CHAPTER V

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF STUDENT’ ATTITUDE TOWARDS SET

The Chapter four has dealt with the direction and magnitude of students’ attitude towards Student Evaluation of Teachers (SET); however, simply knowing the direction and magnitude of attitude is sometimes not adequate. Attitude of a person, as we all understand, comprises of his/her opinions on various issues related to a particular phenomenon or a person or an object. Thus, it is not necessary that students having a positive attitude towards SET have their favorable opinion on each issue related to the SET covered by 62 statements of the attitude scale constructed and used by the investigator in this study, and vice a versa. There may still be some issues on which they have expressed their negative opinion. Likewise, students having unfavorable attitude towards SET may still have positive opinions on few of its dimensions. Thus, to have a complete and deeper understanding of students’ attitude towards SET one has to analyze their opinions on various items that comprise the attitude scale. This is possible only through content analysis. The scholar, in this chapter, has attempted to examine the students’ beliefs relating to SET, that have become the basis of their negative or positive or neutral attitude explained in the preceding chapter. Besides, the scholar has also tried to study the nature of the distribution of students’ scores on certain selected beliefs (statement) of the attitude scale in terms their divergence from normality. The data with regard to the students’ agreement or disagreement with prominent beliefs relating to SET, and the nature of the distribution of their scores on various statements, in terms of skewness, have been given in different tables in the relevant sections of this chapter.
The content analysis of attitude of students towards SET has been presented under the following sections.

5.1. Ability of Students to evaluate their teachers
5.2. Reliability of SET
5.3. Validity of SET
5.4. Objectivity of SET
5.5. Impact of SET
5.6. Use of Outcome of SET
5.7. Trade off between SET and Teacher Evaluation of Student (TES).
5.8. Students Right to Evaluate Teacher.

5.1 ABILITY OF STUDENTS TO EVALUATE THEIR TEACHERS

This section deals with 2 statements of attitude scale which concern with the ability of the students. In this, the ability of students refers to their competence, maturity, experience and seriousness to assess their teachers. In India, right from the Mehrotra committee, one of the important opposition made by the teaching community is that they believed political and social pressures can easily sway students and assessment by such a class may lead to victimization of teachers. In this section, the data with regard to the students’ agreement or disagreement with prominent beliefs relating to students ability on SET, and the nature of the distribution of their scores on each statement, in terms of skewness, have been given in Table-5.1.
Table -5.1
Prominent beliefs relating to ability of students to evaluate their teachers and Nature of Distribution of Scores on Different Items of the Attitudes Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Students are not qualified to assess their teacher as they are immature and lack of experience</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34.44%)</td>
<td>(7.78%)</td>
<td>(57.78%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Students are the best judges of their teacher’s ability, so teacher assessment by the students is highly realistic.</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(80.56%)</td>
<td>(10.33%)</td>
<td>(9.11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Students are not qualified to assess their teachers as they are immature and lack of experience**

It was found that 57.78% of the students opposed the idea that ‘students are not qualified to assess their teachers, as they are immature and inexperienced’. The same table further shows that 34.44% of the students agreed with the statement and the rest of the students that is 7.78%, remained neutral on the issue as they were neither for nor against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.1 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−0.19), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies disagreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.
Discussion

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue:**

Marsh and Overall (1979) reported that many faculty members feel that students evaluations are biased by factors that they believe are unrelated to effective teaching.\(^1\)

McKeachie (1979) noted that students cannot judge all aspect of teaching equally well.\(^2\)

Coburn Louisa (1984) found out students lack maturity and expertise to make judgment about course content.\(^3\)

Peter Elbow (1992) stated that students are immature and not yet educated and do not know about teaching and learning as teacher do. It is true that students may not understand the thoughts—even the goals and intentions of a faculty member. Moreover, it has true that students maybe mistaken about their learning and may even lie.\(^4\)

Basow (1992) through his studies reveals that students are not mature enough to judge their teachers and also found out that male are more bias against female.\(^5\)

Kaur et al (2001) conducted a study on 100 teachers of Punjab Agricultural University and found out that 62% of the teachers believed that students are not mature enough to judge their teachers competency.\(^6\)

---

Mathew (2001) conducted a study on refresher course participant at the University of Kerala on teachers’ attitude towards SET. He found out that teachers were against the introduction of SET due to various reasons, and one reason was they feel that students are not mature enough to assess their teachers.7

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Peterson and Kauchak (1982) “found that students rating are consistent among students and reliable from one to the next.”8 These show that students are mature enough to assess their teachers. Students remarked that before challenging the objectivity of Student Evaluation of Teachers (SET) teachers must remember that ‘those who stay in glass houses should not throw stones on others’. Students are the best judges of their teachers, as only they, no one else, know what happens behind the closed doors in the classroom.

Aleamoni (1981) also indicates “the correlation between student ratings of the same instructor ranged from .70 to .87”.9 He also pointed out that students are the main source of information about the learning environment, including ability to motivate students for continued learning, rapport of degree of communication of the instructors and students. This shows that students are mature enough to assess their teachers.

Narayanaswamy (1991) in his theoretical article reveals that students are the best judges of their teachers’ ability. Teacher assessment by the student is neither fancy nor an ideal concept but one that is highly realistic.10

Connie Eccles also pointed out that there is no one else who spends as much time in the classroom as the students. They are the ones who know the quality of their teachers and should be given the credit to recognize the qualities that make a good teacher, a fair teacher, a teacher who inspires them to do their best.\textsuperscript{11}

Vadhera (1998) also found out in his survey that 60.34% of the college and university teachers of Mizoram agreed that college and university students are mature enough to judge the teaching competency and the style of their teachers.\textsuperscript{12}

2. Students are the best judges of their teachers ability, so teacher assessment by the students is highly realistic

A cursory glance at Table No 5.1 depicts that majority of the students that is 80.56%, have agreed with the statement as students are the best judges of their teachers’ ability, so teacher assessment by the students is highly realistic. The same table further shows that only 9.11% of the students do not agreed with the statement and 10.33% remained neutral. Examination of data vide Table-5.1 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= -0.36), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies majority of students agreed with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Seldin (1980) who stated that it is manifestly true that the only direct daily observers of a professor’s classroom teaching performance the student in the classroom and are fit to evaluate their teachers.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Connie Eccles, \textit{High School students should evaluate their teachers}. ComPortOne 1996-2007
\end{enumerate}
Narayanaswamy, (1991) in his theoretical article also expressed that students are the best judges of their teachers’ ability. Teacher assessment by the students is neither fantasy nor an ideal concept, but one that is highly realistic.14

Sreven (1995) reveals students have a front row seat to observe teacher behavior and classroom processes, and are the best judge of what they have learned.15

Harrison et al. (1996) have stated that college students, in general possess self insight into how they make judgments concerning their instructors since they have an implicit awareness of the relative importance of the factors they are considering.16

Feldman (1997) reported that students as a rater of instruction appear to be obvious and pragmatic choice.17

A study conducted by Vadhera (1998), also shows that 55.17% of the teachers have agreed with the statement that students are in a very good position to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their teachers.18

Wallace and Wallace (1998) stated that other researchers agree that students are the best evaluator because they have a unique vantage point to offer commentaries and suggestions to teachers and some basic assurances to administrator.19

Felder and Rebecca Brent (2004) says students are in better position than anyone else to judge certain aspects of teaching, such as how clear, interesting, respected and fair course instructor is, and they are the only ones who can say how an instructor has influenced their attitude towards the course subject. 20

An empirical survey conducted by George Mathew (2001) also found out that teachers quite wholeheartedly concede (86.50%) that students are the persons best qualified to judge their performance as teachers. It also indicates that teachers are not unaware that much of their professional satisfaction derives from being appreciated by their students.21

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Mc Keachie (1979) noted that students could not judge all aspects of teaching equally well.22

Wallace and Wallace (1998) concurred that, as the scope of SET widened, subject matter included in SET questions exceed what students are qualified to assess.23

Read et al. (2001) Student evaluations are criticized in the literature for containing items students cannot properly assess and leaving out demographic and background questions that are recognized sources of response bias.24

5.2 RELIABILITY OF SET

This section contains 5 statements of attitude scale which concern with reliability of SET. A test is said to be ‘reliable’ if it tends to give the same result when repeated. One of the opposition made by teachers and other on the introduction of SET is relating to its reliability. In this section, the data with regard to the students’ agreement or disagreement with prominent beliefs relating to the reliability of SET, and the nature of the distribution of their scores on each statement, in terms of skewness, have been given in Table-5.2

Table -5.2
A Prominent Beliefs Relating to the Reliability of SET and Nature of Distribution of Scores on Different Items of the Attitudes Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lack of seriousness on the part of students will lower the reliability of their rating of teachers.</td>
<td>539 (59.89%)</td>
<td>159 (17.67%)</td>
<td>202 (22.44%)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SET will be consistent over time.</td>
<td>423 (47%)</td>
<td>297 (33%)</td>
<td>180 (18.22%)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A teacher who was rated low by the students at a particular class will also score low in other class.</td>
<td>437 (48.56%)</td>
<td>200 (22.22%)</td>
<td>263 (29.22%)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The rating of teachers by students will be same even after the students left the institution.</td>
<td>473 (52.56%)</td>
<td>196 (21.78%)</td>
<td>423 (47%)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>SET is more reliable than peer evaluation and self appraisal.</td>
<td>700 (77.78%)</td>
<td>122 (13.56%)</td>
<td>78 (8.67%)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Lack of seriousness on the part of the students will lower the reliability of their rating of teachers**

A cursory glance at Table No 5.2 depicts that 22.44% of the students have agreed with the statement that lack of seriousness on the part of the students will lower the reliability of their rating of teachers. They feel that in India most of the students are not serious enough in their studies. A further analysis of the same table reveals that 59.89% of the students opposed this statement as they feel students are mature and serious enough in their studies and if the teachers think, they are not serious that shows the teachers did not motivate them to be serious in their learning. It was also found that 17.67% of the students remained neutral. An analysis of data vide Table-5.2 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was positively skewed (Sk= +2.2), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the lower end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the lower end of the distribution in a negative statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Marsh and Overall (1979) reported that many faculty members insist that student evaluations are biased by factors that they believe are unrelated to effective teaching and students are not serious enough in their studies.25

Stadman (1983) also noted that reliability is so low that they should not be used for judging individual performance.26

---
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Kaur et al. (2001) through their study pointed out 53% of the teachers agree to the statement that students should not evaluate the teachers as they are immature and not serious enough with their studies.\textsuperscript{27}

Gray and Bergmann (2003) stated in their article a study conducted by Daniel Hamermesh, found out that better-looking teachers get significantly better rating which clearly shows that students are not serious enough in their rating of teachers.\textsuperscript{28}

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Aleamoni (1978a) reported reliabilities ranging from 0.81 to 0.94 for items and 0.88 to 0.98 for subscales of the Course/Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire (CIEQ)\textsuperscript{29}

Darling-Hammond and others (1983) pointed out student ratings have been restricted to higher education and this method is inexpensive and has a high degree of reliability.\textsuperscript{30}

Defino (1983) reveals that research shows the instrument used in SET is to be reliable, as the scores of an individual remain relatively consistent on repeated measurements.\textsuperscript{31}

Gigliotti and Buchtel (1990) stated that while potential bias exists, actual bias of student ratings is so low it does not affect the reliability.\textsuperscript{32}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{28} Mary Gray and Barbara R. Bergmann(2003). Student Teaching Evaluations Inaccurate, Demanding, Misused, Academe, September-October,2003
  \item \textsuperscript{29} Aleamoni,L.M.(1978a). Development and factorial validation of the Arizona Course/Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire, Educational and Psychological Measurement,38,1063-1067.
  \item \textsuperscript{31} Defino,M.E (1983). The Evaluation of Student Teachers, 1983 ED 240103.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Gigliotti,R.J., and Buchtel,F.S.(1990). Attribution Bias and Course Evaluations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(2),341-351.
\end{itemize}
Narayanaswamy (1991) mention that students are the best judges of their teachers’ ability. The result of the evaluation of teachers by students could be one of the factor in deciding the worth of teachers and not the only factor in doing so.\textsuperscript{33}

Vadhera (1998) reveals from his study that 67% of the teachers agree that students are the right judges of their teachers and their teaching effectiveness.\textsuperscript{34}

Evans (2004) stated that most research indicates that the fears of teachers such as fairness of students evaluations, leniency in grading, sex discrimination are largely unfounded and that students do evaluate teachers reliably, regardless of how they are graded.\textsuperscript{35}

Murray (2005) stated that research indicate that student evaluations are valid or accurate and they are relatively free of bias as the students are mature enough.\textsuperscript{36}

2. **Rating of teachers by students will be consistent over time**

It was found in Table -5.2 that 47% of the students have an opinion in support of the statement that rating of teachers by students will be consistent over time. It was also discovered that 20 % of the students do not agree with the statement. The same Table further shows that 33% of the students remained neutral on the issue, as they do not take any position either for or against this issue. An examination of data vide Table-5.2 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= - 0.30), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the upper end of the distribution in a positive statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.


\textsuperscript{35} David Richard Evans (2004). *Students Evaluation of Teachers*. National College of Nursing, Japan

Discussion

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Firth (1979), on the student evaluation of faculty made several years after graduation (upto ten years in one study) do support this statement as they have found remarkable consistency in students’ original opinions as well as the opinions taken after they had left the institutions.  

The cross-sectional studies conducted by Marsh (1977) also revealed a close agreement between retrospective ratings of former students and those of currently enrolled students towards evaluating the teachers.

Harry G. Murray (2005) through his study reveals that student rating are reasonably stable or consistent across courses years, rating forms and group of raters and also valid and accurate by the evaluation made by others.

(b) **Studies Against the Issue**

Ambady and Rosenthal (1993) reveals that student ratings were highly consistent between judges, with a global reliability measure of .85 overall.

Vadhera (1998) from his empirical study reveals that 58.62% of the teachers oppose SET because they feel that students could not make a consistent judgment about the teachers and their teaching.


3. A teachers who was rated low by the students will in a particular class also score low in other classes.

A casual look at table -5.2 depicts that 48.56 % of the students have agreed with the statement that a teachers who was rated low by the students will in a particular class also score low in other classes. The same Table further shows that 29.12% of the students did not agree with this statement while 22.22% of the students remained neutral. Examination of data vide Table-5.2 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=-0.59), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies majority of students agreed with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Aleamoni and Hexner (1980) cited seven studies that do not support that the size of the class affects student ratings and from their study found out no relationship between the size of the class and student rating.42

Shapiro (1990) also reveals from his study that no relationships exist between the class size and student ratings on student class evaluation. This indicates that the size of the class had no affect on the student rating.43

Michael Huemer (1992) stated that student tend to agree with each other in their ratings of an instructor whether they are in lower and higher class.44

---


(b) Studies Against the Issue

Gage (1961) through his study reported curvilinear relationships occur between class size and student ratings.45

Feldman (1979) assert that smaller class size lead to better rating. He also concludes that elective courses usually have better reviews than required courses as well as higher-level courses.46

4. The rating of teachers by students will be same even after the students left the institutions

A cursory glance at Table-5.2 depict that 52.56 % of the students have an opinion in support of the statement that the rating of teachers by students will be same even after the students have left the institutions. The same table further shows that 25.67 % of the students did not agree with the statement and the rest of the students 21.77% of the students remained neutral, as they did not take any position either for or against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.2 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−0.70), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Favour of the Issue

Drucker and Remmers (1951) showed that alumni who had been out of school five to ten years rated instructors much the same as students currently enrolled.47

Mc Keachie et al. (1978) also reveal that the student rating of the instructor is almost similar even after they left the institution.48

(b) **Studies Against the Issue**

Aleamoni and Hexner (1980) reported that graduated students and those who already left the institution tended to rate instructors more favorably than the present students.49

5. **Students rating of teachers’ is more reliable than peer evaluation and self appraisal.**

A critical analysis of the Table- 5.2 reveals that 77.78% of the students have their opinion in support of Students rating of teachers’ is more reliable than peer evaluation, self-evaluation and self-appraisal. The same Table further shows that 8.67% of the students opposed the statement and the rest of the students 13.56% remained neutral on the issue, as they do not take any position either for or against this statement. Examination of data vide Table-5.2 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−0.36), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Feldman (1989b) found that student ratings of teaching effectiveness have a moderate to high correlations with instructor self-rating.50

Abrami, ‘d’ Apollonia and Cohen (1990) from their study found out that student ratings are correlated with other evaluation of teachers such as peer evaluation, self rating, expert judges and alumni rating.  

Michael Huemer stated that most of the researchers agree that Student Evaluation of Faculty is highly reliable and is more reliable than self-evaluation and peer evaluation.  

Harrison et al. (2004) found evidence that based on the scoring of student ratings did not significantly differ from other faculty evaluation of instructor performance. However, SET provides both relevant and reliable feedback than other faculty evaluation. 

(c) Studies Against the Issue
Cahn (1986) reported that teachers should be assessed by experts in the field such as peer evaluation, as students are immature and lack of experience.

5.3 VALIDITY OF SET
Under this, sub-head there is 1 statements of attitude scale which concern with the validity of SET. A test is said to be ‘valid’ if it is measuring what it is intended to measure. Validity is much more difficult to assess than reliability. In this section, the data with regard to the students’ agreement or disagreement with prominent beliefs relating to the validity of SET, and the nature of the

distribution of their scores on each statement, in terms of skewness, have been given in Table-5.3

Table—5.3
A Prominent Beliefs relating to Validity of SET and Nature of Distribution of Scores on Different Items of the Attitudes Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers who are rated high by the students will also be rated high by expert judges.</td>
<td>522 (58%)</td>
<td>214 (23.78%)</td>
<td>164 (18.22%)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Teachers who are rated high by the students will also be rated higher by expert judges

A critical analysis of the Table -5.3 shows that 58 % of the students agree with the statement that teachers who are rated high by the students will also be rated higher by expert judges. The same Table also shows that 18.22% of the students do not accept the statement on the validity of SET and 23.78% of the students remained neutral on this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.3 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−0.59), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement, implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Various studies such as Aleamoni,(1978); Ballard, Rearden and Nelson,(1976). Marsh, Overall, and Kesler (1979) compared students’ ratings, professor evaluations of their own teaching, and expert judges’ rating of videotape recordings of the professors’ classroom presentations. A similar pattern for each teacher was found with each of the three types of measures. Expert judges also rated those teachers whom students as excellent evaluated high and
by themselves; ineffective teachers were rated similarly by all these three groups. The only notable difference among the ratings was that students tended to rate teachers a bit lower than peers.\textsuperscript{55}

In the fourteen studies cited by Aleamon and Hexner (1980) compared student ratings to colleague rating, expert judges ratings, graduating seniors, alumni ratings and student learning measures and found out that there exist a moderate to high positive correlations.\textsuperscript{56}

Teven and Mc Croskey(1997) reveals from their study that student ratings are correlated with other indicators of teacher competence such as peer evaluation, self-ratings, expert judges ratings, graduating seniors and alumni ratings.\textsuperscript{57}

(b) \textbf{Studies Against the Issue}

Singhal (1968) conducted a study on student rating of teachers by their colleague, experts and students and found no significant relationship among them.\textsuperscript{58}

Armor et al. (1976) indicate that principal, colleague evaluation of teachers tend to be more lenient than student rating of their teachers.\textsuperscript{59}


\textsuperscript{58} Aleamon, L.M. and Hexner,P.Z (1980). \textit{A review of the research on student evaluation and a report on the effect of different sets of instruction on student course and instructor evaluation}. \textit{Instructional Science},9,67-84.


85
McKeachie (1979) noted that student could not judge all aspects of teaching equally well. 60

Follman (1983) found in his study that when students were asked to name their best and worst teachers, 15% to 20% of the instructors' appeared in both the lists. So, the student ratings are not reliable and are invalid, other method of evaluation is required in order to assess the teachers. 61

Cahn (1986) argues that teacher should be assessed by expert in the field or by their colleague. 62

Marsh and Roche (1997) reveal that student evaluation of teacher teaching effectiveness appears to be invalid and at the same time, ratings by colleagues and experts are not reliable. The expert and colleagues do not even substantially agree with each other in instructor ratings. 63

Vadhera (1998) reveals that 60.34% of the teachers do not like SET because they feel that the student ratings of teachers are not valid as these are influenced by extraneous factors. 64

5.4 OBJECTIVITY OF SET

Under this, sub-head there are 4 statements of attitude scale which concern with the objectivity of SET. Objectivity has two aspects- objectivity of items and objectivity of scoring. Objectivity of item construction implies that the items should be as simple as possible. Objectivity of scoring means that personal judgment of the respondents and the investigator should not affect scores. Those who opposed SET pointed that it is rather subjective, its items were unclear and ambiguous, and some of the items does not relate to teaching effectiveness. In this section, the data with regard to the students’ agreement or disagreement with prominent beliefs relating to the objectivity of SET, and the nature of the distribution of their scores on each statement, in terms of skewness, have been given in Table-5.4.

Table-5.4
A Prominent Beliefs Relating to Objectivity of SET and Nature of Distribution of Scores on Different Items of the Attitudes Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SET will be affected by religion, caste, sex, tribe of teachers.</td>
<td>117 (19.67%)</td>
<td>124 (13.78%)</td>
<td>599 (66.56%)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Less demanding teachers will be rated higher if students assess their teachers.</td>
<td>282 (31.33%)</td>
<td>210 (23.33%)</td>
<td>408 (45.34%)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>SET would be based on the popularity, attractiveness, smartness rather than their teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td>202 (22.45%)</td>
<td>103 (11.44%)</td>
<td>595 (66.11%)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SET is more objective than other alternatives.</td>
<td>515 (57.22%)</td>
<td>254 (28.22%)</td>
<td>53 (5.89%)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) of teaching effectiveness will be affected by religion, caste, sex and tribe of a teacher

A glance at Table-5.4 reveals that only 19.67% of the students feel that religion, caste, sex and tribe of the teachers will affect assessment of teachers teaching effectiveness. On the other hand, 66.56% of the students argued that religion, caste, sex and tribe of the teacher would not affect evaluating a teacher’s teaching effectiveness. They believed that students would not be biased in giving judgment to their teachers on the ground of sex, religion and others. It is also discovered vide Table 5.4 that 13.78% of the students remained neutral, as they do not take any position either for or against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.4 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk = -5.22), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies disagreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Marsh and Overall (1979) which pointed that many faculty members insist that students evaluation are biased by factors that they believe are unrelated to effective teaching.65

Leed et.al (1998) report, from a study they carried out at Temple University in the USA, that the results suggest that, all else being equal, students prefer male, and native born instructors. Instructors' SETs fall with age until instructors reached 54, at which point the SET began to turn upward. Part time instructors have lower SET. Of these results, however, only the coefficient on the sex of the instructor is significant at the 10% level.66


Mathew (2001) from his studies reveals that respondents opine that as students could be biased by sex, religion and others. 67

Singh (2008) reveals it is very difficult to examine fair evaluation of teachers’ performance by the students in a caste-ridden society. Shirkers would manipulate a good grade from them if students belong to their own caste. Then, the very purpose of evaluation would be futile.68

B.K.Mishra (2008) from his theoretical article noted that in a state, as Bihar where colleges and universities are mired with party politics as well as caste divide, the students’ evaluation would never be fair.69

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Basow and Silberg (1987) through their studies report no relationship between a professor’s gender and student rating of teachers. 70

Seldin (1993) also point out against the statement that ‘Many major reviews of student’s evaluations conclude that gender does not have a significant effect’. 71

Franklin and Theall (1992) studies gender issues and ratings at two large universities of USA. The overall analysis shows that gender of the teacher or the students does not have a consistent or significant effect on ratings.72

69. Ibid
2. **Less demanding teachers will be rated higher if students assess their teachers**

An analysis of the Table-5.4 shows that 45.34% of the students expressed their opinion against the statement that less demanding teachers will be rated higher if students assess their teachers. The same Table also show that 31.33% of students accepted the statement and the rest 23.33% remained neutral. Examination of data vide Table-5.4 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= -1.49), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies majority of students were not in agreement with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Wallace and Wallace (1998) wrote that one could buy evaluations by decreasing workload, decreasing the difficulty of exams, spoon-feeding material directed to the exam and decreasing grading standards, but none of these behavioral outcomes is consistent with the mission of education.73

(b) **Studies Against the Issue**

Frey (1978), Palmer, Carliner and Romer (1978), Abrami and others (1980), Howard and Maxwell (1980) and Peterson and Cooper (1980) have reported that even difficult and demanding teachers are also given outstanding evaluations as the less demanding.74

---


74. Vadhera, R.P: *Students' Evaluation of Teachers (SET): Myths and realities* (*Unpublished*)
Vadhera (1998) found that 46.55% of the teachers opine that students would not give better rating to those teachers who are less demanding. He also point out that students can differentiate hard working teachers and less demanding teachers.75

Kaur et.al.(2001) conducted a survey on the attitude of teachers towards SET which also found out that 51% of the teachers disagree with the statement that assessment of teachers by students will make the teacher less demanding.76

David Evans (2004) pointed out that the debate on the fairness of student evaluations still rages on although most research indicates that the fears of teachers are largely unfounded, and that students do evaluate teachers reliably, regardless of how they themselves are graded.77

3. **SET would be based on their popularity, attractiveness, smartness rather than their teaching effectiveness.**

A perusal of Table-5.4 shows that only 22.45% of the students themselves have accepted the above statement that SET would be based on their popularity, attractiveness, smartness rather than their teaching effectiveness while 66.11% of the students do not accepted this view and 11.44% of the students remained neutral. Examination of data vide Table-5.4 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= -1.41), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies majority of students were not in agreement with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

McKeachie's (1979) reported that a very important biasing factor is the students' expectations about the instructors, as the instructor's reputation affects his/her ratings.78

Gomez et al. (1992) reported that teaching ratings by students are not accurate measures of teaching performance.79

Holden et al. (1997) several researchers reported that majority of faculty believe student ratings are influenced more by irrelevant personal qualities of the faculty than by academically relevant activities.80

Rubin (1995) found that instructors with attractive physical appearance but authoritarian attitudes have less reviews of such authoritarian attitude than similar instructors with less attractive physical appearance.81

Vadhera(1998) found out 51.72% of the teachers express their view that student should not evaluate teachers on the basis of their teaching as their evaluation would be biased by factors such as popularity of the teachers, smartness, physical appearance and others.82

Kaur et al. (2001) also reveals through their studies that 59% of the respondent teachers contended that students would evaluate the teachers based on their popularity and grading stridency.83

80. Annette Rashid Gall (2005) (Quoted) Faculty perception of the effects of student evaluations of teaching on higher education instructional practice and instructor morale. (Unpublished)
(b) **Studies Against the Issue**

Abbot and Perkins (1978) and Reardon and Waters (1979) have reported findings against this statement as their studies have shown that students consider the quality of teacher-student relationship to be second in importance to a teacher’s ability to present material clearly.\(^\text{84}\)

Aleamoni (1976) found that students praise instructors for their warm, friendly, humorous manner in the classroom but frankly criticize them if their courses are not well organized or their methods of stimulating students to learn are poor. This shows that students are able to differentiate between their personal qualities and teaching qualities.\(^\text{85}\)

McKeachie (1979) found out for improving teaching, student ratings would provide an accurate diagnosis of problems and solutions.\(^\text{86}\)

Seldin (1980) argued that student is the best evaluator for teaching. It is manifestly true that the only direct, observers of a professor’s classroom teaching performance are the students in the classroom.\(^\text{87}\)

Feldman (1989) pointed out that students are using preparation and organization, stimulation of interest, motivation, and answering questions, masterly in subject and treating students courteously as the basis for their rating.\(^\text{88}\)

---

\(^{84}\) R.P.Vadhra: *Students’ Evaluation of Teachers (SET) Myths and realities (Unplished)*


Peterson, Wahlquist, C & Bone (2000), in research on elementary high school students’ views, argued that students are capable of distinguishing between a teacher they like and a teacher who improves their learning. Students’ surveys are not merely popularity contests; students distinguish between merely liking a teacher and one who enables their learning. While students can distinguish between a teacher who supports learning and one who treats them well.89

4. **Students rating of teacher’s teaching will considerably be more objective than other alternatives.**

A cursory glance at Table-5.4 also reveals that 57.22% of the students accepted the statement that students rating of teacher’s teaching will considerably be more objective than other alternatives. The same table further shows that only 14.56% of the students are against the statement. It also shows 28.22% remained neutral on this statement, as they do not take any stand either for or against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.4 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−0.57), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement, implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Marsh (1987) had found positive attitude of teachers or academic staff to student evaluation of instruction. The findings also attest the usefulness and accuracy of student evaluation as an index of teaching effectiveness.90


Vadhera (1998) found out through his study that 53.45% of the University and college teachers expressed their opinion in favor with the statement that students’ rating of teachers is considerably more objective than any other alternative namely colleagues, head of department or institution. About 60.35% of the teachers have reported that only students can objectively evaluate their teachers’ teaching, as they are the ones who sit in the class of the same teacher for months and years together.91

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Tagomori (1993) reveals that 79% of Student Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness (SETE) of the items either were flawed or did not identify with teaching performance.92

Marsh and Roche (1997) stated that not only student rating but also rating by colleagues and trained observers are not even reliable.93

5.5. IMPACT OF SET

There are 12 statements of attitude scale which concern with the impact of SET on teaching quality, it affect on students and whether it lead to student centered of system. In this section, the data with regard to the students’ agreement or disagreement with prominent beliefs relating to the impact of SET on teaching quality of teachers, its affect on students and the nature of the distribution of their scores on each statement, in terms of skewness, have been given in Table-5.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Skew -ness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teachers will try their level best only if the students evaluate their teaching.</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(53.78%)</td>
<td>(12.22%)</td>
<td>(34%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SET will make teachers more responsible towards their duties.</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(84.78%)</td>
<td>(9.22%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>SET will force teachers to pay due attention to their teaching.</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(69.78%)</td>
<td>(15.33%)</td>
<td>(14.89%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>In order to check the declining quality of teaching, student’s evaluation of teachers’ teaching effectiveness is necessary.</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(82.78%)</td>
<td>(10.33%)</td>
<td>(6.89%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>SET will make teachers to do things as per students’ interest.</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>+0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(67%)</td>
<td>(14.44%)</td>
<td>(18.56%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>SET will affect teachers’ confidence in a negative way.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(22.67%)</td>
<td>(17.44%)</td>
<td>(59.89%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>SET will reduce the status of teachers.</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20.33%)</td>
<td>(16.44%)</td>
<td>(63.22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Rating of teachers by students will lead to mockery of teaching profession.</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(22.23%)</td>
<td>(23.78%)</td>
<td>(53.89%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>SET will have a negative effect on teachers’ autonomy.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(21.33%)</td>
<td>(19.56%)</td>
<td>(59.11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>SET will make teachers at the mercy of their students.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(38.44%)</td>
<td>(18.11%)</td>
<td>(43.45%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>SET will help in realization of Student-centred system of education.</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(73.89%)</td>
<td>(15.33%)</td>
<td>(10.78%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Introduction of SET will make students serious in their studies.</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td>(16.67%)</td>
<td>(13.33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Teachers will try their level best only if the students evaluate their teaching

A cursory glance at Table-5.5 depicts that 53.78% of the students opined that teachers would try their level best only if the students evaluate their teaching formally. The same Table further shows that 34% of the students expressed their disagreement with the statement, and believed this will make teachers more responsible towards their duties. The same Table reveals that the rest of the students that is 12.22% remained neutral on this issue, as they do not take any stand either for or against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk = -0.79), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Marsh and Dunkin (1992), in their comprehensive review, demonstrate the utility of the students’ evaluation of university teaching to change in teaching effectiveness due to feedback from student ratings.94

Murray (cited in Marsh and Dunkin, 1992) summarized result of survey of faculty members from seven universities on whether students’ evaluation of teaching are useful for improving teaching. Majority of the faculty members accept that evaluation improved their teaching.95


Marsh and Roche (1993) also found those students’ evaluations of university teaching feedback coupled with consultation is an effective means to enhance teaching effectiveness.\textsuperscript{96}

Thailambal(1998) also has the same view and points out that the intention of the student’s assessment of the teacher is to make the teacher take stock of his potentialities.\textsuperscript{97}

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Centra (1972) reported from his study that there is no significant change in teachers teaching because of SET information.\textsuperscript{98}

Ryan et al. (1980) found that the greater proportion of respondents believed that SET process had more negative than positive effects on their own and their colleagues’ morale and job satisfaction.\textsuperscript{99}

2. SET will make teachers more responsible towards their duties

It was found vide Table-5.5 that 84.78% of the students accepted that assessment of teachers by the students would make teachers more responsible towards their duties. The students feel that the present day teachers lack the responsibility to do their job and there are teachers who are not worth their salt. However, through the introduction of Students Evaluation of Teachers, the weakness of the teachers can be brought out to their attention for their improvement and not for victimization. The same table also shows that 6% of the students disagree with the statement

\begin{flushleft}
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while 9.22 remained neutral, as they did not take any position either for or against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= -0.22), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in support of the Issue

Narayanaswamy (1991) in his article also pointed out in support of this view by stating that assessment of teachers by students is not desirable but also essential for the development of higher education. The result of the assessment of teachers by students could be one of the factors in deciding the worth of teachers and not the only factor in doing so.\(^{100}\)

Simpson and Siguaw (2000); Stapleton and Murkison 2001); Trout (1997); Zelby (1974) have reported modern Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) practices were originally designed as a benign tool to be formatively in support of faculty development in various areas, and self improvement.\(^{101}\)

The overriding purpose of evaluation is clearly to improve the teaching program, to move faculty excellence (Seldin,1980,p.157)\(^{102}\)

---


Vadhera (1998) found that 72.41% of the teachers agreed SET would help them in knowing their shortcomings and help them in realization of their responsibilities. It also gives them a scope to improve in their successive teaching.\textsuperscript{103}

Studies Against the Issue

Ryan et al. (1980) found that 38% of respondents are not inclined to modify teaching to earn higher SET scores and 30% are only slightly inclined to make changes. Half of the respondents do not believe they could improve SET ratings by any amount through academically relevant activities.\textsuperscript{104}

Spencer and Flyr (1992) found that 77% of responses indicated student evaluations are not taken into account and 73% reported student ratings never or only occasionally lead to instructional improvement.\textsuperscript{105}

3. Introduction of Students’ Evaluation of Teachers (SET) will force to pay due attention to their teaching

Analysis of the Table-5.5 shows that 69.78% of the students agree that introduction of Students’ Evaluation of Teachers (SET) will force teachers to pay due attention to their teaching. The students opined that teachers’ absenteeism is widespread and a substantial number of teachers take their job casually. Therefore, to check and make them serious in their jobs this is one factor to make to improve their teaching effectiveness as teachers. The same table also shows that 14.89% of the students disagree with the statement that rating of students will force teachers to pay due attention to their teaching. They feel that students should be educated first to assess their teachers without causing injury to the teachers. From the table we can also find out that 15.33% of the students remained neutral. An analysis of


data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= -0.64), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

Discussion
(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Gage(1972); Mc Keachie(1972) and Wilson (1998) found out introduction of SET make the teachers more serious in their teaching and found improvement under certain circumstances.106

Centra (1972) reveal that teachers’ evaluation by their students help teacher to improve their teaching effectiveness.107

Marsh and Roche (1993) which shows that students’ evaluation of university teaching feedback coupled with consultation is an effective means to enhance improvement in teaching effectiveness.108

Simpson and Squaw (2000) stated that student ratings of teacher are important to faculty for both psychological and economic reasons. Psychologically, student rating, maybe malicious to those who actually are trying to teach well. Economically, student rating maybe used as performance criteria that affect promotion and salaries. The extent of these may encourage faculty to try to improve their SET ratings.109

Harry G. Murray (2005) in one of the survey of the teachers opinion found out that SET leads to teachers pay due respect to their teaching and also improved their teaching.\textsuperscript{110}

\textbf{(b) Studies Against the Issue}

Ryan et al. (1980) found that the greater proportion of respondent believe that SET process has more negative than positive effects on their own and their colleagues morale and job satisfaction.\textsuperscript{111}

Pearce and Porter (1986) through their studies reveal that employees receiving less than outstanding ratings may experience a significant drop in commitment to the organization.\textsuperscript{112}

Des Jarlais (1996) reported that SET would lead to deteriorating quality of faculty work life, which ultimately contributes to a decline in the overall quality of post secondary institution.\textsuperscript{113}

Haskell (1997) argued that Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEF) is a threat to academic freedom. Not only does SEF influence instructors’ grading policies, teaching style and course difficulty, but also it may also restrict what a professor says in class. Professors may feel inhibited from discussing controversial ideas or challenging students’ belief, for fear that some students will express their disagreement through the course evaluation form.\textsuperscript{114}
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4. **In order to check the declining quality of teaching, student’s evaluation of teacher’s teaching effectiveness is necessary**

A quick look at Table-5.5 reveals that 82.78% of the students have an opinion in favor of the statement that in order to check the declining quality of teaching, student’s evaluation of teacher’s teaching effectiveness is necessary. The same Table shows that only 6.89% of the students disagree with the statement while 10.33% of the students remained neutral, as they do not take any position either for or against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= -0.30), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the upper end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Seldin (1984) reveals that in a perfect world, faculty evaluation is for improving teaching.\(^{115}\)

Frost and Fukami (1997) reveals that public scrutiny and criticism of professors made teaching quality a priority for administration and evaluation by students become very common as a result in order to improve the quality of teachers.\(^{116}\)

Schmelkin and Spencer (1997) found that instructors significantly improved their teachings when students provided personal consultations after they were ratings.\(^{117}\)


Foote (1998) stated that faculty performance evaluation is essential to sustain a high standard of excellence, effectiveness and accountability.\textsuperscript{118}

(b) \textbf{Studies Against the Issue}

Centra (1972) stated that some researchers have contended that using SET information did not bring improvement.\textsuperscript{119}

Ryan et al. (1980), found that the mandatory use of student evaluations led “to a significant reduction in faculty morale and job satisfaction”. They also reported cases where instructors lowered standards and workloads, developed easier examinations and probably inflated students’ grades.\textsuperscript{120}

5. SET will make teachers to do things as per students’ interest

A casual look at Table-5.5 reveals that 67% of the students are against the statement, SET will make teachers to do things as per students’ interest. The same Table, further shows that only 18.56% of the students agree with the statement and 14.44% of the students remained neutral on this issue should not be made to all students, as they believe certain norms should be set to students to entitle them to assess their teachers. An analysis of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= +0.84), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the lower end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the lower end of the distribution in a negative statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Zelly (1974) also wrote that teachers in order to get higher SET rating might not be consistent with the best educational practices.\textsuperscript{121}

Vadhera (1998) from his empirical studies found out that 48.28\% of the teachers at college and university level opined that introduction of SET would affect academic freedom and autonomy of teachers and it would make them do what students would like them to do.\textsuperscript{122}

Kaur et.al. (2001) conducted a study on 100 teachers of Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana and found out that 53\% of the teachers do not want students to evaluate their teachers, as this will lead them to do things according to the wishes of the students.\textsuperscript{123}

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Mishra et.al (1990) found that student rating of teachers help the teachers to become more indirect in their behavior and the students begin to like them more.\textsuperscript{124}

B.Lalrinsanga (2009) from his theoretical article reveals that the three colleges which practice Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) in Mizoram, certain norms were set to assess their teachers and, attendance is one of the most common criteria used by the authority to judge their teachers. The teachers in these colleges are not against the introduction of SET.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{121} Zelly,L.W (1974) \textit{Student-faculty evaluation}. \textit{Science}, \textit{183}(4131) 1267-1270
\textsuperscript{124} Mishra, Brundaban and Patel (1990) \textit{Studies of Evaluation of Teachers (in India and abroad IV)}
\textsuperscript{125} B.Lalrinsanga (2009) Evaluation of Teachers by Students: opinion of the teachers and students in Mizoram (Unplished article)
6. **Students Evaluation of Teachers’ (SET) will affect teachers’ confidence in a negative way**

A critical analysis of the Table-5.5 reveals that 59.89% of the students oppose the statement that SET will affect teachers’ confidence in a negative way. The same Table also shows that 22.67% of the students are in favor of the statement whereas 17.44% of the students remained neutral, as they do not take any position either for or against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= -4.39), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies disagreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Vadhera (1998) from his empirical studies reveals that 54% of the teachers believe that SET will affect teachers teaching negatively as they will lose confidence to face the same students who have rated him/her low.\(^{126}\)

Simpson and Siguaw (2000) after examining SET came out with the view that some instructors in order to increase their rating by students dumb down their course work, lower workload and affect them in a negative way.\(^{127}\)

Kaur et.al (2001) from their studies found out that 61% of the teachers feel that evaluation of teachers by students would have a negative effect on teaching.\(^{128}\)


Mathew (2001) from his study reveals that one of the reservations made by the teachers’ on the implementation of SET is that it will lead to personal insecurity and lack of confidence of the teacher in their performance as teachers.\textsuperscript{129}

(b) \textbf{Studies Against the Issue}

Mishra (1983) found significant and positive behavioral changes in teachers because of receiving feedback through student rating.\textsuperscript{130}

Johnsrud (1996) from his study states that teachers who feel good about their work perform better.\textsuperscript{131}

Marsh and Roche (1997) reveal that teaching evaluations provide feedback to instructors about their pedagogical strengths and weaknesses, which is helpful for their development.\textsuperscript{132}

According to Thailambal (1998) “If a teacher enjoys teaching and has confidence on his teaching effectiveness he will not worry about students’ assessment and survive even in the most hostile circumstances”\textsuperscript{133}

Blau (1999) also pointed out a direct relationship between performance ratings, overall job satisfaction and future performance.\textsuperscript{134}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 130. Studies of Evaluation of Teachers (in India and abroad IV), \url{http://www.sachin.com}
\end{itemize}
Researches by Griffin (2001) reveal in general instructors report that they find student-rating feedback helpful.135

Franklin (2005) through her study found out many faculty uses student ratings of instruction to get feedback to assess their teaching practices and course designs.136

7. Evaluation of teachers by the students will reduce the status of teachers

A glance at Table-5.5 reveals that 63.22% of the students oppose the statement that evaluation of teachers by the students will reduce the status of teachers. They feel that giving students a right to evaluate their teachers would create closer relationship between the teachers and the taught and understanding themselves which is all for the good of the concerned parties. It seems that the students wanted to change their teachers’ position from ‘to judge’ to ‘be judged’. The same Table also reveals that 20.33% of the students opined that assessment of teachers by the students would reduce the status of the teachers. They believe that this innovative system will hamper the status and deteriorate the position of the teachers. It is also found that 16.44% of the students remained neutral, as they do not take any position either for or against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk= -5.03), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies disagreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Simpson and Siquaw (2000) from their studies came out with the view that some instructors design instructional changes to increase SET rating and is a kind of reducing the status of teaching.

Stapleton and Murkison (2001) expressed concern that the use of SET results in lowered academic standard and reducing the status of teachers.

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Seldin (1980) which states the main purpose of SET is to improve teaching by moving faculty toward excellence and helps faculty instructional practices and morale.

According to the survey report of Vadhera (1998), the percentage of college and university teachers in Mizoram, which has an opinion on introduction of assessment of teachers by students will reduce the status of teachers is 43.10% and the teachers who oppose this statement is 46.55% but still they oppose SET due to other reasons.

8. Rating of teachers by students will lead to mockery of teaching profession

A glance at Table-5.5 reveals that 22.33% of the students feel that introduction of assessment of teaching by students will leads to mockery of teaching profession. A further analysis of the same table shows that 53.89% of the students

express their disagreement that introduction of students rating of teachers will lead to mockery of teaching profession and 23.78% of the students remained neutral on this statement. Examination of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−5.19), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies disagreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

Discussion
(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Simpson and Ryan et al. (1980) found that the greater proportion of respondents believe that the SET process have more negative than positive effects on their own and their colleagues’ morale and job satisfaction.\(^{141}\)

Kaur et al.(2001) from their study found out that 47% of the respondent teachers feel that giving students a chance to evaluate their teachers will make a mockery of teachers and the teaching profession. They argue that when others like doctors, engineers and IAS officers were not evaluated.\(^{142}\)

Calin Valsan (2007) stated that knowing that SET plays an important role in the tenure and promotion of the professor, the students could used-teaching scores to threaten the professor into compliance .It can lead to mockery of the teaching profession.\(^{143}\)


\(^{143}\) 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’s University Lennoxville, Canada.
(b) **Studies Against the Issue**

Vadhera (1998) found that 44.83% of the teachers disagree with the statement that student rating of teachers will make mockery of teaching profession.\(^{144}\)

Harry Murray (2005) reveals after the introduction of SET, teachers were weight higher in annual salary and hold a good rapport with the students.\(^{145}\)

9. **Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) teaching will negatively affect teacher’s autonomy**

A casual look at Table-5.5 reveals that 59.11% of the students disagree with the statement that Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) teaching will negatively affect teachers’ autonomy. They feel that this is a lame excuse of teachers for availing exemption from students’ evaluation. The same Table also shows that 21.33% of the students agreed to this statement and believed that the prestige and morale of the teachers would be hurt if students evaluated them. It also point out that 19.56% of the students remained neutral. Examination of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−4.38), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies disagreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.


Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Ryan et al. (1980) from their study on faculty opinion surveys revealed that faculty has a very negative attitude towards the used student’s evaluation of teaching.\textsuperscript{146}

Des Jarbais (1996) stated that some believe that SET led to the deteriorating quality of faculty work life, which contributes to a decline in the quality of higher education institutions.\textsuperscript{147}

Vadhera (1998) reveals that 48.28% of the teachers opined that introduction of SET would affect academic freedom and autonomy of teachers. If SET were implemented, it would make them do what students would like them to do.\textsuperscript{148}

J. Khuntia (2008) comments that SET would politicize the teaching-learning atmosphere and have a negative impact on the overall academic environment in an institution.\textsuperscript{149}

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Mishra (1983) found that the teaching behavior of the teacher could be changed in a positive direction by giving feedback information in the way of self-rating and student rating.\textsuperscript{150}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{150} Nilesh Patil (2005) \textit{Studies on evaluation of teachers} (in India and abroad IV): http://www.saching.com
\end{flushright}
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Ryan et al. (1996) also pointed out that in student’s ratings of teachers, students give concern to specific teacher behaviors and characteristics including such items as enthusiasm, organization, rapport and fairness, which brought with them to the learning situation a lead to teachers improvement.151

Marsh and Roche (1997) stated that teaching evaluation provides feedback to instructors about their pedagogical strengths and weaknesses, which is important for their improvement.152

If this statement is right with the teachers, it should also be true with students who are scolded, criticized, ridiculed and rated low by the teacher every now and then. A good teacher will have no fear about assessment by any one because teaching is a joy for him. If a teacher enjoys teaching and has confidence on his teaching effectiveness, he will not worry about student’s assessment and survive even in the most hostile circumstances. (Thailambal, P.1998)153

Vadhera (1998) from his study reveals that 56.90% of respondent’s teachers do not support the opinion that SET will lead the teachers’ negatively.154

Wilson (1998) pointed out that some researchers have found those teachers who try to strengthen weakness identified in SET did receive better evaluation.155

Foote (1998) stated that faculty performance evaluation is essential to sustain a high standard of excellence, effectiveness and accountability.\textsuperscript{156}

Harry G. Murray (2005) reveals that student evaluation of teaching has improved the teacher teaching effectiveness.\textsuperscript{157}

10. **Evaluation of teachers by students will make teachers at the mercy of the students**

A perusal of data vide Table-5.5 shows that 43.44% of the students disagree with the statement as Evaluation of teachers by students will make teachers at the mercy of the students. They have an opinion that introduction of Students Evaluations of Teachers (SET) will enhance in students a sense of responsibility and develop a cordial relationship with the teachers. They do not believe assessment of teachers by students will make teachers at the mercy of the students as this will make students realize their duties and responsibility and empowerment of students. A good teacher always possesses confidence and will not sell his dignity in order to score good with the students; he will survive in the most hostile situation. The same Table reveals that 38.44% of the students agree with this statement whereas 18.12% of the students remained neutral. An analysis of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−2.02), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies disagreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.


\textsuperscript{157} Harry G. Murray,(2005) *Student Evaluation of Teaching : Has it made a difference.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.
(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Haskell (1997) pointed some argue student evaluation of faculty is a threat to academic freedom.\textsuperscript{158}

Dershowitz (1992) reports that some of the students have used the power of their evaluations in an attempt to exact their political revenge for their political revenge for politically incorrect teaching.\textsuperscript{159}

Kaur et. al (2001) from their study concluded that 572 of the teacher do not want the introduction of SET as they believe it will affect the autonomy of teachers and believe it is a threat to the teacher.\textsuperscript{160}

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Isiaka (1998) had reported that college teachers in Ghana and Kenya accept student evaluation. The study also showed that while the acceptance cut across gender, emphasis was on the use of such student evaluation for formative purposes and this will improve their relationship.\textsuperscript{161}

Good relationship between students and teachers will be developed through the introduction of SET. (Biddle)\textsuperscript{162}

Murray (1997) from his study conducted on faculty opinion survey found out that 73.40% of the faculty agrees student evaluations provide useful feedback for improvement of teaching.\textsuperscript{163}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{162} Biddle (1964) Evaluation of Teachers: Analysis and conclusions.
\bibitem{163} Murray,H.G.,(1997). Does Evaluation of Teaching lead to improvement of Teaching?. International Journal of Academic Development, 2:8-23
\end{thebibliography}
Vadhera (1998) through his study found out that 67.24% of the teachers agree that students are the right judges of their teachers and their teaching effectiveness and 72.41% of teachers agree that SET will help them in knowing their shortcomings and weaknesses.164

Kelley 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 U.S.A. evaluation results are routinely used by administrators in hiring, tenure and salary decisions. They believe students are like a consumers and they have the right to determine and assess the qualities of the material they receive.165

Harry G. Murray (2005) stated that, at present nearly 100% of North American institutions make use of student evaluation and according to his survey 75% of faculty members support the use of student evaluation.166

Connie Eccles (2007) pointed out evaluations are part of the business world. Teachers should not consider themselves above other professions. In the workplace, employees are evaluated in a number of ways. Everybody needs evaluation to remind us to set goals and do our best.167

---

165. 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)
11. Students evaluation of teachers’ teaching will help in realization of student-centre system of education

A cursory glance at Table-5.5 reveals that 73.89% of the students have their opinion in support of Students evaluation of teachers’ teaching will help in realization of student-centre system of education. The same Table further shows that 10.78% of the students oppose the statement and the rest of the students 15.33% remain neutral on the issue, as they do not take any position either for or against this statement. Examination of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=-0.53), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies that majority of students agree with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Simpson and Siguaw (2000) pointed out Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) leads to the student-oriented or student-as-a customer approach to education.\textsuperscript{168}

Hobson and Talbot (2001) reveals that in an era of growing accountability and outcomes evaluations, achieving a better understanding of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness may be a necessary step toward including scholarship of teaching in decisions on faculty tenure and promotion. This help in realizing student as the center of teaching-learning process.\textsuperscript{169}


Patricia A. Gordon pointed out that students need not be silent partners in the improvement of teaching in higher education. In actively seeking students’ responses to instruction, colleges and universities are sending the important message that they honor and support the teaching-learning process.  

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Trout (1997) stated that SET practice lead to more harmful to higher education than improvement of teachers teaching effectiveness. It encourages instructor to satisfy the demands and pleas of students who resent the appropriate rigors of college instruction. These forms are not just invalid what and reliable, they are pernicious.

12. Introduction of teachers’ rating by the students will make the students punctual and serious in their studies.

It was found vide Table-5.23 that 70% of the students have support the statement that Introduction of teachers’ rating by the students will make the students punctual and serious in their studies. It was also discovered vide Table 5.5 that 13.33% of the students do not agree with the statement and the rest of the students 16.67% remain neutral, as they do not take any position either for or against this issue. Examination of data vide Table-5.5 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=-0.54), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies that majority of students agree with the issue under reference.

170. Patricia A. Gordon. Student Evaluations of College Instructors (Available internet)
Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Aleamon (1981) who stated that student ratings encourage communication between students and their instructors. This may lead to the kind of student and the instructor involvement in the teaching learning, raise the level of instruction, and improve the quality of education.\textsuperscript{172}

M. Cecil Smith (1990) through her study found out that students agree that an evaluation is useful and important and reported that they take evaluation seriously. The evaluation of teachers does not only improve their teaching effectiveness but also helps the student to become more active and serious in their studies.\textsuperscript{173}

Naomi Rockler-Glader (2006) stated that professors use teacher evaluations to get feedback about their courses identify problems and how to fix them and help the students to be more serious in their studies.\textsuperscript{174}

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Gilbaugh (1982) in his survey found out that 70% of the students admit that their rating of an instructor was influenced by the grade they expected to get.\textsuperscript{175}

Haskell (1997) points out that some argue that Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEF) is a threat to academic freedom. Not only does SEF influence instructors grading policies, teaching style and course difficulty but students may restrict what a professor says in class.\textsuperscript{176}


\textsuperscript{174} Naomi Rockler-Glader (2006). \textit{Teacher Evaluation Forms. How to rate your professor and leave constructive feedback.}


5.6 USE OF OUTCOME OF SET

Under this, there are 7 statements of attitude scale which dealt the use of SET outcome. It covered the linkage of SET outcomes with appointment and promotion, use of feedback of SET for self improvement. Those who supported SET believed that this will improved the quality of higher education and to be more effective while, other opposed it believed its degrade the quality of education. In this section, the data with regard to the students’ agreement or disagreement with prominent beliefs relating to the use of outcome of SET, and the nature of the distribution of their scores on each statement, in terms of skewness, have been given in Table-5.6.

Table 5.6
A prominent beliefs on use of outcome of SET and Nature of Distribution of Scores on Different Items of the Attitudes Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SET should be linked with the promotion of teachers.</td>
<td>422 (46.89%)</td>
<td>248 (27.56%)</td>
<td>230 (25.56%)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Student’s opinion must be taken about the effectiveness of teachers, while appointing teachers.</td>
<td>542 (60.22%)</td>
<td>215 (23.89%)</td>
<td>143 (15.89%)</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rating of teachers’ teaching will help teachers to know where he/she stands as a teacher in the eye of the students.</td>
<td>751 (83.44%)</td>
<td>84 (9.33%)</td>
<td>65 (7.22%)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SET will help teachers in knowing and improving their own weaknesses.</td>
<td>782 (86.89%)</td>
<td>68 (7.56%)</td>
<td>50 (5.56%)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Introduction of SET will help students in selecting the course of study.</td>
<td>606 (67.33%)</td>
<td>141 (15.67%)</td>
<td>153 (17%)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>SET will help the students in selecting the right institution for admission.</td>
<td>650 (72.22%)</td>
<td>142 (15.78%)</td>
<td>108 (12%)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Level of teachers’ teaching effectiveness should be made as criteria for accreditation of colleges and universities by NAAC.</td>
<td>465 (51.67%)</td>
<td>305 (33.89%)</td>
<td>130 (14.44%)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Assessment of the teachers by students should be linked with the promotion of teachers**

An analysis of the Table-5.6 shows that 46.89% of the students express their opinion in favor of assessment of teachers by students should be linked with their promotion. The students feel that to check the deteriorating quality of classroom teaching students rating of their teachers must be related to their promotion. According to them, unless it effects their promotion assessment of teachers by students will not operate well. The same Table also shows that 25.56% of the students are against this statement. They think that political and social pressures can easily sway students and students rating of teachers may lead to even victimization of teachers. It also shown that 23.56% of the students remained neutral on the above statement. An analysis of data vide Table-5.6 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−0.50), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

**(a) Studies in Support of the Issue**

O’Connel and Dickinson (1993) which noted that Students Evaluation of Teachers Effectiveness (SETE) is one of the most common processes used in evaluating promotion, tenure and other benefit.\(^{177}\)

Seldin (1984) stated that in higher education today, the principal purposes of student evaluations are to improve performance and provide rationale for administrative decisions on tenure, promotion and retention.\(^{178}\)

---


William and Ceci, (1997) stated that Students’ evaluation of teaching has assumed greater importance in the last 20 years because of the need for impartial information on which to appraise instructors for re-appointment, tenure and promotion.179

Hobson and Talbot (2001) pointed out that in an era of growing accountability evaluation of teaching effectiveness is an important criterion for judging the teachers for scholarship, tenure and promotion.180

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Zelby (1974) pointed out changing the purpose of SET from improvement of teaching effectiveness of teachers to faculty tenure and promotion made the process harmful to teaching.181

Ryan et al. (1980) found that the mandatory use of formative and summative students’ evaluation of teachers led to a significant reduction in faculty morale and job satisfaction. They also reported cases where instructors lowered standards and workloads, developed easier examinations, and probably inflated students’ grades.182

Rutland (1990) stated that many authors reported indecisions among faculty about the appropriateness of the use of the SET for personnel and tenure decision.183

Newport (1996) writes that few of the higher education administrators in the USA who rely on amateur raters to assess teaching performance, would allow untrained and inexperienced students to cut their hair, or to make investment decisions involving a few thousand dollars of their personal funds. Yet, in the USA, untrained, amateur student rater routinely used in making salary adjustments, tenure and promotion decisions-decisions that sometimes have severe consequences for those who are affected.184

Simpson and Siquaw (2000) in their study concluded that use of the SET for summative purposes makes the instrument vitally important to faculty’s perhaps encouraging lowering of educational standards.185

Stapleton and Murkison (2001) stated that if the university administration used SET scores to measure teaching effectiveness and reward faculty who receive high scores, one would expect faculty to search out the least-cost method of raising SET scores in their classes.186

2. Students opinion must be taken about the effectiveness of teachers’ while appointing teachers

An analysis of Table-5.6 depicts that 60.22% of the students have their opinion in support of Students opinion must be taken about the effectiveness of teachers’ while appointing teachers. The same Table further shows that 15.89% of the students oppose the statement and the rest of the students 23.89% remain neutral on the issue, as they do not take any position either for or against this statement. Table-5.6 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this state-


ment was negatively skewed (Sk=−0.56), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies agreement of majority of students with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Chermesh (1978) stated that Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) may serve diverse purposes in colleges and universities such as decision making regarding faculty appointment and promotion, tenure and salary level, teaching diagnosis and improvement.187

Seldin (1984) also pointed out in higher education today, the principal purposes of student evaluations are to improve performance and provide rationale for administrative decisions on appointment, tenure, promotion and retention.188

Rifkin (1995) reveals that students rating of teacher help them to improve their performance and made the authority with the responsibility to decide on the re-appointment, pay, merit pay, tenure and appointment of an individual instructor.189

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Gilbaugh (1982) in one of his survey found out that 70% of the students admitted that their rating of an instructor was influenced by the grade they expected to get. He opposed summative evaluation of teachers by students, as students are immature and inexperience.190

Chacko (1983) stated that some researchers have found that a moderate correlation between grade leniency and rating does exist which indicate students are not capable enough to assess their teacher on important issues.\textsuperscript{191}

3. **Rating of teachers’ teaching will help teachers to know where he/she stands as a teacher in the eyes of the students**

A perusal of Table 5.6 reveals that 83.44\% of the students agree with the statement that rating of teachers’ teaching will help teachers to know where he/she stands as a teacher in the eyes of the students. They feel that students are the best judges of their teachers’ ability. Yet, we do not listen to the students and do not value their opinion. The same table also further show that 7.22\% of the students disagree with the statement as they argue that students do not have sufficient knowledge to judge the depth of their teachers in their respective subjects. Further, the table also shows that 9.33\% of the students remain neutral. An analysis of data vide Table-5.6 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−0.25), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies that majority of students are in agreement with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Vadhera (1998) reported findings in support of this statement through his survey on the college and university teachers of Mizoram. He found out that 67.24\% of the teachers agree students are the right judges of their teachers and their teaching effectiveness and 72.41\% of teachers also accept that Students’ Evaluation of Teachers’ (SET) will help them in knowing their shortcoming and weaknesses.\textsuperscript{192}


Kaur et al. (2001) also found out that 57% of the college teachers accepted to check the deteriorating quality of classroom teaching giving students the right to evaluate their teachers’ effectiveness.193

Coburn, Louisa (1984) also stated in his article that the purpose of evaluating the teacher by the student is to recognize areas of strengths as well as areas where improvement is needed with an aim towards continued professional growth.194

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Gomez-Meija and Balkin (1972) say that other researchers reported that teaching ratings are not accurate measures of teaching performances.195

Gilbaugh (1982) reported that 360 of 518 students surveyed at San Jose State University response shows 70% of the students admit that their rating of an instructor is influenced by the grade they expect to get.196

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Wallace and Wallace (1998) wrote that one could buy evaluations by decreasing workload, decreasing the difficulty of exams, spoon feeding material directed to the exam and decreasing grading standard but none of these behavioural outcomes is consistent with the mission of education.197

Johnson and Kelley (1998) warned that a main effect student evaluation of teacher performance is short-term thinking which may work against educational objectives.¹⁹⁸

3. **Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) teaching will help teachers in knowing and improving their own weaknesses**

A perusal of Table-5.6 shows that overwhelmingly 86.89% of the students accept the statement that Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) teaching will help teachers in knowing and improving their own weaknesses. According to the students, they are the main source of information about teaching-learning process and the most logical evaluators of the quality and effectiveness of teaching. They believe through this feedback, teachers can easily know where he/she stand. The same Table also reveals that 5.56% of the students oppose to the statement, as they believed students are immature and their rating would be affected by other variables than teaching. The same Table also reveals that 7.56% of the students remain neutral, as they do not take any position either for or against this issue. An analysis of data vide Table-5.6 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=-0.19), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies that majority of students are in agreement with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Seldin (1980) stated the overriding purpose of evaluation is clearly to improve the teaching program, to move toward faculty excellence.¹⁹⁹


Cohen (1980) reveals that Student Evaluation of Teacher (SET) feedback is important for improving college instruction.\textsuperscript{200}

Marsh and Dunkin (1992) summarized result of published surveys from seven universities that asked faculty whether SET was useful for improving teaching and whether students’ evaluation had led to improved teaching. Across seven studies two third of the faculty said that these evaluation led to improved teaching.\textsuperscript{201}

Marsh and Roche (1993) found that Students’ Evaluations of University Teaching (SEUT) feedback coupled with consultation was an effective mean to enhance teaching effectiveness.\textsuperscript{202}

Rifkin (1995) confirmed that the primary purpose of SET is formative; that is facilitating faculty growth, development and self-improvement.\textsuperscript{203}

Foote (1998) also pointed out that faculty performance evaluation is essential to sustain a high standard of excellence, effectiveness and accountability.\textsuperscript{204}

Vadhera (1998) in his study reveals that 72.41% of the teachers accept Students’ Evaluation of Teachers (SET) will help them in knowing their shortcoming and weaknesses.\textsuperscript{205}
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Simpson and Siquaw (2000) in their study found out that modern SET practices were originally designed as a benign tool to be used formatively in support of faculty development and self-improvement.  

5. Introduction of students’ evaluation of teachers’ teaching will help students selecting the course of study

A quick glance at Table-5.6 depicts that 67.33% of the students have an opinion in support of introduction of student’s evaluation of teachers’ teaching will help students selecting the course of study. The same Table further shows that 17% of the students oppose the statement and the rest of the students 15.67% remain neutral on the issue, as they do not take any position either for or against this statement. An analysis of data vide Table-5.6 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=-0.72), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies that majority of students agree with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Gage (1972) who identified specific influences that led to teaching improvement and help students in their course of study.  

Marilyn E. Stassen (1973) stated that students’ evaluation of teachers could help the students change the course of study according to the interest of the students. At the same time, the result can support activities that might be tempting to drop in order to be more relevant.  

Young and Shaw (1999) found when 912 university students rated 25 descriptions of effective teachers; subject matter knowledge was regarded as the most important. SET also help students in selecting the course of study.\textsuperscript{209}

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Zelby (1974) wrote that teaching in order to get higher SET rating might not be consistent with the best educational practices. Instructors are fallible and incentive driven like everyone else and may incorporate practices designed to increase ratings, especially when ratings are used in the process.\textsuperscript{210}

Millman(1982) agreed and stated that few studies have been conducted to investigate the affect of SET on college level instruction and the used of student rating for selecting the course of study is doubtful.\textsuperscript{211}

6. Students rating of teachers’ will help students in selecting the right institution for admission.

A quick glance at Table-5.6 depicts that 72.22% of the students have their opinion in support of students rating of teachers’ will help students in selecting the right institution for admission. The same Table further shows that 12% of the students opposed the statement and the rest of the students 15.78% remain neutral on the issue, as they do not take any position either for or against this statement. An analysis of data vide Table-5.6 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=-0.54), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies that majority of students agree with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Dash (1992) found out 68% of the respondents said that university teachers of today are more skilled than when the respondent began his or her university career 30 or more years ago and this is mainly due to introduction of SET.\textsuperscript{212}

Marsh and Dunkin (1992) stated that in their comprehensive review, they demonstrated the utility of the students' evaluations of university teaching for changes in teaching effectiveness due to feedback from student rating, tenure, promoting decisions, students’ course selection and institution for admission.\textsuperscript{213}

Harry G. Murray, (2005) through his survey found out today nearly 100% of North American institutions make use of student evaluations, and according to him 70%-75% of faculty members support the use of student evaluation and also agree in helping to select the right institution.\textsuperscript{214}

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Des Jarlais (1995) stated that higher education in American after introduction of SET is experiencing a crisis of confidence.\textsuperscript{215}

Simmons (1996). Stated that the problems of Student Evaluation and Teacher Effectiveness (SETEs) are multitude and do not categorically represent a profes-


sional endeavor with education. Therefore, selection of institution based on student rating may not be a wise decision.\textsuperscript{216}

7. \textbf{Level of teachers’ teaching effectiveness should be made as criteria for accreditation of colleges and universities by National Assessment and Accreditation (NAAC).}

It was found on Table-5.6 that as many as 51.67\% of the students have an opinion in support of the statement that Level of teachers’ teaching effectiveness should be made as criteria for accreditation of colleges and universities by National Assessment and Accreditation (NAAC). It was also discovered that 12.11\% of the students do not agreed with the statement. The same Table further shows that 33.89\% of the students remain neutral on the issue, as they do not take any position either for or against this issue. An analysis of data vide Table-5.6 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−0.30), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies that majority of students agree with the issue under reference.

\textbf{Discussion}

\textbf{(a) Studies in Support of the Issue}

Lalfamkima Varte (2006) in his article point out that NAAC in its assessment on the quality of education introduced a methodology that looks into how various policies and processes of the institution determine the educational provisions and consequently the quality of its performance. In this assessment criterion, it includes SET as of the important sub criteria.\textsuperscript{217}


H.K.Laldinpuii Fente,(2006) pointed out in her article that given the importance of student feedback for quality education at higher stage, a system of evaluation of college teacher by the students was introduced in conformity to the guideline of NAAC and 72% of the faculty members expressed that they were motivated by the feedback.\textsuperscript{218}

Nilesh Patel (2009) pointed out that Government T.Romana College (Aizawl) had also prepared the scheme of practice of SET as per recommendation of NAAC. Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU), Amritsar became the first Indian university to adopt manual for self study self study derived by NAAC.\textsuperscript{219}

In regard to the studies against the issue there is no relate study found in India as NAAC acceriditation is recently implemented.

5.7 TRADE-OFF BETWEEN SET AND TES

Under this, there are 2 statements of attitude scale which concern with the trade-off between SET and TES. In this section, the data with regard to the students’ agreement or disagreement with prominent beliefs relating to the trade-off between SET and TES, and the nature of the distribution of their scores on each statement, in terms of skewness, have been given in Table 5.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SET will lead to a trade off between teachers and students.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(18.67%)</td>
<td>(51.33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SET will be dangerous for those educational institutions which have provision for internal assessment.</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.78%)</td>
<td>(30.56%)</td>
<td>(39.67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{218} H.K.Laldinpuii Fente (2006). Importance of Feedback for quality Education in Higher education in Mizoram.

\textsuperscript{219} Nilesh Patil (2009). Studies on Evaluation of Teachers (in India and abroad) \url{http://www.saching.com}
1. Students Evaluation of Teachers will lead to a trade off between teachers and students

A quick look at Table-5.7 shows that 30% of the students feel that giving students a chance to evaluate their teachers will lead to a trade off between teachers and students. They feel that student rating of teachers will hurt the ego of their teachers and will lead to a negative impact on the part of the teachers. The same Table shows that 51.33% of the students opine that Students Evaluation of Teachers (SET) would not lead to trade off between teacher and students. Rather they believe introduction of SET would create conducive atmosphere and closure dialogue would be developing between the teachers and students. It was also found that 18.67% of the students remained neutral, as they did not take any position either for or against this statement. An analysis of data vide Table-5.7 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=−6.31), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies that majority of students disagree with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Vadhera (1998) reveal that 65% of the teachers feel that introduction of SET would lead to a trade off between teacher and students. Teachers might do anything and everything possible on their parts to get better ratings from students.\textsuperscript{220}

Kaur et al (2001) also found out that 38% of the teachers agree that SET will lead to a trade off between the students and the teachers.\textsuperscript{221}


(b) **Studies Against the Issue**

Oskarsson (1989) pointed out that through student rating; teacher and student realize their responsibilities. This leads to democratic development of language learning.222

Patel (1990) found that after giving feedback, the teachers become more indirect or less direct in their behavior; the students began to like them more.223

Harry Murray (2005) in one of his survey found out 75% of faculty support the use of student evaluations and believe that it helps in developing closer relationship between the teacher and the student.224

2. **Students evaluation of teachers teaching will be dangerous for those educational institutions, which have provision for internal assessment.**

A perusal of Table-5.7 shows that 39.67% of the students oppose the statement that Students evaluation of teachers teaching will be dangerous for those educational institutions, which have provision for internal assessment. They think those institutions, which already introduced SET make teachers more responsible towards their duties and will have a healthier dialogue between the teachers and the students. The same table further reveals that 29.78% of the students agree with the statement. They feel that introduction of SET would be dangerous and counter productive for our educational institutions especially those which have a provision of internal assessment by students. To them, this will make the teacher do everything and anything to please the students. It also depict that 30.56% remained neutral on this statement, as they do not take any stand either for or against this issue. An analysis of data vide Table-5.7 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of

---


students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=-2.18), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a negative statement implies that majority of students disagree with the issue under reference.

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Vadhera (1998) shows that 65.53% of the teachers feel that introduction of SET would be dangerous and counter productive for educational institution, especially those that have a provision of internal assessment of students.\(^{225}\)

Kaur et al. (2001) reveals from their study that 56% of the teachers believe that SET will be dangerous for institutions having internal assessment.\(^{226}\)

(b) Studies Against the Issue

Marilyn E. Stassen(1973) pointed out Student Evaluation of Teachers can help to change the course of study to be in tune with the interest of the students. The teachers cannot fool the students. They are the fairest critics and through SET the teachers can know where they stands.\(^{227}\)

Biddle (1964) stated that teacher evaluation by student becomes very important to improve classroom ethos so that the teaching-learning process is successfully completed.\(^{228}\)

---

5.8 STUDENTS RIGHT TO EVALUATE TEACHER

Under this, there are 2 statements of attitude scale which concern with the students right to evaluate teacher. Those who supported SET say students are the best judge of their teachers and they have the legitimate right to assess their teacher. In this section, the data with regard to the students’ agreement or disagreement with prominent beliefs relating to student right to evaluate teacher, and the nature of the distribution of their scores on each statement, in terms of skewness, have been given in Table 5.8.

Table No. 5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Students being consumer of education must be given the right to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their teachers.</td>
<td>764 (84.89%)</td>
<td>83 (9.22%)</td>
<td>53 (5.89%)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teachers consider evaluation of students as their right at the same time they should not deny the same right to their students.</td>
<td>591 (65.67%)</td>
<td>174 (19.33%)</td>
<td>135 (15%)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Students being the consumer of education must be given the right to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their teachers**

A quick look at Table-5.8 reveals that 84.89% of the students agree with the statement that Students being the consumer of education must be given the right to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of their teachers. They think that the student being an aware consumer have the right to assess the qualities of the teachers. The same Table further shows that 5.89% of the students disagreed with the statement. It also shows 9.22% remain neutral on this statement, as they do not take any stand either for or against this issue. An analysis of data vide Table-5.8 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of students on this statement was negatively skewed.
(Sk=−0.21), which means that more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution in a positive statement implies that majority of students agree with the issue under reference.

**Discussion**

(a) **Studies in Support of the Issue**

Vadhera (1998) who found out through his study that 60.34% of the University and college teachers express their opinion in favor of students as the consumer of education who have a legitimate right to evaluate the quality of knowledge and learning experiences provided to them by their teachers.\(^{229}\)

Patricia A. Gordon stated that students need not be silent partners in the improvement of teaching in higher education. In actively seeking students’ responses to instruction, college and universities are sending the important message that they honor and support the teaching-learning process.\(^{230}\)

Mc Collough and Gremler (1999) stated that student as a customer approaches to education delivery became increasingly popular as a way to guarantee instructor performance.\(^{231}\)

(b) **Studies Against the Issue**

Michael Huemer (2000) point out that Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEF) are widely used maybe the belief that the university is a business and that the re-

---


\(^{230}\) Patricia A. Gordon: Student Evaluation of College Instructors. (An unpublished paper)

sponsibility of any business is to satisfy the customer. In a business world cus-
tomer is always right, where as in university’s responsibility maybe to satisfy its
students. However, it is also a university’s responsibility to educate those individu-
als whom it is certifying as educated. 232

2. Teachers consider evaluation of students as their right at the same time
they should not deny the same right to their students.

It was found vide Table-5.8 that 65.67% of the students agree with this state-
ment that Teachers consider evaluation of students as their right at the same time
they should not deny the same right to their students. They feel teachers should not
consider themselves above other profession. In the workplace, employees are evalu-
ated in a number of ways. According to them evaluation is part of the business
world. The same table further shows that 15% of the students express their opinion
against this statement. They argue that when other professionals like doctors, their
subordinates why should their students evaluate teachers do not evaluate engineers
and IAS officers. It is also found that 19.33% of the students remain neutral. An
analysis of data vide Table-5.8 reveals that the distribution of attitude scores of
students on this statement was negatively skewed (Sk=-0.55), which means that
more number of students had their attitude score closer to the higher end of the
distribution. The concentration of scores towards the higher end of the distribution
in a positive statement implies that majority of students agree with the issue under
reference

Discussion

(a) Studies in Support of the Issue

Narayanaswamy (1991) stated in his theoretical article, as an aware con-
sumer, the higher-level learner has a right to assess the qualities and capabilities of
the substance he receives. It is not already there, it must be given to him. 233

233. Srinivasa Narayanaswamy: Evaluation of Teachers by Students: Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU)
Richmond (2003) stated that student opinion is of particular importance because it represents an important addition to the data customarily used to judge faculty competence.\textsuperscript{234}

Lalhmasai (2006) also pointed that out students are the real consumers; therefore, they have a legitimate right to evaluate the kind of knowledge provided to them by their teachers.\textsuperscript{235}

(b) Studies in Support of the Issue

Vadhera (1998) reveals that 43.10\% of the teachers do not like to share power with the students. They think that giving students a right to evaluate their teachers would reduce their status.\textsuperscript{236}

Kaur et al. (2001) point out that 52\% of the teachers do not want the introduction of SET as this mechanism will reduce the status difference between the teacher and student.\textsuperscript{237}

CONCLUSION

The content analysis of students’ attitude on important issues relating to SET and the nature of distribution of their scores, as presented under different sections of this chapter, has not only broadened our understanding of what and how students community, which is expected to evaluate their teachers, think about different issues relating to SET, but will also facilitate the decision making with regard to its successful effective implementation.

\textsuperscript{235} Lalhmasai (2006) : Evaluation of Teacher by students.