中科大學報第 5 卷第 1 期暨教育特刊
2018 年 12 月第 113 至 130 頁

The Use of Evaluation Indicators to Examine College English Teacher Teaching Behaviors: A Case Study of One Technological University in Central Taiwan

Lisa Hsu[1*] Yuan-Hsiung Hsu[2]

[1] Professor, Department of Applied English National Taichung University of Science and Technology
[2]Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering Hsiuping University of Science and Technology
[*]Corresponding Author

Abstract

This study aimed to understand how college students perceived their English teachers' teaching behaviors via using evaluation indicators that were developed for the purpose to assess teachers in a fair and meaningful way. Fuzzy Delphi Method and Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process to construct an operational assessment mode and quantify the college English teachers' teaching behaviors in the classroom utilized in this study. Three aspects were evaluated: Teacher misbehaviors, teacher verbal behaviors, and teacher non-verbal behaviors. Two-hundred and forty-four college students from a central Taiwan university participated in this study voluntarily and anonymously. The finding revealed that most English teachers at this university performed better on non-verbal behaviors while teaching, especially, giving varied tones with facial expressions, followed by verbal behaviors. Teaching approaches gained a higher score from students' perspective whereas teacher-student interaction was the least satisfactory. The last aspect of teacher misbehavior was teacher misbehaviors, which included mocking students, lack of expertise, and lack of professional growth. The result showed English teachers need urgent improvement on professional growth. Since the population was only selected from one single university; some limitations need to be addressed. The result could only be generalized to this particular university. Even though some drawbacks could not be overlooked in this study, the result was very similar to the experts' opinions when constructing college teachers' behavior evaluation indicators. A further discussion, future suggestions and limitations of this study are addressed at the end of this article.

Keywords: English teacher, evaluation indicators, immediacy behaviors, misbehaviors

運用評量指標來檢視大學英語教師之教學行為：以臺灣中部某科技大學為例

徐玥沂[1*] 徐遠雄[2]

[1]國立臺中科技應用英語系教授

[2]修平科技大學機械工程學系副教授

[*]通訊作者

摘要

本研究旨在使用為評量教師所開發的評估指標，公正並有意義的指標模式，從大學生角度如何評量看待他們的英語教師的教學行為。本研究使用模糊德爾菲法和模糊分析層次過程，完成評估指標的建構後，驗證結果客觀地來評量教師的教學行為。評估分三個方面，分別是：教師不當行為、教師口語行為、和教師非口語行為。受測者是來自臺灣中部某科技大學的224名大學生自願且匿名參加了這項研究。研究結果顯示，此科技大學的大多數英語教師在教學過程中表現得比較好的是非口語行為，尤其是在臉部方面提供不同的表情及語調，然後是口語行為，此面向從學生的角度來看教學方式得分較高，而師生互動則最不令人滿意。最後一個面向是教師的不當行為，其中包括嘲笑學生、缺乏專業知識和缺乏專業成長。結果顯示，英語教師需要迫切在專業成長上改進努力。由於受測者只選自一所大學，因此本研究的限制不可忽略。研究結果只能概括到這個特定的大學。儘管本研究存在一些不足之處，但在評估大學教師行為指標時，本研究的結果與專家建構指標意見非常相似。文末將進一步的討論並針對本研究的限制和未來研究建議提出建言。

關鍵詞：英語教師，評量指標，即時性行為，不當行為

airiti

I. Introduction

English teachers' teaching behaviors have seldom been given a closer look or given a fair assessment, especially in universities. Some possible reasons may lie behind this phenomenon, one being higher education's respect for teaching autonomy, also Asia's unique culture in which teachers' authority is rarely challenged (Hsu, 2012; Pye & Pye, 2009), not to mention, classroom teaching behavior being seldom investigated nor openly discussed. Though Asian students' tend to be quiet and not actively participate in classroom discussions, aside from the cultural impact, teachers' teaching approaches may also cause students' reticence and passivity (Cheng, 2000; Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). English teachers who exhibit some inappropriate behaviors often ignore or underestimate the severity of these misbehaviors and their impact on students' productive learning outcome. On the other side, English teachers may exhibit some great verbal and non-verbal behaviors that could cause a significant impact on developing students' confidence and enhancing students' learning outcome. As of years of teaching experiences and observations, the fundamental problem lies in the formal education teacher evaluation system mostly often has become a formality. The author believes without a humble heart and willingness to self-examine teachers' teaching behaviors, a lively and fruitful teaching outcome will hardly ever happen. The purpose of this study is to use the evaluation indicators that were developed for assessing English teachers' communicative behaviors in the classroom. This model established from the author's fundamental works published in the Bookman (Hsu, 2013a) and questionnaires used in her prior dissertation that explores the relationship between teacher's immediacy and students' willingness to communicate in English (Hsu & Roso, 2007). In order to avoid subjectivity when assessing teacher's teaching behaviors and increasing accuracy and participation, this study utilized commentary volume indicators to assess teacher teaching behaviors, specifically, English teachers. Furthermore, this study result serves a purpose to help English teachers be willing to take self-assessment and provide a good guideline to implement some effective and positive behaviors in a classroom.

II. Review of the Literature

1. Teacher's Role Enhancing Students' Positive Learning Outcome

The English teacher's role has changed dramatically from past to the present. If we reveal the differences between past teaching approaches and current ones, they probably could be summed up by stating that a traditional teaching mode was to overlook that students' learning competences were different, which caused some students to lose their confidence when learning and increase their learning anxiety (Gkonou, 2013; Hsu, 2017). The teachers' role used to be a knowledge giver whereas nowadays the teacher's role has changed to be a capability builder (Merrill, 2013). The reform of teaching method tends to favor teachers who encourage, help, and accompany students along the way of their learning process. Teachers design learning activities to enhance students' learning, via group activities, cooperative

airiti

learning, and group discussion, allowing students to learn from each other (Frydenberg, 2012). Teachers lead students to think and learn, eventually, students are confident to solve problems by themselves. They share in the class and evaluate each other's work. A teacher's responsibility is to understand students' problems and guide them to put their knowledge into practice (Ashbrook, 2013). The teacher is the coach beside students instead of the authoritative role who gives lectures on the stage. When a teacher becomes an instructor, it means there are more opportunities to communicate with students. It can be anticipated that students who are getting more encouragement and clear guidance therefore have their learning process eventually become more autonomous and productive.

2. Significance of English Teacher's Teaching Behaviors

English teaching education continuously gains attention from educators leading to many teaching strategies being implemented to improve English education; however students' role and responsibilities have been more discussed than teachers' teaching behaviors. English teachers' teaching behaviors in the classroom are worthy of examination and in-depth discussion. Teachers play a significant role and make a big difference in the classroom (Henning, 2012; Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Teachers need to be aware and get fully well trained. From the author's experience and observation, the first step will be checking on a teacher's teaching behaviors. Gradually, an open-minded concept will be developed in which teachers are willing to step out their comfort zone. English educators seem to overlook teachers' inappropriate and destructive teaching behaviors that could cause a devastating effect on students' learning. The rationale of this study is based on examining teachers' immediacy and misbehaviors, and the significant impact brought to effective English education as seen from a scale constructed by experts.

3. Immediacy Verbal and Non-verbal Behaviors

Immediacy behaviors are actions that express positive feelings to another person and often used as a means to reduce the distance between people (Anderson, 2000; Mehrabian, 1971). Immediacy is separated into verbal and nonverbal, two different aspects. Both verbal and non-verbal immediacy behaviors are important components for communication. Also, they can increase rapport between teachers and students in the classroom. Verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors communicate kindheartedness, involvement and psychological closeness to the receivers (students in this scenario). Surely, immediacy delivers a message that indicates the speakers' availability for communication and responsiveness. Likewise, immediacy often signals a positive desire and pleasure to interact with people. Students are sensitive; they can quickly pick up signals from the teachers' reaction. Put another way, the students don't care how much a teacher knows until they know how much the teacher cares. It is simple. A student cannot be deceived. Teacher immediacy behaviors are beneficial in the classroom setting (Henning, 2012). Immediacy is an influential

means for teachers to promote a great, positive, and supportive classroom climate (Kelly, Rice, Wyatt, Ducking, & Denton, 2015). The more a teacher is perceived as immediate, the more likely students feel comfortable to interact with that teacher and ask questions while learning. According to findings from several studies, the impact on students could also include the students initiating more learning outside of class, more fondness for the teacher and the course the teacher provides, and ultimately better understanding of the learning material (Christophel, 1990; Jaasma & Koper, 1999; Mottet, Parker-Raley, Cunningham, Beebe & Raffeld, 2006). Specifically, regarding teachers' verbal and nonverbal immediacy, studies have repeatedly confirmed the significance of teacher immediacy bringing a positive outcome to students' learning (Allen, Witt, & Wheeless, 2006; Ballester, 2015).

4. Teachers' Misbehaviors

Teacher misbehaviors' impact on the students is enormous and far more than previously imagined. Students may start feeling emotionally uncomfortable, followed by distractions, de-motivation, and ineffective learning. They may then be absent from school and drop out of school (Dolin, 1995). According to the findings from several researches, students' affective feelings deeply affect their participation in the classroom, including low willingness to answer questions and lack of interest to interact with the teacher (Hsu, 2014). In another study, students' motivation to learn is closely related with whether the teacher has a caring response (Myers, Martin, & Mottet, 2002; Hsu, 2013b). Teacher's misbehavior on students' affective feelings demonstrated negative impact in several aspects. Hsu's (2014) study showed that there was a significant negative correlation with students' evaluation in the area of course content, teacher evaluation, taking another course similar to the one they were taking, and taking another course under the same teacher. In other words, when students observe or experience the teacher's misbehavior, the students tend to be dissatisfied with the content of the curriculum, the teacher's evaluation tends to be negative, and in addition, even if the students' schedule is open, they would not want to take related courses, not to mention take a course under the same teacher's instruction. These phenomena deserve all educators and English teachers' further attention.

However, Asian cultural or educational policy tends to explore student biases, but it rarely examines the teacher's perceptions of bias in the classroom. It seems to be some teachers clearly overlooked or underestimate their seriousness and always feel good about themselves, lack reflection, and have no crisis awareness. This may be due to the influence of Confucianism on Asia's education and culture (Fwu & Wang, 2002; Pye & Pye, 2009). The teacher's identity seems to have a special status that cannot be challenged. Traditional cultural values attach great importance to obeying authority. The teacher is the authority of the classroom. These factors have caused teachers in the teacher-student relationship to maintain a large power distance (Hofstede, 1986; Pye & Pye, 2009). Teachers often teach from their own preference to lead the classroom using a teacher-center interactive approach (Li, 2003;

Hsu, 2012). Murray (1991) confirmed that teacher misbehavior is one of the main reasons leading to reduced teacher effectiveness. Moreover, teacher misbehaviors affect students' learning satisfaction (Banfield, Richmond, & McCroskey, 2006). In-depth investigation of teacher misbehaviors in Taiwan Universities is essential to improving the quality of education, and it is worthy of further study. Research into misbehaviors and the impact those misbehaviors bring to the classroom and students by Taiwanese teachers, especially those who teach in higher academia, is still lacking to date.

III. Method

This study explored the evaluation indicators for assessing teacher behaviors based on the fundamental works that Hsu (2013a) published in the Bookman and questionnaires used in her dissertation that explores the relationship between teacher's immediacy and students' willingness to communicate in English (Hsu & Roso, 2007). The procedure of conducting this research is divided into three stages. First, the Fuzzy Delphi Method (FDM) was used to establish the hierarchical structure of the impact assessment on teacher behaviors. This step was used the FDM to determine the evaluation indicators, selecting 15 experts and scholars from relevant fields to examine teachers' classroom behaviors in a total of 59 items, they are including: misbehaviors (28 items), verbal behaviors (17 items) and non-verbal behaviors (14 items). The principle of screening evaluation items followed Huang's (2010) suggestions. Five ways to determine the threshold was suggested, for instance, (1) threshold values range from 6 to 8, (2) subjective decision makers, (3) consultation with experts to formulate, (4) arithmetic mean, and (5) use the line chart. Since the thresholds of (1) and (4) were determined more objectively and purely by means of computational results, this study calculated the thresholds with the combination of these two methods.

In this study, the mean value was the threshold value of the category, if the average was greater than 6, and then between the mean and 6, indicators were identified as to reach a consensus. In the end, 42 behaviors were agreed upon by all experts at this stage of conducting FDM. Next, 30 scholars and experts in the related field were invited to take the next step of doing Fuzzy Hierarchy Analysis Process (FHAP) for the purpose of constructing the weight for each indicator. Of the first 15 scholars who participated, 15 scholars and experts also continued on to the second stage. Another 15 experts were scholars whose expertise may not be teaching English, however, they all have doctor degrees, studied overseas and are capable of using English to teach their specialized subjects. Moreover, some were occupying higher administration positions in different universities. Table 1 provides a detailed background of these scholars. The model calculates the weight value of each evaluation indicator based on quantitative statistical analysis, and discusses the effect of various factors on "evaluating teacher behaviors." After nearly 3 months of back-and-forth discussions and thorough examinations, all participating scholars reached a consensus, and 27

evaluation indicators to examine college English teachers were confirmed.

Lastly, the third stage was carried by using the final set of 27 evaluation indicators to conduct a further survey. In order to understand students' perspective, this evaluation model was used to conduct an empirical study to examine the appropriateness and inappropriateness of teacher's classroom behaviors. A total of 262 questionnaires were collected. Eighteen questionnaires were incomplete, so valid questionnaires numbered only 244.

Table 1. 30 Scholars and Experts Background Descriptions

Specialties	Positions	Administration Positions	From different universities	Genders
English Teaching 15 Business 5 Leisure Management 3 Information Management 7	Professor 5 Associate Professor 15 Assistant Professor 10	6 out of 30	5 out of 30	12 Male 18 Female Total: 30

1. Procedure of Conducting FDM

Fuzzy Delphi Method (FDM), as the name implies, combines the fuzzy theory with the traditional Delphi method to mend the problems encountered by the traditional Delphi method. The so-called fuzzy theory is a general term of fuzzy relations, fuzzy sets, fuzzy logic, fuzzy control and fuzzy measurement theory. Fuzzy theory was proposed by Zadeh (1965) in academic journals: Fuzzy Set Theory, and the reason why the fuzzy set is applied is proposed in this paper. Take some key features as an example. First, scientific requirements must be extremely accurate with no room allowed for error. Second, it solves the dilemma that science must rely on precise mathematical definitions or the phenomena could not be studied. Third, it solves the problem that human language is very vague and semantically varies from person to person. In 1985, for the first time, some scholars applied the fuzzy theory to the Delphi method. Ishikawa et al., (1993) used the idea of cumulative number distribution and fuzzy integral to integrate the expert opinion into fuzzy number, namely Fuzzy Delphi Method. The method is applied in this study to make sure that the evaluation indicators can be reliable and objective.

2. Highlights of FDM Data Analysis

For each evaluation item i, the statistical analysis of "the most conservative cognitive value" and "the most optimistic cognitive value" were given by all experts. The extreme values other than "2 times standard deviation" are removed. And then to find out the ones that are not to be removed and still remain from the minimum value of the most conservative cognitive value CiL, the geometric mean value CiM, the maximum value CiU, and the minimum value of the most optimistic cognitive value OiL, the geometric mean value OiM, the maximum value OiU are calculated respectively. Each of the evaluation items i calculated from the triangular fuzzy numbers Ci=(CiL, CiM, CiU) of "the most conservative cognitive value" and the triangular fuzzy number Oi=(OiL, OiM, OiU) of "the most optimistic

cognitive value." Two methods were used to determine if experts' opinions reached a consensus.

(1) First, if the two triangular fuzzy numbers showed no overlap ($C^i_U \leqq O^i_L$), then it means that each expert's opinion interval value has the consensus and the opinion tends to this consensus sector scope. Therefore, the consensus importance level evaluation G^i equals the arithmetic mean of C^i_M and O^i_M.

$$G^i = \frac{C^i_M + O^i_M}{2}$$

(2) Second, if the two-triangle fuzzy numbers overlap, that is, ($C^i_U > O^i_L$). It means that the expert opinion interval value, not only showed no consensus, but also gave extreme value. Therefore, the consensus importance value G^i is equal to the intersection degree of the fuzzy relations of the two triangular fuzzy numbers. And a quantization score having the maximum value of the fuzzy set is obtained.

$$G^i = \frac{(C^i_U \times O^i_M) - (O^i_L \times C^i_M)}{(O^i_M - O^i_L) - (C^i_U - C^i_M)}$$

3. Procedure of Conducting FAHP

Consistency ratio (CR) measures the overall consistency of the matrix where CR comes from the consistency index (CI) and the random index (RI). Saaty (1980) suggested when CR $\leqq$ 0.1 means matrix consistency can be accepted whereas CR > 0.1 means matrix consistency cannot be accepted. Among the various factors affecting the evaluation of teacher behaviors, their interaction and association make their analysis difficult. Therefore, by conducting FAHP quantitative analysis, some potential problems can be resolved. The goal is to eliminate ambiguity because it may bias decision-making. Furthermore, FAHP can reflect features of strategic problems, enabling a better understanding of each indicator. Although each evaluation indicator is expected to be independent from another, sometimes these indicators cannot be clearly disassociated. That is, instead of disassociating them, the only thing that can be done is to reduce the degree of overlap among the indicators. In this case, the fuzzy theory of FAHP can be applied to eliminate the above-mentioned problem; thereby improving the effectiveness of the evaluation factors. This study computes the FDM and FAHP based on experts' opinions and advice, which means that the selection of indicators will be objective to a certain degree.

4. Weight Calculation and Analysis of Each Indicator

After the questionnaire is collected, the values given in each questionnaire are separately collected, and the values are calculated as triangular fuzzy numbers. Finally, the fuzzy weight value is calculated and positively normalized. Misbehaviors, verbal behavior, and non-verbal

behavior are the three focal facets discussed in this study. After statistical analysis, it is found that the maximum eigenvalue (λmax) is 3.1014 that is considered to be quite close to the number of influence factors 3, and the CR is 0.0279 that is far less than the judgment reference value of 0.1, which shows that the content of the collected expert questionnaires has consistency, and there is no obvious contradiction. According to the hierarchical order of the evaluation structure, the relative weight value and the absolute weight value of each evaluation factor are calculated, and the importance degree of each evaluation factor is sorted according to the value of the absolute weight value. The weight value and the ranking are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. College English Teacher Evaluation Indicator's Weight and Overall Weight Rank

Theme	1st Level		2nd Level		3rd Level		Overall Weight	Sort
	Aspect	Weight	Item	Weight	Indicator	Weight		
The Construction of Evaluation Indicators for College English Teacher Teaching Behaviors	Misbehaviors	.416	Scorn and ridicule students	.333	Criticize students in a sarcastic tone	.156	.022	22
					Ridicule the students with sharp words	.283	.039	12
					Compare the grades of others to mock students	.347	.048	8
					Translate the textbook content word by word	.214	.030	18
			Lack of teaching professionalism	.422	Teaching too hard or too easy, does not fit the student's level	.373	.065	3
					Does not prepare for the class before teaching and is incomprehensible	.377	.066	2
					Giving grades inconsistently and discourages students	.250	.044	10
			Lack of professional growth	.245	Does not receive new knowledge, and is clearly stagnant without growth	.415	.042	11
					Teaching approach is rigid and boring	.307	.031	17
					Feels good about their own teaching approach and shows no intention to amend	.278	.028	19
	Verbal behavior	.357	teaching methods	.519	Use humor in class	.311	.057	5
					Praise the performance of the students	.312	.058	4
					Teaching is lively and enthusiastic	.378	.070	1
			Verbal expression	.289	Address students by name	.330	.034	15
					Refers to class as "our" class or what "we" are doing	.226	.023	21
					Ask questions or encourage students to talk	.445	.046	9
			Teacher-student interaction	.192	Use his/her own example to share his/her experience	.090	.006	27
					Provide feedback on students' individual work	.181	.012	26
					Get into discussions based on students' questions	.189	.013	24
					Initiate conversations with individual students before or after class	.186	.013	25
					Help students gladly	.353	.024	20
	Nonverbal behavior	.227	Nonverbal expression	.401	Express themselves comfortably while teaching	.429	.039	13
					Go to the front vacant seat or desk while teaching	.183	.017	23
					Use gestures while teaching	.388	.035	14
			Tone and facial	.599	Use a variety of vocal expressions while teaching	.239	.033	16

			expressions	Look at the class while teaching	.392	.053	6
				Smile at the class while teaching	.369	.050	7

Table 1 showed that the weight value of the *misbehavior* in the first level is .416, followed by *verbal behavior*, the weight value is .357, and the last is *non-verbal behavior*, and the weight value is .227. When the weight value is closer to 1, it means the significance is higher. The results can be interpreted that teachers' misbehaviors is the most important factor when students assessed their teachers. In addition, the *verbal behavior* is the most effective factor while assessing teachers' classroom behaviors. The weight value of 35.7 percent explains the importance.

5. Participants

Two hundred and forty-four participants were from three different colleges at this university, mainly from College of Languages (238), College of Business (3), and College of Information (3). The freshmen participants were 47 (19%), sophomores 38 (16%), juniors 100 (41%), and seniors 59 (24%). Three main English courses were reported, they are: Freshmen English, 43 (18%), Conversational English, 41 (17%), and Specialized English, 160 (65%). Participants' gender mainly were female 199 (82%) and male 45 (18%). Also, the participants reported teachers' gender being assessed as follows: 157 female teachers making up 64% while 87 male teachers making up 36%. There were 162 Taiwanese English teachers and 82 native-speaker English teachers assessed in this study.

6. Instrument

Google Forms was used to collect and investigate the information needed to explore the feasibility of the actual operation of the assessment. Participants were given a link to complete the questionnaire and could access when they were available. They were voluntary and anonymous. After running the FDM and FAHP procedure, experts' opinions reached a consensus. Twenty-seven teachers' behaviors were believed to be worth a further investigation in this empirical study. This included 10 items of teacher misbehaviors, 11 items of teacher verbal behaviors, and 6 nonverbal behaviors. In this questionnaire, the basic attributes of the data are detailed as follows. The options are divided into five levels, which are "usually, frequently, occasionally, seldom, hardly ever" and given 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 point respectively. After the questionnaire was collected, the average score was calculated and normalized. The closer the value was to 1, the more this particular behavior was in line with the student's observation frequency and vice versa. The normalization formula is (score average -1) / (full distance), if it is a reverse question, it is 1- ((score average -1) / (full distance)). The full distance is the highest score minus the lowest score, which is 5-1=4.

IV. Findings & Discussions

This study used Google Forms to conduct a questionnaire survey of classroom behaviors

airiti

and analyzed the data via Excel and fuzzy formula. Data was calculated by layers analysis according to the above-mentioned methods, and finally obtained the evaluation result of the teacher's classroom behaviors from this particular university's 244 participants' perspective. Table 2 indicated that the overall evaluation result of English teachers' classroom behavior is .387. The evaluation of classroom behavior of non-verbal behavior is higher (.705) than the evaluation of verbal behavior (.301) and misbehaviors (.288). The closer the value was to 1 means this is a particular behavior shared by most teachers, and students perceive them as affective behaviors; on the other hand, the farther the value was from 1, indicated that teachers did so but the students perceive them as poor ineffective behaviors. Therefore, we may focus on improving these two types of behaviors, *misbehaviors* and *verbal behaviors*, for the purpose of providing fruitful teaching.

Among them, seven particular behaviors' indicators evaluated below 0.2 need further attention. They are: "Address students by names", "Get into discussions based on students' questions," "Feels good about their own teaching methods and show no intention to amend," "Teaching is lively and enthusiastic," "Does not prepare for the class before teaching and is incomprehensible," "Initiates conversations with individual students before or after class," and "Criticize students in a sarcastic tone." It is worth mentioning that two behaviors are ranked as the top two in calculation and ranking table for evaluating indicator overall weight values. They are: "Teaching is lively and enthusiastic, (.070)." and "Does not prepare for the class before teaching and is incomprehensible, (.066)." Table 1 displays the details. This finding and phenomena require close attention. According to the experts' opinions while constructing this evaluation indicator, *teacher's teaching* receives the most attention and ranked as the most significant indicator while assessing teacher's teaching. This expectation has shown the same result in this study. In other words, students evaluated their English teachers by indicating their English teachers did not teach in a lively and enthusiastic way, also, their teachers often come to teach without preparation.

A further revelation of this study is that this technological university's English teachers perform better on non-verbal behavior--both on nonverbal expressions, and tone and facial expressions. Evaluation indicators value ranged from .660 to .768. Teachers give eye contact, use gestures, use varied tones and express themselves comfortably. Additionally, teachers demonstrate their friendliness by being closer to the students, for instance, go to the front vacant seat or chair while teaching. These non-verbal behaviors were seen in previous studies to bring a positive learning outcome (Ballester, 2015; Hsu, 2011).

According to the standardize interpretation, the outcome farther from 1 indicated teachers did poorly and students evaluated these items as needing improvement. Taking a closer look at verbal aspects indicate verbal expression (.377) is closer to 1 among the three dimensions, followed by teaching methods (.282). The least value fell on teacher-student interaction (.235). A noteworthy phenomenon in this particular aspect, 4 out of 11 items,

indicates evaluation value is below .2 which is much lower than the overall average indication value, .387. When given an in-depth examination, this clearly shows that students rarely receive what they should have. They should be called by their own name, should have their opinions valued, should be able to talk to their teachers, and on top of that, deserve a lively and enthusiastic learning atmosphere.

In the literature review, a previous study has established a supportive classroom climate is essential and associated with students' positive learning outcome (Kelly et. al, 2015). As for the last aspect, misbehavior, there are 3 items' evaluation value that are below .2 and are worthy of all teachers' attention. This study revealed this technological university's English teachers have a tendency to ridicule the students with sharp words, come to class without previous preparation, and feels good about their own teaching approach and show no intention of change. These findings were quite discouraging. "Lack of professional growth" was the most serious and important evaluation indicator for English teachers (.412), highest among the remaining items. The teaching approach of their English teachers is rigid and boring, as observed by most of their students, (.647). This result confirmed the most significant factor while assessing teacher's teaching behavior. A lively and enthusiastic teaching with a well preparation before teaching is expected by students. Next, they do not receive new knowledge. The knowledge they have is clearly stagnant when viewed from students' perspective (.404). In order to change the learning outcome and help our students to be competitive, teachers must take this result to heart and ask ourselves what we can do to make our teaching better. Studies confirmed that teacher misbehavior is one of the main reasons leading to reduced teacher teaching effectiveness (Murray,1991) and decreased students' motivation (Hsu, 2013). To review more items indicator evaluation values, further details displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. English Teachers Teaching Behaviors Evaluation Indicator Result

Theme	Result	1st level		2nd Level		3rd Level	
		Aspect	Result	Item	Result	Indicator	Result
English Teachers Teaching Behaviors Evaluation Indicator	.387	misbehaviors	.288	Scorn and ridicule students	.252	Criticize students in a sarcastic tone	.315
						Ridicule the students with sharp words	.196
						Compare the grades of others to mock students	.293
						Translate the textbook content word by word	.214
				Lack of teaching professionalism	.245	Teaching too hard or too easy, does not fit the student's level	.298
						Does not prepare for the class before teaching and makes teaching incomprehensible	.176
						Giving grades inconsistently and discourage students	.270
				Lack of professional growth	.412	Do not receive new knowledge and teaching is clearly stagnant without growth	.404
						Teaching approach is rigid and boring	.647
						Feel good about their own teaching approach and show no intention to amend	.165
		Verbal behaviors	.301	teaching methods	.282	Use humor in class	.493
						Praise the performance of the students	.213
						Teaching is lively and enthusiastic	.166
				Verbal expression	.377	Address students by name	.113
						Refers to class as "our" class or what "we" are doing	.333
						Ask questions or encourage students to talk	.596
				Teacher-student interaction	.235	Use his/her own example to share his/her experience	.328
						Provide feedback on students' individual work	.212
						Get into discussions based on students' questions	.139
						Initiate conversations with individual students before or after class	.189
						Help students gladly	.299
		Nonverbal behaviors	.705	Nonverbal expressions	.704	Express themselves comfortably while teaching	.681
						Go to the front vacant seat or desk while teaching	.675
						Use gestures while teaching	.744
				Tone and facial expressions	.705	Use a variety of vocal expression while teaching	.681
						Look at the class while teaching	.660
						Smile at the class while teaching	.768

airiti

V.Conclusion

The detailed discussions and data shown definitely provide all English teachers, particularly, English teachers at this university, a heavy blow. This generation is very different from a decade ago. Their evaluation to teachers' teaching quality has become much more direct. While most teachers still face the challenge to be assessed yearly by students, the outcome of this study may give us a chance to reconsider or reexamine our own teaching with a humble, willing, learning heart. In addition, compared to a school's evaluation system, the author believes this "Construction of Evaluation Indicators for College English Teacher Teaching Behaviors" has a much stronger reliability and validity that should be valued and hopefully widely used at this university and/or elsewhere. Additionally, this study outcome also revealed reliable indicators that really can help English teachers examine their classroom teaching behaviors objectively. By examining these indicators, a teacher will get a wake-up call and realize that without changing themselves, fruitful and successful English education is rarely possible.

Admitting that this study still has some weaknesses, the empirical study result was quite similar to the experts' opinions when constructing college teachers' behavior evaluation indicators. Surely, weaknesses should not be overlooked. The participants were all from one single university; it could bias the result without a doubt. And the finding could only be generalized to this college's English teachers. Additionally, there may be more expectation put upon native-speaker English teachers. If this is true, it may skew the outcome of this study. Future study could consider examining separately native-speakers and non-native speakers while assessing their teaching behaviors. Another approach may consider comparing these two groups. In the future, more teachers from different schools and different regions should be considered as well as more participants. Furthermore, future study may use these evaluation indicators to assess all college teachers or English teachers in secondary schools. All-in-all, this gives us a chance to self-examine before a poor report shocks us and forces change.

References

Allen, M., Witt, P. L., & Wheeless, L. R. (2006). The role of teacher immediacy as a motivational factor in student learning: Using meta-analysis to test a causal model. *Communication Education, 55*, 21-31. doi: 10.1080/03634520500343368

Andersen, P. (2000). *Cues of culture: The basis of intercultural differences in nonverbal communication*. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader, (9th ed., pp. 258-270). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ashbrook, T. (2013). Flipped Schools: Homework at School, Lectures At Home. Retrieved from http://onpoint.wbur.org/2013/11/05/flipped-schools-clintondale

Ballester, E. P. (2015). Verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy and foreign language anxiety in an EFL university course. *Porta Linguarum 23*, enero 2015, 9-24.

Banfield, S. R., Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2006). The effect of teacher misbehaviors on teacher credibility and affect for the teacher. *Communication Education, 55*, 63-72.

Cheng, X. (2000). Asian students' reticence revisited. *System, 28*(3), 435-446.

Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education, 39*, 323-340.

Dolin, D. J. (1995). *Ain't Misbehavin': A study of teacher misbehaviors, related to communication behaviors, and student resistance*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.

Frydenberg, M. (2012). *Flipping Excel. Paper presented to 2012 Proceedings of the Information Systems Educators Conference* ISSN: 2167-1435, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA v29 n1914. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.296.9411&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Fwu, B. J., & Wang, H. H. (2002). The social status of teachers in Taiwan. *Comparative Education, 38*, 211-224.

Gkonou, C. (2013). A diary study on the causes of English language classroom anxiety. *International Journal of English Studies, 13*(1), 51-68.

Henning, Z. T. (2012). From barnyards to learning communities: Student perceptions of teachers' immediacy behaviors. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 13 (1)*, 37-43.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*, 301-320.

Hsu, L., & Roso, C. (2007). The relationship between teachers' verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students' willingness to speak in English in central Taiwanese college classrooms. *The proceeding of 2007 TESOL Conference, Department of Applied English, National Taichung Institute of Technology,* 26-42.

Hsu, L. (2011). Similarities and Differences between Traditional and Nontraditional Students in Regard to Demand for Teacher Immediacy. *Languages, Literary Studies and International Studies: An International Journal, 8*, 129-150.

Hsu, L. (2012). Causes of student unwillingness to talk in English classes. *Journal of the National Taichung Institute of Technology, 16*, 101-114.

Hsu, L. (2013a). *Development and Validation of a Questionnaire to Assess Taiwanese Teacher Misbehavior in the Classroom*. Taipei, Taiwan: Bookman Books, Ltd.

Hsu, L. (2013b). The relationship between Taiwanese English teacher misbehaviors and college student motivation in English classes. *Journal of Applied English, Ming Chuan University*.

Hsu, L. (2014). An exploration of the effects of college English teacher misbehaviors on students' willingness to communicate in English classes. *American Journal of Educational Research, 2*(11), 1050-1059.

Hsu, L. (2017). Explorations in Flipped Classroom and College Student's English Learning Anxiety. *Journal of National Taichung University of Science and Technology, 4*(1), 127-144.

Huang, S.J. (2010). *Explore the impact of community care, care for the elderly to participate Taichung base status and differences in life satisfaction*. Unpublished master's thesis. Asia University, Taichung, Taiwan.

Ishikawa, A., Amagasa T., Tamizawa G., Totsuta R., & Mieno H. (1993). The max-min delphi method and fuzzy Delphi method via fuzzy integration. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems, 55*, 241-253.

Jaasma, M. A. & Koper, R. J. (1999). The relationship of student-faculty out-of-class communication to teacher immediacy and trust and to student motivation. *Communication Education, 48*(1), 41-48.

Kelly, S., Rice, C., Wyatt, B., Ducking, J., & Denton, Z. (2015). Teacher Immediacy and Decreased Student Quantitative Reasoning Anxiety: The Mediating Effect of Perception. *Communication Education, 64*(2), 171-186, doi:10.1080/03634523.2015.1014383

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques & Principles in Language Teaching (3rd ed.)*. New York: Oxford University Press. *Journal of Changsha Social Work College, 20*(3), 68-69

Li, L.T. (2003). Carl Rogers and me: Revisiting Teaching. *Thinking Classroom, 4*, 34-42.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). Nonverbal communication. In *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. University of Nebraska Press.

Merrill, M. D. (2013). *First principles of instruction: Identifying and designing effective, efficient, and engaging instruction.* San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Mottet, T. P., Parker-Raley, J., Cunningham, C., Beebe, S. A., & Raffeld, P. C. (2006). Testing the neutralizing effect of teacher immediacy on student course workload

expectancy violations and tolerance for teacher unavailability. *Communication Education, 55,* 147-166.

Murray, H. G. (1991). Effective teaching behaviors in the college classroom. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, 7,* 135-172.

Myers, S. A., Martin, M. M., & Mottet, T. P. (2002). Students' motives for communicating with their instructors: Considering instructor socio-communicative style, student socio-communicative orientation, and student gender. *Communication Education, 51,* 121-133.

Pye, M. W., & Pye, L. W. (2009). *Asian power and politics: The cultural dimensions of authority*. Harvard University Press.

Saaty, T. L. (1980). *The analytic hierarchy process*, (9th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Zadeh, L. A. (1965). Fuzzy Sets, *Information and Control*, *8*, 338-353.