CHAPTER - II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The importance of related literature cannot be denied in any research. It is an important aspect of the research project which works as a guide post, not only with regard to the work done in the field, but also to perceive the gaps and lacunas in the concerned field of research. It helps in understanding the potentialities of the problem in hand. Besides this, survey of related literature means to locate, to read and to evaluate the past as well as current literature of research concerned with the planned investigation. The time spent in such a survey is invariably a wise investment.

Like other fields, the research worker in the field of education also needs to acquire comprehensive information about what has been done in the particular area in which he intends to take up a problem for research. In the words of Scot and Mertheimer "Review of related literature may serve to avoid unnecessary worn out problems and may help to make progress towards solution of new ones"

Pointing to the necessity of survey of Related Literature, Good, Barr and Scates write, "Survey of related literature helps us to show whether evidence already available solves problems adequately without further investigation, and thus may save duplication. It may contribute to the general scholarship of the investigator by providing ideas, theories and explanations valuable in formulating the problem and may also suggest the methods of research appropriately." The main purpose of survey of literature is not compilation but an analytical review of the various researches. It stimulates and encourages the investigator to dive deep into the intricacies of the problems and enables him to formulate hypotheses regarding their possible solutions.
Due to lack of resources and time, it was not possible for the investigator to get access to the entire published and unpublished research in the field but still an attempt has been made to study the literature concerned with the investigation in the hand. For the sake of convenience, the investigator has divided the work under the following sequences.

2.1 A gist of studies reviewed
2.2 Related studies on Student Evaluation of Teachers (SET)
2.3 Studies on attitude of teachers towards student evaluation of teachers (SET)
2.4 Studies on attitude of students towards student evaluation of teachers (SET)
2.5 Relevance of present study in relation to the studies reviewed

2.1 A GIST OF STUDIES REVIEWED

In India, research in the field of student evaluation teachers is of recent origin. Consequently, research publications in the field are very limited. As can be seen in this Table-2.1 only a few reviews of Indian studies are included most of the reviews reported are of studies conducted abroad. A perusal of data in Table-2.1 suggests that out of 86 studies, only 6 (7%) are from India and the remaining 80 (93%) are from abroad. Less number of studies in India on SET are largely because of the fact that issue of SET came into focus very recently and has not yet become a reality in our institutions of higher learning. Besides, the same table also reveals that 18 (21%) of these studies are related to attitude (10.5% on teachers and 10.5% on students attitude) and the remaining 68 (79%) to other aspects of SET. It may also be noted that a large percentage of Indian studies on SET relate to attitude or opinion surveys of students or teachers whereas the studies from abroad are related either to its objectivity or reliability or validity or construction and validation of scales for the rating of faculty by students. However, it is encouraging to know that research in this area in India and abroad, as shown in the table, during the last five decades i.e. 1960 to 2000 has grown from 4 to 5 times.
### Table 2.1
A Gist of Studies Reviewed Relating to SET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Attitude of Teacher</th>
<th>Attitude of Student</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Abroad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1960-1970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1970-1980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1980-1990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1990-2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2000 till date</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 RELATED STUDIES ON STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS (SET)

Cohen and Humphreys (1960) in their study found that majors in psychology subject were found to rate courses and instructors about the same as non-majors. However, students required to take a psychology course tended to rate it lower than did students who selected other courses.¹

Crawford and Bradshaw (1968) in their study asked students to describe the characteristics of the most effective teacher they had ever had. The most frequent characteristics reported by students were

(a) knowledge of subject

(b) planned and organized lecture

(c) interest in teaching

(d) warmth toward students.²

---


Cohen and Brawer (1969) insisted that student gains toward achievement of specific objectives of a course are the ultimate criteria for evaluating effective faculty performance and also discovered that the teacher's characteristics are highly diverse.³

McKeachie (1969) found that students who performed particularly well on the test, rated their teachers are more effective than did students who performed more poorly on the test.⁴

Walker (1969) conducted a study on the relationship between the degree of teachers' teaching experiences and students' rating and found out that students' ratings tended to improve with the experience of the faculty member. A full professor tended also to receive higher student rating than did other ranks.⁵

Costein et al. (1971) examined the influence of gender on student rating of their teachers and found out the following—

(a) In four of the five studies teachers rated high on skill tended to be effective with women.
(b) In all five studies, teachers rated high in structure tended to be more effective with women than with men, and the more structured instructors tend to be ineffective for male students.
(c) Teachers who were high in 'Rapport' (warmth) tended to be effective on measures of student thinking.
(d) Teachers whom students rated as having an impact on beliefs were effective in changing attitudes.⁶

---

McKeachie et al (1971) reported that student ratings have some usefulness. Students come to a class with many different personal objectives for the class. Some of these objectives may coincide with those of the instructor, but the overlap between instructor and student goals or between the goals of differing students is certainly far from perfect. 7

Centra (1972) conducted a study on five different types of colleges in USA to find out if feedback to teachers from student evaluation would improve teaching. This very extensive research divided teachers into three testing groups of feedback, no feedback, and a control group. The results proved no significant changes among them. The surprising results were that all three groups were nearly identical in their scores, an indication that the group of instructors who received student feedback did not noticeably modify their teaching practices. 8

Klierman (1975) on the bases of her study listed eleven most provocative items which reflect faculty attitudes. The most notable are summarized below:

1. Student evaluations were used when they support the prior affirmative or negative decision of the college committee or administration.

2. All students and faculty interviewed indicated that students couldn't usually judge breadth or depth of a teacher's knowledge of his subject.

3. One of the faculty reservations was whether to include those students who are hostile toward teachers in general?

4. Whether allowing students to make unsubstantiated and anonymous charge via unsigned student evaluation was also another reservation made by the faculty.

5. The mastery of subject matter affects the evaluation.

6. Faculty feared that racial, ethnic, and sex bias of students affect evaluation of teachers by their students.


(7) Another reservation of the faculty towards student ratings was the validity of student evaluations.⁹

Dunkin and Biddle (1974) through their work found out the criteria by which teachers and teaching evaluation are numerous. They also reported the difficulties in assessing the teachers as one set of criteria couldn't be found adequately fitted to all teaching situations. Another studies conducted by Marsh (1977) in a cross-sectional study found a close agreement between retrospective ratings of former students and those of currently enrolled students towards evaluating the teachers.¹⁰

Babski, Carl (1976) from his research work found out that an instructional rating system when properly developed can provide reliable and valid information about teaching. The research findings suggest that the criteria used by students in their ratings of instructors had much more to do with course objectives and consumer satisfaction than with entertainment value. Such attributes as preparedness, clarity, and stimulation of students' intellectual curiosity were typically mentioned by students in describing their best instructor. Correlation for teacher personality characteristics were not fruitful except for the repeating characteristics that continued to appear in the research -the characteristics of warmth towards students. Other correlations of student ratings which noted were- majors tended to rate courses more highly than non majors in some cases; students required to take a course sometimes rated it lower than those for whom it was an elective; and experience and higher ranking instructors usually received higher ratings than did their less ranked or inexperienced colleagues. There was also some evidence that feedback in the form of student ratings may improve the teacher's performance.¹¹

Abbot and Perkins (1978) in their study had shown that students consider the quality of teacher-student relationship to be second in importance to a teacher's ability to present material clearly.\(^{12}\)

Marsh et al. (1979) compared student's ratings, professor's evaluation of their own teaching and expert judges rating of videotape recordings of the professors' classroom presentation. A similar pattern for each teacher was found with each of three types of measures. Those teacher which were evaluated by students as excellent were also rated high by expert judges and by themselves; ineffective teachers also were rated similarly by all these three groups. The only notable difference among the ratings was that students tended to rate teachers lower than their peers.\(^{13}\)

Centra (1979) discovered a little or no relationship between the following characteristics of students and their ratings of instruction: age, grade point average, year in college, and academic ability. No consistent relationship was found between student ratings and such variables as the amount of homework assigned or grading standards. However, Feldman (1979) found that smaller class size lead to better ratings. He also reported that students having elective courses give better rating of their instructors in comparison with other courses.\(^{14}\)

Perry et al. (1979) found out that students' expectations affect student ratings of their teacher. Students who expect a course or teacher to be good generally find their expectations confirmed.\(^{15}\)


\(^{15}\) Feldman, K.A (1979) "The significance of circumstances for college students' ratings of their teachers and courses" Research in Higher Education. 10, 149-172.

Marsh and Overall (1979) conducted a study on the student evaluation of faculty made several years after graduation (up to ten years in one study), and found remarkable consistency in students' original opinions as well as the opinions taken after they had left the institutions.\(^{16}\)

Peterson and Cooper (1980) in their study tested the notion that less demanding teachers will be rated higher if the teachers are to be evaluated by the students, and found that even strict and demanding teachers were given higher grade than those teachers who were less demanding.\(^{17}\)

Aleamoni (1981) from his studies pointed out in support of the use of student rating of teacher performance.

1. Students are the main source of information about the learning environment.

2. Students are the most logical evaluators of the quality, the effectiveness of course content, method of instruction and textbooks.

3. Student ratings of the teachers encourage communication between students and their instructors. It may lead to the student and instructor involvement in the teaching-learning process, and raise the level of instruction.

4. Student ratings of particular instructors and courses can be used by other students and instructors, and may increase the chances that excellence in instruction will be rewarded.\(^{18}\)

Braskamp et al. (1981) in their study have shown that factors other than teachers teaching ability influence such ratings. On the whole it was clear that such vari-


able had much less effect on students' ratings than the qualities students see in the individual teachers.  

Peter Cohen (1981) in his study used a meta-analytic methodology to synthesize research on the relationship between student ratings of instruction and student achievement. The average correlation between an overall instructor rating and student achievement was .43, the average correlation between an overall course rating and achievement was .47. While a large, effect sizes were also found for more specific rating dimensions such as skill and structure, other dimensions showed more modest relationship with student achievement. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis showed that rating / achievement correlations were larger for full time faculty when students knew their final grade before rating instructors and when an external evaluator grade student achievement tests. The result of the meta-analysis provides strong support for the validity of student ratings as a measure of teaching effectiveness.  

Peterson & Kauchak (1982) found that student rating of their teachers were consistent among students and reliable from over years. Franklin and Theall (1989) found that faculty familiar with SET literature made better use of their rating.  

Stedman (1983) pointed out that students evaluation of teachers effectiveness is one of the most common processes used in evaluating, promotion, tenure and other benefits. However, their reliability is so low that they should not be used for judging individual performance.  

The cross-sectional studies conducted by Marsh (1983) also revealed a close agreement between retrospective ratings of former students and those of currently enrolled students towards evaluating the teachers.23

Darlong-Hammond and others (1983) conducted a study on the reliability and validity of student rating of their teachers and found out that this method is expensive and has high degrees of reliability but it questions the validity and bias remains.24

Braskamp et.al (1984) found out from their research work that an instructor's ratings for a given course tend to be relatively consistent over successive years; there is not much variation in student ratings for an individual instructor regardless of whether the form is administered to current students or to alumni.25

Hunter (1984) pointed out that while evaluating the quality of teaching of teachers, we at least need information of diverse types, relating to diverse situations, and drawn from diverse sources. Evaluation based on any single instrument or to rely on only a single authority is mindless. Land (1985) this study proved that one set of criteria is not sufficient to all situations. Furthermore, high marks on all criteria do not indicate the most valuable teacher for all situations.26

Sorcinelli (1986) reveals that in student ratings, teachers teaching in small classes, instructors taking electives and courses in humanities tend to receive ratings that are more favourable. For each characteristic, the differences are minimal, but together they may be meaningful.27

Wigington et al. (1989) conducted a study on student ratings of instructor among different classes and instructor variables. This study involved 5,483 evaluations of 242 different classes and found out that instructors with discussion classes had higher overall ratings than other class types and smaller classes showed a higher rating than larger within a class type. There was no difference among class types in comparisons of class rank.  

Abrami et al. (1990) from their studies found out that student ratings of overall teaching effectiveness are moderately correlated with independent measures of student learning and achievement. Students of highly rated teachers achieve higher final scores, can better apply course material, and are more inclined to pursue the subject subsequently. 

Franklin and Theall (1992) studied gender issues and rating at two large universities. The overall analysis shows that gender of the teacher or the students does not have a consistent or significant affect on ratings. The deeper analysis at the first institution, using academic discipline as a variable found that in certain departments there appeared to be a gender bias favoring male faculty. Further, analysis of course assignment showed that female teachers had been assigned a predominantly heavy load of lower level, all factor associated individually with depressed rating.  

Durham and Ryan (1992) conducted a comparative study on Japanese and Australian university students on various aspects of teachers. Major findings of the study were -

(a) There were few differences between Japanese and Australian students in regards to the kinds of personality of good teachers.

(b) Japanese students were much less concerned about the subject-mastery of their teachers than Australian students.

(c) For the Japanese students helping students to think and correcting mistakes in a friendly way were more important than the Australians, who were more concerned with the imparting of knowledge than the Japanese.

(d) The Australian students believed that an impartial teacher is the most important criteria whereas the Japanese students concern that teacher should also listen to students and get to know them.\textsuperscript{31}

Freeman (1992) through his study found that students were less willing to take a course from the masculine instructor than from either the feminine or the androgynous instructor. Both female and male students prefer instructors (science instructors, in particular) who possess both feminine and masculine characteristics, regardless of the gender of the instructor.\textsuperscript{32}

Cashin (1992) found that student ratings can be influenced by class size, a very small classes tend to receive higher ratings, by discipline—humanities instructors tend to receive higher ratings than instructors in the physical sciences and by the type of teaching—instructor who used discussion courses tend to receive higher ratings than lecture courses.\textsuperscript{33}

Spencer and Flyr (1992) found that only 23% of faculty made changes to their teaching based on student evaluations and the majority of these changes were superficial, such as altering handouts, modifying presentation habits, and changing assignments.\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
Ambady and Rosenthal (1993) from there studies found that consensual judgments of college teachers' non-verbal behaviour based on a very brief silent video were 30 seconds - significantly predicted end of semester teaching evaluation scores. A charismatic teacher - mostly the ones perceived as cool - are the only one who can truly influence classroom expectations without incurring the wrath of students.35

Tagomori (1993) conducted a study on the instruments used for student evaluation of faculty. He did a content analysis of 4,028 evaluation items contained in the 200 evaluation instruments. His analysis revealed that 54.6% of the items were ambiguous, unclear and subjective. Another 24.5% of the items did not correlate with classroom teaching performance. Altogether 79.1% of the items either were flawed or did not identify with teaching performance.36

Griffée (1995) conducted a study on student feedback, self assessment and teacher evaluation by their students and found out that female students tended to rate slightly higher than the male student, 94 of high grade evaluation given to the teacher, 51 are female students and 43 male students. Students also tended to rate the teacher somewhat as they rated themselves. This indicates that student evaluation of teacher is not reliable as the students are immature.37

Simpson (1995) from his study found out that student evaluation often contains wrong global questions that would affect the evaluation grade of the teachers. So, the reliability of student rating of teachers is doubtful.38

Shimzu (1995) conducted a study on the opinion of students towards the qualities of Japanese English teachers and found out that the teachers were reliable, intelligent, and easy to acquaint with, not show favoritism and not treat students as idiots.\(^3\)

Basow (1995) analyzed various studies related to student ratings and came out that most of them examined only the main effects, whereas the results of the interaction of numerous variables may be significant if the influence occur simultaneously.\(^4\)

Hadley and Hadley (1996) conducted a survey on the opinion of the students on the concept of good teachers. The most frequent answer given by students were kind hearted, friendly, impartial, understandable, cheerful, punctual, fun loving, enthusiastic and humorous.\(^5\)

Kelly (1996) conducted a study on the validity of student's teaching evaluation scores and they replicated the instrument factor structure very closely, yielding five factors virtually identical to those of a previous study that used two different population. For construct validation, they developed a preliminary theoretical model that predicts different effects on sets of variables on student ratings of teachers. Student expectations about teachers had noteworthy effect on all dimensions of teaching effectiveness. Class size, teacher experience had much weaker effects on the ratings.\(^6\)

---

Nerger et al. (1997) pointed out that most researchers agreed that students' evaluations of university teaching are used primarily for constructive purposes, such as to encourage instructors to improve their teaching effectiveness and to inform the students about their selection of courses.43

Elisha Babad et al. (1999) conducted a research on warm/cold instructor using students' evaluation of teaching (SET) as dependent variables. Students completed attributed course evaluation form three times (a) after receiving fabricated warm or cold information but before seeing the instructor; (b) after a 30 minutes exposure to the instructor in an introductory lecture; and (c) at the end of the semester. In the first administration, strong warm/cold difference was found for the social components of SET, and warm instructor was judged as more lenient. In the larger courses of instructor, the cold instructor was judged higher than the warm one in academic component of SET. In the second administration, following a 30-minute exposure to the instructor, students' judgments changed considerably, and most warm/cold effects disappeared and found a moderate level of perseverance. In the third administration, all warm/cold differences practically disappeared. These findings were interpreted as demonstrating students flexibility in accommodating their judgments to the accumulating real-life information. It argued that although cognitive factors determine a certain level of perseverance, motivational factors and cognitive style play a major role in determining whether initial judgments will persevere or not. Students' personal beliefs in human changeability were found related to their actual change in judgment. Thus, perseverance of judgments is also related to systematic individual differences in students' cognitive style.44


Balachandran (2000) indicated that women teachers were slightly more susceptible to feedback than male teachers.\(^{45}\)

Theall and Franklin (2001) state that student spend a full term in the course, observe the instructor in class and in interactions with students, and can accurately judge what or how much they have learned with respect to their knowledge at entry. Students report the frequencies of teacher behaviors, the amount of work required, and the difficulty of the material. They can answer the questions about the clarity of lectures, the value of readings and assignments, the clarity of the instructor's explanations, the instructor's availability and helpfulness, and many other aspects of the teaching and learning process. No one else is as qualified to report on what transpired during the term simply because no one else is present for as much of the term.\(^{46}\)

Centra (2003) after analyzing various studies on students evaluation of teaching found out that student evaluations are (a) reliable and stable; (b) valid when compared with student learning and other indicators of effective teaching; (c) useful in improving teaching; and (d) minimally affected by various course, teacher or student characteristics that could bias results.\(^{47}\)

Penny (2003) found out that the results of student ratings provide evaluators with valid, reliable and valuable data concerning the quality and effectiveness of teaching.\(^{48}\)

---


Mary Gray and Bergman (2003) from their study found that student ratings of teachers measure only student satisfaction, and does not really assess the effectiveness of teacher. This study also found out sex of the teacher, physical appearance and other extraneous factor affect student evaluation, which indicate that it is not reliable.\textsuperscript{49}

Evans (2004) after reviewing the findings of various researches relating to student ratings of teachers, found that the fears of teachers on student ratings are largely unfounded and student evaluate their teachers reliably, regardless of how they themselves are graded.\textsuperscript{50}

Surowiecki, (2004) on the bases of a study reported that the central issue in the student evaluation of teaching is the notion of teaching effectiveness. as reflected by teaching scores.\textsuperscript{51}

Eric Landrum and Ronna (2004) conducted a study on the relationship between student performance and instructor evaluation. Results from the present study indicate that while course and instructor evaluations seem related, there were subtle differences in those items or factors that influence the outcome of these measures. These results help to update and revisit the issue of student performance and course and instructor evaluations, and continual work in this area needs to be conducted in order to better understand the relationship between course and instructor evaluations, and what factors influence these evaluations.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{49} Mary Gray and Barbara Bergman (2003). Student Teaching Evaluation, Inaccurate, Demeaning, Misused, September-October, 2003, Academe


33
Kelly Massoni (2004) through her research work found out that Students Evaluation of Teachers is of vital importance to the careers of teachers, especially to teachers at college level. In USA evaluation results are routinely used by administration in hiring, tenure and salary decisions. They believe students are like consumers and they have the right to determine and assess the qualities of the material they receive.\textsuperscript{53}

Allan Safer et al. (2005) in this study, the student ratings of the overall effectiveness of their instructor were recorded from 75 sections of college algebra freshman classes at California State University. These ratings were appraised in relation to seven independent variables, including number of students per class, number of rows per class, mean student grade, instructor, time of the class, frequency of instruction per week and whether Web-based instruction was offered. A multiple regression analysis of the data revealed three significant findings; (1) ratings of individual instructors sizably differed. (2) mean student grades positively correlated to their ratings of the teachers. (3) the number of rows per classroom was negatively associated with student ratings, that is, the classrooms with the most row tended to yield the lowest student ratings. The last finding provides statistical support for the impression that the proximity to the teacher is important in the learning experience and that the design of the classroom matters.\textsuperscript{54}

Murray (2005) through his study reveals that student rating are reasonably stable or consistent across course years, rating forms and group of raters and also valid and accurate by the evaluation made by others.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{53} Kelley Massoni (2004) The influence of Gender on Students’ Evaluation of Teachers or Why what we can’t count can hurt us. (Unpublished manuscript, University of Kansas)


Joseph et al. (2007) conducted a study on the validity of a student evaluation of teaching scale in a business school of private colleges and found out the larger the eigenvalue, the more variance accounted for and the more important the factor is. The eigenvalues all indicate a very high percent of variance explained by the first factor before rotation. It clearly shows the dominance of one-factor solutions.\footnote{Joseph G. Glynne, Paul L. Sauer, Gregory, R. Wood (2007). Dimensionality of a Student Evaluation of Teaching Scale: A ten year review. (Available in internal)}

Marsh (2007) reported that studies relating to students' evaluation of university teachers often use a multidimensional instrument, which assess dimensions such as students' perception of the instructor's subject knowledge, preparation and organization, classroom management skills, respect for the students, workload, and value of course material. However, the reliability, stability, and applicability of students' evaluations of university teaching have been questioned on multiple grounds.\footnote{Marsh, H.W. (2007). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and usefulness. In R. Perry and J.C. Smart (Eds), The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An evidence-based perspective (pp 319-383). Netherlands: Springer.}

McKeachie (2007) found out from his study that student ratings of teachers could be biased and subject to multiple external factors outside of the instructor's ability to teach, create, and maintain an effective course. Potential biases include prior subject interest, expected grade, reason for taking the course, class size, instructor rank and gender, and student personality. Besides, this instructor could bias the rating through grading leniency and grade inflation.\footnote{McKeachie, W.J. (2007). Good teaching makes difference—And we know what it is. In R. Perry and J.C. Smart (Eds), The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An evidence-based perspective (pp.457-474). Netherlands: Springer.}

Calin Valsan (2007) found that using student rating of teacher for tenure and promotion can easily lead to mockery of the teaching profession.\footnote{Calin Valsan (2007) The invisible hands behind the Student Evaluation of Teaching: The rise of the New Managerial Elite in the Governance of Higher Education. Bishop University, Canada}
Connie Eccles (2007) reported evaluations are part of the business world, teachers should not consider themselves above other professions. In the workplace, employees are evaluated in a numbers of ways. Everybody needs evaluation to remind us to set goals and do our best.\textsuperscript{60}

Nathan (2008) conducted a study on the relationship between student ratings of course easiness and course quality. It found out that student ratings of teaching effectiveness are widely used to make judgments of faculty teaching performance but the rating may not be accurate indicators of teaching performance because they are contaminated by course easiness.\textsuperscript{61}

Boysen (2008) investigated whether there is a positive correlation between intentional revenge for low grades and student evaluations of teaching. For this study, a survey was conducted to 143 college students and found out only 8\% of students admitted taking revenge while assessing their instructors, as they believed the instructors give them low grade.\textsuperscript{62}

Hefer Bembenutty (2009) conducted a study to find out whether academic delay of gratification is positively associated with final course grade and student rating of the course and the instructor. It was found out that students rating of the course and teaching effectiveness were highly correlated (r=.68) and academic delay of gratification was significantly correlated to students' rating of the course (r=.21) and teaching effectiveness (r=.20). Delay of gratification was related to final course grade (r=.29) and teaching effectiveness was related to students' ex-

\textsuperscript{60} Connie Eccles (2007) \textbf{High School students should evaluate their teachers.} ComPortOne


pected grade and final course grade. Students' rating of the course was also related to students' expected and final course grade. Final course grade was related to expected course grade (r = .59).63

Douglas (2010). explored the factors that affect students' evaluation of economic instruction. The study used factor analysis to determine the validity and reliability of the evaluation instrument in assessing instructor or course effectiveness in principles of economic courses. Result indicated positive associations between student perception of teaching effectiveness, learning facilitation, effective communication and clarity of course elements and course evaluation and feedback.64

Jening Todd (2010) conducted a study on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) university faculty and the effect of self-disclosure in their professional life. One concern is that self-disclosure as LGBT could result in negative evaluation of one's teaching by students due to student bias against LGBT people. This study analyzed student evaluations of three-university faculty (one female bisexual, one lesbian, one transgender person) in the USA. Student evaluation from course section where faculty disclosed their lesbian, bisexual or transgender identities and were compared with evaluations from section of the same courses where lesbian, bisexual or transgender were not self-disclosed by the instructors. The finding indicates that instructor's self-disclosures had no detrimental affect upon student evaluation of instructor's teaching effectiveness.65


2.3 STUDIES ON ATTITUDE OF TEACHERS TOWARDS STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS (SET)

Kliezman (1975) from her study lists eleven most provocative items, which reflect faculty attitudes. The most notable were summarized below:

1. Student evaluations were used when they support the prior affirmative or negative decision of the college committee or administration.
2. All students and faculty interviewed indicated that students couldn't usually judge breadth or depth of a teacher's knowledge of his subject.
3. One of the faculty reservations was whether to include those students who were hostile toward teachers.
4. Whether allowing students to make unsubstantiated and anonymous charge via unsigned student evaluation was also another reservation made by the faculty.
5. The mastery of subject matter affects the evaluation.
6. Faculty feared that racial, ethnic, and sex bias of students affect evaluation of teachers by their students.
7. Another reservation of the faculty towards student ratings was the validity of student evaluations.66

Meyer et.al. (1981) in their studies found out that teachers considered evaluating of their teaching by their students as a threat, whether the evaluation is valid or invalid, the teachers usually had a negative attitude in first instance. However, it is more attuned to instruction-wide aims and structures. It also pointed out that demonstrated to improve the standard of teaching and the capacity for promoting education will be helped more than hurt by formal processes of teacher evaluation.67

Ryan et al. (1980) from his study reveal that a majority of faculty respondent's believed Student Evaluation of Teacher (SET) ratings were less influenced by academically relevant achievement and more influenced by irrelevant personal qualities of the faculty. A substantial proportion of the respondents believed they could not improve their SET rating and were not likely to try.68

Vadhera (1998) in an empirical study on the attitude of university and college teachers of North Eastern Hill University, Mizoram Campus, Aizawl, towards student's evaluation of teachers found that—

a) the percentage of college and university teachers in Mizoram, having negative attitude towards SET (51.72%) was higher than the percentage of teachers having positive attitude. The percentage of teachers having neutral attitude was 1.72%,

b) A considerably high percentage (67.24%) of teachers agreed that students were the right judges of their teachers

c) 72.41% of the teachers agreed SET would give feedback to teachers

d) Teachers opined that SET would enhance the self-respect of students and promote a sense of responsibility

e) Majority of teachers agreed that college and university students are mature enough to judge the teaching competency and style of their teachers.69

Kaur et al. (2001) in their empirical study on the attitude of teachers towards evaluation of teachers by students, wherein the data was collected from 100 teachers of Punjab Agricultural University, found that more than 50% of the respondent teachers held that students alone are not capable to evaluate the teachers and more than 60% of the teachers admitted that students cannot judg-

---

ing their teachers. The study further pointed out evaluation of teachers by the students will reduce the status of teachers and also will undermine autonomy of teachers as well as of the institution.  

George Mathew (2001) conducted a study on the attitude of English and Life Science teachers' towards Students' Evaluation of teachers, that had undergone Refresher courses training at Academic Staff College, University of Kerala, and found that teachers have already acknowledged the need for accountability in their profession. Further, a significant percentage (77%) seems to have understood, and have acknowledged the necessity of being evaluated by their students, at least as a theoretical proposition. He also found out teachers are not willing to be evaluated by students, as it can lead to personal insecurity, lack of confidence in their performance as a teachers, fear of losing respect, sort of backlash from either their peers or their students. 

Joshua and Joshua (2004) this study was designed to assess the attitudes of Nigerian secondary school teachers to student evaluation of teachers (SET), and to find out if the attitudes expressed were influenced by teacher characteristics such as gender, professional status, geographical location, academic qualification and teaching experience. The study was a survey, and made use of a researcher-designed questionnaire as research instrument. Teachers in one state in Nigeria were sampled, as similar conditions apply for teachers in all states in Nigeria. A stratified random technique was used to select 480 teachers from 20 schools. Four hypotheses were tested using t-test and four-way ANOVA. The findings were that:

(i) Nigerian teachers expressed significantly negative attitudes to SET when the results of such evaluation were to serve both formative and summative purposes, although the attitudes were more negative when the purpose was summative; and

---


71. George Mathew : Teachers' attitude towards evaluation of teachers by students, University News; A weekly Journal of Higher education, Vol.39 No 16, April,16-22, p.1-8
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(ii) the attitudes expressed by Nigerian teachers to SET were not significantly influenced by the gender, academic qualification and teaching experience of the teachers under the two forms of purposes. However, under both purposes, teachers in urban areas were found to express relatively more negative attitudes to SET than their counterparts in rural areas. It was concluded that Nigerian teachers are not too different from their counterparts abroad in treating SET with serious caution. It was recommended that Nigerian school policy makers and administrators should exercise great care in the use of student ratings of teachers, especially in personnel decisions.\textsuperscript{72}

Ishwara (2007) found that majority of the university teachers agreed with the evaluation of their performance by students. It is also statistically proved that, there is no association between teachers' attitude towards Student Evaluation of Teacher (SET) Performance and their organizational, demographic and career related aspects. Kshirsagar (2005) conducted a study of the attitude of B.Ed. teacher on student rating and found out majority of the teachers have theor consent and willingness for SET.\textsuperscript{73}

2.4 STUDIES ON ATTITUDE OF STUDENTS TOWARDS STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS (SET)

Kulis and Mc Keachie (1975) in their study on Evaluation of Teachers by students in higher education found -

(i) Students tend to rate courses in their major fields and electives higher than outside their majors, and

(ii) Students like the introduction of SET and have a positive attitude towards this issue.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{72} Monday T. Joshua, Akon M. Joshua (2004) \textit{Attitudes of Nigerian Secondary School Teachers' to Students' Evaluation of Teachers} \textit{Teacher Development, Vol. 8 Issue No 1, page 57-79}


\textsuperscript{74} Kulis, J.A. and Mc Keachie, W.J.(1975) "The Evaluation of Teachers in Higher Education"
Feldman (1978) in his study on course characteristics and college student ratings of their teachers found out that

(i) a small positive relationship existed between class ratings and the student average interest in the subject areas,

(ii) most of the students have a positive attitude towards student ratings of their teachers.75

Basow and Silberg (1987) from their study on student evaluation of college Professors found that students support evaluation of teacher by students and that the gender of a student has a little affect on his/her ratings.76

Lunde (1988) in his study on students' comments about teaching and teacher behavior found that the teaching style, commitment and the mastery of the subject affect the student ratings of their teacher and at the same time, students have a positive attitude on assessment of the teachers by the students.77

Cashin (1990) from his study on student ratings of instructors found out that

(i) students believed that they were mature enough to assess their teachers teaching effectiveness.

(ii) students had a positive attitude towards student ratings of instructors, and

(iii) students characteristics have relatively little influence on ratings on ratings of overall effective of teacher teaching.78

77. Lunde, J.P. "Listening to student Learn: What are their comments saying?" Teaching at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1988, 10(1), 1-4 (Newsletter available from the Teaching and Learning Center, University of Nebraska, Lincoln)
Cashin (1992) in another study on student ratings found that-
(i) the attitude of students on student ratings of the teachers was positive,
(ii) student rating was influenced by class size (very small classes tend to
receive higher ratings),
(iii) student rating was also influenced by subject or discipline (humanities
instructors tend to receive higher ratings than instructor their counter
parts in other disciplines).  \(^79\)

Greenwood & Gilmore (1997) found that Students have a positive opinion
on the use of SET. Ryan (1998) in comparative study found out that the Japanese
students have a positive opinion on Students Evaluation of Teachers, but their idea
of an ideal teacher is entirely different from the western countries. \(^80\)

Shakournia et.al. (2002) conducted a study on the attitude of students tow-
dards teachers' evaluation, and found out students' opinions towards SET are opti-
mal and, therefore, the university authorities should manage to improve the quality
of these evaluations and better usage of result. \(^81\)


2.5 RELEVANCE OF PRESENT STUDY IN RELATION TO THE STUDIES REVIEWED

Table-2.2
Status of Research Relating to SET in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>No. of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>First Survey of Research in Education</td>
<td>Up to 1974</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second Survey of Research in Education</td>
<td>1974-1978</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third Survey of Research in Education</td>
<td>1978-1983</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fifth Survey of Research in Education</td>
<td>1988-1993</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Abstract of Research Studies</td>
<td>From 1998 onward</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Higher Education in India a Comprehensive bibliography</td>
<td>From 1970-1990</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Review of researches under status study reveals that most of these studies were conducted abroad. An analysis of the studies reviewed by the investigator on SET shows that out of 85 studies reviewed in this chapter reveals that most of the studies especially aborad are focussed on the reliability, validity, objectivity, construction and validation of scales for the the rating of faculty by student, attitude of teachers towards SET, criteria for evaluating faculty performance, relationship between teachers’ teaching experiences and student rating, influence of gender of student rating, comparison of student rating with other evaluation, student rating of instructor and student achievement. A large majority of the studies on SET, focus on its reliability, validity and its feedback. Only few studies conducted abroad have provided a holistic picture of SET. Some studies, directly or indirectly related with the present study have already been conducted in abroad, the main lacuna in all these studies is that they did all this without analysising the gender, level of education and its content. Besides, no study has made an at-
tempt to study all the major aspect of students towards SET as attempted by the present investigator.

Absence of research entries in the first four Surveys of Research in Education on SET, as shown in Table-2.2, is a clear indication that till 1988 it was not at all the concern of researchers in India. The first and the lone entry on research relating to performance of faculty was found in the Fifth Survey of Research that covered a period from 1988 to 93. Melhrotra Committee report gave the real momentum to the research on SET that had so far remained neglected. However, in western countries, there were more than 1,000 researches on rating of faculty by students, whereas the same area in India had remained dry. It is surprising to see that no serious research work has been done on the opinion of students towards SET which clearly indicate that there is no serious thinking on the issue. If we want to see SET really to be implemented in our system. We need to have a study on the attitude of both the players- the teachers and the students. The investigator, therefore, felt the need to study the attitude of Mizo students towards SET.