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CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

A review of empirical findings indicates not only the relevance and significance of the problem of study but also the appropriateness of the methodology adopted and the process of the analysis of the research work undertaken. While a research review directs the researcher at every stage of his work it gives the readers the right perspective to understand as well as appreciate the procedure followed in studying the problem.

Reviews of related studies are presented under three major divisions viz., studies on 'teaching', 'student evaluation of teaching' and 'student evaluation of teaching as feedback to teachers'.
3.2 STUDIES ON TEACHING

The present study conceives of teaching as a system of activities intended to induce learning. So only studies which include at least one variable of the behaviour or characteristic of teachers, are reviewed. Researches dealing with behaviours or characteristics of learners, nature of objectives, and curriculum which are not related to teacher variables have not been included in the review.

3.2.1 Studies prior to 1960:

After reviewing research on teaching effectiveness published between 1900 and 1952, Marsh and Wilder (1954) concluded that no single specific observable teacher act had been identified till then, whose frequency or presence of occurrence was invariably and significantly correlated with student achievement.

Fattu (1962) and Hawson (1960) separately reviewed research on predictor criteria and teacher effectiveness and concluded that research had failed to substantiate links for teacher effectiveness with presage variables like intelligence, age, experience, cultural background, socio-economic background, sex, marital status, scores on aptitude tests, job interest, voice quality and special aptitudes. There was however, slight positive correlation between scholarship and teaching effectiveness.

Teaching process, during this period, was evaluated more in terms of subjective assessment and the research results
were not encouraging.

3.2.2 Studies During the Sixties

Research since 1960 had optimistically begun to relate certain teacher behaviours to specific consequences in the climate of the classroom and in the academic achievement of pupils. Use of sophisticated observation tools like the one constructed by Flanders (FICS) and computers that handle large quantities of data have facilitated studies in this direction.

Flanders (1960) using his observational tool for interaction in the classroom, studied the verbal behaviours of teachers. He found that pupils of more flexible teachers scored higher in mathematics and social studies and that dependent-prone pupils learned more in geometry than independent-prone pupils while working with a more indirect teacher.

Ryan (1960) reported that high positive correlation was found to exist between productive pupil behaviour (alertness, participation, confidence, responsibility, etc.,) and the following three facets of teacher behaviour:

1) Understanding and friendly
2) Organized and businesslike
3) Stimulating and original

Fielstra (1963) compared the top and bottom quartiles of 200 secondary level student teachers who were given a composite rating on teaching performance. His finding is that measures which best discriminate the two groups of student teachers are
the following:

1) Adaptability to a variety of teaching situations

ii) Skill in planning

iii) Success in carrying out plans

iv) Resourcefulness in teaching and

v) Effective teacher - pupil relationship

In Britain, Poole (1964) conducted an elaborate experiment on classroom behaviour and pupil learning. A week's mathematics lessons in various schools were tape-recorded and filmed. The pupils were all of the age 13+ and having IQ between 95 and 100. Failure to learn appeared to be much more dependent on lack of opportunity for student to ask questions and recognition and correction of errors than on inattentiveness.

Research during this period mainly related certain teacher behaviours to specific consequences in the climate of the classroom and the academic achievements of pupils. The salient feature is the use of objective tools for the assessment of teaching process.

3.2.3 Studies since 1970:

During the sixties teaching came to be regarded as an art and as such researchers were concerned with methods that were supposed to be good on a subjective basis. Those who were apathetic towards this subjective bias turned their attention to the study of 'curriculum', carefully avoiding research on 'methods'. This trend as Brophy (1979) points out, resulted in
The situation, however, began to change as a result of social concern about declining student achievement, teacher accountability and related issues. The stress was therefore placed on outcome, especially that of cognitive growth, as the criteria of teaching effectiveness.

Currently, a more realistic approach to the study of teaching is that of viewing teacher activity as a function of a constellation of factors. Teachers must not only master particular skills, but know when to use them. Teacher acts are not generalized to constructs such as indirectness, warmth and permissiveness but to less abstract constructs which may be constituted by operationally defined teacher characteristics. Teacher acts are related to contexts before conclusion regarding teacher characteristic is arrived at. The emphasis is also more on cognitive outcomes than on affective outcomes (Brophy, 1975).

The effectiveness of a teacher depends to a large extent upon the combination of techniques he employs in the teaching-learning situation in the classroom and this is known as the style of his teaching. Although there are some styles that should be discouraged, there is no single style which is better than all the rest (Bligh, 1975).

Teaching styles may be identified based on observation or student ratings or judgments. Ryan (1967) made a very large number of observations and identified three
basic teaching styles:

i) the friendly, understanding and sympathetic

ii) the responsible, businesslike and systematic and

iii) the stimulating and imaginative.

Using factor analysis, Greenwood et al. (1973), derived eight factors of teaching from specific items of behaviour: facilitation of learning, obsoloscence of presentation, commitment to teaching, evaluation, voice communication, openness, concurrency of knowledge and rapport.

It is evident from the studies reviewed that the study of teaching process is mainly on observation by experts or opinions of students and their criteria are related to student growth or achievement.

3.2.4 Characteristics of Effective Teaching:

The researchers in the field of teaching and teachers who are interested in professional improvement are particular in finding the criteria or characteristics of effective teaching often on the basis of student perception. Student evaluation forms include teacher characteristics or teacher behaviour which affect learning. The role dimensions and characteristic which have been identified in few studies are given below:

Sorensen and others (1963) attempted to develop an instrument that would assess teacher role expectations. A form was designed to measure six role dimensions viz.,
(i) Information given (ii) Disciplinarian (iii) Advisor
(iv) Counselor (v) Motivator (vi) Referrer—and was
administered to 284 students. All these six factors were
confirmed through factor analysis.

Two groups of students (691 and 569) in introductory psychology were asked to rate their instructors on a
46-item questionnaire in a study by Isaacson and others
(1969). Six items consistently appeared after factor
analysis over two surveys administered in different semesters
with different students and teachers. They were (i) Skill
(ii) Overload (difficulty) (iii) Structure (planning and
organization) (iv) Feedback (of performance) (v) Group
interaction and (vi) Student–teacher rapport.

Student preferences for types of college professors were studied by Yamamoto and Dizney (1966). The few roles
in order of preferences given by juniors were: (i) Teacher
(ii) Researcher (iii) Socialite and (iv) Administrator.
Researcher (ii) gains preference in the case of graduates.

Crawford and Bradshaw (1968) analysed the perception
of 300 students who were asked to describe the characteristics
of the most effective professor they knew. A list of
thirteen characteristics emerged in their study which is
given below:

1) Knowledge of the subject
2) Organisation
3) Enthusiasm
4) Interest in students
5) Encouragement of student participation
6) Ability to relate subject to other fields
7) Speaking ability
8) Lack of defensive attitudes
9) Clear criteria for evaluation
10) Variety of teaching methods
11) Sense of humour
12) Neat appearance
13) Punctuality

Two nearly identical studies designed to determine teaching characteristics most predictive of college students' over all judgment of teaching effectiveness were analysed separately by French-Lazovik, Grace (1974). The first study was carried out at the University of Washington during the 1956-57 academic year, and the second at the University of Pittsburgh during 1971-72.

The high-ranking items (rank order indicates the relative contribution of the item to the over all prediction) on the two lists gives a picture of surprising consistency across a 15-year time span on two quite different student and
faculty populations. Five of the items taken from Guthrie's (1954) list in the early fifties and included in Washington study (1956-57) were in top 10 in that study. They were:

i) Knowledge of the subject

ii) Arousal of student interest

iii) Teacher's interest in the subject

iv) Good use of examples and illustrations

v) Clarity of explanations

Four of Guthrie's items included in the study (1971-72) of the University of Pittsburg were the top 4 in it. The items were:

i) Clarity

ii) Arousal of student interest

iii) Use of examples

iv) Knowledge of subject

From this study it is apparent that some of the criteria used by college students in judging their teachers surprisingly remain unchanged over several decades.

A review of seven factor analytic studies among college students by Cashim (1973) revealed the following factors as common to all the studies:

i) Course generalization

ii) Workload or difficulty level of course

iii) Student-teacher rapport and interaction

iv) General teaching skills
v) Instructor impact
vi) Stimulation and interest and
vii) Grading and evaluation methods

A few characteristics consistently appear in all the studies. It is therefore, evident that there are a few fixed characteristics which are perceived as important whatever be the sample.

3.3 STUDIES ON STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Studies related to reliability and validity of student evaluation of teaching are first reviewed. Then follows the review of studies on colleague evaluation and self-evaluation. Finally factors - student variables and teacher variables - affecting student evaluation of teaching, in the empirical studies are reviewed.

3.3.1 Reliability:

The reliability or the consistency with which students are capable of evaluating their teachers has to be ascertained before the judgments of students could be accepted and put to use for specific purposes. Researchers have looked at this problem from different angles.

The question regarding reliability was studied by Guthrie (1927) as early as in 1925. He adopted ranking procedure and found the coefficient of correlation between rankings at an interval of two weeks. Two hundred and eighty-five student
at the University of Washington ranked their teachers in order of quality. Teachers on whom fewer than 5 rankings were available were not included in the samples. The correlation between the two sets of ranks was 0.89. The same experiment was repeated with 365 freshmen with not more than six weeks' acquaintance with the teachers. The correlation in this case was 0.72. It is natural that a fortnight interval in the case of freshmen would show more changes than in the case of students who had many months of acquaintance with the teachers.

Guthrie (1954) summarized the results of work carried on at the University of Washington over several years by careful attention to improvement in the technique and administration of surveys through student ratings he could raise the reliability of student evaluation to 0.94. He compared student ratings made a year or more apart on several hundred teachers and the correlations were of the order of .87 to .89.

Using Washington Registration Scale, Vokes (1962) measured clarity of teacher's explanation and increase in student interest in the subject. Over 2000 students rated 305 teachers in four years' study. Taking a 2-year interval, ratings given by different groups of students correlated .37 for this period.

Miklich (1969) taught two introductory courses in psychology in two groups of 41 and 65 students at Hawaii University. One of the courses he had taught several times before and knew well and the other was a course which he was teaching for the first time. For the new course, he explained
the examination procedure at a special testing session in mid-term. There were considerable differences in the ratings by the two classes. There was a highly significant \( p < .004 \) difference in teachers self-reliance and confidence in favour of the familiar course and a significant \( p < .03 \) on fairness of grading in favour of the course on which he had explained the examination procedure. The study reveals that students responded realistically and therefore reliably, to actual changes in teacher behaviour.

Student judgement, thus, changes over time as do complex matters related to human beings. But the judgement does not fluctuate so widely as to be unpredictable. The ratings are sensitive to changes in teacher behaviour.

3.3.2 Validity:

Since student growth is regarded as the ultimate criterion of teacher effectiveness, research results showing the relationship between this factor and student evaluation are considered to be evidence for the validity of student evaluation.

Using the Purdue Rating Scale for Instruction, Bendig (1953) assessed six instructors by 132 students in classes of introductory psychology. The sum of each student's standard scores on three achievement tests were correlated with items relating to course rating and to instructor rating. The correlation between achievement score and course rating was significant (.01 level) whereas correlation of achievement
and instructor rating was non-significant \((r = .140)\)

McKeachie, Lin and Mann (1971) conducted a series of five studies. Different students and instructors were involved in each study. Students assessed their teachers on a rating instrument containing questions around the dimensions of skill, overload, structure, feedback, group interaction and student-teacher rapport. Student growth was measured by Introductory Psychology Criteria Test in the first two studies, by a multiple choice test of knowledge and an essay examination for the third test, by a test of oral expression, a test of grammar and a test of reading for a French course for the fourth study, and by measures of attitudinal sophistication and achievement in introductory economics for the fifth study. The following were the findings:

i) In 4 of the studies, instructors rated high on 'skill' tended to be effective with women students.

ii) In all the 5 studies, teachers rated high in 'structure' tended to be more effective with women than with men.

iii) Teachers who were high in 'rapport' (warmth) tended to be effective on measures of student thinking.

iv) Teachers whom students rated as having an impact on beliefs were effective in changing attitudes.

The researchers concluded by suggesting that the objectives and goals of the teacher and of the students are to be known in order to determine the effectiveness of the teacher.

Sullivan and Skanes (1974) studied the relationship
between the instructor evaluations of 2300 students completed at the 10th week of the semester and their marks at the end of 13 weeks in final examinations in courses of Biology, Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, Psychology and Science. Out of the 10 correlations, 9 were positive and eight were .32 or above.

Impact of work experience in the validity of student evaluation of teaching effectiveness was studied by comparing the student evaluations of teaching in the final year and their rating after having graduated and worked for one year. The study was conducted in Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand by Firth (1979). Comparison of the two ratings showed that there was little difference in the two sets of scores. Therefore, increasing maturity and job opportunity do not significantly alter student evaluation or relative teaching effectiveness.

Most of the validity studies have used student performance on a standardized examination as a criterion. Some studies have used some other criteria of achievement as well. Several of the more recent investigations reveal higher relationships between study achievement and ratings on teachers.

Feelings of course-mastery and disposition to pursue the subject matter further etc., are effective consequences of instructions. Overall and Marsh (1979) showed the effective consequences were significantly related to student evaluation.
3.3.4 Colleague Evaluation:

Student ratings and colleague evaluation correlated well \( (r = .43 \text{ to } .69) \) in studies where colleague ratings were not based on actual classroom visits (Blackburn and Clark, 1975; Maslow and Zimmermann, 1956). It is likely that at least a part of the basis of colleague evaluation was feedback from students. Centra (1975) conducted his study at a new University when teaching reputation had not yet been established and compared colleague and student ratings. There was good agreement between the evaluation of the same colleague on different visits \( (r = .78) \) but there was much less agreement between the evaluations of different colleagues \( (r = .26) \). Such a lack of agreement precluded any good correspondence with student evaluations \( (r = .20) \).

3.3.5 Self-Evaluation:

Faculty self-evaluations are the general impressions of teaching effectiveness and not in reference to the particular course in the study of Blackburn and Clark (1975), and in their study, correlation between self-evaluation and student evaluation was only .19.

Centra (1972) asked faculty to select one particular course in which to evaluate themselves and to be evaluated by the students at the middle of the semester. Self-evaluation by the faculty tended to be more favourable than the student evaluation and the correlation between them was moderate (.21). However, items that received consistently high or low ratings
by all faculty were also given similar ratings by all students.

Webb and Nolan (1955) reported a correlation of .62 between student ratings and self-ratings of 51 'non-professional' teachers in military setting. There was however, no significant correlation between either student or self-evaluation and the supervisors who regularly evaluated the teachers.

Doyle and Crichton (1978) found .47 correlation between student ratings and self-ratings of 10 teaching assistants in charge of different sections of a multi-section course. Colleague ratings which were not based upon actual classroom observations correlated .37 with student evaluation and .32 with self-ratings.

Braskamp and others (1979) in their study, collected student evaluation from under-graduate students (207 courses) taught by faculty in the division of social sciences. Both the student evaluations and the faculty self-evaluations were summarised by 8 evaluation scores (breadth of coverage, group interaction, organisation, individual interaction, instructor enthusiasm, learning value, overall ratings of the teachers and the courses). The first 6 are the evaluation factors. There was considerable student-faculty agreement in the ratings of all the evaluation factors (.4). The findings confirmed the validity of student evaluations.

Members of the faculty evaluated their own teaching and were evaluated by the students in each of two courses in
the study by Marsch et al. (1979). Despite faculty reservation about validity of student ratings, there was considerable agreement between students and members of the faculty in the ratings.

In four of the above six studies, the correlations between student and self evaluation were high and in one it was moderate. In the study of Blackburn and Clark (1975), self evaluations of teachers were not controlled with respect to any course. The studies indicate moderate to high correlation between self and student evaluation of teaching.

3.3.5 Factors Affecting Student Evaluation:

It is being suggested by critics of student evaluation of teaching that student evaluation is affected by variables other than those connected with teaching. These factors are mainly related to the teachers or to the students.

3.3.5 Student Variables:

Not all the students in a class rate a teacher alike. There are individual differences in judging a teacher. Therefore, researchers have tried to analyze the influence of personality factors, sex, seniority etc., of students on their rating pattern of teachers.

3.3.6.1 Personality characteristics:

White and Wash (1966) studied ratings of 8 teachers by 186 students (Psychology) at the University of Georgia. The students' need of social approval was measured through Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Fiftyseven students
who were high in need of social approval as revealed by factor analysis, wanted teachers that emphasized warmth, sociability and showed friendly, cheerful, outgoing characteristics in a group-oriented classroom with strong democratic overtones. Others (131), however, wanted to identify with the teacher whom they wished to be a good leader, and a friendly but not necessarily a warm and social person. The differential rating based on differential viewpoints is only a weak tendency rather than a strong distorting effect.

Ratings on three psychology teachers from 227 students were obtained at the University of California in 1965 - 66 by Yonge and Sassenrath (1968). The students also completed the Omnibus Personality Inventory. Students, who were well-adjusted, had positive self-regard and disliked ambiguities and uncertainties, rated one type of teachers highly; students who tended to evaluate ideas and things in terms of immediate utility and were strongly religious, rated highly another type of teachers; and students with diverse interests in artistic matters rated highly yet another type of teachers. The investigators conclude that the study does not mean that the ratings are distorted by the personality characteristics of the raters and thus lack objectivity, but that human perceptions require a point of view and a context and these are part of the meaning of what is perceived.

Levinthal, Lansky and Andrews (1971) used a nine-item rating scale and rated one teacher by 263 psychology
at the University of Cincinnatti. They also secured measures of the desirability of the nine items as seen by each student. They concluded that though students' ideals did vary, this fact does not prevent them from giving a reasonably clear picture of a teacher's activities.

With regard to personality characteristics of students, the first of the three studies mentioned above finds a weak differential rating on differential viewpoints. In the second study, the authors find differential ratings of students in terms of students' personality characteristics. Levinthal, Lansky and Andrews, however, find no influence of students' personality characteristics on student ratings.

3.3.6.2 Students' sex:

The sex of the student raters bears little or no relationship to their ratings of teachers, as per the findings of Rayder (1968) and Lovell and Hanen (1965).

3.3.6.3 Students' seniority:

Some researchers have reported no effect of age or seniority, while others have shown that there is a tendency for senior students to give higher ratings (Drucker and Remmers, 1951). Rayder (1968) concludes that seniority does not affect the general ratings.

3.3.6.4 Students' marks/grades:

A tendency for students who get higher marks to rate their teachers higher can be expected, because students who are interested in the class (thereby getting higher marks)
may evaluate the teacher higher than the ones who are not interested in the class (thereby getting lower marks).

Holmes (1971) asked students in seven classes with enrolments of 100 each, to assess their instruction. Correlations were computed between students expecting A, B and C grades and their ratings of teachers on Instructor Presentation, Evaluation-Interaction and Student Stimulation. None of the items on the Instructor Presentation category was related to expected grades. Students expecting lower grades were not more critical of their instructor.

Kleine (1975), in an experiment in a large introductory course at the University of Texas, found that students who were expecting higher grades in the course tended to rate the instructor higher than students who were expecting lower grades, or who were not sure of their performance.

The majority of the studies (Spraghts 1967 and Miller 1972) indicate that the marks/grades a teacher gives do not influence the rating the students give him, except that there is a slight (not significant enough) tendency for students with better marks/grades or better expectations in the performance to rate teachers higher.

Having seen the evidences related to the supposed influence of factors that would affect ratings, it may be said that if the average rating of a group of students is considered for a teacher, the distorting effects are so mild that they could be ignored for purposes of application.
3.3.7 Teacher Variables:

Teachers often hold that evaluation by students is affected by factors such as teachers' personality, characteristics, seniority, warmth and popularity. Empirical evidences from researchers do not point to any one direction.

3.3.7.1 Teachers' personality characteristics:

Isaacson, McKeachie and Milholland (1963) used the 16 PF and a peer group nomination form on 33 teachers in Michigan University. Each teacher was also assessed on a standard form by students ranging from 35 to 40. Teaching ability was not reliably connected to four of the five factors developed from the peer group nomination form—urgency, agreeableness, dependability and emotional stability. The only factor that consistently correlated (.5) with teaching effectiveness was 'Culture'. The four sub-scales over which scores are summed to obtain a total score for culture are characterised by the following polar descriptions:

Artistically sensitive Artistically insensitive

Intellectual Unreflective, narrow

Polished, refined Crude, boorish

Imaginative Simple, direct

Sorey (1966) used the Guilford-Zimmermann Temperament survey and a Teacher self-rating Scale and studied the effect of teachers' temperament and student rating. He found that it was not always easy to distinguish best teachers from worst teachers on personality grounds. He also
discovered that students' concept of the college teacher's role in terms of personality characteristics demonstrated that the characteristics valued by teachers were associated by students with inferior teaching.

Connection between teaching ability as perceived by students and personality is not very clear from the two studies.

3.3.7.2 Teachers' seniority:

Heilman and Armentrout (1936) found no difference in rating in relation to the length of service of teachers. Riley, Ryan and Lifshitz (1950, 1969) reported in their large-scale study that younger teachers received better ratings than did the older ones. Gage (1961) reported that teachers with less experience received lower ratings as compared to teachers with more experience. After a review of studies Flood Page (1974) concluded that only a negligible part of the assessment to be accounted for by the teachers' seniority.

3.3.7.3 Rapport established with students (warmth):

Teachers generally feel that rapport between teachers and students is a factor which affects the judgment of students. Solomon, Rosenberg and Bezdek (1964) found that student rating of teaching skill was not affected by teacher warmth. Mckwachie, Lgw and Mann (1971) while studying the validity of student ratings found that those teachers rated high on rapport tended to be seen as effective in getting students to think. Isaacson,
for improving college teaching". (Cohen, 1973). Acceptance of student evaluation by teachers has its bearing on the beliefs of teachers about students' qualification in evaluating teaching. A review of studies on the feedback effect of student evaluation teaching and on the attributes of the recipients of feedback are below.

Feedback Effect of Student Evaluation on Teachers:

A study by Marsh (1977) indicates that 'most outstanding' evaluations as being more valuable than 'average' would not make a good one. Guthrie (1954) did not find there was any clear-cut connection between teaching quality and student rating. While weighing the years of work at Washington, students did not praise mere mountebanks and surface charm did not blind students to more important aspects of teaching.

Having seen the evidences related to the supposed influence of factors that would affect ratings, it may be said that if the average rating of a group of students is considered for a teacher, the distorting effects are so mild that they could be ignored for purposes of application.

3.4 STUDIES ON THE FEEDBACK OF STUDENT EVALUATION TO TEACHERS

"For all the limitations and inconsistencies revealed by research on student ratings on teaching effectiveness, there is enough promising and convergent data to suggest possible directions.
for improving college teaching". (Cohen, 1973). Acceptance of student evaluation by teachers has its bearing on the beliefs of teachers about students' qualification in evaluating teaching. A review of studies on the feedback effect of student evaluation of teaching and on the attributes of the recipients of feedback are given below.

3.4.1 Feedback Effect of Student Evaluation on Teachers:

Study by Marsh (1977) indicates that 'most outstanding' instructors perceive student evaluations as being more valuable than 'least outstanding' instructors.

Tuckman and Oliver (1968) conducted an experiment in which 256 teachers, in high school and technical institutes were rated both by students and supervisors, twice at an interval of 12 weeks. Student feedback led to positive change among teachers as measured by change in student ratings. Less experienced instructors (one to three years) showed greater receptivity to student feedback than instructors with more experience (4 or more years). Teachers seemed to be defensive towards administrators who (attempted to) tell them without much basis how to teach and feedback from supervisors had a negative effect.

In an investigation involving five colleges, Centra (1963) studied the effect of student rating on teachers who had rated themselves on the same instrument. He discovered that instructors who had rated themselves more favourably than their students had rated them changed their behaviour. Additional time
(more than a semester) plus data to aid the instructor in interpreting feedback also helped teachers to change their practices.

Miller (1971) conducted an experiment at the University of Iowa in which 36 instructors were rated on a standard rating form by their students. Students from 16 classes on three courses averaging about 20 students each completed the rating forms and were given examinations at half and full term. On two of the courses, feedback produced no more improvement in the teachers as measured by gain in examination scores than no feedback. In the third course, however, a small significant difference appeared in favour of feedback condition.

Meighan (1977) studied the worthiness of pupils' perceptions of the classroom techniques of student teachers. In his study in the Birmingham/West Midlands area, he involved three groups (English, History and Social Studies) post-graduate certificate of education students in a ten-week teaching practice. The student teachers selected a class and asked each pupil during the 8th, 9th and 10th week of the practice to write down his or her perceptions of their student teacher's classroom technique. They used a set of 16 cue questions from four areas - presentation, attitude to pupils, class management and discipline. The 21 student teachers who completed the exercise, all reported that they found it worthwhile and instructive. The results also suggest that although pupils are untrained observers, their perceptions show enough consensus
and agreement with the assessment of supervising teacher, supervising tutor and the student teacher himself to use as feedback on teaching performance for student teachers. The pupils appeared to enjoy being consulted and to take the exercise seriously.

Banadaranayake (1978) in his study collected student evaluations of members of medical faculty. The students were those who had completed the first qualifying examination in medical school. The evaluated teachers would not be involved in the next phase of the course for these students. In the first evaluation 12 teachers were evaluated by 67 students and in the second evaluation which was carried out the next year 9 teachers were evaluated by 64 students. Each teacher was provided with data of his rating and also of the mean rating for all teachers on each item. Positive change, often significant, was observed in the majority of instances for the six teachers who were evaluated twice. It was also found that halo effect arising from students of one ethnic group evaluating teachers of the same ethnic group was absent.

Study by Overall and Marsh (1979) suggests that feedback of student ratings coupled with a frank discussion of their implication with an expert can be effective for improving teaching effectiveness. The study involved 751 students in 30 sections of a course in computer programming. A randomly selected sample of teachers were given feedback from mid-term ratings. These teachers also had a discussion with the authors
on the ratings and strategies for improvement. Students in
the feedback and non-feedback sections were similar in terms
of pretest scores and mid-term ratings. It was found that
instructors who received feedback were rated more favourably at
the end of the term by their students. Final examination
scores and affective outcomes were better for the students
taught by teachers in the feedback group.

McKeachie et al., (1980) in a recent study compared
the effect upon teaching of feedback from student ratings with
the effect produced when such feedback was supplemented by
consultation with a more experienced teacher. The forty
teachers in the sample were assigned to one of three groups
which received:

1) Personal feedback of student ratings with
consultation from an experienced teacher, or

2) Computer print-out of student ratings, or

3) No student ratings.

The instructors who received consultation about their
ratings earlier in the term were rated as most effective at
the end of the term.

The results of the studies in general indicate that
the feedback effect of student rating on teachers is positive
and there is no tendency for the teachers to ignore it. There
are enough evidences for the possibility of professional
improvement for teachers by using student evaluation as a
feedback technique.
3.4.2 Attributes of the Recipients of Feedback:

The effects of feedback is likely to be related to the personal characteristics of the teacher and to the situation in which he or she operates. Empirical findings suggest that individuals may seek exposure to information which is in consonance with their position (Totem and Glasmah, 1979).

Findings of Zimbardo and Bbaren (1970) indicate that individuals with low self-esteem are more easily influenced and the individual's level of intelligence determines the effectiveness of some kind of messages. Level of tolerance to cognitive inconsistency and internal versus external locus of control (Rotter, 1966), the basic pattern of motivation (Katz, 1968) and the ego involvement with the content of the feedback are some of the important personality variables which may be related to the effect of the feedback (Rotem and Glasman, 1979).

Teachers' attitudes towards educational innovations are dependent on whether they saw the innovation as a threat to themselves or to their own status (Tobias, 1968).

There is a lack in studies examining interaction between effects of feedback and teachers personality. Miller (1971) rightly suggests that it remains desirable to gain additional information on the kinds of teachers who are affected by feedback.