

## An Assessment of Japanese Instructional Management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology Students

Nuntiporn Junjareon<sup>1</sup> (*nuntiporn@tni.ac.th*)

Bundit Anuyahong<sup>2</sup> (*bundit@tni.ac.th*)

### Abstract

The purposes of this research were 1) to assess Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students in seven aspects: Instructor, Instructional Activities, Instructional Process, Contents, Instructional Supporting, Teaching Materials and Evaluation, 2) to compare student opinions on seven aspects according to gender and academic year, and 3) to gather supplemental suggestions. Research samples were 427 students derived through simple random sampling technique. The instruments used for gathering the data were the rating scale and open-ended questionnaire. The statistics used for analyzing the data were frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, t-test, F-test and content analysis. The research findings were as follows: 1) opinions in Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students in overall were at high level, 2) there were not statistically significant differences both in gender and academic year, 3) students had supplemental suggestions as follows; there are a lot of Japanese quizzes in the classroom, the teacher should decrease a number of quizzes, Japanese conversation in classroom should be encouraged, the institution should provide Japanese native speakers to practice conversation outside classroom.

**Keywords:** *Japanese Instructional Management, Japanese Learning Assessment*

### Introduction

Higher education plays an essential role in society by creating new knowledge, transmitting it to students and fostering instruction. Quality teaching in higher education matters for student learning outcomes (Dweck, 2000).

For many years, assessment was used primarily to describe processes of evaluating the effectiveness of sequences of instructional activities when the sequence was completed. The actions that guided learning processes before the end of the sequence were generally not regarded as kinds of assessments. Within the Japanese language literature, they were typically discussed as aspects of the regulation of learning processes (Black, 1986).

Teaching and learning in Japanese classroom at College of General Education and Languages, Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology have focused on generating the highest effectiveness of the learners' ability. In order to develop the learners' competency in higher level, the researcher requires to assess teaching and learning in Japanese classes in all aspects for instructor, teaching-learning process, materials and evaluation. The results of the study will be used for improving instructional management and developing teaching materials in Japanese classes to be highly efficient.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer, Japanese Department, College of General Education and Languages, Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology, Thailand

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, English Department, College of General Education and Languages, Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology, Thailand

## **Research purposes**

- 1) to assess Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students in seven aspects: Instructor, Instructional Activities, Instructional Process, Contents, Instructional Supporting, Teaching Materials and Evaluation.
- 2) to compare student opinions on seven aspects according to gender and academic year.
- 3) to gather supplemental suggestions.

## **Methodology**

### ***Population and Samples***

This research was to study an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students in seven aspects: Instructor, Instructional Activities, Instructional Process, Contents, Instructional Supporting, Teaching Materials and Evaluation which consisted of population and samples as follows:

Population of this research was 591 TNI students Business Administration in the second semester of 2015 academic year. Samples of the research were 427 TNI students derived through simple random sampling technique. The instruments used for gathering the data were the rating-scale and open-ended questionnaire. The statistics used for analyzing the data were frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, t-test, F-test, and content analysis.

### ***Instrumentation***

The instrument used in this study is a questionnaire. The questionnaire was constructed by the researcher, based on an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students.

The first part (Part 1) of this questionnaire asks for the demographic information on their genders and academic year. The participants were asked to report their information by ticking in only one box.

The second part (Part 2) concerns an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students. This part comprises 46 items of an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students in 7 major areas: 12 items of Instructor, 6 items of Instructional Activities, 9 items of Instructional Process, 5 items of Contents, 4 items of Instructional Supporting, 5 items of Teaching Materials And 5 items of Evaluation. The participants were asked to check by ticking in only one box under the five levels of importance on each item in Part 2 to indicate their assessment of Japanese instructional management of TNI students in each area listed in the questionnaire.

The five levels of assessment of Japanese instructional management used in the questionnaire are “Strongly Agree”, “Agree”, “Neither agree nor disagree”, “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree”. Responses from the student questionnaires were subsequently coded. The data of the students’ coded responses were statistically calculated and analyzed. The computation of Cronbach’s Alpha as a measure of reliability was employed to indicate how reliable the research questionnaire results are. Reliability is defined as the proportion of the students’ responses to each item in the questionnaire and the reliability coefficient or calculated alpha is a lower bound of the true reliability of the research instrument, or the questionnaire. The descriptive statistics is also used to determine the individual summary statistics for each of the 46 items in the questionnaire.

The third part (Part 3) asks for more opinions and suggestions of TNI undergraduate students about an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students which based on open-ended questions.

### ***Data collection***

An assessment of Japanese instructional management of TNI students were accessed through the questionnaire in the second semester of 2015 academic year.

The administration of the research questionnaire was conducted in Japanese classes. Part 1 concerns the demographic variables about their genders and academic years. The 46 items of Part 2 cover an assessment of Japanese instructional management. Therefore, the participants were requested to consider each item carefully and indicate how important each item was for their study. A total of 427 TNI students from Business Administration completed the questionnaire.

The analyses of the research data were conducted by means of descriptive statistics. The descriptive statistical analyses of the frequencies and percentages of the students' responses were employed to report their demographic variables and to indicate the rank order of the items in each area of an assessment of Japanese instructional management listed in the questionnaire. The frequency distributions were analyzed to determine the proportions of the students' responses to the five levels of importance on the 46 items in 7 majors area: 12 items of Instructor, 6 items of Instructional Activities, 9 items of Instructional Process, 5 items of Contents, 4 items of Instructional Supporting, 5 items of Teaching Materials and 5 items of Evaluation.

### ***Data Analysis from Questionnaire***

Data analysis from questionnaire both single item and whole questionnaire which presented a form of rating scale. These rating scales were calculated to find out mean and standard deviation and then translated based on criteria developed by Best (1981) as follows:

- |                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| $1.00 \leq \bar{X} < 1.50$ | refers to students strongly disagree on an assessment of Japanese instructional management          |
| $1.51 \leq \bar{X} < 2.50$ | refers to students disagree on an assessment of Japanese instructional management                   |
| $2.51 \leq \bar{X} < 3.50$ | refers to students neither disagree nor agree on an assessment of Japanese instructional management |
| $3.51 \leq \bar{X} < 4.50$ | refers to students agree on an assessment of Japanese instructional management                      |
| $4.51 \leq \bar{X} < 5.00$ | refers to students strongly agree on an assessment of Japanese instructional management             |

### ***The statistics used for analyzing the data***

The collected data was analyzed using a computer program. The statistics used for analyzing the data were frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, t-test, f-test, and content analysis.

## Results

### Results of Data Analysis

#### Phase 1: The results of demographic variable of TNI undergraduate students

The analysis of the data from the students' questionnaire reported by TNI undergraduate students in the 2015 academic year is presented in the first section deals with the demographic variables from the students' responses to Part 1 of the questionnaire: genders and academic years as following table.

**Table 1: Table of the results of demographic data of respondents**

Demographic data of respondents	n=427	Percentage
<b>1. Genders</b>		
1.1 Male	143	33.50
1.2 Female	284	66.50
<b>Total</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2. Academic Years</b>		
1st Year	136	31.90
2nd Year	62	14.50
3rd Year	88	20.60
4th Year	138	32.30
5th Year	3	0.70
<b>Total</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>100</b>

Table showed that percentages of TNI undergraduate respondents in genders ranged from 66.50% for female and 33.50% for male; in academic years ranged from 32.30% for 4<sup>th</sup> year, 31.90% for 1<sup>st</sup> year, 20.60% for 3<sup>rd</sup> year, 14.50% for 2<sup>nd</sup> year and 0.70% for 5<sup>th</sup>.

#### Phase 2: An assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students

**Table2: Table of mean and standard deviation of an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students in total**

Components	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Level
Instructor	4.48	0.46	high
Instructional Activities	4.09	0.59	high
Instructional Process	4.23	0.55	high
Contents	4.29	.060	high
Instructional Supporting	4.05	0.73	high
Teaching Materials	4.07	0.74	high
Evaluation	4.35	0.58	high
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>high</b>

The table above indicated that TNI students had a high level of an assessment of Japanese instructional management in overall ( $\bar{X}=4.26$ ), when considered in each aspect, it was found that the students had high levels of an assessment of Japanese instructional

management in Instructor ( $\bar{X}=4.48$ ) Evaluation ( $\bar{X}=4.35$ ), Contents ( $\bar{X}=4.29$ ), Instructional Process ( $\bar{X}=4.2$ ), Instructional Activities ( $\bar{X}=4.09$ ), Teaching Materials ( $\bar{X}=4.07$ ) and Instructional Supporting ( $\bar{X}=4.05$ ) respectively.

**Phase 3 The results of the comparison of an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students according to genders and academic years**

**Table 3: Table of mean and standard deviation of an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students according to genders**

Components	Male (M) n=143		Female (F) n=284		t	p
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
Instructor	4.46	0.47	4.50	0.46	0.815	0.65
Instructional Activities	4.04	0.61	4.11	0.58	1.155	0.71
Instructional Process	4.15	0.54	4.26	0.55	1.946	0.18
Contents	4.28	0.62	4.30	0.59	0.336	0.90
Instructional Supporting	4.04	0.74	4.05	0.73	0.147	0.91
Teaching Materials	4.04	0.76	4.09	0.73	0.684	0.85
Evaluation	4.31	0.54	4.36	0.59	0.848	0.02
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>1.153</b>	<b>0.66</b>

The table showed that students with different genders had no statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in total. When considered in each aspect, it was found that there were statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in evaluation. For the rest aspect, there were not statistically significant differences.

**Table 4: Table of comparison of an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students according to academic years**

Components	SS	df	MS	F	p	Sheffe'
<b>Instructor</b>						
Between groups	0.860	4	0.215	1.006	0.404	
Within groups	90.137	422	0.214			
<b>Total</b>	90.997	426				
<b>Instructional Activities</b>						
Between groups	3.408	4	0.852	2.483	0.043	
Within groups	144.819	422	0.343			
<b>Total</b>	148.227	426				
<b>Instructional Process</b>						
Between groups	4.326	4	1.082	3.715	0.006	2 <sup>nd</sup> – 5 <sup>th</sup>
Within groups	122.852	422	0.291			
<b>Total</b>	127.178	426				
<b>Contents</b>						
Between groups	2.750	4	.688	1.945	0.102	

Within groups	149.174	422	.353				
<b>Total</b>	151.924	426					
<b>Instructional Supporting</b>							
Between groups	26.974	4	6.744	14.150	0.000	1 <sup>st</sup> – 4 <sup>th</sup>	
Within groups	201.117	422	.477			2 <sup>nd</sup> – 4 <sup>th</sup>	
<b>Total</b>	228.091	426				3 <sup>rd</sup> – 4 <sup>th</sup>	
<b>Teaching Materials</b>							
Between groups	8.614	4	2.154	4.054	0.003	2 <sup>nd</sup> – 3 <sup>rd</sup>	
Within groups	224.167	422	.531				
<b>Total</b>	232.781	426					
<b>Evaluation</b>							
Between groups	1.052	4	.263	.789	0.533		
Within groups	140.695	422	.333				
<b>Total</b>	141.747	426					
<b>Total</b>							
Between groups	1.864	4	.466	2.216	0.066		
Within groups	88.724	422	.210				
<b>Total</b>	90.588	426					

\* Statistical significance at 0.05 level

The table illustrated that students with different academic years had no statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in total. When considered in each aspect, it was found that there were statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Instructional Process, Instructional Supporting and Teaching Materials.

Furthermore, in Instructional Process, there was one pair difference which was students' opinion from second year and fifth year. For Instructional Supporting, there were three pair differences which were students' opinion from 1) first year and fourth year, 2) second year and fourth year, and 3) third year and fourth year respectively. In Teaching Materials, there was one pair difference which was students' opinion from second year and third year.

#### **Phase 4: The results of suggestions of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students about an assessment of Japanese instructional management**

TNI students had supplemental suggestions as following:

- 1) There are too many Japanese quizzes in the classroom; the teacher should decrease a number of quizzes.
- 2) Japanese conversation in classroom should be more encouraged.
- 3) More Japanese native speakers to practice conversation outside classroom should be arranged 2-3 times a week.

#### **Conclusions**

According to the study and data analysis, the results of this study were concluded as follows:

#### **Phase 1: The results of demographic variable of TNI undergraduate students**

Percentages of TNI undergraduate respondents in genders ranged from 66.50% for female and 33.50% for male; in academic years ranged from 32.30% for 4<sup>th</sup> year, 31.90% for 1<sup>st</sup> year, 20.60% for 3<sup>rd</sup> year, 14.50% for 2<sup>nd</sup> year and 0.70% for 5<sup>th</sup>.

### **Phase 2: An assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students**

TNI students had a high level of an assessment of Japanese instructional management in overall ( $\bar{x}=4.26$ ), when considered in each aspect, it was found that the students had high levels of an assessment of Japanese instructional management in Instructor ( $\bar{x}=4.48$ ) Evaluation ( $\bar{x}=4.35$ ), Contents ( $\bar{x}=4.29$ ), Instructional Process ( $\bar{x}=4.2$ ), Instructional Activities ( $\bar{x}=4.09$ ), Teaching Materials ( $\bar{x}=4.07$ ) and Instructional Supporting ( $\bar{x}=4.05$ ) respectively.

### **Phase 3: The results of the comparison of an assessment of Japanese instructional management of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students according to genders and academic years**

1. Students with different genders had no statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in total. When considered in each aspect, it was found that there were statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in evaluation. For the rest aspect, there were not statistically significant differences.

2. Students with different academic years had no statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in total. When considered in each aspect, it was found that there were statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Instructional Process, Instructional Supporting and Teaching Materials.

Furthermore, in Instructional Process, there was one pair difference which was students' opinion from second year and fifth year. For Instructional Supporting, there were three pair differences which were students' opinion from 1) first year and fourth year, 2) second year and fourth year, and 3) third year and fourth year respectively. In Teaching Materials, there was one pair difference which was students' opinion from second year and third year.

### **Phase 4: The results of suggestions of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology students about an assessment of Japanese instructional management as following:**

- 1) There are too many Japanese quizzes in the classroom; the teacher should decrease a number of quizzes.
- 2) Japanese conversation in classroom should be more encouraged.
- 3) More Japanese native speakers to practice conversation outside classroom should be arranged 2-3 times a week.

### **Discussion**

According to the study and data analysis the results of this study could be discussed as follows.

The results of an assessment of Japanese instructional management in overall were at high level ( $\bar{x}=4.26$ ). It might be because College of General Education and Languages has focused on continuously assessment of Japanese languages learning through various forms of learning activities such as quizzes, tasks, assignments and projects in order to reach a learning outcome. This is related to the notion of Stakes (1998) and Ruthven (1994) who state that assessment is one area of education that continues to generate discussions in professional and research cycles both from the perspectives of philosophy and practice. Moreover, assessment has become an instrument of change, a means of quality control and an instrument of educational reform.

On the other hand, students with different academic years had no statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in total. When considered in each aspect, it was found that there were statistically significant differences at 0.05 level in Instructional Process, Instructional Supporting and Teaching Materials. It might be because instructional process in Japanese classes emphasize specific practicing, review previous learning and giving adequate time for practicing skills which related to the idea of Rockoff (2004) who advocated that the effective Japanese learning emphasises specific practices, like reviewing previous learning, providing model responses for students, giving adequate time for practice to embed skills securely executive summary and progressively introducing new learning (scaffolding) are also elements of high quality instruction.

### Acknowledgements

This research is supported by College of General Education and Languages, Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology, Bangkok, Thailand

### References

- Black, H. (1986). Assessment for learning. In D. L. Nuttall (Ed.), *Assessing educational achievement* (pp. 7–18). London: Falmer Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (2000). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality and development*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Rockoff, J. E. (2004). *The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data*. *The American Economic Review*, 94(2), 247-252.
- Ruthven, K. (1994). *Better judgment: rethinking assessment in mathematics education*. *Education Studies in Mathematics*, 27(4), 433-450.
- Stake, R. (1998). *Some comments on assessment in US education*. Education policy analysis archives, 6(14). Retrieved on 2007/9/26 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v6n14.html>.