CHAPTER VII

RESULT

The presentations of the result were divided into 2 part; the first was descriptive statistics of independent variables and dependent variables and the second was stepwise multiple regression analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics of independent variables were shown by using mean and standard deviation (S.D.) in the table 7.1, 7.2. and7.3 and by using frequency and percentage in the table 7.4

Table 7.1 Results of Past Academic Grade and Socioeconomic Status (interval scale)

	X	S.D.
Expense	3154.05	1241.77
Education of Father	8.95	6.05
Education of Mother	8.46	5.51
Past Academic Grade		
5th	2.76	0.36
4th	2.78	0.37

1. Expense (Table 7.1)

It was found that the average expense recieved per month of the dental students was 3154.05 bath (S.D. = 1241.77)

2. Education of Parents (Table 7.1)

It was found that the level of education of father was nearly the same as the level of education of mother. Mean of education of father and mother were 8.95 year and 8.46 year respetively (S.D. = 6.05 and 5.51 respectively which wer the level of secondary school.

3. Past Academic Grade (Table 7.1)

It was found that the fourth year grade was nearly equal to the fifth year grade. Mean of the fourth year and fifth year grade were 2.76 and 2.78 respectively (S.D.= 0.36 and 0.37 respectively)

Table 7.2 Results of Study Habits and Attitudes

STUDY HABITS AND ATTITUDES	X	S.D.
Delay Avoidance	85.08	9.96
Working Method	83.00	9.10
Teacher Approval	83.05	10.42
Educational Acceptance	89.08	7.84

4. Study Habits and Attitudes (Table 7.2)

It was found that mean of educational acceptance was the highest (X=89.08, S.D. =7.84) and the second was delay avoidance (X=85.08, S.D.=9.69) The lowest were working method and teacher approval (X=83.00, S.D.=9.10 and X=83.05, S.D.=10.42) which were nearly the same.

Table 7.3 Results of Opinion on Instruction of Each Department and Average All the Departments

	Content		Activities		Evaluation		Teacher		Facilities	
	X	S.D.	X	S.D.	X	S.D.	X	S.D.	X	S.D.
Surg	21.54	3.96	23.70	3.45	16.46	2.22	29.95	2.24	29.08	4.75
Pedo	22.89	2.51	24.84	3.07	19.54	1.68	29.05	3.20	27.30	3.92
Diag	17.73	2.55	20.43	3.34	15.89	2.33	27.22	2.62	27.49	4.17
Ortho	17.68	2.73	21.19	3.61	16.32	2.94	25.62	4.44	27.60	3.69
Perio	19.76	2.89	21.08	3.50	16.95	2.11	29.35	3.34	26.46	3.57
Resto	19.76	2.81	18.32	3.65	15.87	3.06	19.73	4.39	22.11	3.51
Prost	19.41	2.99	21.97	3.36	17.62	2.62	28.30	3.52	22.89	3.60
Occlu	15.49	3.12	17.38	3.17	15.22	2.34	21.65	3.46	22.14	4.10
All Clinic	17.97	2.87	18.05	3.79	10.97	2.96	22.24	3.69	21.76	3.59

5. Opinion on Instruction

It was found that the mean of the opinion on instruction of Restorative Department and Oral Biolgy Department were lower than the others. And the highest was Pedodontic Department the details of each department were in the table 7.3

Table 7.4 Results of Socioeconomic Status (nominal scale)

		f	%
SEX	MALE	15	40.5
	FEMALE	22	59.5
OCCUPATION	OFFICER	13	35.1
OF FATHER	COMMERCIAL	24	64.9
OCCUPATION	OFFICER	10	27.0
OF MOTHER	COMMERCIAL	22	59.5
	NONE	5	13.5

6. Sex and Occupation of Parents (Table 7.4)

It was found that the female dental students were more than the male dental students (male = 40.5% and female = 59.5%). The occupation of parents of the students were only officer and commercial, and the commercial was more than the officer.

Table 7.5 Results of the Clinical Practicum Grade

	6th		Cum 6th	
	X	S.D.	X	S.D.
Surg	2.32	0.48	2.48	0.44
Pedo	2.70	0.74	2.73	0.68
Diag	2.95	0.66	2.92	0.34
Ortho	2.65	0.92	2.65	0.92
Perio	3.24	0.55	2.89	0.47
Resto	2.81	0.78	2.66	0.58
Prost	2.76	0.79	2.91	0.52
Occlu	2.89	0.81	2.82	0.59
All Clinic	2.75	0.40	2.75	0.36

7. The Clinical Practicum Grade (dependent variables, Table 7.5)

It was found that Oral Surgery Department had the lowest mean in both the sixth year clinical practicum grade and the sixth year cumulative clinical practicum grade (X = 2.32, S.D. = .48 and X = 2.48, S.D. = .44 respectively). And the sixth year clinical practicam grade of average all clinic was the same as the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade and the details of every departments were shown in the table 7.5

Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis

Stepwise multiple regression was employed for analysis and devided into 2 parts; the first, the sixth year clinical practicum grade was used as the dependent variable and the second, the sixth year cumulative clinical practicum grade was used as the dependent variable.

1. For average all clinic, using the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.6 and 7.7)

Table 7.6 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Average all Clinic (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

All Clinic	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FIFTH GR,	0.4456	0.1986	0.1986	8.673***

The variable that entered on the first step number was the fifth year grade, and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.1986. And after that there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was the fifth year grade which could explain 19% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of average all clinic.

Table 7.7 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Average all Clinic (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

All Clinic	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FIFTH GR.	0.4456	0.5712	0.1939	2.945***

R	=	0.4456
S.E. est	=	0.4173
a	=	1.1671
p	=	<0.001***
	=	<0.01**
	=	<0.05 *

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B) between the fifth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.4456 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.001 (p<0.001). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 1.167 + 0.5716 \quad 5^{th}GR$$
$$Z = 0.4456 \quad 5^{th} \ GR$$

2. For Oral Surgery Department, using the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.8 and 7.9)

Table 7.8 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Oral Surgery Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Oral Surgery	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 EDU Mo	0.3772	0.1423	0.1423	5.806*

The variable that entered on the first step number was education of mother, and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.1423. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was the education of mother which could explain 14% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Oral Surgery Department.

Table 7.9 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Oral Surgery Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Oral Surgery	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 EDU Mo	-0.3772	-0.0325	0.0135	-2.410*

R	=	0.3772
S.E. est	=	0.4458
a	=	2.5991
p	=	<0.001***
	=	<0.01**
	=	<0.05 *

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B)between education of mother and the dependent variable was -0.3772 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.05 (p<0.05). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 2.5991 - 0.0325 \text{ EDU Mo}$$
$$Z = -0.3772 \text{ EDU Mo}$$

3. For Pedodontic Department, using the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.10 and 7.11)

Table 7.10 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Pedodontic Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Pedodontic	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FIFTH GR	0.4646	0.2158	0.2158	9.634***

The variable that entered on the first step number was the fifth year grade, and the correlation of determinant(R^2) was 0.2158. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly.

This showed that the best predictor was the fifth year grade which could explain 21% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Pedodontic Department

Table 7.11 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Pedodontic Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Pedodontic	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FIFTH GR	0.4646	0.9590	0.3090	3.104***
R =	0.4646			
S.E. est =	0.6649			
a =	0.0541			
p =	<0.001***			
=	<0.01**			
=	<0.05 *			

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B) between the fifth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.4646 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.001 (p<0.001). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 0.541 + 0.959 \ 5^{th}GR$$
$$Z = 0.4646 \ 5^{th}GR$$

4. For Orthodontic Department, using the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.12 and 7.13)

Table 7.12 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Orthodontic Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Orthodontic	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 SEX	0.4354	0.1896	0.1896	8.188***

The variable that entered on the first step number was sex, and the correlation of determinant(R^2) was 0.1896. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was sex which could explain 18% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Orthodontic Department.

Table 7.13 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Orthodontic Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Orthodontic	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 SEX	-0.4354	-0.8000	-2.796	-2.861***
R	= 0.4354			
S.E. est	= 0.8350			
a	= 3.0000			
p	= <0.001***			
	= <0.01**			
	= <0.05 *			

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B) between sex and the dependent variable was -0.4354 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.001 ($p<0.001$). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 3 - 0.8 \text{ SEX}$$
$$Z = -0.4354 \text{ SEX}$$

5. For Periodontic Department, using the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.14 and 7.15)

Table 7.14 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Periodontic Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Periodontic	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FIFTH GR	0.3778	0.1428	0.1428	5.827*

The variable that entered on the first step number was the fifth year grade, and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.1427. And after that, there were no variable that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was the fifth year grade which could explain 14% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Periodontic Department.

Table 7.15 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Periodontic Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Periodontic	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FIFTH GR	0.3778	0.5772	0.2391	2.414*
R	= 0.3778			
S.E. est	= 0.5146			
a	= 1.6490			
p	= <0.001***			
	= <0.01**			
	= <0.05 *			

It was found that standardized regression coefficient(B) between the fifth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.3778 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.05 (p<0.05). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 1.649 + 0.5772 \; 5^{th} \; GR$$

$$Z = 0.3778 \; 5^{th} \; GR$$

6. For Restorative Department, using the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.16 and 7.17)

Table 7.16 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Restorative Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Restorative	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FIFTH GR	0.4195	0.1760	0.1760	7.476*

The variable that entered on the first step number was the fifth year grade, and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.1760. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was the

fifth year grade which could explain 17% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Restorative department.

Table 7.17 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Restorative Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Restorative	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FIFTH GR	0.4195	0.9077	0.3320	2.734***
R =	0.4195			
S.E. est =	0.7143			
a =	0.3039			
p =	<0.001***			
=	<0.01**			
=	<0.05 *			

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B) between the fifth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.4195 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.001 (p<0.001). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 3.039 + 0.9077 \; 5^{th} \; GR$$
$$Z = 0.4195 \; 5^{th} \; GR$$

7. For Prosthetic Department, using the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.18 and 7.19)

Table 7.18 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Prosthodontic Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Prosthodontic	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FIFTH GR	0.3772	0.1432	0.1423	5.807*

The variable that entered on the first step nuber was the fifth year grade, and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.1423. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was the fifth year grade which could explain 14% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Prosthodontic Department.

Table 7.19 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Prosthodontic Department (the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Prosthodontic	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FIFTH GR	0.3772	0.8372	0.3474	2.410*
R =	0.3772			
S.E. est =	0.7477			
a =	0.4444			
p =	<0.001***			
=	<0.01**			
=	<0.05 *			

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B) between the fifth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.3772 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.05 (p <0.05). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 0.4444 + 0.8372 \ 5^{th}GR$$
$$Z = 0.3772 \ 5^{th}GR$$

8. For average all clinic, using the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.20 and 7.21)

Table 7.20 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Average All Clinic (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

All Clinic	R	R²	R² change	F
1 FOURTH GR	0.5406	0.2923	0.2923	14.454***

The variable that entered on the first step numbner was the fourth year grade, and the correlation of determinant(R²) was 0.2923. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was the fourth year grade which could explain 29% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of average all clinic.

Table 7.21 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Average All Clinic (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

All Clinic	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FOURTH GR	0.5406	0.5286	0.1390	3.802***

R   = 0.5406

S.E. est = 0.3097

a   = 1.2824

p   = <0.001***

         = <0.01**

         = <0.05 *

It was found that standardized regression coefficient(B) between the fourth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.5406 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.001 (p <0.001). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 1.2824 + 0.5286 \text{ 4}^{th}\text{ GR}$$
$$Z = 0.5406 \text{ 4}^{th}\text{ GR}$$

9. For Oral Surgery Department, using the 6th year cumulative practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.22 and 7.23)

Table 7.22 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Oral Surgery Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Oral Surgery	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FOURTH GR	0.6263	0.3922	0.3922	22.589***
2 T Surg	0.6871	0.4721	0.0799	15.204***

The variable that entered on the first step number was the fourth year grade, and the correlation of determinant(R^2) was 0.3922 . And when opinion on teacher entered on the second step number, it could increase the

correlation of determinant significantly (R^2= 0.4721). And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictors were the fourth year grade and opinion on teacher which could explain 47% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Oral Surgery Department.

Table 7.23 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Oral Surgery Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Oral Surgery	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FOURTH GR	0.6448	0.7577	0.1467	5.164***
2 T Surg	0.2832	0.0553	0.0244	2.268*
R =	0.6871			
S.E. est =	0.3262			
a =	-1.2787			
p =	<0.001***			
=	<0.01**			
=	<0.05 *			

It was found that standardized regression coefficient(B) of the fourth year grade and opinion on teacher were 0.6448 and 0.2832 respectively. The combination of the independent variables could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.001 (p<

0.001). The regression equation respectively in raw scores
and standard scores were :

$$Y = 1.2787 + 0.7577 \text{ 4}^{th} \text{ GR} + 0.0533 \text{ T Surg}$$
$$Z = 0.6448 \text{ 4}^{th} \text{ GR} + 0.2832 \text{ T Surg}$$

10. For Pedodontic Department, using the 6th year
cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent
variable. (Table 7.24 and7.25)

Table 7.24 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Pedodontic
Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade
as the dependent variable)

Pedodontic	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FOURTH GR	0.4467	0.1996	0.1996	8.727**

The variable that entered on the first step number
was the fourth year grade, and the correlation of
determinant(R^2) was 0.1996. And after that, there were
no variables that could increase the correlation of
determinant significantly. This showed that the best
predictor was the fourth year grade which could explain 19%
of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Pedodontic
Department.

Table 7.25 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Pedodontic Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Pedodontic	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FOURTH GR	0.4467	0.8219	0.2782	2.954**
R =	0.4467			
S.E. $_{est}$ =	0.6198			
a =	0.4461			
p =	<0.001***			
=	<0.01**			
=	<0.05 *			

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B) between the fourth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.4467 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.01 (p <0.01). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 0.4461 + 0.8219 \ 4^{th} \ GR$$
$$Z = 0.4467 \ 4^{th} \ GR$$

11. For Oral Diagnosis Department, using the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.26 and 7.27)

Table 7.26 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Oral Diagnosis Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Oral Diagnosis	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FOURTH GR	0.3267	0.1067	0.1067	4.182*

The variable that entered on the first step number was the fourth year grade and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.1067. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was the fourth year grade which could explain 10% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Oral Diagnosis Department.

Table 7.27 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Oral Diagnosis Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Oral Diagnosis	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FOURTH GR	0.3267	0.3001	0.1468	2.045*

R   =   0.3267

S.E. est =   0.3269

a   =   2.0900

p   =   <0.001***

        =   <0.01**

        =   <0.05 *

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B) between the fourth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.3267 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.05 (p <0.05). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 2.09 + 0.3001 \ 4^{th} \ GR$$
$$Z = 0.3267 \ 4^{th} \ GR$$

12. For Orthodontic Department, using the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. (Table 7.28 and7.29)

Table 7.28 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Orthodontic Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Orthodontic	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 SEX	0.4691	0.2201	0.2201	9.879**

The variable that entered on the first step number was sex, and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.2201. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was sex which could explain 22% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Orthodontic Department.

Table 7.29 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Orthodontic Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Orthodontic	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 SEX	-0.4691	-0.8667	0.2757	-3.143*
R	= 0.4691			
S.E. est	= 0.8235			
a	= 3.0000			
p	= <0.001***			
	= <0.01**			
	= <0.05 *			

It was found that standardized regression coefficeint (B) between sex and the dependent variable was -0.4691 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.01 (p<0.01). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 3 - 0.8667 \text{ SEX}$$

$$Z = -0.4691 \text{ SEX}$$

13. For Periodontic Department, using the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable.(Table 7.30 and 7.31)

Table 7.30 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Periodontic Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Periodontic	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FOURTH GR	0.3974	0.1579	0.1579	6.564*

The variable that entered on the first step number was the fourth year grade, and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.1579. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was the fourth year grade which could explain 15% of the variation in clinical praticum grade of Periodontic Department.

Table 7.31 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Periodontic Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Periodontic	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FOURTH GR	0.3974	0.5069	0.1979	2.562*

R   =   0.3974

S.E. $_{est}$ =   0.4408

a   =   1.4767

p   =   <0.001***

        =   <0.01**

        =   <0.05 *

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B) between the fourth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.3974 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.05 (p <0.05). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 0.14767 + 0.506 \; 4^{th} \; GR$$
$$Z = 0.3974 \; 4^{th} \; GR$$

14. For Restorative Department, using the 6th year cumulative clnical practicum grade as the dependent variable.(Table 7.32 and7.33)

Table 7.32 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Restorative Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Restorative	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FORURTH GR	0.4576	0.2094	0.2094	9.270***
2 W.M.	0.5478	0.3001	0.0907	7.288***
3 D.A.	0.6938	0.4808	0.1807	10.187***
4 E Resto	0.7488	0.5607	0.0799	10.212***
5 FOURTH GR	0.7308	0.5340	-0.0267	12.605***

The variable that entered on the first step mumber was the fourth year grade and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.2094. The second step number was working method, R^2=0.3001. The third step number was delay avoidance, R^2 = 0.4808. The fourth step number was evaluation, R^2 = 0.5607. But when the evaluation entered on the fourth step, the regression coefficient of the fourth year grade, the first step number, was not significant. Thus, the fourth year grade could not combine in the equation, and had to be removed from the equation and R^2 was 0.5340. This showed that the best predictors were working method, delay avoidance, and evaluation which could explain 53% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Restorative Department.

Table 7.33 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Restorative Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Restorative	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 W.M.	-0.9071	-0.0574	-0.0123	-4.683***
2 D.A.	0.9633	0.0557	0.0111	4.974***
3 E Resto	0.4101	0.0772	0.0226	3.423***

R = 0.7308

S.E. est = 0.4103

a = 1.4572

p = <0.001***

= <0.01**

= <0.05 *

It was found that standardized regression coefficient(B) of working method, delay avoidance, and opinion on evaluation wer -0.9071, 0.9633, and 0.4101 respectively. The combination of the independent variables could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.001 (p<0.001). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

Y = 1.4572 - 0.0574 W.M. + 0.0557 D.A. + 0.0772 E Resto

Z = -0.9071 W.M. + 0.9633 D.A. + 0.4101 E Resto

15. For Oral Biology Department (Occlusion), using the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable.(Table 7.34 and 7.35)

Table 7.34 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Oral Biology Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Occlusion	R	R^2	R^2 change	F
1 FOURTH GR	0.3748	0.1405	0.1405	5.719*

The variable that entered on the first step number was the fourth year grade, and the correlation of determinant (R^2) was 0.1405. And after that, there were no variables that could increase the correlation of determinant significantly. This showed that the best predictor was the fourth year grade which could explain 14% of the variation in clinical practicum grade of Oral Biology Department (Occlusion).

Table 7.35 Stepwise Multiple Regression of Oral Biology Department (the 6th year cumulative clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable)

Occlusion	B	b	S.E.b.	t
1 FOURTH GR	0.3748	0.5974	0.2498	2.391*

R	=	0.3748
S.E. est	=	0.5565
a	=	1.1646
p	=	<0.001***
	=	<0.01**
	=	<0.05 *

It was found that standardized regression coefficient (B) between the fourth year grade and the dependent variable was 0.3748 and could explain the variation of the dependent variable at significant level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). The regression equation respectively in raw scores and standard scores were :

$$Y = 1.1646 + 0.5974 \text{ 4}^{th}\text{ GR}$$
$$Z = 0.3748 \text{ 4}^{th}\text{ GR}$$

16. For Oral Diagnosis Department and Oral Biology Department(Occlusion), using the 6th year clinical practicum grade as the dependent variable. It was found that there were no variables that could enter on the step number of

stepwise multiple regression.

17. For Prosthodontic Department, using the 6th year cumulative clinical praacticum grade as the dependent variable. It was found that there were no variables that could enter on the step number of stepwise multiple regression.