STUDENTS PERCEPTION ON FACULTY EVALUATION IN A BUSINESS SCHOOL

Veni M. Nair [1]& Kalpana S. Kumaran [2]

Abstract: *Most B-Schools evaluate the performance of a faculty based on Student's feedback. But do students take this feedback seriously? Do they rate the faculty based on their leniency in class. Are strict faculty members rated poorly? This is a serious concern to all faculty members of B-school, especially when their performance appraisal is based on student's evaluations. This paper tries to find student's perception regarding the faculty evaluations. The study was conducted in B-schools of Navi Mumbai. To test the hypothesis, Bivariate and Multivariate techniques were used with the aid of SPSS 12.0. The results indicate that students are not serious in their evaluation and are usually biased to the personality of the faculty.*

Keywords : Faculty evaluation, Students perception, feedback

[1] Asst: Professor,ITM Business School,Sector-4,Kharghar,Navi Mumbai, veninair@itm.edu
[2] Asst: Professor,ITM Business School,Sector-4,Kharghar,Navi Mumbai, kalpanas@itm.edu

Introduction:

Most of the literature on student feedback focuses on the reliability and the focuses on students. One study focused on student perceptions of the entire faculty and course evaluation process, not just on the student perceptions of a single course or faculty member.(Richard et al, 2006). Most of the past studies focused on perceptions by students on faculty performance are the sources of students' perceptions about teaching effectiveness. Since this is a serious concern to all faculty members of B-school, especially when their performance appraisal is based on student's evaluations, this study has great significance.

Literature Review

Differences in student evaluations can arise because of variation in the type of courses, different student perceptions of instructors, and the type of students found in a particular class. Consider initially the type of courses and consequently the kind of students that may be in these courses. Many studies show the influence of course specific effects.

Langbien (1994) found that students who are taking higher level subjects tend to be more motivated and evaluate instructors more favorably. Studies that focused on the time of day the course is offered and the potential influence on student evaluations have yielded mixed results. De- Berg and Wilson (1990) and Husbands and Fosh (1993) have found that classes scheduled later in the day are perceived by students to be less effective, partly because there may be a fatigue factor at play. However, other studies have not found a significant effect of time scheduling on student evaluations (Aleamoni, 1981; Koh and Tan, 1997). Feldman (1984) surveyed various empirical studies indicating that there is a consistent trend showing student scores improving as classes get smaller These results are corroborated by a recent study by Liaw and Goh (2003) showing that class size creates a bias in student evaluations in that instructors of smaller classes tend to obtain more favorable student evaluations. This result may be due to the fact that in smaller classes the instructor and students have more contact and have the opportunity to interact more.

Barry and Thompson (1997) evaluated 50,000 student rating forms from a wide spectrum of business classes and found significant differences among cours **courses** and programs for teaching effectiveness. These differences were about fairness in grading and preparedness for class. A recent investigation by Whitworth, Price, and Randall (2002) revealed that SET is significantly influenced by gender of faculty and by the level of courses. From these studies,

one can see the importance of controlling for differences in course type when comparing teaching evaluations. Many studies have analyzed the impact of expected grade point average of students on student evaluations.

An overview of this controversy in psychology is provided in a series of review articles in the November 1997 issue of the American Psychologist (Greenwald, 1997). Several studies of economics students have also indicated a significant relationship between expected grades and more favourable student evaluations (Nelson &Lynch, 1984; Nichols & Soper, 1972).

Methodology:

A sample of 105 MBA students were administered the questionnaire. The questionnaire was adapted from Richard et al(2006). It contained 20 questions. These questions were reduced to 8 factors through factor analysis. With factor analysis, helps in identifying the separate dimensions and in determining the extent to which each variable is explained by each dimension. Factor loading of above 0.50 is only considered. ANOVA and correlation were used to find the perception of students and also to find if any significant difference could be observed between the gender or in the age group of students.

Research Questions:

H1: There is a significant difference in the perception towards faculty evaluation in different age groups of respondents

H2: There is a significant difference in perception towards faculty evaluation with the different specialisations of the students.

H3: There is a significant difference in perception towards faculty evaluation with the gender of the respondents.

H4: There is a significant correlation between Purpose explained and feedback is effective and important.

H5: There is a significant correlation between purpose explained and feedback is taken seriously and objectively

H6: There is a significant correlation between biased and negative rating and higher rating for female faculty

H7: There is a significant correlation between rating based on personality and higher rating for female faculty

Discussions and Findings

1. **Profile of the Sample**

	Variable	Frequency	Percentage
1.	**Age**		
	20 - 22	43	42.6
	23 - 25	55	54.5
	26 - 28	3	3.0
2.	**Gender**		
	Male	65	63.1
	Female	38	36.9
3.	**Experience**		
	Fresher	80	77.7
	0-1 year	15	14.6
	>1 <2 years	3	2.9
	Above 2 yrs	5	4.9
4.	**Specialisation**		
	Finance	41	40.2
	Marketing	47	46.1
	Operations	7	6.9
	Others	7	6.9

The demographic profile of the sample indicates that the sample mainly comprises of youth in the age group of 20-25 yrs(97%). The gender ratio is more or less equal with male showing slight increase. As far as their industry experience is concerned, freshers comprise 80% of the sample. The sample has an equal number of finance and marketing specialisation students. Since the study was done on management students, the sample comprises of youth who are fresher.

2. Factor Analysis

All the questions were factor analysed to reduce the number of items. Therefore, items with factor loading of .50 or more on a factor were retained. Factor analysis was done using the principal component analysis followed by a varimax rotation

KMO and Barlett's test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin	Measure of Sampling	
Adequacy.		.551
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-square	565.802
	df	190
	Sig.	.000

Rotated Component Matrix[a]

	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Number of forms			-.261			.608		.453
Purpose explained								.865
minutes to complete				.777				
Adequate time	-.312	.537					.466	
Minutes needed to complete				.837				
Objective evaluation			.872					
Serious			.804					
Important to faculty					.678		.311	
Rate high for better grades		.906						
Rate high for better grades in future courses	.266	.849						
Higher rate for no home work	.443	.400	-.385					.262
Higher rate for easy exams	.767	.328						

Higher rate for good sense of humour	.431						.624	
Higher rate for giving good grades	.793							
higher for female faculty	.811							
comfortable in giving negative evaluation						.773		
highr rate for personality & enthosiasm	.297			-.274			.634	
Completing at the beginning of the class is better	.259		.350		-.284	.586		
Questions are clear			.291		.676		-.369	
Evaluation if effective	.390				.610			-.288

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 19 iterations.

The factors of Feedback that were identified are as follows. The total of 20 questions were reduced to 8 factors as is shown here.

Results of factor Analysis for higher rating in Feedback

	Factor	
1	Higher rating for Female faculty	Cronbach's alpha= .681
2.	Higher rating for bias and negative faculty	
3	Higher rating for objective and serious faculty	
4	Need more time more effective feedback	
5	Feedback is effective and importance	
6	Should be taken during Comfortable time	
7	Higher rating based on Personality	
8	Purpose should be explained	

3. Anova

H1: There is a significant difference in the perception towards faculty evaluation in different age groups of respondents

H2: There is a significant difference in perception towards faculty evaluation with the different specialisations of the students.

H3: There is a significant difference in perception towards faculty evaluation with the gender of the respondents.

ANOVA for age and perception towards feedback

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
lineintfemalefaculty	Between Groups	34.997	3	11.666	1.347	.264
	Within Groups	848.516	98	8.658		
	Total	883.513	101			
biasandnegativefacult y	Between Groups	16.325	3	5.442	1.558	.205
	Within Groups	335.235	96	3.492		
	Total	351.560	99			
objectiveandserious	Between Groups	3.304	3	1.101	.428	.733
	Within Groups	252.009	98	2.572		
	Total	255.314	101			
timetaken	Between Groups	6.594	3	2.198	1.011	.391
	Within Groups	210.827	97	2.173		
	Total	217.421	100			
effectiveandimportan t	Between Groups	32.539	3	10.846	1.699	.173
	Within Groups	587.295	92	6.384		
	Total	619.833	95			
comfortabletime	Between Groups	4.323	3	1.441	.577	.631
	Within Groups	234.677	94	2.497		
	Total	239.000	97			
personality	Between Groups	4.978	3	1.659	.773	.512
	Within Groups	201.892	94	2.148		
	Total	206.870	97			
purposeexplained	Between Groups	1.532	3	.511	.642	.590
	Within Groups	77.880	98	.795		
	Total	79.412	101			

ANOVA for specialisation and perception towards feedback

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
lineintfemalefaculty	Between Groups	7.866	2	3.933	.455	.636
	Within Groups	837.916	97	8.638		
	Total	845.782	99			
biasandnegativefacult y	Between Groups	.070	2	.035	.010	.990
	Within Groups	332.705	95	3.502		
	Total	332.776	97			
Objective and serious	Between Groups	14.715	2	7.358	3.102	.049
	Within Groups	230.045	97	2.372		
	Total	244.760	99			
timetaken	Between Groups	.020	2	.010	.004	.996
	Within Groups	215.394	96	2.244		
	Total	215.414	98			
effectiveandimportan t	Between Groups	5.982	2	2.991	.448	.641
	Within Groups	607.958	91	6.681		
	Total	613.940	93			
comfortabletime	Between Groups	1.868	2	.934	.382	.683
	Within Groups	227.317	93	2.444		
	Total	229.185	95			
personality	Between Groups	.529	2	.264	.123	.884
	Within Groups	199.805	93	2.148		
	Total	200.333	95			
purposeexplained	Between Groups	.701	2	.350	.435	.648
	Within Groups	78.139	97	.806		
	Total	78.840	99			

ANOVA for gender and perception towards feedback

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Female faculty	Between Groups	19.224	3	6.408	.731	.536
	Within Groups	849.920	97	8.762		
	Total	869.144	100			
Bias and negative ty	Between Groups	8.518	3	2.839	.800	.497
	Within Groups	337.321	95	3.551		
	Total	345.838	98			
Objective and serious	Between Groups	7.832	3	2.611	1.045	.376
	Within Groups	242.257	97	2.497		
	Total	250.089	100			
timetaken	Between Groups	16.355	3	5.452	2.615	.056
	Within Groups	200.172	96	2.085		
	Total	216.528	99			
Effectiveand important	Between Groups	37.684	3	12.561	1.968	.124
	Within Groups	580.870	91	6.383		
	Total	618.554	94			
Comfortable time	Between Groups	13.174	3	4.391	1.839	.145
	Within Groups	222.069	93	2.388		
	Total	235.242	96			
Personality	Between Groups	8.298	3	2.766	1.307	.277
	Within Groups	196.862	93	2.117		
	Total	205.160	96			
Purpose explained	Between Groups	2.476	3	.825	1.045	.376
	Within Groups	76.652	97	.790		
	Total	79.129	100			

Inference: Since the P value is not falling below 0.05 in any of the cases, we can infer that there is no significant difference in the perception towards faculty evaluation with respect to age, gender or their area of specialisation.

4. Correlation between purpose explained and effective and serious feedback

H4: There is a significant correlation between Purpose explained and feedback is effective and important.

H5: There is a significant correlation between purpose explained and feedback is taken seriously and objectively

Correlation co-efficient for explained purpose and feedback is effective and important

	Perception Variables	Correlation coefficient
1	Objective and serious	.060
2	Effective and important	.131

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2 tailed)
* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level(2tailed)

Inference :The study shows that the students need not take feedback as serious and important even if the purpose is explained. Explaining the purpose has no relation to the perception towards feedback as important or serious.

5. **Correlation between Gender of the of the faculty and biased rating**

H6: There is a significant correlation between biased and negative rating and higher rating for female faculty
H7: There is a significant correlation between rating based on personality and higher rating for female faculty

	Perception Variables	Correlation coefficient
1	Biased and negative rating	.326**
2	Personality based rating	.490**

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2 tailed)
* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level(2tailed)
Inference: Those students whose rating are biased and are influenced by personality actually give more rating to female faculty. This could lead to bias in faculty evaluation.

Conclusion

It is found from the study that there is no difference in the perception towards faculty evaluation with respect to gender, age and the area of specialisation that they have accepted. But there seems to be a bias towards female faculty members as they seem to be going for the personality of the faculty. Even after the purpose was explained they did not take it seriously. Thus we can conclude that though students know the importance of feedback sometimes they can be biased. Therefore evaluating a faculty purely on the basis of feedback can have repercussions both to the faculty as well as the management.

References

1. Rajendra Nargundkar (2008), " Market Research", Text and cases; Third Edition, p 123 – 129
2. Link, C. R. and Ratledge, C. E., (1973) Student perception, IQ and Achievement, Journal of Human resources, Jan, 1978
3. Lumsden, K.G.,(11973) Summary of an Analysis of student Evaluation of Faculty and Courses, Journal of Economic Education.
4. Eeldman, K. A. (1984). Class size and college students' evaluations of teachers and courses: A closer look. Research in Higer Education.
5. Countries and some implications of practice. Assessment and Evaluation of Higer Education,
6. Isely, P., & Singh, H. (2005). Do Higher Grades lead to Favorable Student Evaluations? Journal ofEconomic Education, 36(1), 29-43.
7. Langbien, L.I. (1994). The validity of student evaluations of teaching. Political Science
   and Politics, 27(3), 545-553.
8. Liaw, S.H., & Goh, K.L. (2003). Evidence of control of biases in student evaluations of teaching. The Intemationaljoumal of Educational Management, 17(1),37-43.
9. Nelson, J., & Lynch, A. (1984). Grades, simultaneity, and teaching evaluations. Joumal of Economic Education, 15(1), 21-37.
10. W, Rama, D., & Raghunandan, K. (2001). The relationship between student evaluations of teaching and faculty evaluations. Joumal of Education for Business, 76(4), 189-192.
11 BUSINESS EDUCATION DIGEST Does Facuity Rank Influence Student Teaching Evaluations? Implications for Assessing instructor Effectiveness
12. Yunker, P, & Yunker, J. (2003). Are student evaluations of teaching valid? Evidence from an analytical business core course. Joumal of Education for Business, 78(6), 313-317.
13. Whitworth, J.E. & Randell, H.L.(2002) factors that affect college of business student opinion of Teaching and learning, Journal of Education for Business
14. Simenlinger, E & Galperan, B. (2009) Attributes of effective Business Teaching, Academy of Educational Leadership, Vol 13.
15. Andrushak, G. (2008)Student evaluation of faculty – Management Innovation in Russion Higher education Institutes, Problems of economic transition, Vol 50.