

Performance Appraisal of University Faculty in India: A Study of Academia Readiness to Student Evaluation of Teachers (SET)

B.K. Punia¹

Renu Siwatch²

¹Professor,
Haryana School of Business,
Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology,
Hisar (Haryana) INDIA

²Assistant Professor,
Department of Management Studies,
N. C. College of Engineering, Israna(Haryana) INDIA

Abstract

All professions in the society have their roots in the profession of teaching and the faculty play an important role in transforming the personality of their students. With the central role in this transformational the faculty also need to be evaluated and that too by the students. The use of faculty performance appraisal system is gaining popularity in Indian education system as its outcome expected to bring out meaningful outcome for all those involved in the process ultimately leading to professional learning and growth. The present study is based upon the views of 500 faculty members working in universities across the country. As per the findings of the study, evaluation of faculty by the students can be one of the most effective ways of appraising the faculties' performance as the students are real consumer of education process. Though the academia has shown positive outlook towards their evaluation by the students yet also expressed the possibility of instances of students' favouritism or bias during faculty performance evaluation. Female faculty has exhibited elevated favour for SET as compared to male respondents. Central, General and Residential Universities respondents have shown high favouredness towards SET in contrast to State, Technical/Special Characters and Affiliating University respondents. The paper concludes with organisational and HR implications in the context of educational service sector.

1.0 Introduction

As on date the institutions of higher education are facing the inter and intra challenges from a large number of private as well as international educational institutes vis-à-vis facing the changing laws, rules and regulation of the Indian government and also the University Grants Commission. Performance appraisal practice and performance management are not new terms in Indian university system as most of the universities are using performance appraisal inventory designed/recommended by UGC. The use of multiple sources of feedback has been recommended among management scholars and practitioners alike (Ulrich, 1993), and student evaluation of teachers (SET) is one component in the direction. Although (SET) is implemented in many educational organisations, yet not everyone is convinced of the desirability and utility of these ratings. Supporters argue that evaluative judgments on a regular basis have a strong positive influence on the improvement of instructional skills. Performance of faculty as such can not be well managed until and unless the organisation adopts a well organised system of performance evaluation.

In this trying situation when surroundings are giving challenges, the universities have to judge the faculty performance by way of applying 360 degree appraisal and feedback mechanism wherein SET encompasses a significant constituent. From the literature review it has emerged that SET can be an effective tool as the student is the ultimate consumer of their service. The inclusion of SET has been significant but controversial tool in the improvement of teaching quality during the last few decades. Although SET is implemented in many educational institutes, yet not everyone is convinced of the desirability and utility of these ratings. Supporters argue that evaluative judgments on a regular basis have a strong positive influence on the improvement of instructional skills. It is quite logical that students, who indeed 'enjoy' the teaching and instruction, are involved in this form of quality care. As stated by Centra (1993) and Kulik (2001) the initial aim of student evaluations of teaching serves two goals i.e. mapping the quality of teaching in faculties/universities, and providing information and help to instructors in order to improve their teaching. Nowadays, student ratings are also used in administrative decision-making, informing students concerning the selection of courses, curriculum development, external quality care and research on teaching. Penny (2003) argues that the use of student evaluations is seen as a key indicator in quality monitoring. In fact it is not possible to fully evaluate the day-to-day atmosphere in a classroom unless one is in the classroom daily and hence students rating may get additional weightage. If the problems in a classroom are related to teaching style like control, respect, behaviour, etc., it is possible, if caught early in a faculty's career, that more time could be spent on re-training the faculty members. The academia could learn techniques that promote a learning atmosphere and a good faculty will always value the input from the students and will definitely use it to improve his teaching style.

However it is a common feeling that the students are not qualified enough to evaluate. It may be particularly painful if these evaluations are used to terminate or reprimand the faculties. Some times the SET becomes nothing but a popularity contest. Some feel that if faculties are being evaluated by students they will make their classes easier in an effort to get a better evaluation from the students. It would be hard to be on one's best behaviour for an entire semester just to get a good evaluation. Many researchers feel that evaluations are unnecessary since the grades are indicative of the learning process going on in the classroom. But grades are only the end result and only a part of the learning process. Some faculties have their curriculum so simple that the only ones who could possibly fail are those who don't go to class. Others are at the other end of the spectrum and passing in their class is nearly impossible for even the best students. And it may be that faculties who dislike a student and good grades may be impossible to obtain despite the work performed. The concerns with the

practice are largely who should do it, for what purpose, and by what means? Jackson (1998) identifies nine approaches to teacher evaluation, namely: classroom observation, students' ratings, student achievement, peer-rating, self-rating, teacher interview, parents' rating, competency tests, and indirect measures and SET is one of these. Gupta and Gupta (2007) through their study results has shown that students' feedback is an essential tool for quality enhancement as the students do remain the key stakeholders in the educational process. So the use of student evaluations of teachers' performance has been an important but controversial tool in the improvement of teaching quality during the past few decades. Despite the recent popularity of multiple perspective feedback systems, there is little theory to guide research in this area and to encourage the successful implementation of multiple perspective feedback in organizations. This can be done best by integrating organizational development and individual performance perspectives, and feedback so attained can lead to improved individual, work group, and organizational performance (Johnson, Olson and Courtney, 1996). In fact when the structure and systems of the organization are congruent with the goals of the feedback program, it is bound to positively influence the individual performance determinants (e.g., declarative knowledge, motivation). And that is how a study on present theme can lead to improved individual performance, which contributes to desired organizational outcomes.

2.0 Objectives and Methodology

Every study has some rationale behind its origin. The objective of this study was to solicit the views of faculty on one of the contemporary issue of performance evaluation i.e. evaluation of faculty by the students (SET), however the specific objectives of the study have been as under:

- To explore the overall possibility of including 'Students' Evaluation of the Teachers' (SET) as a method of faculty performance evaluation in Indian universities.
- To study the levels of faculty favour to SET according to demographic variables
- To examine the variations in faculty favour to SET according to demographic variables.

Research Design and Instrument: To achieve the above-stated objective a descriptive-cum-exploratory research design has been taken up. A mix of these designs provides enough provision for protection against biasness, maximizes reliability, and provides opportunities for considering various facets of the research problem. A well structured questionnaire has been utilized for data collection wherein the respondents were asked to respond on a 'Five Point Scale' ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". Prior to administering the questionnaire for final survey, Cronbach's Alpha test (Cronbach, 1951) has been used to check the statistical reliability of the questionnaire

and an Alpha Coefficient Value for students' evaluation of teachers (SET) dimension was found to be .558 which can be considered reasonably good for further data analysis vis-à-vis justifying the reliability of research instrument. Personal visit to different universities was a way of gathering data as well as data was collected through post/ mail because of wide geographical dispersion of universities and the respondents were continuously followed through telephonic requests.

The Sample and Data Analysis: The sample size for this study has been 500 faculty members from different universities having different academic stream and employing faculty with different qualifications and at different designations. In all, respondents from 24 universities of the country have been taken for the present investigation which encompasses 129 Professors, 204 Readers and 167 Lecturers from the sample institutions. Stratified random sampling with adequate input of convenience sampling has been applied for selecting university faculty members. Altogether all the major streams of studies i.e. science (150), social science (239), arts (111) have been included in the sample. The sample has been taken from central (109) and state universities (391), residential (158) and affiliating universities (342), and general (388) and special character universities (122). In the sample, majority has been found of male faculty members i.e. 355 and a vast the majority of teachers have been found having Ph.D. degree i.e. 412. To analyse the data, first of all it was transposed in normal probability distribution to have three distinct levels i.e. high, moderate and low on both the dimensions of the study. Thereafter composite scores on both the dimensions were computed out of ten by applying data reduction technique through SPSS package. The outcome on both the dimensions has been analyzed and interpreted with the help of tabulation, percentage, data computation for mean derivation, and one way ANOVA.

3.0 Results and Discussion

Indian higher education system has undergone a see change during the last few years and the students' evaluation of teachers (SET) has become a common phenomenon in some institutions of higher education. To make any feedback useful, source credibility is one of the critical components for the feedback recipient. Hence the study of the nature is quite significant, timely and explores the faculty opinion on SET under the following three distinct sub-heads.

Students' Evaluation of the Teachers: Statement-wise: Eight statements constitute the SET dimension for the present study and the results of the same have been shown as per Table-1. In the present education system internal assessment is an integral part of the performance evaluation of the students. Ilgen, Fisher and Taylor (1979) viewed that recipients of feedback will perceive a source as credible if the source is familiar with the recipient's task and performance. The common myth against the internal assessment is that it breeds the culture of sycophancy, lobbying and nepotism though the system also helps in maintaining continuity and discipline amongst the students but when the respondents were asked on the similar line that what they believe whether the SET will be dangerous for the institutes having internal assessment and 45 percent respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed to the notion; whereas 34 percent faculty members agreed or strongly agreed to the statement. Lowest mean score (2.85) of the statement confirms that evaluation of teachers by the students will not be much dangerous for the institutions having internal assessment as a part student evaluation. The results of Thailambal (1998), Vadhera (1999) and Lahiri (2003) studies also supported the Teacher (SET) whereas they were also agree that there are various myths and realities, and basis and biases of SET but ultimately the study favoured the SET for holistic development the system and the growth and development of faculty.

Table-1: Students' Evaluation of Teachers: Statement wise

No. Statements	Response					Value	
	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	S.D.
1 Evaluation of teachers by the students will be dangerous for the institutions having internal assessment.	91 (18)	137 (27)	101 (21)	96 (19)	75 (15)	2.85	1.33
2 Students do not have sufficient knowledge to evaluate the depth and understanding of teachers in their subjects.	55 (11)	144 (29)	102 (20)	118 (24)	81 (16)	3.05	1.27
3 Evaluation of teachers by the students will reduce status difference between students and teachers.	59 (12)	135 (27)	107 (21)	141 (28)	58 (12)	3.01	1.22
4 Students will evaluate teachers on the basis of their popularity and assessment parameters used by teachers for the students.	33 (7)	104 (21)	126 (25)	178 (35)	59 (12)	3.25	1.11
5 Evaluation of teachers by the students will affect autonomy of the teachers.	56 (11)	133 (27)	119 (24)	142 (28)	50 (10)	2.99	1.18
6 Evaluation of teachers by the students would have positive effects in their teaching quality.	41 (8)	46 (9)	100 (20)	212 (43)	101 (20)	3.57	1.15

7	Evaluation of teachers by the students will enhance the teachers' self respect and sense of responsibility.	51 (10)	74 (15)	98 (20)	192 (38)	85 (17)	3.37	1.22
8	Evaluation of teachers by the students if implemented must be linked with promotion policy.	58 (12)	85 (17)	97 (19)	175 (35)	85 (17)	3.29	1.26

Note : Figures in the parenthesis show the percentage.

Performance evaluation is believed to have strong associations with raters' knowledge and competency to assess. In the teacher-taught association, the teacher is considered to be superior and knowledgeable as compared to the taught. In India particularly the 'Students' Evaluation of the Teachers' is not usually favoured by faculty because the teachers think that the students are not mature enough to judge the experienced faculty. However results on this dimension have been found equally poised for agreement or disagreement. 40 percent respondents were found agreeing or strongly agreeing whereas the same number of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed to the statement. The mean score of 3.05 present middle of the road approach. Kaur, Singh and Kaur (2001) also supported that the students alone are not capable to evaluate the teachers and admitted that students cannot judge their teachers. One of the biggest condemnations against SET is that it may reduce the status difference between the teachers and the students. More number of respondents has been found agreeing or strongly agreeing to the statement than those disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. The mean score of 3.01 on the statement presents the results in the above-mentioned direction and the academia does not very strongly approve their evaluation by students since it may reduce their status in the eyes of students but Kaur, Singh and Kaur (2001) in their study results also revealed that evaluation of teachers by the students will reduce the status of the teachers, and undermine the autonomy of teachers as well as of the institution. Majority of the respondents expressed the fear that it could be used as a means by the authorities to humiliate the teachers and thus would not help them in knowing and improving their weaknesses. Iyamu, et al. (2005) found through their study that lecturers generally do not accept student evaluation, particularly when it is for summative purposes. Despite lecturers' fear about SET, it is recommended that student evaluation of classroom teaching should be made mandatory and conducted regularly in Nigerian universities. Nigerian university faculty generally has a low perception of the need for student evaluation. Further they revealed that the teachers are likely to be apprehensive and sensitive when this practice is introduced into the system. Similarly Odhiambo (2005) in his study revealed that only a quarter of the teachers (23.5 percent) indicated that they would favour to be appraised by their students.

On the basis of these results it can be concluded that the university faculty do not very strongly approve their evaluation by the students since it may reduce their status in the eyes of the students. Teachers do not seem to share

power with students and hence wish to remain independent on their evaluation by the students. Vadhera (1998) studied the opinions of teachers on different issues related to SET through an opinion survey scale consisting of 49 statements. For the first time in India, the study has brought out the reasons and magnitude of teachers' opposition to, and negative attitude of the teachers towards their evaluation by the students. But the study results of Kaur, Singh and Kaur (2001) revealed that the respondents felt that the university level is the most suitable level for the introduction of teachers' evaluation by the students and preferred that a committee should evaluate the teachers. Thus reviews on the subject brings out that in India the prevailing systems of faculty evaluation have their inbuilt weaknesses and need to be replaced by objective, transparent and incentive oriented system which encourage the faculty to be extra committed in teaching, research and extension activities.

With changing academic scenario, the views of students towards their teachers are also changing. In practice it has been seen that a teacher close to the students will find more popularity irrespective of the fact whether he is good teacher or not. The common conception among the faculty members is that student ratings of teachers just reflect teachers' popularity and grading sternness shown by the teachers in students evaluation, and that faculty are able to acquire higher student ratings by giving higher grades and this relationship could be explained by fact that students more positively disposed towards instructors normally give them higher grades. 47 percent respondents were found agreeing and strongly agreeing to the statement "Students will evaluate teachers on the basis of their popularity and assessment parameters used by teachers for the students" whereas only 28 percent respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed to the statement and the mean score of 3.25 fro the statement also supports the above discussion. The study results of Martin (1998) and Read, et al. (2001) have shown that students ratings are influenced by extraneous factors such as students characteristics that includes race, gender, age, academic, material, biases towards the course and the teacher and teacher characteristics like race, gender, rank, experience, weight, dress etc. whereas some other environmental characteristics like physical quality and the atmosphere of the classroom. Rocca and McCroskey (1999) also found a positive correlation between immediacy behaviour and three attractiveness categories i.e. Task Attractiveness (the desire to work with the subject matter), Physical Attractiveness (the appearance of the instructor), and Social Attractiveness

(the desire to socialize with the instructor). Fuhrmann and Geyer (2003) also have studied the effect of potential biases on global ratings in the context of teaching behaviour. They concluded that biases, like, the students' interest in the subject or their liking for the teacher may be a result of good teaching behaviour and may not be considered a sheer bias of student ratings. They also concentrate on the students' attitudes towards evaluating their teachers. The empirical results are based on qualitative interviews at Austrian Commercial Colleges and a structural equation model shows that the students' global ratings of teachers mainly depend on their teaching behaviour. However, global ratings are also affected by the students' attitudes towards evaluating their teachers, also by the students' liking for their teacher and their interest in the subject.

In the academic sphere, the autonomy of faculty occupies the centre stage which may further rest upon the idea of professional freedom and self-directed professional development. Successful teachers have always been autonomous in the sense of having a strong sense of personal responsibility for their profession, exercising through incessant reflection and analysis the highest possible degree of affective and cognitive control of the teaching process, and exploiting the freedom that this noble profession confers. That way the autonomous teachers are supposed to be more satisfied and committed with their profession. The power difference and the ability to have complete professional control could never likely to be equal between the teacher and the taught. If students act as rater of their teachers' performance it may affect the teachers' autonomy and teaching quality as well. 38 percent respondents agreed or strongly agreed with equal number of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed to the statement "evaluation of teachers by the students will affect autonomy of the teachers" and the mean score of 2.99 also go in favour of the above discussion. The views of the respondents were solicited on the impact of students' evaluation of teachers on the teaching quality. It is the normal perception that human beings work better when they are under pressure. Here if the stress becomes distress than it will definitely adversely affect the outcome; however eustress always act as motivator. On this front a vast majority of 63 percent respondents agreed and strongly agreed on the contention positive relationship between students' ratings and teaching quality. And surprising this statement registered the highest mean score (3.57) of the dimension and supporting the idea of SET for superior teaching quality. Upadhaya and Soni (2002) through their study results indicated that there may be other factors besides simply the learning the student obtains during a course, which are related to their evaluation of the teacher. The students may be more interested in evaluating the process of the learning experience rather than the outcome, despite the overwhelming importance of the outcome (knowledge gained) to their future. Similarly Joshi (2002) has called the feedback from students to be an exercise

worth taking and worth promoting. Vadhera (1998) also studied the opinions of teachers on different issues related to SET through an opinion survey scale consisting of 49 statements. For the first time in India, the study has brought out the reasons and magnitude of teachers' opposition to, and negative attitude of the teachers towards their evaluation by the students

In the administrative language it is said that 'respect is commanded not demanded'. It means that if a leader is taken in high esteem by the followers, the leader is effective one and deserves respect. As to whether "evaluation of teachers by the students will enhance the teachers' self respect and sense of responsibility", 55 percent respondents agreed or strongly agreed whereas only 25 percent respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed and the second highest mean score (3.37) of the statement go in favour of elevated self respect and sense of responsibility for the teachers if they are evaluated by their students. At the entry point every employee think in terms of his career progression. The performance appraisal system available in that particular organisation serves as a facilitator for employees' promotion avenues and that way performance evaluation outcome can be the base of promotions in any organization. Whether the implementation of SET should be linked with teachers' promotion or not was also enquired from the faculty members. 52 percent respondents supported the idea that it must be linked with faculty promotion, however 29 percent respondents did not support the idea that SET outcome should have any linkage with faculty promotion. A sound mean score of 3.29 also favours the idea of linking SET outcome with promotion policy of university teachers. Gupta and Gupta (2007) through their study have shown that students' feedback is an essential tool for quality enhancement as the students do remain the key stakeholders in the educational process. It can be said that the involvement of students and ensuring their participation in the process of quality assurance would go a long way in making system of higher education. Penny (2003) argued that the use of student evaluations is seen as a key indicator in quality monitoring and a good faculty will always value the input from the students and will use it to improve his teaching style.

Levels of Faculty Favour to SET according to Demographic Variables: Although SET has been implemented in many countries and in many educational organizations yet not everyone is convinced of the desirability and utility of these ratings. Since the students are the real customers of the system the respondents of different universities were asked as to what extent the faculty is in favour of the concept. The Table-2 demonstrates the results regarding the views of the respondents on students' evaluation of teachers across their demographic variables.

The results reveal that on the basis of age the eldest faculty members i.e. 'above 55 years' of age have favoured highly (37 percent) followed by the youngest faculty of the

universities (32 percent). Describing the data on the basis of gender, the respondents have exhibited just about analogous level of unanimity but when data was compared narrowly female faculty has exhibited higher favour for SET as compared to male respondents The study of Isiaka (1998)

has brought out that lecturers in selected Colleges of Education in Ghana and Kenya accepted the idea of students evaluating their classroom effectiveness however the work laid emphasis on the use of student evaluation for formative purposes only.

Table-2 : Levels of Faculty Favour to SET according to Demographic Variables

Dimensions of Faculty Demographics		Faculty Favour To SET						Overall Status	
		High		Moderate		Low			
		Count	[%]	Count (%)		Count (%)		Count (%)	
Age Category	Below 35 yrs	35	[32]	46	[43]	27	[25]	108	[100]
	36-45 yrs.	59	[30]	88	[44]	51	[26]	198	[100]
	46-55 yrs	44	[31]	68	[48]	31	[21]	143	[100]
	Above 55 yrs.	19	[37]	21	[41]	11	[22]	51	[100]
Gender	Male	110	[31]	163	[46]	82	[23]	355	[100]
	Female	47	[32]	60	[41]	38	[26]	145	[100]
Academic Stream	Science/Engineering	52	[35]	66	[44]	32	[21]	150	[100]
	Social Sciences	76	[32]	103	[43]	60	[25]	239	[100]
	Arts/Humanities	29	[26]	54	[49]	28	[25]	111	[100]
Highest Qualification	Basic Entry Qualification	24	[27]	42	[48]	22	[25]	88	[100]
	Ph. D.	133	[32]	181	[44]	98	[24]	412	[100]
Designation	Lecturer	61	[37]	65	[39]	41	[24]	167	[100]
	Reader	61	[30]	94	[46]	49	[24]	204	[100]
	Professor	35	[27]	64	[50]	30	[23]	129	[100]
Total Experience	below 7 yrs.	26	[35]	25	[34]	23	[31]	74	[100]
	7-15 yrs.	57	[36]	72	[45]	31	[19]	160	[100]
	16-21yrs	22	[26]	42	[49]	22	[25]	86	[100]
	above 21 yrs.	52	[29]	84	[47]	44	[24]	180	[100]
Designation Experience	below 7 yrs.	72	[29]	111	[45]	63	[26]	246	[100]
	7-15 yrs.	72	[36]	87	[44]	39	[20]	198	[100]
	16-21yrs	6	[17]	14	[40]	15	[43]	35	[100]
	above 21 yrs.	7	[33]	11	[52]	3	[14]	21	[100]
Organisation Experience	below 7 yrs.	45	[31]	60	[41]	40	[28]	145	[100]
	7-15 yrs.	62	[35]	79	[45]	36	[20]	177	[100]
	16-21yrs	16	[27]	27	[45]	17	[28]	60	[100]
	above 21 yrs.	34	[29]	57	[48]	27	[23]	118	[100]
Category of Organisation	Central University	39	[36]	51	[47]	19	[17]	109	[100]
	State University	118	[30]	172	[44]	101	[26]	391	[100]
Nature of Organisation	General University	126	[32]	170	[44]	92	[24]	388	[100]
Structure of Organisation	Tech./Spl. Character Uni.	31	[28]	53	[47]	28	[25]	112	[100]
Structure of Organisation	Affiliating University	103	[30]	152	[44]	87	[25]	342	[100]
	Residential University	54	[34]	71	[45]	33	[21]	158	[100]
Overall Status		157	[31]	223	[45]	120	[24]	500	[100]

On the basis of academic stream, the science/engineering respondents have revealed high favouredness (35 percent) followed by the social science faculty (32 percent). On the basis of highest qualifications, the respondents holding Ph.D. degree have shown high acceptance towards the SET in contrast to the respondents who have only basic entry qualifications. When the data was examined across the designation, some contrasting perceptions emerged.

Though according to age, the eldest faculty had witnessed high favour towards the SET but herein the professors of the university system have been found dominating in the low favouredness and on the bottom of the designations while witnessing high favouredness. In this variable, 37 percent lecturers have witnessed their high favour for SET followed 30 percent readers and only 27 percent professors. It means the professors of the universities seem to be

comparatively scared of the concept of implementation of SET whereas the lecturers seem to perceive it in a more affirmative way. In the Isiaka's (1998) study result, teachers' opinions were not dependent on gender, but on seniority (teaching experience), as more experienced lecturers were found to show more preference for student rating of teaching effectiveness than their junior counterparts.

On the basis of 'total experience' variable it seems that the young faculty perceives the SET in a more confirmatory way because 36 percent faculty members who were having '7-15 years total work experience' and the 35 percent faculties who have 'below 7 years experience' have revealed high favouredness towards the possible implementation of SET and that also supported by results of Isiaka's study (1998). When data was compared across the 'designation variable' it was found that 36 percent respondents who have '7-15 years' of experience in the same designation have shown high inclination towards SET and they were followed by the faculty having 'above 21 years of designation experience' (33 percent). The study by Iyamu, et al. (2005) revealed that Nigerian university lecturers at the lower level demonstrated low acceptance of student evaluation compared with their senior counterparts where these junior lecturers are likely to resent this practice but Nigerian university lecturers are more accepting of student evaluation for formative purposes than for summative purposes. The results give an interesting concern that only 17 percent of the faculty members who have '16-21 years' of designation experience have shown high favour whereas 83 percent have revealed a low and moderate level towards SET. Across the 'organisation experience' variable, the respondents having '7-15 years' of organisation experience and 'below 7 years' of organisation experience has shown high credence in the ratio of 31:35 percent towards SET by means of favoring it. On the basis of 'total experience' variable it seems that the young faculty perceives the SET in a more confirmatory way because 36 percent faculty members who were having 'below 7-15 years total work experience' and the 35 percent faculties who have 'below 7 years experience' have revealed high favouredness towards the possible implementation of SET. When data was compared across the 'designation variable' it was found that 36 percent respondents who have '7-15 years' of experience in the same designation have shown high inclination towards SET and they were followed by the faculty having 'above 21 years of designation experience' (33 percent). The results give an interesting concern that only 17 percent of the faculty members having '16-21 years' of designation experience have shown high favour whereas 83 percent have revealed a low and moderate level towards SET. Across the 'organisation experience' variable, the respondents having '7-15 years' of organisation experience and 'below 7 years' of organisation experience has shown high credence in the ratio of 31:35 percent towards SET by means of favoring it.

When the respondents' perception about possible implementation of SET was examined on the basis of category of the organisations it has been found that the central university faculty has shown high favour (36 percent) towards the SET in contrast to 30 percent state university faculty who had registered their high favouredness towards SET. Whereas on the basis of nature of the organisation results explain that the general university faculty has shown more favour (32 percent) towards the implication of SET while the technical/ special characters university faculty have comparatively less favour (28 percent) towards the implementation of SET. The faculty of residential universities has shown high positivity (36 percent) towards implementation of SET as compared to the faculty of affiliating universities (30 percent). As a whole the possibility of introducing SET in the university system was highly favoured by 31 percent respondents and low inclination was witnessed by 24 percent respondents and a whopping 45 percent of the respondents marked their preference in the moderate favour zone indicating at the possibility of converting them into high favour zone.

Variations in Faculty Favour to SET according to Demographic Variables: The variations in faculty favour to SET have been analysed this part of the study and as to whether the respondents differ significantly or not have been verified by using ANOVA and the results have been shown as per the Table-3. As can be witnessed from the Table-3 that according age categories of the respondents, the faculty members have been found differing significantly at 0.01 level ($F=3.56$, $p=.01$). It was observed the highest mean score was witnessed by the respondents of the age groups of 'above 55 years' (mean=5.62) followed by 'below 7 years' age group (mean=5.59). Contrary results have emerged on gender basis of the respondents as the faculty members did not differ significantly though female faculty has shown higher inclination towards SET as compared to the male respondents. When the results were explored on the basis of academic stream, highest qualifications, designation, total experience, designation experience, organisation experience organisation category, nature of the organisation, and the organisation structure, the results witnessed no significant variations. It has been observed that the science/engineering faculty has shown higher mean score (5.57) followed by social science (mean score=5.37) and arts/humanities faculty (mean score=5.37). Designation-wise, the lecturers have witnessed increased favour and very interestingly the professors have witnessed least favour to SET. When mean scores were compared for total work experience variable it was found that newer faculty has witnessed increased favour to SET when compared with faculty having more work experience. On the basis of organisational variables, the respondents serving in central universities, general universities and residential universities have revealed encouraging favour towards possible implementation of SET in Indian universities.

Table-3: Variations in the Faculty Favour to SET across Demographic Variables

Dimensions of Faculty Demographics		Count (%)	Mean	F-Value	p-value
Age Category	Below 35 yrs	108(21)	5.59	3.56	.014
	36-45 yrs.	198(40)	5.34		
	46-55 yrs	143(29)	5.34		
	Above 55 yrs.	51(10)	5.62		
Gender	Male	355(71)	5.38	.694	.405
	Female	145(29)	5.53		
Academic Stream	Science/Engineering	150(30)	5.57	1.29	.275
	Social Sciences	239(48)	5.37		
	Arts/Humanities	111(22)	5.33		
Highest Qualification	Basic Entry Qualification	88(18)	5.43	1.03	.311
	Ph. D.	412(82)	5.42		
Designation	Lecturer	167(33)	5.60	.638	.529
	Reader	204(41)	5.39		
	Professor	129(26)	5.24		
Total Experience	below 7 yrs.	74(15)	5.55	1.04	.373
	7-15 yrs.	160(32)	5.64		
	16-21yrs	86(17)	5.19		
	above 21 yrs.	180(36)	5.29		
Designation Experience	below 7 yrs.	246(49)	5.41	.364	.779
	7-15 yrs.	198(40)	5.60		
	16-21yrs	35(7)	4.60		
	above 21 yrs.	21(4)	5.29		
Organisation Experience	below 7 yrs.	145(29)	5.44	1.72	.161
	7-15 yrs.	177(35)	5.63		
	16-21yrs	60(12)	5.01		
	above 21 yrs.	118(24)	5.30		
Organisation Category	Central University	109(22)	5.62	3.44	.064
	State University	391(78)	5.37		
Nature of Organisation	General University	388(78)	5.46	.723	.396
	Tech./Spl. Character Uni.	112(22)	5.28		
Organisation Structure	Affiliating University	342(68)	5.40	.247	.619
	Residential University	158(32)	5.48		

Note: Significant at 1 percent level if p -value = .01

Significant at 5 percent level if p -value = .05

4.0 Implications of the Study

As viewed by Jackman and Strober (2003) nobody likes performance reviews. Subordinates are terrified they'll hear nothing but criticism. Bosses, for their part, think their direct reports will respond to even the mildest criticism with stonewalling, anger, or tears. The result? Everyone keeps quiet and says as little as possible. That's unfortunate, because most people need help figuring out how they can improve their performance and advance their careers. This fear of feedback doesn't come into play just during annual reviews. But when SET is implemented in the institutions of higher learning it will have a multiplier effect on the system and the performance. A study on student versus supervisor feedback to teachers demonstrated that teachers

significantly improved their performance following feedback from students while feedback from the teachers' supervisors actually decreased performance (Tuckman and Oliver, 1968). In the study, teachers regarded students as more credible because students were believed to have more opportunity to observe teaching behaviors. Feedback is considered as a part of longitudinal performance management process influenced by, and contributing to, the individual's feedback orientation and the organization's feedback culture and feedback from the students will help in fostering the feedback culture which refers to the organization's support for feedback, including non-threatening, behaviourally focused feedback, coaching to help interpret and use feedback, and a strong link between performance

improvement and valued outcomes. Critical events in faculty academic life will direct attention to the value of feedback and thereby start a performance management cycle of receiving, absorbing, and applying feedback in the following days, weeks, and months. Human resource research and practice in general need to measure feedback orientation and culture and capture longitudinal feedback processes to better understand and influence the effects of feedback on self-awareness, self-confidence, and job performance. Multi-source feedback systems wherein SET constitutes a part have been implemented in many organizations as a tool to enhance faculty management and development efforts. Interestingly, compared to the number of other systems in place, the amount of empirical work conducted to support the use of these systems is scarce and that is why the study of this nature need to be promoted and outcome need to be implemented for holistic development of the system and all those connected to it.

5.0 Conclusion

Evaluation of faculty by the students seems to be call of the day in present day education system. Various misgivings about the incorporation of the concept for university faculty have been properly clarified though the paper. Results of the study reveal that the university faculty is quite optimistic have shown positive attitude towards teachers' evaluation by the students. However, faculty have some perceived dreads about the SET as the performance appraisal can also be affected by the students' attitudes towards evaluating their teachers, as well as by the students' liking for their faculty and their interest in any particular subject. Qualification-wise, the respondents holding Ph.D. degree have given away higher acceptance towards the SET in contrast to the respondents having only basic entry qualifications. The eldest and youngest faculty members have favoured highly in contrast to middle-aged faculty. A good number of respondents think that SET will not be dangerous for the institutes having the system of internal assessment. Significant variations have emerged on the basis of age of the respondents for faculty favour to SET and in rest of the variables no significant differences have been found at any of the levels of significance.

References

- Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective Faculty Evaluation*, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests", *Psychometrika*, Vol. 16, pp. 297-334.
- Fuhrmann, B. G. and Geyer, A. (2003). "Students' Evaluation of Teachers and Instructional Quality-Analysis of Relevant Factors Based on Empirical Evaluation Research", *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 229-238.
- Gupta, Arun K. and Renu, Gupta (2007). "Students' Feedback for Quality Assessment: Challenges and Tasks Ahead", *University News*, Vol. 45, No. 30, pp. 23-29.
- Ilgel, D. R., Fisher, C. D. and Taylor, S. M. (1979). "Consequences of Individual Feedback on Behaviour in Organizations", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 64, No.4, pp. 349-371.
- Isiaka, B.T. (1998). "Teachers' Perception of Students' Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness", *Lagos Journal of Education (Special Edition)*, pp. 6-11.
- Iyamu, E. O.S., Oglebaen S. and Aduwa E. (2005). "Lecturers' Perception of Student Evaluation in Nigerian Universities", *International Education Journal*, Vol. 6, No.5, pp. 619-625.
- Jackman, J. M., and Strober, M. H. (2003). "Fear of Feedback", *Harvard Business Review*. April, pp. 3-8.
- Jackson, M. (1998). "Teacher Characteristics and Teaching Effectiveness", *Studies in Education*, Vol. 12, No.1, pp.101-112.
- Johnson, J. W., Olson, A. M., and Courtney, C. L. (1996). "Implementing Multiple Perspective Feedback: An Integrated Framework", *Human Resource Management Review*. Vol. 6, No. 4. pp. 253-277.
- Kaur, K.; Singh, S. and Kaur, M. (2001). "Evaluation of Teachers by Students", *University News*, Vol. 39, No. 15, pp. 5-8.
- Kulik, J. A. (2001). "Student Ratings: Validity, Utility and Controversy", *New Directions for Institutional Research*, Vol. 27, No.5, pp. 9-25.
- Lahiri, S. (2003). "Students' Evaluation of Teachers: Basis and Biases", *University News*, Vol. 41, No. 30, pp. 8-11.
- London, M. and Smither, J. W. (2002). "Feedback Orientation, Feedback Culture, and the Longitudinal Performance Management Process." *Human Resource Management Review*. Vol. 12, No. 1. pp. 81-100.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). "Students' Evaluations of University Teaching: Research Findings, Methodological Issues, and Directions for Further Research", *International Journal of Educational Research*, Vol.11, No. 3, pp. 253-388.
- Martin, J. R. (1998) "Evaluating Faculty Based on Student Opinions: Problems, Implications and Recommendations from Deming's Theory of Management Perspective", *Issues in Accounting Education*, November, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 1079-1094.
- Odhiambo, G.O. (2005). "Teacher Appraisal: The Experiences of Kenyan Secondary School Teachers", *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 402-416.

- Penny, A. R. (2003). "Changing the Agenda for Research into Students' Views about University Teaching: Four Shortcomings of SRT Research", *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 399-411.
- Read, W., Rama, J. D and Raghunandan, K. (2001). "The Relationship between Student Evaluations of Teaching and Faculty Evaluations", *Journal of Education for Business*, Vol. 76, No. 4, pp.189-192.
- Rocca, K.A. and McCroskey, J.C. (1999). "The Interrelationship of Student Ratings of Instructors' Immediacy, Verbal Aggressiveness, Homophily, and Interpersonal Attraction", *Communication Education*, Vol. 48, No. 4, pp. 308-316.
- Thailambal, P. (1998). "Students' Assessment of Teacher – Why Not", *University News*, Vol. 36, No. 9, pp. 1-2 & 4.
- Tuckman, B.W. and Oliver, W.F. (1968). "Effectiveness of Feedback to Teachers as a Function of Source", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 59, No. 4, pp. 297-301.
- Ulrich, D. (1993). "Editors Note", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 32, Nos. 2 & 3, pp. 209-210.
- Upadhyaya, M. and Soni, S. (2002). "Student Evaluations: Key to Teachers' Performance", *University News*, Vol. 40, No. 41, pp. 7-10.
- Vadhera, Ved Pal (1998). "Students' Evaluation of Teachers: An Opinion Survey of Teachers", *University News*, Vol. 36, No. 30, pp. 7-11.
- Vadhera, Ved Pal (1999). "Students' Evaluation of Teachers – Myths and Realities", *University News*, Vol. 37, No.41, pp. 3-5.
- Wachtel, H. K. (1998). "Student Evaluation of College Teaching Effectiveness: A Brief Review", *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 192-210.
- Williams, J. R. and Lucke, S. B. (2000). "360° Feedback System Effectiveness: Test of a Model in a Field Setting", *Journal of Quality Management*. Vol. 4, No. 1. pp. 23-49.