructors, indicate that teaching aids are hard to find, and 24.4 per cent of the MR instructors and 23.7 per cent of the OR instructors indicate that present teaching aids are not suitable for classes. Only 2.1 per cent of the MR instructors indicate other problems, such as having no room to keep the equipment for teaching history. Chi square tests reveal that there is one significant difference between the MR and the OR instructors as regards to the problem of inadequate supplies of audio-visual materials. Instructors in the MR group and the OR group have common problems concerning teaching aids, but a higher percentage of OR than MR instructors have inadequate audio-visual materials.

Items 25, in Section II of the questionnaire, asks history instructors to identify the difficulties they encounter from their colleagues. The answers are shown in Table LVII.
### TABLE LVII

**The Difficulties History Instructors Encounter From Their Colleagues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items and Code**</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=41</td>
<td>n=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.

**25--Have you encountered any of the following difficulties? a. the old generation of faculty does not accept new discoveries or concepts, b. the new generation of faculty accepts new discoveries or concepts without judgment, c. a lack of support from your colleagues, d. suspicion or disapproval from your colleagues, e. a lack of teaching skills among history instructors, f. other.

There are a small number of responses to this question. The results indicate that 19.5 per cent of the MR instructors report that they encounter difficulty with older faculty who do not accept new discoveries or concepts, while 16.5 per cent of the OR instructors report a lack of teaching skills among history instructors. The results also indicate that 14.6 per cent of the MR history instructors and 11.3 per cent of the OR history instructors have difficulty with younger faculty who accept new discoveries or concepts without judgment, and 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 15.5 per cent of the OR instructors have difficulty with a lack of support from their colleagues. In the OR group, 4.1 per cent of the history
instructors encounter suspicion or disapproval from their colleagues; none of the MR instructors encounter such difficulties. Some 7.3 per cent of the MR instructors and 15.5 per cent of the OR instructors encounter other difficulties, such as different instructors having different goals, or a lack of a job description for some instructors, or a need for some form of faculty evaluation. No significant difference exists between the instructors in the MR and OR groups in regard to the difficulties they encounter with their colleagues.

Items 26, in Section II of the questionnaire asked instructors to identify the difficulties they encounter with the administrations at their institutions. These data are presented in Table LVIII.

As the data in Table LVIII indicate, 34.1 per cent of the MR instructors, the highest percentage response, report they have difficulty with administrative policies which are unfavorable toward the teaching of history, while 29.9 per cent of the OR instructors the highest percentage of response for them, report they encounter a lack of support, cooperation, and encouragement from administrators. In the MR group, 31.7 per cent of the instructors encounter difficulty with administrative policies which are unfavorable toward research in history, while 12.4 per cent of the OR instructors encounter the same difficulty. Some 12.2 per cent of the MR
TABLE LVIII
THE DIFFICULTIES HISTORY INSTRUCTORS ENCOUNTER WITH THE ADMINISTRATION AT THEIR INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items f and Code***</th>
<th>Metro. Region</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>14 34.1</td>
<td>27 27.8</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>13 31.7</td>
<td>12 12.4</td>
<td>7.264</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>5 12.2</td>
<td>11 11.3</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>11 28.6</td>
<td>29 29.9</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>6 14.0</td>
<td>10 10.3</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6   6.2</td>
<td>2.651</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the 0.05 level
**Respondents were allowed to select more than one choice.
***26. Have you encountered any of the following difficulties at your institution? a. the administrative policies are unfavorable toward the teaching of history, b. the administrative policies are unfavorable toward research in history, c. the administrative policies make it difficult for instructors to get further education, d. a lack of support, cooperation, and encouragement from administrators, e. too much official red tape, f. other.

Instructors and 11.3 per cent of the OR instructors encounter difficulty with administrative policies, which make it difficult for instructors to get further education, and 14.6 per cent of the OR instructors and 10.3 per cent of the OR instructors encounter too much official red tape. In the OR group, 6.2 per cent of the history instructors encounter other difficulties, such as a lack of communication between faculty and administrators, or administrators thinking that anybody can teach history. Chi square tests reveal that there is one significant difference between the OR and the OK instructors as related to the difficulties they encounter with
administrative policies. According to the above data, both MR and OR groups encounter similar difficulties with the administrations at their institutions, however, the MR instructors seem to encounter more difficulty with administrative policies which are unfavorable to the teaching of history.

**Conclusion**

Hypothesis six states that there will be no significant differences in the classroom teaching strategies of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by their teaching behaviors. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to the following teaching behaviors:

1. **The problems instructors might have when they teach history courses.**—Problems listed included those with students, classrooms, and teaching aids, among other things.

2. **The techniques instructors use most often in teaching their classes.**—Various techniques are used by the respondents including, lectures, historical analysis, inquiries, and others.

3. **The process of their lecture method.**—Various processes mentioned as being put to use by the respondents include a lecture or a question and answer period, or an open discussion. OR instructors are, however, more likely than MR instructors to alternate their lectures with questioning sessions.
4. Instructors' opinions on how frequently lecture notes should be revised.—Respondents varied on their response to this question once a semester to once a year.

5. The reasons why instructors have not changed their lecture notes.—Instructors responding listed various reasons why they have not changed their notes, including a lack of funs and a lack of new data.

6. The activities instructors use in their classes.—Instructors listed such activities as games, audio-visual materials and field trips, to name a few.

7. The problems of preparing class presentations.—The instructors listed problems such as too much work, lack of research materials, or an inadequate place to work.

8. How much advance instructors prepare for class presentations.—Instructors responded that they spent anywhere from a day to a few hours preparing.

9. How instructors organize their presentations.—Instructors responded that they used a chronological approach and a written syllabus.

10. The purposes of instructors' presentations.—Instructors responded that the purposes of their presentations varied from contemporary application, to the perpetuation of
Thai culture. However, OR instructors make more of an effort than MR instructors to perpetuate the Thai culture.

11. The importance of establishing good relationships with their students.--Instructors indicated they thought maintaining a good relationship with their students results in a positive effect on student-teacher relationships.

12. How frequently instructors talk with their students.--Instructors responded that they often talk informally with their students.

13. The types of things instructors discuss during class periods in addition to syllabus content.--Instructors responded that they discuss social, political, or educational problems with their students.

14. The characteristics of students.--Fewer MR than OR instructors report that their students have inadequate backgrounds in history and lack the ability to search for more knowledge.

15. Students' behaviors in class.--More MR than OR instructors report that their students listen to and believe, uncritically, what is said in lectures.

16. The general content of history syllabi.--The instructors indicated that the content varied from easy to difficulty, and whether it was contemporary or not.
Significant difference are found between the two groups, however. More MR than OR instructors believe that the content of history syllabi is too hard. On the other hand, more OR than MR instructors report that syllabi are (a) not current with trends in history (b) are not applicable to future usage.

17. The amount of time instructors have to teach their history courses.—Instructors, for the most part, responded that they have an insufficient amount of time to teach the syllabus.

18. Adequacy of textbooks.—Instructors indicated that although the present number of textbooks available on the market for history classes is adequate, there is a shortage of textbooks for students, a lack of good Thai language history textbooks, and texts frequently do not coincide with syllabi. More OR than MR instructors report a lack of textbooks for classes.

19. Supplemental reading sources.—The instructors' indicate reading sources for research and assignments are adequate and suitable, but a need exists for history books in the Thai language. Library holdings are limited and frequently out-dated. Moreover, instructors have no part in the selection of library books. However, more OR than MR instructors report a lack of historical journals in their libraries.
20. **Objectives when instructors evaluate their students.**—A great majority of the instructors indicated that they evaluate their students in order to help develop their own teaching skills.

21. **The way in which instructors evaluate their students.**—More OR than MR instructors grade their students by written projects.

22. **How often instructors evaluate their students.**—Instructors responded that they evaluate their students, for the most part, twice a semester, and in many cases, at an arbitrary point during the semester.

23. **The difficulties instructors have in evaluating students.**—Instructors indicated that those difficulties listed include a lack of skills, a lack of good tests, to name a few. However, more MR than OR instructors have difficulty in evaluating students with tests designed for different objectives.

24. **The problems instructors have concerning teaching aids.**—The problems instructors indicated they were having included a lack of funds or an inadequate supply of audiovisual materials to name a few. OR instructors, however, are more likely than MR instructors to have inadequate audiovisual materials.
25. The difficulties instructors encounter from their colleagues.--Instructors listed having difficulties with such things as suspicious colleagues or disagreements over new discoveries, to name a few.

26. The difficulties instructors encounter with their respective administrations.--The instructors indicated such difficulties as unfavorable policies or a lack of support. However, MR instructors, more frequently than OR instructors, encounter administrative policies which are unfavorable toward research in history.

General Comments

The last item, in Section II, of the questionnaire is designed to elicit information from the teachers colleges history instructors (see Appendix B). The item asks instructors to write their comments concerning problems or suggestions they have for the improvement of teaching history in teachers colleges. Since many of the responses are similar, they are grouped and summarized as follow:

1. Teaching techniques.--The teaching techniques that history instructors used when they were students are out of date, so instructors need to attend seminars in new methods of teaching history given by experts in the field. The professional development of history instructors in technique
and method should be added in order to increase the use of new technology in teaching. Seminars in the teaching-learning process should be held regularly at every teachers college. Field trips to historical sites should be incorporated into the curriculum. Budgets are limited, so it is very difficult to improve the teaching-learning process.

2. **Students**.--Higher admission standards are needed. Some students are not interested in studying by themselves and have no skills in reading. Students only want the grade, not the knowledge. Some students don't want to study or improve themselves, which makes the instructors very upset. Most students like the lecture method because they don't have to study much.

3. **Syllabi and time to teach**.--The time instructors have to teach their history courses should be adjusted to coincide with the syllabi. The content of the history syllabi should be improved in order to make it more effective. The curriculum doesn't respond to the needs of the communities. The portion of the history syllabi that require mere memorization should be abolished.

4. **Classroom conditions**.--There should be an educational center for history to provide easier access to use instructional equipment. There is a need for large lecture rooms that can accommodate more than three regular classes of students.
5. **Classroom supplies and equipment.**—There is a lack of funds for the buying and making of some instructional materials. There are not enough slides and teaching equipment for Eastern and Western Civilization; the instructor has to borrow them from other departments, which is not practical.

6. **Textbooks and reading material.**—Textbooks and reference books are expensive and difficult to find. There are a limited number of books in the library in both English and Thai. Teachers colleges should seek more funds for the purchase of books and supplementary reading materials for the library. There is a lack of history books and historical journals in Thai. Instructors should be encouraged to write more, to increase the number of books and instructional handbooks.

7. **Testing and evaluation.**—The tests and evaluations are not adequate. Tests and evaluations should not measure only how well students memorize content.

8. **Colleagues and administration.**—The most important problem is that the instructors don't try to adapt themselves to the changing world. History instructors in each teachers college should have a chance to have discussions with colleagues from other institutions who teach in the same field. Administrators do not provide funds for the attending of any seminars in history because they think that the instructors will never do anything with the seminar's information.
9. **Seminars and professional meetings.**—Support from administrators should be increased to permit instructors to attend inservice programs or to continue their studies. History instructors should organize meetings among themselves on a regular basis to exchange and discuss subject content, instructional methods, including the use of instructional media. Expert historians should be invited to attend these meetings in order to exchange new knowledge. Instructors of all educational institutions should attend such meetings to exchange ideas, and to identify goals for history teaching. Some history instructors do not realize the importance of their teaching duties because they have other administrative responsibilities, so academic development has been ignored.

10. **Research study.**—Administrators should realize the importance of research study in history. Research studies in Thai history and local history need to be promoted and emphasized.

11. **Other comments.**—Administrators should be open-minded in permitting political discussion and lecture within a teachers college. Academic freedom for history instructors should be increased. One of the most important problems concerning the teaching of history in higher educational institutions is that this subject has been ignored by all groups for more than 50 years. Some history courses have
been cancelled at some teachers colleges because the institutions emphasize vocational education.

Summary

Chapter IV contained the presentation and analysis of data. In August 1985, questionnaires were sent to 42 history instructors in Thai teachers colleges in the MR (Metropolitan region) group and to 138 history instructors in the OR (other regions) group. The presentation in this chapter is the result of the questionnaires received from 41 history instructors in the MR group and from 97 in the OR group. The total responses are from 76.7 per cent of the total population.

From the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), the chi square test of independence is used to determine if differences exist between the responses of history instructors in the MR and OR groups. A correction, Yates' correction for continuity, is used with 2 x 2 tables when any frequencies are less than five. Fisher's Exact Probability Test is used with very small tables where chi square cannot be calculated. The t test of difference is used to determine if significant differences exist between the responses of the MR and the OR instructors for the items in which the Likert type scale is applied.

On the basis of these tests, the following is a summary of the six major null hypotheses.
Hypothesis One

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences between history instructors in the metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by (a) salary, (b) teaching experience, and (c) degrees held. The hypothesis is rejected with respect to:

(a) **Salary**.--MR instructors are more likely to have higher monthly salaries than OR instructors.

This hypothesis is accepted with respect to:

(b) **Teaching experience**.--The types of experience at a teachers college, at a high school, at a technical college, and at a four-year college, and the respondents' academic rank showed that there is no significant difference between the MR and OR history instructors. However, significantly more OR instructors than MR instructors report having teaching experience at the elementary school and at the junior high school level.

(c) **Degrees held**.--The level of academic preparation, such as the subject in which the higher certificate, the bachelor's degree, and the master's degree are held, and the data revealed by the responses the questions of whether or not other degrees are being sought, showed that there is no significant difference between the MR and OR history instructors. However, significantly more MR than OR instructors have earned a specialized subject certificate in history, and more MR
instructors than OR instructors cited the completion of all levels of their education in the region where they are presently working.

**Hypothesis Two**

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences in the academic preparation of history instructors in the metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in history. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to the number of graduate credit hours they earned in history, experience in a seminar in teaching taught by a history professor, and an apprenticeship with a history professor. For these items, there is no significant difference between the HR and OR history instructors. However, significantly more OR than HR instructors had a course in the methods of teaching history.

**Hypothesis Three**

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant difference in the professional preparation of history instructors in the metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in education. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to the number of graduate credit hours earned in education.
Hypothesis Four

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences in the professional achievements of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand, as measured by (a) attendance at professional meetings, (b) the types of publications, and (c) membership in professional organizations. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to:

(a) Attendance at professional meetings.—The attendance rate is related to the release time offered by the institution to attend professional meeting or conduct research. The number of professional seminars attended was also included in the data.

(b) The type of publications.—The respondents indicated the types of historical writings which history instructors had published.

(c) Membership in professional organizations.—In addition to membership in professional organizations, the respondents indicated the types of professional journals they are currently reading on a regular basis, and their location, and the respondents indicated whether or not they were members of an historical organization or educational organization. More OR than MR instructors belong to a social science organization.
Hypothesis Five

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences in the teaching assignments of history instructors in the MR and the OK in Thailand as measured by (a) the number of hours they devoted to course preparations and (b) teaching load. This hypothesis is reject with respect to:

(a) **The number of hours devoted to course preparation**—OK instructors spent more hours per week than MR instructors in the preparation of class presentations.

This hypothesis is accepted with respect to:

(b) **Teaching load**.—This category reflects the amount of time spent on supervision of student teaching, faculty committee meetings, reading professional publications, conducting research, teaching fields other than history, other responsibilities for academic duties, student service responsibilities, clerical duties, registration duties, advising responsibilities, counselor responsibilities, number of periods taught per week, number of students in class; areas of teaching in Thai history, local history, Southeast Asian history, East Asian history, South Asian history, American history, and world history. As regards to the above items, there are no significant differences between the MR and OK history instructors. However, OK instructors spent significantly more time on grading students, and student consultations than the MR instructors; more OK instructors than MR instructors reported having administrative duties; and
more OR instructors than MR instructors reported teaching European history and the history of Western Civilization.

Hypothesis Six

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences in the classroom teaching strategies of history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by their teaching behaviors. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to the following teaching behaviors:

1. The problems instructors might have when they teach history courses. -- Problems listed included those with students, classrooms, and teaching aids, among other things.

2. The techniques instructors use most often in teaching their classes. -- Various techniques are used by the respondents including, lectures, historical analysis, inquiries, and others.

3. The process of their lecture method. -- Various processes mentioned as being put to use by the respondents include a lecture or a question and answer period, or an open discussion. OR instructors are, however, more likely than MR instructors to alternate their lectures with questioning sessions.
4. Instructors' opinions on how frequently lecture notes should be revised.--Respondents varied on their response to this question once a semester to once a year.

5. The reasons why instructors have not changed their lecture notes.--Instructors responding listed various reasons why they have not changed their notes, including a lack of funds and a lack of new data.

6. The activities instructors use in their classes.--Instructors listed such activities as games, audio-visual materials and field trips, to name a few.

7. The problems of preparing class presentations.--The instructors listed problems such as too much work, lack of research materials, or an inadequate place to work.

8. How much advance instructors prepare for class presentations.--Instructors responded that they spent anywhere from a day to a few hours preparing.

9. How instructors organize their presentations.--Instructors responded that they used a chronological approach and a written syllabus.

10. The purposes of instructors' presentations.--Instructors responded that the purposes of their presentations varied from contemporary application, to the perpetuation of
Thai culture. However, OR instructors make more of an effort than MR instructors to perpetuate the Thai culture.

11. The importance of establishing good relationships with their students. -- Instructors indicated they thought maintaining a good relationship with their students results in a positive effect on student-teacher relationships.

12. How frequently instructors talk with their students. -- Instructors responded that they often talk informally with their students.

13. The types of things instructors discuss during class periods in addition to syllabus content. -- Instructors responded that they discuss social, political, or educational problems with their students.

14. The characteristics of students. -- Fewer MR than OR instructors report that their students have inadequate backgrounds in history and lack the ability to search for more knowledge.

15. Students' behaviors in class. -- More MR than OR instructors report that their students listen to and believe, uncritically, what is said in lectures.

16. The general content of history syllabi. -- The instructors indicated that the content varied from easy to difficulty, and whether it was contemporary or not.
Significant differences are found between the two groups, however. More MR than OR instructors believe that the content of history syllabi is too hard. On the other hand, more OR than MR instructors report that syllabi are (a) not current with trends in history (b) are not applicable to future usage.

17. **The amount of time instructors have to teach their history courses.**—Instructors, for the most part, responded that they have an insufficient amount of time to teach the syllabus.

18. **Adequacy of textbooks.**—Instructors indicated that although the present number of textbooks available on the market for history classes is adequate, there is a shortage of textbooks for students, a lack of good Thai language history textbooks, and texts frequently do not coincide with syllabi. More OR than MR instructors report a lack of textbooks for classes.

19. **Supplemental reading sources.**—The instructors indicate reading sources for research and assignments are adequate and suitable, but a need exists for history books in the Thai language. Library holdings are limited and frequently out-dated. Moreover, instructors have no part in the selection of library books. However, more OR than MR instructors report a lack of historical journals in their libraries.
20. **Objectives when instructors evaluate their students.**—A great majority of the instructors indicated that they evaluate their students in order to help develop their own teaching skills.

21. **The way in which instructors evaluate their students.**—More OR than MR instructors grade their students by written projects.

22. **How often instructors evaluate their students.**—Instructors responded that they evaluate their students, for the most part, twice a semester, and in many case, at an arbitrary point during the semester.

23. **The difficulties instructors have in evaluating students.**—Instructors indicated that those difficulties listed include a lack of skills, a lack of good tests, to name a few. However, more MR than OR instructors have difficulty in evaluating students with tests designed for different objectives.

24. **The problems instructors have concerning teaching aids.**—The problems instructors indicated they were having included a lack of funds or an inadequate supply of audiovisual materials to name a few. OR instructors, however, are more likely than MR instructors to have inadequate audiovisual materials.
25. The difficulties instructors encounter from their colleagues.---Instructors listed having difficulties with such things as suspicious colleagues or disagreements over new discoveries, to name a few.

26. The difficulties instructors encounter with their respective administrations.---The instructors indicated such difficulties as unfavorable policies or a lack of support. However, MR instructors, more frequently than OR instructors, encounter administrative policies which are unfavorable toward research in history.

The frequency and percentage distributions are also tabulated and shown. A detailed summary of the study, findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the study and findings. Conclusions, implications, and recommendations are also included.

Summary

The major purpose of this study is to compare and analyze the teaching of history in the teachers colleges in the metropolitan region (MR) and other regions (OR) in Thailand. The sub-purposes of this study are to determine if there are significant differences in the personal status, academic preparation, professional preparation, professional achievements, teaching assignments, and classroom teaching strategies of history instructors in the MR group and OR group in Thailand.

The word history was introduced as a new word in the Thai language in the 1930s. It was hoped that the new term would replace the old tradition of studying history and offer a greater meaning to the subject. Since 1897, history was taught only in a few prestigious secondary schools in Bangkok. History as a course of study is now offered in the curricula of all educational institutions in Thailand.
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In teachers colleges, history is part of the general requirement for the bachelor's degree. In some teachers colleges, students can study history as their major or minor subject. There are thirty-six teachers colleges in Thailand, all controlled by the Department of Teacher Education.

Six of the colleges are in Metropolitan Bangkok. Metropolitan Bangkok is not only the capital and the vital center of government and commerce, it also provides the educational facilities that are essential for production and recruitment of business and bureaucrats. The majority of Thai universities, and the most prestigious, are in Bangkok. Ten out of eleven private degree colleges are also located in the capital. Many people who were born and reared outside of Bangkok have come to the capital for further schooling. They have settled in Bangkok because it is the major center of intellectual excitement.

The differences in the educational advantages between the urban and rural areas were also recognized by the government. The government, in the past, spent most of its educational budget for physical facilities in order to increase enrollment in rural areas. Since 1977, the policy of the government has been to minimize the differences in educational quality. It is expected to decrease the flow of students to the capital, and at the same time to cultivate their attachment to their own regions. The educational policy from the central government also tends to be based entirely on the particular
circumstances and traditions of the central region. The central educational authorities are the originators of the educational programs on social and cultural issues in the Bangkok metropolis.

There is a need to focus more on knowledge of the regions where the institutions are located. The thirty-six teachers colleges are an essential part of the process to enhance specific characteristics of each geographical area as well as the nation. It is generally agreed that students should know something about history and geography of the world, but students should also know about current developments and past traditions of their own localities. Any attempt to draft or plan the curriculum for an actual rural setting requires some data about history instructors. There has been little or no previous attempt to investigate the difference in the teaching of history and history instructors in teachers colleges in the metropolitan region and other regions. The major purpose of this study is to compare and analyze the teaching of history in teachers colleges in the BR group and OR group in Thailand.

Data from this study were collected from a written questionnaire which was designed to elicit information from history instructors in the teachers colleges in Thailand. The survey instrument was modified from three questionnaires that were used in "The Teaching of History at the University Level in Thailand: Methods and Problems" by Anukul Jintarax.
in 1979,¹ "A Study of History Instructors in the Junior and Community Colleges in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Accrediting Region" by Raymond Norman Maumusu in 1982,² and The Status and Problems in Teaching Science at Bachelor's Degree Level in Teachers Colleges in Northeastern Region of Thailand by Sawangchit Tanasilangoon in 1983.³

The questionnaire was revised with many suggestions from the faculty members from Thai teachers colleges who have more than ten years of teaching experience in Thailand and who are now doctoral students at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. A pilot questionnaire was also submitted to three selected faculty members from the College of Education and two selected faculty members from the Department of History at North Texas State University for comments and suggestions. In addition, the content validity of the revised questionnaire was established by submitting it to a jury of three history instructors, three college instructors, and one educational officer in the Thai Department of Teacher Education. Each


³Sawangchit Tanasilangoon, Status and Problems in Teaching Science at Bachelor's Degree Level in Teachers Colleges in Northeastern Region (Ubol Rajathani, Thailand, 1983), pp. 102-111.
item of the questionnaire which four or more of the jury wished to modify or delete was changed or deleted. The final draft of the questionnaire contained fifty-two questions and one comment space to elicit information from the history instructors from Thai teachers colleges (see Appendix B).

The questionnaires were hand delivered or mailed to forty-two history instructors in the MR group and 138 history instructors in the OR group by research assistants in Thailand. A total of 138 (76.7 per cent) usable return questionnaires were received.

The data were tabulated to produce the total number and percentages of instructors in each category. The chi square test of independence was used to determine if significant differences existed at the 0.05 level or greater between the responses of history instructors in the MR and OR groups. The t test of differences was used to determine if significant difference existed at the 0.05 level or greater between the responses of the MR and OR instructors, in order to apply the Likert type scale.

Findings

The data findings are reported in relation to particular research hypotheses and also in terms of the affect of those components of the teaching on history by instructors in the MR and OR groups. In addition, frequency and percentage distributions are tabulated to show the total number and percentage of instructors in each category of response. A
A descriptive profile of history instructors in teachers colleges in Thailand is also reported.

An analysis of demographic data reveals that the greater majority of the forty-one responding MR history instructors are female (82.7 per cent), and are over forty years of age (56.1 per cent). For the OR history instructors, the majority of the ninety-seven respondents are also female (60.8 per cent), and are between thirty-six to forty (39.6 per cent) years of age.

The following major data findings are summarized according to the research hypotheses.

**Hypothesis One**

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences between history instructors in the Metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by (a) salary, (b) teaching experience, and (c) degrees held. The hypothesis is rejected with respect to:

(a) **Salary.**—MR instructors are more likely to have higher monthly salaries than OR instructors.

This hypothesis is accepted with respect to:

(b) **Teaching experience.**—This experience was broken down into teaching experience at a teachers college, or at a high school, or at a technical college, and at a four-year college; academic rank. For these items, there is no significant difference between the MR and OR history instructors. However, significantly more OR instructors than
In instructors report having teaching experience at the elementary school and at the junior high school.

(c) Degrees held.—The level of academic preparation; subject in which the higher certificate, the bachelor’s degree, and the master’s degree are held; other degrees being sought; and completion of most recent graduate work. For these items, there is no significant difference between the KK and OK history instructors. However, significantly more OK than OK instructors have earned a specialized subject certificate in history, and more OK instructors than OK instructors cited the completion of all levels of their education in the regions where they are presently working.

**Hypothesis Two**

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences in the academic preparation of history instructors in the metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours they have earned in history. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to the number of graduate credit hours earned in history, and experience in a seminar in teaching taught by a history professor, and an apprenticeship with a history professor. For these items, there is no significant difference between the KK and OK history instructors. However, significantly more OK than OK instructors had a course in the methods of teaching history.
Hypothesis Three

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant difference in the professional preparation of history instructors in the metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by the number of graduate credit hours in education. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to the number of graduate credit hours earned in education. This item is not found to be significantly different between the NR and the OR history instructors.

Hypothesis Four

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences in the professional achievements of history instructors in the metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand, as measured by (a) attendance at professional meetings, (b) the type of publications, and (c) membership in professional organizations. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to:

(a) Attendance at professional meetings. -- Respondents indicated the number of seminars they attended in the last five years. For these items, there is no significant difference between the NR and OR instructors.

(b) The type of publications. -- Respondents indicated that they had published books or articles or other. No significant difference between the NR group and OR group exists on this item.
(c) *Membership in professional organizations.*—The type of professional journals, and their location, which history instructors are currently reading on a regular basis, were some of the questions asked of the respondents. As regards to the above items, there is no significant difference between the UT and OK history instructors. However, more UT than UT instructors belong to a social science organization. This item is found to be significantly different between the history instructors in the UT group and in the OK group.

**Hypothesis Five**

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences in the teaching assignments of history instructors in the UT and the OK in Thailand as measured by (a) the number of hours they devoted to course preparations and (b) teaching load. This hypothesis is rejected with respect to:

(a) **The number of hours devoted to course presentation.**—UT instructors spend more hours per week than UT instructors in the preparation for class presentations.

This hypothesis is accepted with respect to:

(b) **Teaching load.**—The amount of time spent on supervision of student teaching, faculty committee meetings, reading professional publications, conducting research, teaching in fields other than history were some of the time consuming duties of the respondents that effected their overall teaching load. Other aspects of the teaching load
included student service responsibilities, clerical duties, registration duties, advising responsibilities, counselor responsibilities, number of periods taught per week, number of students in class; areas of teaching in Thai history, local history, Southeast Asian history, East Asian history, South Asian history, American history, and world history. As regards to the above items, there is no significant differences between the instructors.

However, instructors spend significantly more time on grading students, and student consultations than the instructors; more instructors than instructors report having administrative duties, and more instructors than instructors report teaching European history and the history of Western Civilization.

**Hypothesis Six**

This hypothesis states that there will be no significant differences in the classroom teaching strategies of instructors in the metropolitan region and other regions in Thailand as measured by their teaching behaviors. This hypothesis is accepted with respect to the following teaching behaviors:

1. The problems instructors might have when they teach history courses. --Problems listed included those with students, classrooms, and teaching aids, among other things.
2. **The techniques instructors use most often in teaching their classes.**—Various techniques are used by the respondents including, lectures, historical analysis, inquiries, and others.

3. **The process of their lecture method.**—Various processes mentioned as being put to use by the respondents include a lecture or a question and answer period, or an open discussion. Or instructors are, however, more likely than INR instructors to alternate their lectures with questioning sessions.

4. **Instructors' opinions on how frequently lecture notes should be revised.**—Respondents varied on their response to this question once a semester to once a year.

5. **The reasons why instructors have not changed their lecture notes.**—Instructors responding listed various reasons why they have not changed their notes, including a lack of funds and a lack of new data.

6. **The activities instructors use in their classes.**—Instructors listed such activities as games, audio-visual materials and field trips, to name a few.

7. **The problems of preparing class presentations.**—The instructors listed problems such as too much work, lack of research materials, or an inadequate place to work.
8. How much advance instructors prepare for class presentations.--Instructors responded that they spent anywhere from a day to a few hours preparing.

9. How instructors organize their presentations.--Instructors responded that they used a chronological approach and a written syllabus.

10. The purposes of instructors' presentations.--Instructors responded that the purposes of their presentations varied from contemporary application, to the perpetuation of Thai culture. However, OR instructors make more of an effort than MR instructors to perpetuate the Thai culture.

11. The importance of establishing good relationships with their students.--Instructors indicated they thought maintaining a good relationship with their students results in a positive effect on student-teacher relationships.

12. How frequently instructors talk with their students.--Instructors responded that they often talk informally with their students.

13. The types of things instructors discuss during class periods in addition to syllabus content.--Instructors responded that they discuss social, political, or educational problems with their students.
14. **The characteristics of students.**--Fewer MR than OR instructors report that their students have inadequate backgrounds in history and lack the ability to search for more knowledge.

15. **Students' behaviors in class.**--More MR than OR instructors report that their students listen to and believe, uncritically, what is said in lectures.

16. **The general content of history syllabi.**--The instructors indicated that the content varied from easy to difficulty, and whether it was contemporary or not. Significant difference are found between the two groups, however. More MR than OR instructors believe that the content of history syllabi is too hard. On the other hand, more OR than MR instructors report that syllabi are (a) not current with trends in history (b) are not applicable to future usage.

17. **The amount of time instructors have to teach their history courses.**--Instructors, for the most part, responded that they have an insufficient amount of time to teach the syllabus.

18. **Adequacy of textbooks.**--Instructors indicated that although the present number of textbooks available on the market for history classes is adequate, there is a shortage of textbooks for students, a lack of good Thai language history textbooks, and texts frequently do not coincide with
syllabi. More OR than NR instructors report a lack of textbooks for classes.

19. **Supplemental reading sources.**—The instructors' indicate reading sources for research and assignments are adequate and suitable, but a need exists for history books in the Thai language. Library holdings are limited and frequently out-dated. Moreover, instructors have no part in the selection of library books. However, more OR than NR instructors report a lack of historical journals in their libraries.

20. **Objectives when instructors evaluate their students.**—A great majority of the instructors indicated that they evaluate their students in order to help develop their own teaching skills.

21. **The way in which instructors evaluate their students.**—More OR than NR instructors grade their students by written projects.

22. **How often instructors evaluate their students.**—Instructors responded that they evaluate their students, for the most part, twice a semester, and in many case, at an arbitrary point during the semester.

23. **The difficulties instructors have in evaluating students.**—Instructors indicated that those difficulties listed include a lack of skills, a lack of good tests, to name
a few. However, more MR than OR instructors have difficulty in evaluating students with tests designed for different objectives.

24. **The problems instructors have concerning teaching aids.**—The problems instructors indicated they were having included a lack of funds or an inadequate supply of audio-visual materials to name a few. OR instructors, however, are more likely than MR instructors to have inadequate audio-visual materials.

25. **The difficulties instructors encounter from their colleagues.**—Instructors listed having difficulties with such things as suspicious colleagues or disagreements over new discoveries, to name a few.

26. **The difficulties instructors encounter with their respective administrations.**—The instructors indicated such difficulties as unfavorable policies or a lack of support. However, MR instructors, more frequently than OR instructors, encounter administrative policies which are unfavorable toward research in history.

**Conclusions**

Based upon the data findings from this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted.
1. There is a high degree of similarity between the respondents from the MR and OR history instructors in Thai teachers colleges with respect to the majority of the criteria.

2. Although some significant differences were found, it would be difficult to state that there is a difference between history instructors in the MR and OR groups.

3. Given the homogeneity of the status of the faculty at teachers colleges, tailoring a standard curricula that would meet the needs of all the faculty may be very possible.

Implications

The following implications appear justified based upon the findings and the conclusions of this study.

Although there is little information on the topic of teaching of history in the teachers colleges in the MR and OR groups, there is evidence in the present study that OR instructors think history syllabi fail to keep with current trend and therefore lack applicability for the future. Instructors in each region should focus more on their own social and cultural problems in their respective areas. Instructors in each region need to analyze and define their objectives in order to produce prospective teachers with sufficient knowledge, ability, and skills to assume roles that fit into their social and economic surroundings.

Herbert P. Phillips explained that many people who come to Bangkok for further schooling finally settle in the capital
because Bangkok is a major center of intellectual excitement.
The findings of this study, however, indicate that there are few significant differences between the history instructors in the AR group and OR group. A lack of differences may be because the Department of Teacher Education randomly assigns instructors to the institutions. Therefore, it may be concluded that the Department of Teacher Education has minimized the differences among teachers colleges with respect to the characteristics of history instructors.

As previously mentioned, in Thailand educational policies are established by the Ministry of Education and handed down for enforcement to the Department of Teacher Education. The Department of Teacher Education is responsible for administering all 36 teachers colleges. Basically, there is very little autonomy in teachers colleges. This study bears out the general similarity of AR and OR history instructors. This similarity should encourage the central educational authorities to work together with the authorities in each college to develop a more diversified curriculum in order to enhance the specific characteristics of each geographic area as well as the nation.

Serious attempts to understand and relate to the needs of each region are fundamental to the logical development of the educational system. The result could be a vital component for the promotion of regional and national characteristics and the bureaucratic and political setting.
Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested based upon the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. Central educational authorities are encouraged to work with administrators in each college to improve the quality of history instruction, to promote the social development of different regions, and to develop effective teacher education programs which are designed to contribute to the social development of Thai youth.

2. The finding of this study could also be used by each region as a basis for research to determine what kinds of history instruction programs are beneficial and acceptable to each region.

3. A study should be made to determine the role of local, provincial, other government agencies, and central governments in planning, in the implementing, and evaluating of history instruction programs in Thailand.

4. Attempts should be made to determine how the number of writings and publications of history in Thai could be increased through the development of educational programs.

5. A comparative study to replicate this study should be conducted to determine whether the generalizations of these findings are also valid in different types of educational institutions in Thailand.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF HISTORY INSTRUCTORS IN THE
TEACHERS COLLEGES IN THAILAND DURING ACADEMIC
YEAR OF 1984*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers Colleges</th>
<th>Degree**</th>
<th>Total of History Faculty</th>
<th>Total of All Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chankasem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Songdej Chao Phya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suan Sunandha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suan Dusit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranakorn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donburi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepastree Lopburi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayutthaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petchaburi Vidyalongkorn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chachengsao</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantaburi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinoonsongkram</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petchaboon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampaengphet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakorn Sawan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utharadit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiangmai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiangrai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udorn Thani</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakon Nakorn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubon Rajathani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahasarakarm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakorn Rajasima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buriram</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakorn Pathom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chonbueang Rajaburi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanjanaburi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petchburi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songkhla</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakorn Sri Thamaraj</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surat Thani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phuket</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**B**—Bachelor's degree, **SC**—Specialized Subject Certificate, **M**—Master's degree, **D**—Doctoral's degree.
APPENDIX B

Questionnaire for History Instructors
at Bachelor's Degrees Level in Teachers Colleges

Directions: Please respond to each question by checking(✔) in of an appropriate answer or filling in the blanks. You may check more than 1 answer on any question that has been labeled "PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY."

Section 1
Demographic Information

1. Name of your college
   your department

2. Sex
   □ Male
   □ Female

3. Age
   □ 25 or under
   □ 26-30
   □ 31-35
   □ 36-40
   □ Over 40

4. Your salary level.
   □ 2765-4945
   □ 6936-8475
   □ Over 9385
   □ 4946-6935
   □ 8476-9385

5. Your academic rank.
   □ Lecturer
   □ Associate Professor
   □ Assistant Professor
   □ Professor

6. What is the highest degree you presently hold?
   □ Bachelor's degree
   □ Master's degree
   □ Specialized subject cert.
   □ Doctoral degree
   □ Other (Please specify)
7. Please check the field in which you hold each degree. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher certificate</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized subject</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please fill in the province or the country from which you received your education. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Province or Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized subject cert.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What degree, if any, are you presently pursuing?

- □ none
- □ Master's degree
- □ Specialized subject cert.
- □ Doctoral degree

10. If you have a master's degree, how long ago was your graduate work done?

- □ I have not taken
- □ 1-3 years
- □ 7 years or more
- □ Less than 1 year
- □ 4-6 years

11. How many semester hours of graduate credit have you earned in history? Do not include credit received for thesis or dissertation.

- □ None
- □ 16-30
- □ 41-50
- □ 1-15
- □ 31-40
- □ 51 or more

12. How many semester hours of graduate credit have you earned in education? Do not include credit received for thesis or dissertation.

- □ none
- □ 16-30
- □ 41-50
- □ 1-15
- □ 31-40
- □ 51 or more

13. Have you experienced the following while studying in the undergraduate level? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- □ A course in the methods of teaching history
- □ A seminar in teaching taught by a history professor
- □ An apprenticeship with a history professor
14. How many seminars in the teaching of history have you attended during the past five years?
   □ None  □ One  □ Two  □ More than two

15. Does your institution provide released time to attend professional meetings or to conduct research?
   □ Yes  □ No

16. Years of your teaching experience in history in teacher colleges.
   □ Less than 1 years  □ 1-3 years  □ 4-6 years  □ 7 years or more

17. If you have previously taught in other educational institutions, please indicate the type of institution and the number of years of experience. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

   Type of institution
   □ Elementary school
   □ Junior high school
   □ High school
   □ Technical college
   □ Four-year college or university
   □ Other (Please specify)

   Years of experience

18. Please indicate the types of historical writings which you have had published or done. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

   □ None
   □ Books
   □ Articles
   □ Instruction hand books

   Approximate number

19. Please indicate the number of professional journal(s) and their location to which you are currently reading on a regular basis. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

   □ Historical-related  □ Educational-related
   □ Social Sciences-related

   Nationally  Abroad

20. Please indicate the type of professional organization(s) and their name(s) which you belong to. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

   □ Historical-related
   □ Educational-related
   □ Social Sciences-related
21. Area of history you are teaching. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Thai history
- Local history
- Southeast Asian history
- East Asian history
- South Asian history
- European history
- American history
- History of Western Civilization
- World history
- Other (Please specify)

22. What is your primary teaching responsibility?
- Teaching history
- Teaching other subject (Please specify)

23. How many periods/week did you teach this semester?
- Less than 5
- 5-10
- 11-15
- Over 15

24. Approximately, how many students do you usually have in your classes?
- Less than 20
- 20-30
- 31-40
- Over 40

25. How much time do you spend, on the average, in the following activities? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Approximate hours/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for class presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of students' teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty committee meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading professional publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach other field other than history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. What responsibilities other than teaching do you have at your institution? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Administrative duty
- Academic duty
- Student personnel service
- Clerical duty (Business administration)
- Registration duty
- Advising
- Counselor
- Other (Please specify)
Section II

1. Which of the following techniques do you use most often in teaching your classes? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Most frequently</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please specify)__________________________

2. If you use the lecture method do you (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ Lecture for the entire period?
☐ Allow students to ask questions at the end of each topic of discussion?
☐ Spend the first half period in lecture, then answer questions or allow class discussion for the remainder of the period?
☐ Alternate your lectures with asking individual students questions?
☐ Arrange some time for open discussion on topics or issues.

3. Which of the following do you use in your classes? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ Case studies
☐ Games and simulations
☐ Audiovisual usage
☐ Special presentation by qualified guest lecturers
☐ Student panel discussions
☐ Field trips
☐ Other (Please describe)__________________________

4. How frequently do you feel that lecture notes or lesson plans should be revised?

☐ Once a semester
☐ Once a year
☐ Once in a while, depending on necessity or circumstance
5. If you have not changed your lecture notes or lesson plans, what are your reasons? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - History is not a subject requiring frequent changes or adjustments in teaching
   - There are no new data or reliable evidence available to you which would make you feel the need for change
   - Lack of funds
   - College-wide syllabi make the change difficult
   - Lack of time
   - Social and/or political reasons discourage the change
   - Other reasons (Please specify)

6. How early do you prepare for class presentations?
   - Month in advance
   - Week in advance
   - Day in advance
   - A few hours before class
   - Depending on subject and time available
   - Other (Please specify)

7. How do you organize your presentation? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Followed a written syllabus
   - Use chronological approach
   - Teach backward, starting from present situation to the past
   - Choose the topics in the past which you feel important and relevant to present events
   - Other (please specify)

8. What is the purpose(s) of your presentation? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Applicable to present social, economic, and politics
   - As needed for history major students
   - As needed for other social science major students
   - As needed for general requirement of the syllabus
   - Perpetuate the Thai culture and civic responsibility
   - Add more content on text assignments or supplemental information
   - Other (please specify)

9. Do you think maintaining a good relationship with your students affects your teaching effectiveness?
   - Could definitely have a very positive effect
   - Could have some positive effect
   - Have no effect whatever
   - Would probably cause negative effect
   - Would definitely cause very negative effect
10. How often do you talk with your students, during the class period, about things which you feel are beneficial to students in addition to the syllabus which you are teaching?
- Never
- Once in a while
- Whenever students ask for your opinion
- Every time when something important or interesting happens
- Regularly, during almost every teaching period

11. During the class period, what types of things have you discussed in addition to the content? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Social problems
- Political problems
- Educational problems
- Other (please specify)

12. Which, if any, of the following behaviors do students display in your class? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Eager to study
- Willing to discuss class content and present situation
- Only listen and believe their instructors
- Hesitate to ask questions and express their ideas
- Lack of attention
- Reluctant to accept other people ideas
- Cooperate poorly when working together
- Other (please specify)

13. What do you think about the content of the history syllabi? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Are efficient
- Are too hard
- Are not agreeable with objectives
- Are not kept up with contemporary trends in history
- Are not applicable for future usage
- Are not clearly stated
- Limited freedom to organize your own course content

14. What do you think about the amount of time you have to teach your history course? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Time is adequate
- Insufficient periods/week in the semester for teaching the content of the syllabus
- The extra-curricular activities influence time to teach
- Each class period is too short
- Each class period is too long
- Other (Please specify)
15. Please indicate the present adequacy of text books for your history classes. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Present text books are adequate
- There is shortage of textbooks for students
- There is a lack of good Thai language history textbooks
- Present textbooks do not coincide with syllabi
- Present textbooks are out-dated
- Some classes do not have a text book
- Other (Please specify)

16. Please indicate the present adequacy of reading sources for research study and reading assignments. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Amount of books are adequate and suitable
- Need of history books in Thai language
- Need of historical journals
- Limited number of history books in the library
- History books available in the library are out-dated
- Instructors have no part in books' selection in the library
- Other (Please specify)

17. What is your objective when you evaluate your students? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- To get students' grades as required by the institution
- To evaluate students' work
- To group students according to their ability
- To develop your teaching skill
- To see if a student developed according to objective
- Other (Please specify)

18. How do you evaluate your students? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Observe students' development in classes
- Grade their exercises after each chapter
- Grade students written projects
- Grade students oral presentations
- Use objective tests
- Use essay tests
- Use combinations of objective and essay tests
- Other (Please specify)

19. How often do you evaluate your students?
- At the end of each semester
- Twice each semester
- Once a month
- At the end of each chapter
- Only upon reaching a proper time
- Other (Please specify)
20. Do any of the following categories contribute to the problems instructors might have when they teach history courses? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ Teaching technique
☐ Students
☐ Syllabuses and time to teach
☐ Classroom condition
☐ Inadequate classroom supplies and equipment
☐ Inadequate textbooks and reading material
☐ Testing and evaluation
☐ Colleagues and administration in your institution
☐ Other (Please specify)

21. Have you ever encountered any of the following problems while preparing class presentations? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ Teach too many subjects
☐ Too much work on other duties
☐ Lack of books for research
☐ Inadequate place and facility for doing research
☐ Cannot find the right techniques and activities
☐ Tired of preparing for class presentation
☐ Other (Please specify)

22. Do any of the following apply to your students? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ Inadequate background in history
☐ Lack of ability to search for more knowledge
☐ Cannot adjust themselves to the teaching and learning process in teacher colleges
☐ Lack of interest in history
☐ Inadequate preparation of class assignments
☐ Other (Please specify)

23. Please indicate the problems concerning teaching aids. (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ Instructors do not know how to use equipment
☐ Inadequate supply of audio-visual material
☐ Present teaching aids are not suitable for classes
☐ Lack of funds to buy teaching aids
☐ Teaching aids in the market are hard to find
☐ Other (Please specify)

24. Do you encounter any of the following difficulties in evaluating students? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ Lack of skill to develop good test instruments
☐ Lack of time to develop good tests
☐ Test was designed for different objective
☐ Lack of proper ways to score and grade
☐ Too many people decide on the score and grade
☐ Other (Please specify)
25. Have you encountered any of the following difficulties? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   □ The old generation of faculty does not accept new discoveries or concepts
   □ The new generation of faculty accepts new discoveries or concepts without judgement
   □ A lack of support from your colleagues
   □ Suspicion or disapproval from your colleagues
   □ A lack of teaching skills among history instructors
   □ Other (Please specify)

26. Have you encountered any of the following difficulties at your institution? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   □ The administrative policies are unfavorable toward the teaching of history
   □ The administrative policies are unfavorable toward research in history
   □ The administrative policies make it difficult for instructors to get further education
   □ A lack of support, cooperation, and encouragement from administrators
   □ Too much official red tape
   □ Other (Please specify)

27. Your comments. In the open space below, please write your comments concerning problems or suggestions you have for the improvement of teaching history at a Teacher College

   ____________________________________________________________

   Thanks for your help.
APPENDIX C

แบบสอบถามสำหรับการรวบรวมข้อมูลทางวิทยาศาสตร์

ข้อ 1 โปรดตอบว่าคุณมีเพศชายต้องผ่านการตรวจประจำปีหรือไม่ □ ผ่าน □ ไม่ผ่าน

| ปีอายุ | อายุจริง | อายุที่ห้ามจ้าง<17 | อายุที่ห้ามจ้าง>17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>36-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. อัตราเงินเดือน

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>รายเดือน</th>
<th>รายเดือน</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,765-4,945</td>
<td>6,935-9,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,935-9,365</td>
<td>9,365-11,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. ตำแหน่งทางวิชาการในหน่วยงานของทราบ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ตำแหน่ง</th>
<th>ตำแหน่ง</th>
<th>ส่วนราชการ</th>
<th>ส่วนราชการ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>อาจารย์</td>
<td>ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์</td>
<td>ร้อยศาสตราจารย์</td>
<td>ศาสตราจารย์</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. วิชาเอกสุขของทราบ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>วิชาเอกสุข</th>
<th>วิชาเอกสุข</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>บริหารธุรกิจ</td>
<td>ปริญญาเอก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>บริหารธุรกิจ</td>
<td>ปริญญาเอก</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. โปรดตอบว่าคุณมีสุขภาพ □ มี □ ไม่ มี ของสารวัสดุที่เหตุการณ์หรือผลกระทบทางสุขภาพของผู้เช่น (ตอบเครื่องยนต์)
1. โบราณคดีพื้นบ้านรัฐบาล จังหวัดต่าง ๆ ของไทย

2. _regeneration

3. _regeneration

4. _regeneration

5. _regeneration

6. _regeneration

7. _regeneration

8. _regeneration

9. _regeneration

10. _regeneration

11. _regeneration

12. _regeneration

13. _regeneration

14. _regeneration
14. ระยะเวลา 5 ปี ผู้มีหน้าที่ หัวหน้าเจ้าหน้าที่ระบบสารสนเทศ ปรับสถานะผู้บังคับบัญชา ดังนี้
   □ ไม่เคยเลย  □ 1 ครั้ง
   □ 2 ครั้ง  □ มากกว่า 2 ครั้ง

15. วิทยาลัยที่มีอัตราการปรับรูปทรงวิทยาการ หรือความในภาพรวมทางวิจัยทางวิทยาศาสตร์หรือไม่
   □ ยังไม่ยืนยัน  □ ไม่เคยสัญญา

16. ระยะเวลาการศึกษาระดับในวิทยาลัยหรือมหาวิทยาลัยที่ใด
   □ ическая 1 ปี  □ 1 - 3 ปี
   □ 4 - 6 ปี  □ มากกว่า 7 ปี

17. อัตราเนื้อหาวิทยาการปริญญาตรีในสาขาวิชาที่เป็นไปตามข้อความ ค่อนข้างเหมาะสมกับแผนการสอนของมหาวิทยาจุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย (ตอบโดยตรง)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>สาขาวิชาการศึกษา</th>
<th>จำนวนเป็นเอกลักษณ์</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ประมวลที่มา</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>มีอัตราการค่อนข้าง</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ไม่มีอัตราการค่อนข้าง</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>วิทยาศาสตร์</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>วิทยาศาสตร์สิ่งผลิต</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ดนตรี</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. โอกาสการเรียนรู้เว็บเพื่อการศึกษาที่มีคุณค่าทางการศึกษา (ตอบโดยตรง)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>จำนวน (เรื่. นท.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ไม่เคยเลย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เคยเลย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>พบบ่อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>พบไม่บ่อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>พบบ่อยทางการศึกษา</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. โอกาสการเข้าร่วมงานที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการศึกษา (ตอบโดยตรง)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ไม่เคยมี (เรื่.)</th>
<th>ไม่เคยมี (ชีว.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ไม่เคยมี (เรื่.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เคยมี (เรื่.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ไม่เคยมี (ชีว.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เคยมี (ชีว.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. โอกาสการเข้าร่วมงานที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการศึกษาที่เป็นสมัชชา (ตอบโดยตรง)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ไม่เคยมี (เรื่.)</th>
<th>ไม่เคยมี (ชีว.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ไม่เคยมี (เรื่.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เคยมี (เรื่.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ไม่เคยมี (ชีว.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เคยมี (ชีว.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. โปรดระบุสาขาวิชาที่เป็นประโยชน์ต่อการสอน (ตอบไม่เกิน 3 ข้อ)

- ประวัติศาสตร์ไทย
- ประวัติศาสตร์โลก
- ประวัติศาสตร์อเมริกา
- ประวัติศาสตร์อียิปต์
- ประวัติศาสตร์จีน
- ประวัติศาสตร์โดยสาร
- ประวัติศาสตร์ศิลปะ
- ประวัติศาสตร์โลก
- ปราชญ์ (โปรดระบุ)

22. จำนวนหลักการสอนของวิชาที่สอน

- สอนวิชาประวัติศาสตร์
- สอนวิชาอื่น (โปรดระบุวิชาหรือนักสอน)

23. จำนวน ครบที่สูงที่สุด ร้อยละในภาคเรียน

- น้อยกว่า 5 ครบที่สูงที่สุด
- 5 - 10 ครบที่สูงที่สุด
- 11 - 15 ครบที่สูงที่สุด
- มากกว่า 15 ครบที่สูงที่สุด

24. จำนวนนักเรียนที่ศึกษาในแต่ละระดับที่เหลือแต่ละภาคเรียนใน หลักการสอน ถ้ามีประมาณเท่าใด

- น้อยกว่า 20 คน
- 20 - 30 คน
- 31 - 40 คน
- มากกว่า 40 คน

25. หลักเกณฑ์ ครบวันเวลาที่เรียนในวันที่จดทะเบียนโดย (ตอบไม่เกิน 3 ข้อ)

- ครบวัน/ครบชั่วโมง
26. นอกจากการสอบถาม หัวข้ออื่นแล้ว พร้อมจะทราบถึงผลการงานตามอันมีผลต่อกล้อง ปฎิบัติงานด้วยตนเอง (ภายใต้) (ยินยอม)

☐ งานบริหาร
☐ งานวิชาการ
☐ งานกิจการนิติการ
☐ งานธุรกิจ
☐ งานทะเบียนและวิเคราะห์
☐ งานอาคารก่อสร้าง
☐ งานแปล
☐ งานอื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)
### แบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับการเรียนการสอนวิชาชีพสารศาสตร์

#### 1. ท่านใช้วิธีการสอนแบบใดมาถึงสุดในการสอนวิชาชีพสารศาสตร์ (ขอให้กล่าวชื่อ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>มาตฐานสูง</th>
<th>มาตฐาน</th>
<th>ปัจจุบัน</th>
<th>หมาย</th>
<th>หมายเหตุสุข</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. ท่านการบรรยายการสอนทั่วไป ท่านการบรรยายสอนอื่น ๆ (ตอบโดยกึ่งหน้า)

- บรรยายเป็นคล่องเก่งๆ
- บรรยายเป็นลายลักษณ์อักษร
- บรรยายเป็นลายลักษณ์อักษร หลักการบรรยายละเอียด
- บรรยายเป็นคล่องเก่งๆ แต่คล่องก้ามพิกหนัก
- บรรยายเป็นลายลักษณ์อักษร หรืออธิบายรายวิชาใน
- บรรยายเป็นลายลักษณ์อักษร
- บรรยายเป็นลายลักษณ์อักษร หลักการบรรยายละเอียด
- บรรยายเป็นลายลักษณ์อักษร หลักการบรรยายละเอียด

#### 3. ท่านการสอนวิชาชีพสารศาสตร์ ท่านจัดการสอนอย่างไร (ตอบโดยกึ่งหน้า)

- การสนทนากล่าวหาตัว
- การรายงานและตีผลการจากงาน (Case Studies)
- การใช้เทคนิคการสอนแบบจำลอง (Simulations)
- การเปรียบเทียบ
- การปรารถนาเพื่อการจูงใจนิสิตทำประโยชน์ให้ใช้งาน
- การเปรียบเทียบ
- การเปรียบเทียบ
- การเปรียบเทียบ
- อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

#### 4. ท่านใช้วิธีการสอนวิชาชีพสารศาสตร์ ท่านใช้วิธีการสอนแบบใดมาถึงสุดใน การสอนวิชาชีพสารศาสตร์ (ขอให้กล่าวชื่อ)

- นักเรียน
- นักเรียน
- นักเรียน
- นักเรียน
- นักเรียน
- นักเรียน
- นักเรียน
- นักเรียน

โปรดให้ข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมในส่วนที่ไม่ได้ระบุ

---

หมายเหตุ: ข้อมูลบางส่วนในเอกสารนี้ไม่สามารถอ่านได้ชัดเจนจนกว่าจะมีการฟอร์มยึดที่ดีกว่านี้.
5. เหนือคลอดม่านไปยังสุ่งบางกระชับและเม็ดสุริยะวิวัฒน์วิวัฒน์ศิลป์ของท่าน ถือ (ตอบคำถาม)
   □ วิวัฒน์ศิลป์เป็นต้นไปจนถึงต้นสุริย์สุริยาผมอยู่
   □ ไม่เข้าสู่วิวัฒน์วิวัฒน์ศิลป์บนการปฏิบัติ
   □ ด้านประมวล
   □ คลอดสอนแบบที่ไม่ต้องการทำตามสถาบันปฏิบัติ
   □ ไม่มีการแยกผู
   □ วงค์กว้างแจ้งคุณสมบัติและ/หรือการผังทางไม่ต้องการทำตามผู้อนุทิน
   □ เอกุลต้น (โปรดระบุ)

6. บรรยายการสอนแนวทางแนวทาง
   □ 1 เทียบความหมาย
   □ 1 ต่อเนื่องค่าแนวหมาย
   □ 1 วันพานะสา
   □ เรียนสอนจึงถือว่าไม่สอนเนื่องผู้สอน
   □ ไม่แน่นอน แต่จะทำงานพันธุ์และเวลาท่อนออยู่
   □ ถ้า ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

7. วิจัยวิวัฒน์วิวัฒน์ศิลป์วิวัฒน์ศิลป์ของ (ตอบคำถาม)
   □ สอนตามแผนกสุริยา
   □ ไข่ไข่ข้างข้างในบุคคล
   □ สมัครไปสนับสนุนในโรงเรียนศิลป์ใด
   □ ลือกเสียการในเรื่องที่ขาดคาวะข้ามการเข้าวิวัฒน์ศิลป์หรือการไปวิวัฒน์ศิลป์
   □ ถ้า ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

8. บรรยายการสอนวิวัฒน์ศิลป์วิวัฒน์ศิลป์ของ (ตอบคำถาม)
   □ ไม่มีความสุขสำหรับที่สุดของหน่วยงานศิลป์ ดังนั้น เฉพาะการเรียน
   □ ครูคณิสม์ต้องการว่าเรียนมักวิวัฒน์ศิลป์ที่เน้น
   □ ทำที่บ้านเป็นที่สุดเรื่องความสุข
   □ เที่ยวว่างเป็นที่สุดของความพอใจ
   □ ไม่เคยมุ่งลงเรียนเข้าเรียนอย่างที่เหมาะสม
   □ ไม่เคยออกมาก่อน จึงสมานสิ่งเรียนหรือเท่านั้นตรง
   □ ถ้า ๆ (โปรดระบุ)
4. ติดภาพวาดครั้งที่ 1 ด้วยวิธีการแบบ 2. โดยจะมีการตั้งลักษณะของภาพรวมดังต่อไปนี้:
   □ เกิดดีต่อานมาก
   □ เกิดดีต่อาน
   □ เป็นผลลัพธ์
   □ อารมณ์จะเกิดต่อทางกล
   □ อาจเกิดต่อการตอบกลับ

5. รายงานการส่งผ่าน
   นั่นก็คือวิธีการตั้งลักษณะของภาพรวมดังต่อไปนี้:
   □ นั่นให้ผลต่อ
   □ ผลต่อ
   □ ผลต่อ
   □ ผลต่อ
   □ ผลต่อ

11. จดหมายการแจ้ง
   หากมีการเปลี่ยนแปลงในเรื่องใด ๆ ที่ต้องแจ้งเรียกเก็บค่าใช้จ่ายในกรณีเรียกเก็บเงินให้จาก
   ผู้ที่ใช้บริการ
   □ ไม่ต้องแจ้ง
   □ แจ้งให้ทราบ
   □ แจ้งให้ทราบ
   □ แจ้งให้ทราบ
   □ อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) ________________________________

12. กรณีที่มีการแจ้งเอกสารทางไปรษณีย์ไปยังเลขที่ติดต่อ (พนักงานในหน้า)
   □ กรณีเรียกเก็บเงินในกรณีเรียกเก็บเงิน
   □ ผลสินค้าที่มีภาระหนี้ของทางเข้าและสินค้าที่มีภาระหนี้
   □ ผลสินค้าที่มีภาระหนี้ของทางเข้า
   □ ผลสินค้าที่มีภาระหนี้ของทางเข้า
   □ ผลสินค้าที่มีภาระหนี้ของทางเข้า
   □ ผลสินค้าที่มีภาระหนี้ของทางเข้า
   □ ผลสินค้าที่มีภาระหนี้ของทางเข้า
   □ ผลสินค้าที่มีภาระหนี้ของทางเข้า
   □ ผลสินค้าที่มีภาระหนี้ของทางเข้า
   □ อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ) ________________________________
13. ตามนั้นควรเลือกบุคคลที่มีความสามารถในการปฏิบัติงานด้านการวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์อย่างไร (ตอบกี่คู่เท่าใด)

☐ เน้นสายทางของตนเอง
☐ เน้นสายทางวิชาการที่มีความต้องการ
☐ เลือกสายทางที่มีความต้องการของทางราชการ
☐ เลือกสายทางที่มีความต้องการของสังคม
☐ เลือกสายทางที่มีความต้องการของตน

14. คำถามอย่างไรที่จะตอบคำถามนี้ให้การวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์ (ตอบกี่คู่เท่าใด)

☐ เลือกสายทางของตนเอง
☐ เลือกสายทางที่มีความต้องการของทางราชการ
☐ เลือกสายทางที่มีความต้องการของสังคม
☐ เลือกสายทางที่มีความต้องการของตน

15. คำถามอย่างไรที่จะตอบคำถามนี้ให้การวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์ (ตอบกี่คู่เท่าใด)

☐ เลือกสายทางของตนเอง
☐ เลือกบุคคลที่มีความสามารถในการวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์

16. คำถามอย่างไรที่จะตอบคำถามนี้ให้การวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์ (ตอบกี่คู่เท่าใด)

☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัย
☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์

17. คำถามอย่างไรที่จะตอบคำถามนี้ให้การวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์ (ตอบกี่คู่เท่าใด)

☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัย
☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์

18. คำถามอย่างไรที่จะตอบคำถามนี้ให้การวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์ (ตอบกี่คู่เท่าใด)

☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัย
☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์

19. คำถามอย่างไรที่จะตอบคำถามนี้ให้การวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์ (ตอบกี่คู่เท่าใด)

☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัย
☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์

20. คำถามอย่างไรที่จะตอบคำถามนี้ให้การวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์ (ตอบกี่คู่เท่าใด)

☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัย
☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์

21. คำถามอย่างไรที่จะตอบคำถามนี้ให้การวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์ (ตอบกี่คู่เท่าใด)

☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัย
☐ วิเคราะห์ผลการวิจัยประวัติศาสตร์
17. ห้ามมีลูกค้าในงานวิจัยและประมวลผลผลิตภัณฑ์ ไม่ให้ยื่นเรื่องขอประชุมหรือขอติชมทุกกลุ่ม

(ตอบกล่าวโดย)

- เทคโนโลยีระบบของนักทีวีดีโอในงานที่เกี่ยวข้อง
- เทคโนโลยีผลผลิตภัณฑ์ของนักทีวีดีโอ
- เทคโนโลยีผลผลิตภัณฑ์ของนักทีวีดีโอ
- เทคโนโลยีผลผลิตภัณฑ์ของนักทีวีดีโอ
- เทคโนโลยีผลผลิตภัณฑ์ของนักทีวีดีโอ
- เทคโนโลยีผลผลิตภัณฑ์ของนักทีวีดีโอ
- เทคโนโลยีผลผลิตภัณฑ์ของนักทีวีดีโอ

18. ห้ามไปวิจัยวิทยาศาสตร์ในการวิจัยและประมวลผลผลิตภัณฑ์ของนักทีวีดีโอ (ตอบใช้คำขอ)

- ด้านภูมิศาสตร์และวิทยาศาสตร์ของนักทีวีดีโอในทางวิทยาศาสตร์
- ด้านภูมิศาสตร์และวิทยาศาสตร์ของนักทีวีดีโอในทางวิทยาศาสตร์
- ด้านภูมิศาสตร์และวิทยาศาสตร์ของนักทีวีดีโอในทางวิทยาศาสตร์
- ด้านภูมิศาสตร์และวิทยาศาสตร์ของนักทีวีดีโอในทางวิทยาศาสตร์
- ด้านภูมิศาสตร์และวิทยาศาสตร์ของนักทีวีดีโอในทางวิทยาศาสตร์
- ด้านภูมิศาสตร์และวิทยาศาสตร์ของนักทีวีดีโอในทางวิทยาศาสตร์
- ด้านภูมิศาสตร์และวิทยาศาสตร์ของนักทีวีดีโอในทางวิทยาศาสตร์

19. ห้ามทำการวิจัยและประมวลผลผลิตภัณฑ์ ไม่ให้ยื่นเรื่องขอประชุมพิเศษเนื่องจาก

- ศูนย์การค้า
- ศูนย์การค้า
- ศูนย์การค้า
- ศูนย์การค้า
- ศูนย์การค้า
- ศูนย์การค้า
- ศูนย์การค้า
- ศูนย์การค้า

20. ห้ามมีการวิจัยที่สอดคล้องกับนักวิทยาศาสตร์ในทางวิทยาศาสตร์ (ตอบใช้คำขอ)

- วิจัยการก่อ
- นักวิทยาศาสตร์
- นักวิทยาศาสตร์
- นักวิทยาศาสตร์
- นักวิทยาศาสตร์
- นักวิทยาศาสตร์
- นักวิทยาศาสตร์
- นักวิทยาศาสตร์
21. มีความรู้เรื่องการศึกษาการสอนของทางเลือกจากอะไร (ตอบให้ครบถ้วน)
   □ ยินดีเลื่อนวิชาที่เรียนการสอนในที่นี้
   □ มีการตอบแทนบทบาทที่ไม่มีเวลาให้เห็น
   □ ขาดการวิพากษ์วิจารณ์การสอนในที่นี้
   □ ไม่แสดงให้เห็นถึงความสามารถในการสอน
   □ ไม่อาจตอบความสามารถในการสอน
   □ เสนอมาตรการการสอน
   □ ออก ๆ (โปรดระบุ) ______________________________

22. ผ่านการศึกษาที่เป็นไปตามที่หน้าที่ที่ต้องทำ (ตอบให้ครบถ้วน)
   □ มีความรู้เรื่องหลักการสอน
   □ ขาดการวิเคราะห์ความสามารถในการสอน
   □ ไม่สามารถตอบแทนการสอนที่มีการสอนในเวลาที่อยู่
   □ ขาดความสม่ำเสมอในการสอน
   □ ไม่แสดงให้เห็นความสามารถในการสอน
   □ ออก ๆ (โปรดระบุ) ______________________________

23. ความประสบผลสำเร็จในการศึกษาการสอนในวิชาประวัติศาสตร์ (ตอบให้ครบถ้วน)
   □ มีความสามารถในการสอนอย่างเป็นระบบ
   □ ยุติการสอนโดยการสอน
   □ ยุติการสอนโดยการสอนแบบไม่สม่ำเสมอ
   □ ขาดการตอบสนองในเรื่องการสอน
   □ ขาดการตอบสนองในเรื่องการสอน
   □ ออก ๆ (โปรดระบุ) ______________________________

24. ผ่านการศึกษาในวิชารักษาและประมูลการเงินของนักศึกษาวิชาประวัติศาสตร์เกิดจาก
    สิ่งแวดล้อม (ตอบให้ครบถ้วน)
   □ ขาดการสอนในวิชารักษาแบบสมบูรณ์
   □ ยุติการสอนในวิชารักษาแบบสมบูรณ์
   □ ขาดการสอนในวิชารักษาแบบสมบูรณ์
   □ ขาดการสอนในวิชารักษาแบบสมบูรณ์
   □ ขาดการสอนในวิชารักษาแบบสมบูรณ์
   □ ออก ๆ (โปรดระบุ) ______________________________
25. ค่าประมวลผลการทราบในวิทยาศาสตร์ (ยกเว้นพิเศษ)

- อาจารย์เรียนมาพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษาและเรียนภาษาไทย
- อาจารย์เรียนมาพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษาไทย
- ไม่ให้เรียนการพิมพ์เรียลไทม์
- ไม่ให้เรียนการพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษาไทย
- อาจารย์เรียนมาพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษาไทย
- อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

26. สิ่งประมวลผลการทราบในวิทยาศาสตร์ (ยกเว้นพิเศษ)

- วิทยาลัยไม่เคยพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษา
- วิทยาลัยไม่เคยพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษาไทย
- วิทยาลัยไม่เคยพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษา
- อาจารย์ไม่เคยพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษา
- อาจารย์ไม่เคยพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษาไทย
- อาจารย์ไม่เคยพิมพ์เรียลไทม์การศึกษาไทย
- อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

27. ท้ายความต้องการ และ/หรือ ขอเสนอแนะในการปรับปรุงการเรียนการสอนวิทยาศาสตร์ในวิทยาการพิมพ์เรียลไทม์
### APPENDIX D

### INSTITUTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENT HISTORY INSTRUCTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers Colleges</th>
<th>Metropolitan Region</th>
<th>Middle Region</th>
<th>Northern Region</th>
<th>Northeast Region</th>
<th>Western Region</th>
<th>Southern Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chankasem</td>
<td>Tepsatree Lopburi</td>
<td>Piboonsongkhras</td>
<td>Udorn Thani</td>
<td>Nakorn Pathom</td>
<td>Tali</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ban Somdej Chao Phya</td>
<td>Ayuthya</td>
<td>Petchaboon</td>
<td>Sakon Nakorn</td>
<td>Nakorn Phathom</td>
<td>Songkhla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suan Sunandha</td>
<td>Petchaburi Vidyalongkorn</td>
<td>Kamphaengpetch</td>
<td>Loay</td>
<td>Chombueng Rajaburi</td>
<td>Sakhon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suan Dusit</td>
<td>Nakorn Sawan</td>
<td>Nakorn Rajasima</td>
<td>Ubon Rajathani</td>
<td>Kanjanaburi</td>
<td>Nakorn Srimarat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pranakorn</td>
<td>Utaradit</td>
<td>Buriram</td>
<td>Mahasarakon</td>
<td>Petchburi</td>
<td>Surat Thani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dhonburi</td>
<td>Chiangrai</td>
<td>Surin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phuket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lampang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>138(77%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Teachers Colleges</th>
<th>Number of Instructors Per Institution</th>
<th>Actual Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 180 students were included in the study with 138 (77%) hit the criteria of the study.
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