UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

TUTORS' ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS' APPRAISAL OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS IN THE BONO REGION OF GHANA

EFFAH AMEYAW GODFRED

2020

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

TUTORS' ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS' APPRAISAL OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS IN THE BONO REGION OF GHANA

BY

GODFRED

V GODFRED

Thesis submitted to the Department of Education and Psychology of the Faculty of Educational Foundations, College of Education Studies, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Master of Philosophy degree in Educational Psychology

December, 2020

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature.....Date ……

Name: …….

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of this thesis were supervised following the guidelines on supervision of the thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Principal Supervisor's Signature……Date……

Name……

ABSTRACT

The study focused on tutors' attitudes towards students' appraisal of their teaching effectiveness in the Bono Region of Ghana. A quantitative descriptive survey design was adopted to conduct this study. The population of the study involved four Collages of Education selected from the Bono Region of Ghana. A multi-stage sampling technique was used in the selection of the sample to be included in the study. Questionnaires were used to gather data in the present study. Data were analysed with Microsoft Excel and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. The analysis conducted were frequencies and percentages, independent sample t-test, Pearson Product Moment Correlation, and one-way ANOVA. A Cronbach's Alpha was used to test the reliability of the study instruments. Findings from the study indicated that tutors have a positive attitude towards students' appraisal of teaching. It was recommended that even though student appraisal of teaching is beneficial and accurate, it should not be the only indicator of measuring the tutor's effectiveness.

KEYWORDS

Tutors

Students

Appraisal

Attitude

Teaching Effectiveness

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In this study's conduct, I relied on the assistance of many people, without whose help, the work would not have been successful. I express my profound gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Mark Owusu Amponsah, Head of Department, Education and Psychology (UCC) and my principal supervisor, who thoroughly read the original manuscript and offered valuable suggestions. All College of Education tutors in Bono and Bono East Region who accepted and cooperated during the data-gathering process also deserve my sincere gratitude. This thesis would not have been successful without your directions and immense support throughout my work. You made time out of your busy schedules and diligently gave me your support. I thank my family for their prayers and emotional support throughout my work. To all those who supported me in diverse ways or from whom I received some favours throughout my work but are inadvertently not mentioned here, I lack valuable words to express my sincere thanks.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my lovely sister, Adjei Dorothy (Osofo-maame), Mercy Adjei (Mum), Adjei Dickson William (Dad), for their patience, support, and prayers throughout this research.

TABLE OF CONTENT

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

In recent years, the appraisal of teaching effectiveness has emerged as a central issue in higher education, leading to greater transparency and progress in teaching quality and student learning (Shah & Sid Nair, 2012). Since teaching efficiency is becoming more critical in the school's evaluation system, it is critical to determine its measure. Teaching is a multi-dimensional task relating to several independent heights or instructor attributes, which sometimes are hard to evaluate (Codruta, Simona, & Georgeta, 2011; Hajdin & Pažur, 2012; Lalla, Frederic, & Ferrari, 2011). According to anecdotal evidence, teaching encompasses several characteristics, including topic knowledge, pedagogical abilities, classroom management, communication, student participation, and evaluation procedures. These factors are linked and necessitate a thorough assessment to capture the full spectrum of educational effectiveness.

Teaching is a type of interactive supremacy intended to change one another's actions (Fenstermacher, Soltis, & Sanger, 2015). According to Calhoun, Weil, Joyce et al. (2016) teaching is a process where the tutor and students create a communal atmosphere, including sets of beliefs and values that, in turn, fit their opinion of certainty (p. 25). In other words, teaching is a type of behavioural control aimed at altering the behaviour ability of another person (Wright, 2018). While it is true that teaching entails leading and influencing others' learning and behaviour, additional factors must be considered to achieve a more thorough

picture. Teaching promotes critical thinking, problem solving, and conceptual comprehension in addition to behaviour management. Engaging students in active learning, stimulating independent thinking, and cultivating a deep comprehension of the subject matter are all components of effective teaching. It is not only concerned with changing behaviour, but also with developing higher-order cognitive skills and instilling a love of learning (Banner & Cannon, 2017).

Teaching is said to be beneficial to the notch that after a time of instruction, student performance increases following that instruction's aims. (Morrison, Ross, Morrison et al., 2019). Therefore, effective teaching measures the change in student motivation, procedural knowledge, metacognition, and capacity to manage stress throughout instruction (Bruns, De Gregorio, & Taut, 2016). Effective teaching considers students' various needs, abilities, and learning styles. It entails tailoring teaching approaches and strategies to individual diversity and promoting inclusive learning environments. Teachers strive to establish helpful and motivating environments that foster growth and development rather than just managing behaviour (MacSuga-Gage, Simonsen, & Briere, 2012).

Teaching effectiveness is at the mercy of the individualities of the instructor, course, and learners (Sajjad, 2010). The instructor's knowledge, expertise, style of instruction, capacity for interaction, excitement, and potential to engage learners constitute teaching effectiveness. Different instructors contribute different viewpoints, experiences, and techniques to the teaching process, influencing how efficiently they impart knowledge and encourage learning. The

overall teaching effectiveness of a tutor, that is, an aspect of teaching, determines a variety of tutor attributes such as openness, the ability to inspire learners and assist them in the study of their topic, the ability to coordinate the lesson even with measurable exercises (Gao & Liu, 2012).

Berry, Daughtrey and Wieder (2010) state, "An effective tutor exhibits instructional awareness, offers guidance in a range of ways to different students, and significantly increases the students' performance." An effective tutor thoroughly understands the subject area and instructional tactics. They are informed about the material they are teaching and know various tactics and techniques for effectively communicating information. This insight enables them to tailor their teaching approaches to specific students' needs and maximise their learning experience. An effective tutor's capacity to dramatically improve pupils' performance is vital to their effectiveness. They assist students in developing a more profound knowledge of the subject matter, improving their abilities, and achieving higher academic accomplishment through their instructional expertise and targeted advice. Effective tutors may excite and inspire learners, build confidence, and enable them to attain their full potential (Kyriacou, 2010).

Perrott (2014) declared that tutors' instructional skills, positive attitudes toward instruction, and content knowledge are essential to effective teaching. He outlined specific components that make a helpful teacher or practical; group interaction, evaluation or grading, breadth of coverage, organisation or clarification, learning or value, assignment/reading, excitement, workload or difficulty, and personal monitoring. For Killen (2010), effective teachers engage

students with the necessary knowledge they need to understand, change their instructional style, use constructive, hands-on instruction, provide students with constant feedback on their results, use the student's responses to evaluate and enhance their teaching and provide specific goals for assignments. Competent tutors are well-known for their commitment to the students and teaching and feel responsible for their student's achievement, success, and professional development (Rubio Cuenca, 2012). Competent tutors believe all students can learn, although they learn differently. Killen (2006) added that efficient tutors have learning outcomes, objectives, and personal teaching goals. As a backing of Killen's viewpoint, Kyriacou (2010) revealed that experienced tutors' unique duty is to have variations in instructions, lesson clarity, task-orientedness, commitment to the learning process, and student attainment.

A teacher's ability to apply and integrate knowledge or skills to a specific population in a specific setting is an effective teacher's critical characteristic (Minor, Onwuegbuzie, & Witcher, 2000). The researcher's viewpoint and Personal understanding of whom an effective tutor is indicates that effective instructors organise and present the procedural knowledge and needed skills to learners to interact with and learn the content. Efficient tutors take care of students as individuals first and as students second. They value every student as a person. (Hindman, Grant, & Stronge, 2013). Effective teachers demonstrate concentrated and sympathetic listening to show students that they care about what is happening in the classroom and their general interests. However, tutors usually seek their conceptions of efficient learning and teaching. Opinions may, however,

differ depending on the course taught or personal span of control, but often learning and teaching exercises, including the formation and maintenance of classroom instruction, the design, planning, and development of teaching materials, the measurement of the coursework of students, the setting and marking of examinations scripts, and the support of students via a ministerial or administrative position (Thomas, 2012). To support students under their supervision, most often employ various pedagogical methods considered beneficial. These methods often include lectures, workshops, tutorials, group work in the laboratory, fieldwork, and many others.

As tutors advance in their daily classroom activities, they must know whether they will acquire appropriate instructional processes and practices. (Sarzynski, 2018). Thus, he needs feedback to improve his teaching skills and teaching materials. More importantly, everyone requires individuals who will give us feedback. That is how we can progress (Bill, 2013). Feedback is information a person gives (e.g., self, experience, instructor, peer, book, family) regarding one's success or cognition characteristics." (Wiggins, 2012). Feedback is a vibrant resource essential to work (Molloy & Boud, 2014). Feedback provides an up-to-date suggestion for improvement and is used to inform revised target goals (Cavanaugh, 2013). On the other hand, feedback entails instructional prospects for applying received feedback through rehearsal efforts or designing tasks that build towards an all-inclusive project (Narciss, 2013). Teaching effectiveness can be evaluated in several ways, including student appraisal, review of course planning documents, classroom observation, supervisor evaluation, peer

evaluation, and self-evaluation (Goe, Bell, & Little, 2008). Howerever, Richardson (2005) noted that universities/colleges could evaluate lectures' teaching by: classroom observation, student ratings, student achievement, peer rating, self-rating, teacher interview, parents rating, competency tests, and indirect measures. However, of these approaches, although engrossed in controversy, student appraisal has gained popularity globally as the primary source of assessing teaching in higher education (Atek, Salim, Halim et al., 2015; Inko-Tariah, 2013a). Student appraisal of lecturers' teaching means that students, as consumers of instruction, are made to express their opinion and feelings concerning the effectiveness of the lecturers' teaching process and activities during the semester and the extent to which they benefited from the process (Idaka, Joshua, & Kritsonis, 2006b)

As such, it seems fair to emphasise that students are the most valuable source of evidence about their tutors' teaching abilities (Hounsell, 2009). Subsequently, different terminologies have occurred and are used interchangeably by authors or researchers to refer to academic student appraisal. For instance, "student ratings of teaching," "course evaluation," "student evaluation of teaching (SET)," "student evaluation," "performance appraisal," and "student Feedback" have all been used in the literature. Lowenthal, Bauer and Chen (2015) and Marzano and Toth (2013) used faculty course and tutor evaluations to refer to end-of-course evaluation. No matter what name they go by, they have been part of academic life for many (Algozzine, Gretes, Flowers et al., 2004). Using student appraisal to gauge instruction efficacy is a fixed feature in higher education. It is

not the only pointer to teaching efficiency but has become the most commonly used method for evaluating college tutors (Kember & Ginns, 2012)

The utilisation of official instruments in gathering student responses in a higher education institution has significantly developed in recent years (Benton & Young, 2018; Marsh, 2007). The use of student appraisal to assess instruction has increased to the point that they are used regularly at almost all universities and colleges worldwide (Algozzine et al., 2004). Student feedback usually employs questionnaire items that appraise teaching effectiveness and various aspect of the course. The items involved in student appraisal assess various and distinguishable aspects of their tutor's teaching effectiveness, behaviour, and the course (Beran, Violato, & Kline, 2007). Students assess their tutors based on their knowledge of the content, how to teach the subject, the reporting and departing time in the lecture room, the teacher's social relationship with students, and the teacher's commitment in his course area, level of the course, class size, different disciplines, gender (Chen & Hoshower, 2003). Benton and Cashin (2014) noted six components that frequently appear on the student evaluations of teaching effectiveness questionnaire: statements on workload and course difficulty; statements on student-teacher, interaction statements on the instructor's communication skills; student self-assessment questions; questions about assessment practices in the course; and, questions about the course content.

Similarly, Langen (2011) identified some measures of teaching effectiveness. They established that student evaluation of teaching effectiveness should embrace; course organisation and planning, student self-rated learning,

grading and examinations, course difficulty or workload, clarity or communication skills, and teacher-student interaction/rapport. About Chung Sea Law (2010), Student Evaluations of Education Quality (SEEQ) is an appraisal instrument. This instrument contains nine (9) separate statements or items on teaching conduct, which should all exist to confirm that student feedback is descriptive of teaching efficiency. He further opined that learning or value; breadth of coverage examinations or grading; organisation; personal rapport, group interaction learning or value; assignments workload and instructor enthusiasm should be included to confirm that an appraisal is illustrative of teaching efficiency.

Several findings from various studies indicate that most colleges worldwide use student evaluations of teaching to appraise teaching efficiency. Chikazinga (2018), As cited in Machingambi and Wadesango (2011), noted that the student evaluations of their tutors' teaching effectiveness gained its root in the 15th Century when students at Bologna University in Italy rewarded their tutors according to their teaching capabilities. The use of student evaluations to appraise instruction has proliferated to the point that they are used frequently at almost all higher education institutions globally (Algozzine et al., 2004). Given that student evaluations are used excessively, Sumaedi, Mahatma Yuda Bakti and Metasari (2012) in Indonesia and Pickford (2013) in the United Kingdom. Campbell and Bozeman (2007) emphasised that the sole measure of teaching effectiveness in North American higher education institutions is the appraisal scores that students complete during each academic semester.

Similarly, in the study of Iyamu and Aduwa-Oglebaen (2005), it was also known that all universities and colleges in Malaysia use students' appraisals to measure professors' and tutors' effectiveness. The usage of SETs is not different from Saudi Arabia. SETE and its modifications in high education quality management and accreditation are recognised (AI-Kuwaiti, 2014). Higher education institutions in Taiwan have long utilised teaching evaluation by students, which offers information on teacher effectiveness and evaluates lecturers (Clayson, 2009). Even so, some universities, such as Harvard, Humber, Alberta, McGill, Michigan, Dalhousie, et cetera, implement an everyday use of end-of-course evaluation instruments across the entire institutional level (Gravestock & Gregor-Greenleaf, 2008).

In the Ghanaian educational system, appraisal of teaching is an essential aspect of assessing the quality and effectiveness of educators in primary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities. In primary and senior high schools, the evaluation of teaching typically involves a combination of formal and informal methods, which includes classroom observation, where teachers are observed in their classrooms by school administrators, circuit supervisors, or designated evaluators to examine their educational practices, classroom management, and relationships with students (Esia-Donkoh & Baffoe, 2018). The observations might be scheduled or unscheduled, and the evaluators can examine various aspects of teaching using standardised observation frameworks or checklists (Ampofo, Onyango, & Ogola, 2019). Students evaluate tutors course-by-course at the College and the University level. Questionnaires are sent around

the various campuses by "the staff of the Quality Assurance Unit (Bemile, Jackson, & Ofosu, 2014). Evidence from the study of Kwarteng, Anane and Nkrumah (2016) also indicated, "The Association of Africa Universities (AAUs) in the year 2000, subsequently at a conference consistently specified that every tertiary institution must have quality assurance system for internal accountability". It shows that student evaluation has been included in African colleges and universities as a critical instrument in the internal guarantee of quality processes as a method of exhibiting an institution's efficiency (Johnson, 2000).

Almost all the colleges of education in Ghana use SETs as an evaluation tool for their teaching effectiveness to meet demands for accountability in higher education. Student ratings have become widespread and standardised (Beran et al., 2007). Many tutors consider student appraisal a valuable indicator of teaching habits that lead to teaching effectiveness. (Beran et al., 2007). Hornstein (2017) insistently stated that student appraisal of teaching effectiveness provides formative feedback to tutors for enhancing their instruction, course content, and structure. They emphasised that student ratings of courses are for promotion and tenure decisions, salary increases, faculty development, and improvement. Moreover, students could offer meaningful feedback when they believe and see that their input is valued (Chen & Hoshower, 2003). Iyamu and Aduwa-Oglebaen (2005) identify some benefits of student appraisal. In their view, excellence in teaching can be recognised and rewarded; it serves as a platform for participation between tutors and students. They also pronounced that the only direct and all-

embracing evidence about tutors' teaching is the student's appraisal of teaching efficiency. It also encourages an institution to consider its desired goals and values. It also serves as a platform for students' contribution to shaping the institution's educational goals (Thomas, 2012).

More importantly, student evaluation serves three main functions. (a) providing evidence for institutional accountability (e.g., demonstrating the presence of adequate procedures for ensuring teaching quality, (b) Improving teaching quality, and (c) providing input for appraisal exercises (e.g., tenure/promotion decisions) (Kember, Leung, & Kwan, 2002). Some of these benefits in students' evaluation of teaching, researchers such as Surgenor (2013) and Wachtel (1998) have suggested that there is some negative and positive attitude of tutors toward student appraisal of their teaching effectiveness. An attitude is an essential concept for understanding human behaviour. According to Morris, Maisto and Dunn (2007), attitude is a relatively stable organisation of beliefs, feelings, and tendencies towards something or someone. They argue that attitude comes in three elements: beliefs, feelings, and behaviour tendencies. Attitude is positive or negative feelings that an individual holds about objects, persons, or ideas (Pickens, 2005). In short, an attitude has to do with the feeling, disposition, manner, and position concerning a person or thing, orientation, or tendency, particularly in people's minds. That is, tutors' attitude concerns their feelings, dispositions, and manner toward student evaluation.

Surgenor (2013), Macfadyen, Dawson, Prest et al. (2016) viewed tutors' attitudes toward student evaluation based on its usefulness, purpose, reliability,

and consequence of evaluation. A study by Moore and Kuol (2005) questioned students' capability to assess tutors' performance due to their incompetent understanding of instruction. They opined that students are not qualified enough to assess their teaching effectiveness because students do not know much about what goes into teaching. Again, tutors express their distress toward student evaluation based on beliefs and personal feelings, which leads to students' incompetence in making equitable decisions. Some tutors argue that student feedback fails to serve their instructional goals and jeopardises their academic liberty and privileges (Clayson, 2018). Fadia Nasser and Barbara Fresko (2002) pointed out that tutors who receive higher ratings tend to exhibit stronger beliefs and support for using the appraisal, while others who receive lower ratings tend to boycott the use of student feedback. Some are also determined to ensure they get helpful feedback from their students.

Similarly, Weinberg, Fleisher and Hashimoto (2007) mentioned that evaluations could be 'bought' by grades and are not essential to academics. On the contrary, Griffin (2004) argues that what matters is not the actual grade but the students' perceptions. If students anticipate a lower grade than they believe they deserve, they will rate the instructor lower on every SET question. According to Zimmerman, Schmidt, Becker et al. (2014), "tutors who receive high appraisals are worse tutors than their colleagues. Contrary to the view of Zimmerman et al., excellent instructors can get inadequate evaluations. The idea is how the ratings look across various disciplines. Li, Benton, Brown et al. (2016) demonstrated that at least six to eight class evaluations should be obtained before accurate,

summative judgments about teaching efficacy can be taken. Indeed an excellent tutor can sometimes get lower evaluations, often due to personal or environmental factors that affect performance. Personal experience shows an excellent instructor who gets one low evaluation across eight diverse classes is an outstanding tutor but not what other scholars posit.

Rentsch (2013) reported that some tutors believe that disappointed and underperforming students express their dissatisfaction most intensively about their performance and effectiveness in teaching and not being objective in their evaluation. Similarly, Inko-Tariah (2013a) also reported that many instructors believe students may not be neutral enough to evaluate their tutors. Moreover, evidence from the study of Marsh (2007) reported that students with an immense interest in a particular subject and students expecting better results tend to rate tutors higher. Contrary to the report from Rentsch (2013), Hornstein (2017) affirmed that the influence of students' prior interest in course evaluations does not institute a bias. They acknowledged that when student feedback is for a cumulative purpose, the impact of student interest in the subject can be a foundation of inequity in that it is the purpose of the course and not the tutor. Another claim tutor put forth is the gender difference in student rating of instruction. Students recognise, assess, and treat female tutors more exceptionally than male tutors (MacNell, Driscoll, & Hunt, 2015). Research of student assessments of educational levels indicated that the students related upward education to masculine instructors and lateral to women instructors (Miller & Chamberlin, 2000). Male teachers appear to get better ratings on enthusiasm, a

limited-time feature for teachers. In contrast, Basow, Codos and Martin (2013) reported that female teachers receive considerably higher ratings than male teachers. Centra and Gaubatz (2000) suggested that for specific teaching methods, the higher appraisal of woman tutors received from female learners, and often from male students, may have indicated student predilections.

Additionally, Alhija and Fresko (2009) found that female students practice giving feminine tutors higher ratings than male students, giving more excellent ratings to masculine tutors. In constrast, Kogan, Schoenfeld-Tacher and Hellyer (2010) reviewed that female faculty members tend to experience more negative effects from student evaluations compared to their male counterparts. According to Boring (2017), The diverse teaching dimensions that learners rate in males and females tend to pertain to sex discrimination. The dimensions of teaching for which students perceive a comparative advantage for women, such as preparation for courses and organisation, tend to be even more time-consuming than the teaching dimensions that students value more in men, such as class leadership (Boring, 2017). Men are more knowledgeable and have higher SET scores than women, but students seem to learn from both tutors, suggesting that female instructors are as skilled as men (Boring, 2017). In general, women in College circles tend to be considered less able and less capable than men, notwithstanding their career accomplishments and aptitudes.

Regarding the age difference in student rating, Wilson, Beyer and Monteiro (2014) used pictures of young and old adults and discovered that elderly tutors obtained more undesirable evaluations of supportiveness and friendship

attitudes than younger tutors. An interrelatedness between age and gender revealed that learners classify older female tutors as less organised than younger female instructors, although the same was correct for male tutors regardless of age. An investigation by Arbuckle and Williams (2003) suggests that young male teachers spontaneously rate enthusiastically.

Besides working experience, Beavis (2012) established that tutors receive lower ratings in their few teaching years than those in later years. In contrast, John (2009) also found that tutors with few teaching years usually obtain lower evaluations than experienced assistant teachers and high-ranking lecturers. Personally, Teachers who receive lower ratings in their first year of teaching are not evidence of bias but probably reflect their considerably lower teaching methods, something that could improve as teachers gain experience. The current knowledge regarding the nature and understanding of tutor attitudes toward students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness was limited in scope, but most of the existing research had only investigated lecturers' perceptions of student evaluation of courses. Consequently, the current research seeks to expand knowledge of tutor attitudes toward student evaluation in the Bono Region Colleges of Education. This study may also provide an in-depth investigation into tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal of teaching.

Statement of the Problem

Students' involvement in appraising their tutors' teaching efficiency is a hands-on indication of educational autonomy (Aduwa-Oglebaen, 2005). Student evaluation of lecturers' teaching entails requiring students to express their

thoughts and feelings about the effectiveness of the lecturers' teaching process and activities throughout the semester, as well as the extent to which they benefited from the method of instructionz (Idaka, Joshua, & Kritsonis, 2006). There is no agitation that students can provide more information about their tutors than others. Students are the direct recipients of instructions. However, tutors accept suggestions and opinions from their students in the classroom. Nevertheless, there are some misconceptions and perceptions of their students in evaluating the worth of their teaching.

Research conducted in various countries and universities, particularly in Europe, Africa, has explored students' evaluation of lecturers' teaching. The findings from these studies indicate that lecturers' perceptions regarding student appraisal are somewhat diverse. For instance, in Sweden University teachers generally view student feedback in a positive light as it carries significant weight in shaping their teaching methods and enhancing course quality (Floden, 2017). Renstch (2013) also reviewed that lecturers feel apprehensive about the possibility that student evaluations could reveal any academic or professional shortcomings they might have. They fear negative student feedback could tarnish their reputation or affect their career prospects. As a result, these lecturers were hesitant to accept student evaluations of their teaching.

In Nigeria and South Africa, several studies have demonstrated that lecturers generally do not embrace student evaluations of their teaching (Iyam & Aduwa-Oglebaen, 2005; Mwachingambi & Wadesango, 2011; Yusuf, Ajidagba, Ayorinde, & Olumoun, 2010); but other studies in Nigeria, and Kenya, showed

that lecturers agree that student evaluations of lecturers' teaching are necessary—however, teachers' positive perceptions mainly apply if the purpose is formative (Adeyemo, 2015; Idaka et al., 2006; Inko-Tariah, 2013; Gichinga, Mukulu, & Mwachiro, 2014). Considering the inconsistent findings from prior research on teacher evaluations, as mentioned earlier, it would be imprudent to make sweeping assumptions about whether lecturers hold positive or negative attitudes towards student evaluations of teaching.

In that regard Gyimah, Kwarteng, Anane, and Nkrumah, (2016) in Ghana conducted an empirical study to examine lecturers perceptions of teaching and course appraisal in the University of Cape Coast. Besides, from the data collected in their study, they concluded that generally, lecturers of UCC have positive perceptions of students' appraisal of courses and teaching. Regardless of the apparent high level of acceptance of the evaluation process among the lecturers at the University of Cape Coast, empirically, tutors' perception regarding students' appraisal of courses and teaching at the Colleges Level appeared unavailable in the literature. Despite a thorough review of the existing literature, it is evident that there is limited or no research has been conducted to examine the standpoints and dispositions of tutors in Ghana regarding the utilisation of student evaluations as a means of assessing their teaching effectiveness, and ensuring quality.

However, it is essential to note that the study conducted by Gyimah et al. (2016) had a specific focus on the lecturers' perception of student appraisal, rather than examining their attitudes towards it. To comprehend the distinction between perception and attitude, it is crucial to understand their conceptual differences.

Perception involves the cognitive and sensory processes through which individuals comprehend and interpret their environment. On the other hand, attitude refers to an individual's inherent disposition, sensitivity, or way of thinking and behaving towards a particular object, person, or situation (Morris, Albert, Maisto & Dunn, 2006). In the context of lecturers' perception of student appraisal, the study by Gyimah et al. (2016) likely aimed to explore how lecturers understand and interpret the feedback provided by students regarding their courses and teaching. It may have focused on examining lecturers' cognitive processes, including how they gather and process information from student appraisals and how they make sense of it in the context of their teaching practices. However, the study did not explicitly delve into the attitudes that lecturers hold towards student appraisal, which can encompass their feelings, beliefs, and behaviors towards this evaluation method.

To gain a more comprehensive understanding of lecturers' attitudes towards student appraisal, future research could explore not only their perceptions but also their attitude (emotions, beliefs, responses, and actions) related to student feedback. Therefore, further investigation is required to obtain a comprehensive understanding of tutors' perspectives and ascertain their feelings and responses they may have regarding the use of student evaluations as a tool for assessing teaching effectiveness since Gyimah et al. (2016) solely concentrated on the lecturers' perspective of student appraisal in the University of Cape Coast. This research gap highlights the need for further investigation to gain insights into how Ghanaian tutors feel and response to the incorporation of student evaluations into

the evaluation process, which can contribute to enhancing teaching standards and career advancement in the Ghanaian higher education system.

Purpose of the Study

The study examined tutors' attitudes toward students' appraisal of teaching effectiveness at the colleges of education in the Bono Region, Ghana.

Objectives of the Study

The following objectives guided the study. Specifically, the study examined;

1. Tutors' attitude toward student's appraisal of teaching effectiveness
2. Tutor's Responses Toward Student's Appraisal of Teaching Effectiveness
3. Gender Differences in the attitude of tutors toward Student Appraisal of Teaching Effectiveness
4. Working experience in the attitude of tutors on students' appraisal of teaching effectiveness
5. Age difference in the attitude of tutors on students' appraisal of teaching effectiveness
6. Differences in the educational level of tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal of teaching effectiveness

Research Questions

The following research question guided the study.

1. What is the attitude of tutors to students' appraisal of teaching effectiveness?
2. What is the response of tutors to students' appraisal of teaching effectiveness?

Research Hypotheses

1. $H0_1$: There are no significant gender differences in the attitude of tutors toward student evaluation of their teaching
2. $H0_2$: There is no significant difference in tutors' attitudes toward students' appraisal of teaching based on their working experience
3. $H0_3$: There is no significant difference in tutors' attitudes toward students' appraisal of teaching based on their Age
4. H0: There are no significant differences in the educational level of tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal of teaching

Significance of the Study

This study will provide a basic understanding of the theory and practice of education regarding student appraisal of teaching. By examining the significance of this study, this study will inform policy decisions, enhance student learning experiences, improve tutor effectiveness, benefit educational institutions, and contribute to the nation's overall progress.

The study will offer insightful information to policymakers about the elements affecting tutors' effectiveness and student learning results. In other words, it will allow them to decide on policies for faculty recruitment, training, and assessment based on evidence, which will improve teaching methods and the standard of education as a whole. More importantly, it will force policymakers to implement evaluation systems that will promote accountability and transparency, enabling instructors to improve their teaching strategies and resulting in better student satisfaction and academic achievements.

Understanding possible impediments to effective teaching will be more accessible by understanding tutors' views toward students' evaluations. The belief is that students will benefit from a more encouraging and stimulating learning environment, as instructors who appreciate their input are more willing to put constructive criticism into practice, change their teaching strategies, and attend to students' unique needs. Additionally, this study will motivate students to offer truthful criticism, boosting cooperation between students and tutors and supporting a student-centred learning strategy.

This study will assist the tutor in recognising the influence of their attitudes on students' evaluations and teaching effectiveness, reflecting on their instructional strategies, receiving helpful criticism, and participating in professional development opportunities to improve their teaching abilities, ultimately resulting in increased job satisfaction and career advancement. In order to promote a positive learning environment, maximise student engagement, and improve educational outcomes, tutors will be better able to assess the effectiveness of their teaching strategies and tailor their instructional approaches to students' needs and preferences.

To Colleges of Education, the study contributes to colleges' and educational institutions' continued efforts to maintain high teaching standards and strengthen quality assurance methods. Institutions can analyse the effectiveness of their faculty members, identify areas for development, and execute focused interventions to improve teaching quality by studying tutors' attitudes. More importantly, it will allow schools or institutions that prioritise students'

evaluations and tutors' attitudes towards it to develop a positive reputation. Students who feel heard and respected are more likely to promote the institution to others, thus attracting prospective students and contributing to long-term institutional success.

A well-educated and skilled workforce is crucial for a nation's economic growth and competitiveness. The study's findings will help improve the quality of education by focusing on enhancing teaching effectiveness in the Region. It will produce highly competent graduates better prepared to meet the job market demands. It will also promote inclusivity, equity, and student engagement, ensuring that education serves as a means to empower individuals and contribute to the overall development and well-being of the Region. Notwithstanding, it will also serve as reference material in academia.

Delimitation

Geographically, the study was delimited to only the four Colleges of Education in the Bono Region. These Colleges are the AL-faruq College of Education, Berekum College of Education, St. Ambrose College of Education, and St. James College of Education. More importantly, the study was restricted to only full-time tutors at the selected Colleges. In terms of the methodology and data collection, the study was confined to the quantitative research approach, the descriptive survey design, and the utilisation of the questionnaire to gather data on the attitude of tutors. Contently, the study was delimited to find tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal of teaching effectiveness in Colleges of Education.

Limitations of the Study

The descriptive survey method was another limiting factor in that, as Leedy (2009) argues, the research may discover and describe what is but cannot predict what would be. Using a questionnaire as a data collection instrument was a study limitation. Because the study heavily relied on self-reported data from tutors, the findings might be subjected to biases and social desirability effects. In that, tutors might provide responses that align with expected norms or present themselves favorably, potentially compromising the data's accuracy and reliability.

More importantly, the study's findings cannot be generalised due to the potential lack of diverse samples. It is because the study was conducted in only four Colleges of Education in one Region in Ghana, which is not representative of the broader tutor population in Ghana but can therefore be generalised in the Region. Therefore, caution should be exercised when applying the results to different contexts.

More importantly, the lack of empirical evidence in Ghana limited the study. Most foreign studies were used in the presentation of the work. Various social and organisational factors, such as institutional policies, peer interactions, and administrative support, are also believed to influence tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal. These contextual factors were not adequately captured or controlled for in the study, potentially limiting the understanding of tutors' attitudes in a broader context.

The coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic delayed the study's data collection process. In that case, the researcher had to call some of the respondents on the

phone because of the covid-19 pandemic and the anxiety attached to its widespread and go to others' homes to get the questionnaires filled out for the researcher. Others did not acknowledge the printed questionnaire and anticipated that the covid-19 virus had contaminated the questionnaire. All covid-19 protocols were observed in any case.

Operational Definitions of Terms

Tutors' Attitudes: Tutor attitude refers to the tutors' beliefs, opinions, and feelings towards students' appraisal of their teaching effectiveness. It includes their receptiveness to student feedback, willingness to adapt teaching practices based on appraisal results, and overall disposition toward student evaluation.

Teaching Effectiveness: Teaching effectiveness refers to how a tutor's teaching methods, strategies, and approaches facilitate student learning and achievement of desired educational outcomes. It involves the tutor's ability to communicate effectively, engage students, provide clear explanations, encourage participation, and create a positive learning environment.

Student Appraisal: Student appraisal refers to the evaluation or assessment made by students regarding the quality and effectiveness of teaching. It encompasses students' perceptions, opinions, feedback on the tutor's teaching methods, clarity of instruction, engagement, and overall learning experience.

College of Education: A College of Education is an academic institution within a university that offers diploma and undergraduate programmes designed to educate and train individuals who aspire to become teachers.

Organisation of the study

The study is organised into five chapters. The first chapter dealt with the study's background, the problem statement, the study's purpose, the research questions, the study's significance, and the study's delimitation. Chapter Two of the study dealt with a review of related literature. Chapter Three examined the methodology; Chapter Four presented the study's results/findings. Chapter Five covered the summary of the study, conclusions based on the findings, and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The current investigation examines tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal of teaching effectiveness. A pertinent literature review related to the issue under investigation is presented in this section. The literature review comprises the conceptual review, theoretical review, conceptual framework, and empirical review. In gathering the data from the vast literature, various academic databases, including ProQuest, ERIC, google scholar, Jurn, and DOAJ, were used to access most of the literature. Some search terms and phrases used included "student feedback," "Appraisal of teaching effectiveness," "Teaching evaluation," Tutors' perspective of evaluation of teaching," and "student Feedback utilisation in Education." The chapter was presented under these themes with their significant subheadings.

Theoretical Framework

Social Identity Theory

The Social Identity Theory, developed by Henri Tajfel and John Turner (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) suggests that individuals derive a part of their self-concept from the groups they belong to and strive to maintain a positive social identity (McLeod, 2008). In the context of tutors and student appraisals, the theory proposes that tutors may view their teaching effectiveness as a critical aspect of their professional identity. Positive appraisals from students can enhance their social identity as competent and effective educators, while negative appraisals may

threaten their self-esteem and professional standing (Tajfel & Turner, 2004). As a result, tutors' attitudes toward student appraisals may be influenced by their desire to maintain a positive social identity.

More importantly, the theory outlines several explanations regarding tutors' attitudes.

1. **Self-Enhancement:** Self-enhancement refers to the tendency of individuals to view themselves in a positive light and to seek positive feedback or appraisals that reinforce their self-perception (Hogg, 2016). In the context of tutoring, tutors who highly value their professional identity may be more inclined to engage in self-enhancement processes when interpreting student appraisals. One potential explanation for this phenomenon is that tutors who highly value their professional identity are more invested in their teaching role and may have a stronger desire to perceive themselves as effective educators (Hogg, 2016). Consequently, they may be more likely to interpret positive student appraisals as accurate reflections of their teaching effectiveness. Research by Wasti and Erdheim (2014) supports this notion. They found that individuals with a robust professional identity were more likely to interpret positive feedback as accurate and reliable, leading to positive attitudes and increased motivation. These individuals may perceive positive feedback as affirmations of their skills and expertise, reinforcing their self-perception as competent tutors.

2. **Social Comparison:** Tutors may engage in social comparison by comparing their appraisals with their colleagues. If they receive higher ratings than their peers, they may perceive themselves as more effective teachers, which can bolster their self-esteem and lead to positive attitudes toward student appraisals.
3. **Threat to Identity**: Tutors who receive negative appraisals may experience a threat to their professional identity. They may perceive such feedback as challenging their competence and respond with defensiveness or skepticism toward student appraisals, attempting to protect their self-concept as effective educators.
4. **Accountability Concerns**: Tutors may also consider the implications of student appraisals on their career progression, promotions, or tenure. If their evaluations heavily impact their professional advancement, they may view student appraisals cautiously, fearing potential negative consequences and developing a more guarded attitude.

Functionalist Theory

Two prominent scholars, Katz and Brunner, developed the functional theory of attitude in the 1950s. Propositions from the theory show that attitude serves numerous functions (Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956). These functions included the Information, Socialisation, Persuasion, and value and knowledge functions**.**

The Functional Theory posits that communication serves an information function, where individuals seek knowledge, clarification, and understanding

through interactions (Katz, 1960). The information function can be crucial in tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal. Tutors may perceive student appraisals as valuable information about their teaching effectiveness. They may view student feedback as a means to gather insights into their strengths and weaknesses, identify improvement areas, and better understand students' needs and expectations. Thus, tutors with a positive attitude toward student appraisal may consider it essential for acquiring valuable information about their teaching practices.

Another function, according to the theory, is the socialisation function of communication, which refers to its role in shaping individuals' beliefs, values, and behaviours

through social interaction (Hussain & Mubarak, 2021). In the context of tutors' attitudes, the socialisation function is influenced by the broader institutional culture, norms, and expectations regarding student appraisal. If an educational institution emphasises the importance of student feedback and creates a supportive environment that encourages tutors to value and utilise the feedback, tutors are more likely to develop positive attitudes toward appraisal. On the other hand, if there is a lack of emphasis or negative connotations associated with student appraisal, tutors may hold more negative attitudes or perceive it as a threat to their professional autonomy. The socialisation function of communication helps shape tutors' attitudes within the institutional context (Anderson, 2014).

Another function of the theory is the persuasion function of communication which focuses on the ability of communication to influence individuals' beliefs,

attitudes, and behaviors. In the context of tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal, the persuasion function plays a critical role in shaping their perception of the appraisal process. Peers, administrators, and educational policymakers may engage in persuasive communication to encourage tutors to value and embrace student appraisal. They may highlight the benefits of student feedback, such as its potential to improve teaching effectiveness, enhance student engagement, and foster a supportive learning environment. Through persuasive messages, tutors can develop positive attitudes toward appraisal and recognise its value in their professional growth and development.

Values in the functional theory represent deeply held beliefs and principles that guide individuals' attitudes and behaviours. In the context of tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal, values can significantly influence their perceptions and actions(Gouveia, Milfont, & Guerra, 2014). Tutors' values, such as a commitment to professional growth, student-centeredness, and a desire for excellence in teaching, can shape their attitudes toward the appraisal process. For instance, if tutors highly value continuous improvement and believe that student feedback is vital in enhancing teaching effectiveness, they are more likely to have positive attitudes toward student appraisal. These tutors may perceive appraisal as an opportunity to align their teaching practices with their values and improve the quality of education they provide(Gouveia et al., 2014). On the other hand, if tutors prioritise autonomy or have concerns about the validity or fairness of student appraisal, their attitudes may be more damaging. Understanding tutors'

values can provide insights into their attitudes and guide efforts to promote a positive appraisal culture.

More importantly**,** knowledge in the functional theory refers to individuals' information, understanding, and expertise. In the context of tutors' attitudes toward student appraisal, knowledge plays a significant role in shaping their perceptions and behaviours. Tutors' knowledge about student appraisal's purpose, benefits, and limitations can influence their attitudes and engagement with the process. Tutors with a deep understanding of the research supporting the validity and effectiveness of student feedback may hold more positive attitudes toward appraisal. They may recognise that student perspectives offer unique insights into the learning experience and provide valuable information for instructional improvement. Conversely, tutors who lack knowledge about the benefits or implementation of student appraisal may have more skeptical attitudes. They may question the credibility or relevance of student appraisal, leading to less engagement with the appraisal process.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory

Cognitive Dissonance Theory, proposed by Leon Festinger in 1957, explains how individuals strive to reduce psychological discomfort when faced with conflicting beliefs, attitudes, or behaviours. This theory can be applied in education to understand tutor attitudes toward student appraisal of teaching effectiveness. According to cognitive dissonance theory, individuals strive for consistency and experience discomfort when they hold conflicting beliefs or attitudes (Miller, Clark, & Jehle, 2015). In the context of student appraisals, tutors

may have pre-existing beliefs about their teaching effectiveness or their teaching methods. If they receive feedback from students that contradicts their self-perception as effective educators, they may experience cognitive dissonance (Harmon-Jones & Harmon-Jones, 2012).

Tutors can use a variety of tactics to alleviate this discomfort. They may ignore the feedback as invalid or biased, downplay its importance, or seek alternative explanations for the poor assessment. Alternatively, instructors may examine their teaching techniques and adjust to feedback, eliminating cognitive dissonance. The extent to which instructors use these tactics influences their attitudes toward student evaluations.

Conceptual Review

Tutor Teaching Effectiveness

Different scholars refer to an effective tutor as "Good"(Watkins & Zhang, 2006), "active" (Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher et al., 2001) 'highly accomplished' (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1987), 'excellent' (Kane, Sandretto, & Heath, 2002), and 'qualified' (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002). Although different and various terms have well been used. According to the viewpoint of Norman (2010) One persistent challenge researchers and policymakers face when considering an evaluation of effective teaching is deciding on its definition" (p. 204). As it stands now, there is no conclusive definition in educational literature, but multiple studies have identified several ways of understanding the concept.

Aslam and Kingdon (2011) stated, "A good tutor is one who constantly yields high accomplishment growth for students" (p. 560). Stronge, Ward and Grant (2011) reported that effective tutors are those who had student learning improvements in the top quartile; fewer effective teachers are those with student learning gains in the bottom quartile" (p. 345). Effective tutors have a sequence of student attitudes, approaches, strategies, and influences that express themselves in non-academic ways and lead to more extraordinary student performance. Campbell, Kyriakides, Muijs et al. (2004) defined tutor effectiveness as the impact of teaching space factors, such as teaching methods, teacher prospects, classroom organisation, and classroom resources, on students' performance.

A tutor must withstand the expectations, threats, and obstacles in the different teaching circumstances, as per .(Coffey & Gibbs, 2002) "they said that an effective tutor needs the ability to be determined, creative in the classroom instruction, and confident when obstacles set in." According to Stronge et al. (2004), an effective instructor emotionally impacts the learners and significantly affects their performance. Killen (2010) also posits that an effective tutor clearly states aims and instructional goals. A tutor may provide an opinion on a subject for the students, which can only be helpful if the primary goal is to examine and contrast various outcomes. However, the instructor could be considered unsuccessful if the aim is to make the student think about numerous possible responses. Tutors' instruction must be captivating for students to grasp holistically. In this regard, schools should exhaust enough time on "routine" and less time on "discussing the learning process (Hatton & Smith, 1995)." Besides,

Gurney (2007) suggested that relying on the theoretical or the practical aspect ensures the teaching environment's likenesses.

Effective educators need to concentrate on the success of learners. Alton-Lee (2003) revealed the need for an active connection between school and home background. Apart from being compassionate, improving feedback, input, assessment, and reacting to students' knowledge, the course aims for various tasks and purposes. Gurney (2007) proposed that different and several factors come together to form an effective tutor. These comprise the tutor's level of devotion, knowledge, and obligation for further learning. Providing learners with several classroom assessments and hand's activities is another construct that will thus render them positive to learn through experiences. Create an eco-friendly environment and respectful interaction with learners to ensure learning. According to Borich (2000), effective tutors' priorities are to have the consistency of lessons, a wide array of instruction, alignment of instructor tasks, participation in the learning activity, and student achievement rate. Therefore, efficient tutors do not teach literally to the class, demonstrating all-embracing and in-depth procedural knowledge. They teach to stimulate and increase learning. Furthermore, in aspects of discipline, work, and teacher ability to interact, they know how to handle their understanding and the school environment and the students, assess and evaluate activities, and give instructions to the learners. Consequently, instructors also imply that they have positive attributes in aspects of career aspirations to be.

Components and Elements of Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness is a multi-faceted concept that encompasses various elements and factors. Good planning, content knowledge, caring, motivation for learning, respect, fairness, and equity are indeed key components that contribute to a teacher's effectiveness. Numerous studies highlight the positive impact of teachers' content knowledge on student outcomes (Hattie, 2009; Hill, Rowan, & Ball, 2005). In furtherance, Research suggests that caring teachers enhance student motivation, engagement, and overall achievement (Wentzel, 2018). When students feel respected, they are more likely to participate, take risks, and develop a positive self-concept (Johnson, 2018). These components are outlined and described regarding appraisal of teaching effectiveness.

Good Planning

Without a well-planned lesson, competence with quality content is not adequate. The lesson plan makes both the content and the debate interactive and entertaining. Proper planning promotes detailed instructions and offers a variety of resources that are compatible with learners' needs. Effective teachers should provide meaning for the subject by providing appropriate materials to students wherever possible and finding ways to increase interest. It helps with the appropriate use of oral questioning, providing instructions, being flexible, and influencing the student's motivation to encourage participation and active participation by everyone. Besides, if the material and methods are appropriate in the classroom to be interpreted, they must be prepared to reconsider. Craig and Dickenson (2003) opined that proper good planning confirms the intervals in which students can speak in open or closed groups or pairs are included in

lessons. Proper planning assembles the content, making performing better during and after class meetings easier. Gurney (2007) also believed that learners should be able to offer input to the instructor to enhance their experience, methodology, and classroom environment if appropriate. Cruickshank & Haefele (2001) indicated that effective teachers could do more measurably over the same period," but good planning also involves surveillance to achieve learning for the school environment and organisation."

Classroom Management and Organization

Effective tutors plan and handle the classroom based on the student's wishes and requirements to create an inspiring and comfortable learning atmosphere for them and improve learning. Marzano and Marzano (2003) claimed that "effective tutors begin class monitoring and management right after the semester commences to ascertain classroom organisation, coordination and student behavior aspirations. According to Ärlestig and Törnsen (2014) classroom supervision tends to be a high precedence for beginners and experienced tutors. Classroom Management is not comparable to specific necessities; more importantly, management is designed to consider learners' desires and formerly prepare an appropriate annual routine, strategies, activities, appraisal, performance standards, and practical instructions for students to produce enthusiasm and motivation for learning. Efficient tutors use minimal classroom rubrics and much more to create a comfortable and beautiful learning atmosphere. Marzano et al. (2003) argued that a sufficient level of classroom rules reflects each other's needs, creates a positive environment, and participates in learning.

MacLeod et al. (2003) characterised the rules and argued that academic abilities are more efficient and valuable. Strong et al. (2003) also indicated that effective tutors use more day-to-day activities than guidelines. Wong, Wong, Rogers et al. (2012) described what instructors want to do between routine and what students do automatically.

Although classroom management focuses on instructions that induce students to evaluate in terms of psychological actions, the organisation of the classroom determines students' inspiration to learn from the learning environment. Effective tutors integrate the classroom and create an ideal instructional atmosphere where students feel secure and comfortable in terms of layout, responsiveness, and accessibility to promote learning and interaction.

Classroom Behaviour

Minimising classroom misconduct requires comprehensive management and organisation of classrooms and a robust instructional process because students learn almost every behaviour from the classroom (Craig & Dickenson, 2003). Moreover, learners should, therefore, understand their expectations. When students react positively, teachers explain how and why they want them to function this way and offer practical advice. Wong and Wong (2005) distinguish between the student and the supervisor. They claimed that "effective tutors with simplified routines and procedures easily organize their classrooms." Ineffective tutors manage and control the class with threats, punishments, and abusive words. They further accentuated that discipline is the behaviour exhibition of students and that management is the students' performance. Several ineffective tutors

utilise gifts infractions cards reward stickers as a defence mechanism for instilling discipline with punishment. They waste time and do not solve the problem. Efficient tutors handle the classroom with procedures and routines for optimizing and engaging learning time. Misbehaviour can occur, such as lucky silence. Most seem to have gained practical silence all the time. Others earn nearly complete silence, but pupils need frequent reminders, while others rarely obtain any silence, and the conduct of pupils needs regular checking. Craig and Dickenson (2003) have pointed out that assuming absolute silence for lengthy periods is unreasonable. Conversely, a good tutor is conscious that individual students will choose to sit gently and have a low level of active involvement in classroom events, although they will know how to get the student to interact.

Communication Skills

Communication skills are critical to people within the education profession. Effective tutors are, at all times, powerful storytellers. They converse openly about the course's goals, content, and aspect, ensure that they justify studying specific materials, and adapt the instruction to their student's experience and skills. An atmosphere without communication indicates that students will not understand the core points. A successful instructor should take something challenging and teach it in a way that seems convenient and easily understandable by students and employ various communication cues (Prozesky, 2000).

Respect, Fairness, and Equity

Learners' description and classifying an effective tutor as a classroom requirement include respect, justice, and fairness to everyone. Claims from

Kyriacou (2010) indicate that having reciprocal reverence is a significant component of the classroom environment that creates a responsive environment for successful instruction. He reiterated that appreciating the students makes them understand the skill and commitment of the instructor to their educational success. Efficient tutors restore an atmosphere of acceptance and ensure that students who do not respect their peers have equal respect. Students value equality, and good teachers react appropriately to wrongdoing individually instead of the entire class (Stronge, Tucker, & Hindman, 2004). He continued that in any circumstance, teachers treat them equitably, either in the case of wrongdoing, the result of an examination, ethnicity, skin colour, age, etc. Favouritism and avoidance (Peart & Campbell, 1999). Efficient tutors, therefore, continuously display reverence for their learners (inside or outside the classroom), justice, and equality concerning individual circumstances, age, background, race, faith, economic status, and several others

Motivation for Learning

Inspiring learners make them more receptive and optimistic about the curriculum, keep them informed of learning's meaning and significance, and have a better learning attitude. Effective tutors develop students' academic self-conception, comprehension of the subject, and ability to learn more and improve achievement. Students have the idea that tutors exhibit a motivational speaker and leader's role as they encourage them to be responsible for their learning. Cleverness can be a significant indication in any lesson. Successful tutors may not

have to be morons, but they have great personalities and can share funny remarks with learners to eliminate pessimistic barriers (Lowman, 1990).

Caring

Effective tutors have cared for every student in order for them to outshine through encouraging learning. Gurney (2007) states that students should engage in the emotional appeal of learning. Learning is an emotional process. Eisner (2002) also says that "teaching is a caring exercise," a practice that plays an essential role in an efficient process—showing consideration not only in the classroom but for a person's life or personal problems. Strong communicators, prudence, and understanding with sensuality and compassion should be good teachers in this situation. Students experience productivity when tutors display compassion, gentleness, and motivation, according to Stronge et al. (2004) effective tutors display sincere concern and empathy for learners by acknowledging the questions and concerns of the learners. Stronge et al. (2004) suggested that good instructors listen to the learners' complaints and assist and show how to address their difficulties and speak regarding their private experiences and feelings that support privacy and confidentiality. Consequently, when the teacher shows concern for the students and understands them personally, there is a more productive achievement.

Classroom Environment

Waxman, Huang and Wang (1997) established that one of the several variables that affect student achievement or performance in the classroom environment and the setting. Even though it is a robust predictor of learners'

hostility. More importantly, having a strong interpersonal relationship with the learners helps them develop a culture of a warm and healthy classroom atmosphere to enable them to achieve their aspirations, as they feel safe, secure, and buoyant in trying new activities and participation.

Attitude

Concept of Attitude

Historically, the recognition of the core concepts underpinning the development of social psychology is an attitude. Prominent scholars on the concept described social psychology as the unified study of attitude (Allport, 1933). "This concept is probably the most identifiable and essential feature of modern American social psychology." The notion of attitudes has undergone a radical transformation, as one may expect from any construct that has received centuries of interest (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). The existing descriptions were comprehensive and contained cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral components. Allport (1935), for instance, described an attitude as a mental and neural state of awareness organised through observation, exuding a prescriptive and dynamic influence upon the individual concerning all situations or objects to which it corresponds."

A couple of years later, Krech and Crutchfield (1948) stated, "An attitude is an ongoing organisation of motivational, emotional, conceptual and thinking skills relating to some object or phenomenon of the person." These definitions highlighted the longstanding existence of attitudes and their close connection with

the behavior of individuals. Some sociologists (Schwarz & Bohner, 2001) and psychologists (Campbell, 1950) have already defined attitudes primarily based on the probability that a person will show a specific behavior in a specific situation. Fishbein and Ajzen (1977) proposed that attitudes involve aspects of a person's context, like another person, a physical object, a behavior, or a policy. It suggests that his attitude is how the individual interacts with his environment.

In recent centuries, the concept of attitude and its depth of knowledge has lost much of its interpretive function and significantly reduced. In the succinct words of Bem (1970) "Attitudes are likes and dislikes." Similarly, in a highly influential textbook, Eagly and Chaiken (1993) defined attitudes as "a psychological tendency expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favour or disfavour." According to Morris et al. (2007), attitude is a relatively stable organisation of beliefs, feelings, and tendencies towards something or someone. They argue that attitude comes in three elements: beliefs, feelings and behaviour tendencies. These definitions show that people's attitudes tend to be relatively stable and modified to some degree. Attitude is "A mental and neutral state of readiness, organised through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related (Albarracin & Shavitt, 2018)." the attention given to this definition shows that attitude is a comprehensive combination of actions to form various experiences. Attitudes are formed through experience, which means they are learned. An attitude is a summary assessment of an object or thought.

Generally, the contemporary concept of attitude describes it as a tendency to react positively or negatively to a person or circumstances. Attitude is positive or negative feelings that an individual holds about objects, persons, or ideas (Pickens, 2005). Altmann (2008), as cited in Dawson (1992) states that in social psychology, "attitude refers to a disposition towards or against a specified phenomenon, person or thing" Attitude is seen as a complex mental state involving beliefs and feelings. That is to say, the manner, disposition, feeling, and position concerning a person or thing, tendency, or orientation, especially in the mind, is the person's attitude. It evaluates things according to his perception, ideas, or feelings (Cherry, 2019). Attitudes are an attitude object's overall evaluation (e.g., like or dislike).

In the same way, this definitional perspective has generated several conceptual models of the attitude concept. The various theories show that attitudes are summary evaluations of objects with affective, cognitive, and behavioural components. Every individual has his or her attitude, but the attitude as a psychological phenomenon is invisible. Ajzen and Cote (2008) contend that there can be many definitions of attitude depending on a specific psychologist's orientation. However, they have a collective agreement. Fishbein and Ajzen agreed that though attitudes are latent or invisible, they are evaluated (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1977). Attitude measures are through A person's response or reaction to an object of an attitude which may be favorable or unfavorable to an object, person, organisation, incident or situation (Morris et al., 2007)

Defining an Attitude

Various authors, scholars, researchers, and psychologists concerning attitude have brought up several ideas and definitions. Unfortunately, Social psychologist does not agree on the accurate definition of an attitude. An attitude is an essential concept for understanding human behaviour. According to Morris et al. (2007), attitude is a relatively stable organisation of feelings, tendencies, and beliefs towards something or someone. They argue that attitude comes in three elements: beliefs, feelings, and behaviour tendencies. These definitions show that people's attitudes tend to be relatively stable and modified to some degree. Fishbein and Ajzen (1977) proposed that attitudes are held to aspects of the person's world, such as another individual, a physical object, a behaviour, or a policy. Therefore, it indicates that an individual's way of interacting with their environment is their attitude. According to Maheshwari (2013) as cited in (Allport1954), "Attitude is "A mental and neutral state of readiness, organised through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related" (Albarracin & Shavitt, 2018). the attention given to this definition shows that attitude recognises as a comprehensive combination of actions to form various experiences. The formation of Attitudes is through experience. That means we learn to form an attitude. An attitude is a summary evaluation of an object or thought. (Agarwal & Malhotra, 2005).

Similarly, Eagly and Chaiken (1993) defined an attitude as 'a psychological tendency to view a particular object or behaviour with a degree of favour or

disfavour'. The notion that reporting an attitude entails conveying an observational judgement about a stimulus object is inevitable in this concept. In other words, reporting an attitude means deciding on approving vs. disapproving or liking vs. dislikes favoring vs. disfavoring a particular issue, object or person. (Haddock & Maio, 2008). Generally, attitude describes the tendency to react positively or negatively to a person or circumstances. Attitude is positive or negative feelings that an individual holds about objects, persons, or ideas (Pickens, 2005). According to Altmann (2008), as cited in Dawson (1992) states that in social psychology, "attitude refers to a disposition towards or against a specified phenomenon, person or thing". Attitude is seen as a complex mental state involving beliefs and feelings. That is to say, the manner, disposition, feeling, and position concerning a person or thing, tendency or orientation, especially in mind, is the person's attitude. It evaluates things according to his perception, ideas, or feelings (Cherry, 2019). Attitudes are considered an overall evaluation (e.g., like or dislike) of an attitude object.

In the same way, this definitional perspective has generated several conceptual models of the attitude concept. The various theories show that attitudes are summary evaluations of objects with affective, cognitive, and behavioural components. Every individual has his or her attitude, but the attitude being a psychological phenomenon is invisible. Ajzen and Fishbein (2005) contend that there can be many definitions of attitude depending on a specific psychologist's orientation, but they have a collective agreement despite those differences. Fishbein and Ajzen agreed that attitudes are latent or invisible but can

be evaluated (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1977). Attitude measurement is through the person's reaction or responses toward the object of the attitude, which may be favourable or unfavourable toward the object, persons, institution, events or situations (Morris et al., 2007).

Attitude Change

This study's primary objectives are to witness tutors' attitudinal changes toward student appraisal of their teaching effectiveness. Believes from the writers of Leon Festinger show that change of attitudes occurs through persuasion, and one may understand the shift in attitude as a reaction to social interaction (Festinger & Kelley, 1951) . These are attributes that relate to the individual who collects and analyses a message, according to Leon. One such attribute is intelligence; intermittent information easily persuades people. The mind frame and mood of the target also play a role in this process. Another feature is the information or the message. The disposition of the message or information plays a significant role in persuasion. Sometimes it is helpful to give both sides of a tale to help change attitudes. A piece of information can demand a person's cognitive evaluation to help change his/her attitude. In the focal course to influence, the individual is given the information and inspired to assess the information and change conclusions. In the fringe course to attitude change, the individual is urged not to look at the substance but rather at the source.

Gawronski (2007) On the other hand, attitude is defined as a positive or undesirable evaluative response to something, shown in one's belief systems, emotions, or expected behaviour. From his perspective, it is a social orientation-

an underlying desire to respond either favorably or unfavorably to something. Myers spells out several attitudinal components that are worth discussing.

A. Cognitive - It relates to our opinions, convictions, and emotions over something. The cognitive process is often a generalisation when a human individual is the entity of an attitude. A statement such as "People who contract HIV/AIDs are sexually liberated" is an illustration."

B. Affective - This is the feeling or emotion that something evokes. e.g. fear, sympathy, hate. For example, one may dislike people living with HIV/AIDS.

C. Conative, or behavioural - This is the propensity or disposition to behave against someone in particular ways. One would want to keep AIDS patients out of the neighborhood, for instance. The concentration is on the person's behavior, not the actual acting; what we plan and do will be very different. Jung's concept of attitude is a "readiness of the psyche to act or react up in a particular manner" (Jung, 1971). According to Jung, attitudes occur in bunches, unconscious and conscious. Jung recognizes various attitudes under this broad category. Below are the key (and not the only) attitude dualities that Jung describes;

a. The presence of two behaviors is irreversible, one unconscious and the other conscious. It implies that consciousness has a structure of functionality that varies from the unconscious, a juxtaposition particularly evident in neurosis (Jung, 1971).

b. Extraversion and introversion: these pairs are so simple to Jung's theory of

forms that he considered them the "attitude type."

c. Rational and irrational attitudes: The rational attitude divides the psychological roles of thought and feeling, each with its attitude. The irrational attitude involves dividing the psychological roles of feeling and intuition, each with its attitude. Thus there is traditional reasoning, emotions, feeling, and instinctive behaviour (Jung, 1971).

Characteristics of an Attitude

Attitude has several essential characteristics or properties. Some of these properties include the strength or degree, accessibility, an object, and occurs within situations.

Attitude has a Strength.

Several studies asserted that attitudes differ in any degree of strength,", "centrality", or "crystallisation" (Krosnick & Petty, 1995; Krosnick & Abelson, 1992). These definitions have been challenging to conceptualize empirically. Scholars have used several metrics to measure attitude strength, including the severity of participants' sentiments about the object, the certainty they report retaining the attitude, or the value they assign to it. Unfortunately, the different attitude strength indicators are just weakly related to each other (Krosnick & Abelson, 1992), and attitude strength results are often context-dependent (Haddock, Rothman, Reber et al., 1999; Krosnick & Petty, 1995).

In many other areas of research, on the other hand, attitude strength has proven beneficial. In reaction to persuasive communication, firmly held attitudes are more consistent over time and less likely to change. They are more robust

behavior determinants than weak attitudes (Krosnick & Abelson, 1992). Once again, though, a constructive strategy allows for the same assumptions. A more generous amount of information would be perpetually reachable to the degree that we are prone to assume more frequently about important issues for all of us. Increased chronic availability of greater availability of data might, in the switch, reduce the possibility of returning at a varying judgment if a few new bits of information were added to the interpretation in reaction to a persuasive message.

Similarly, when required to assess a personal judgement and when faced with a behavioral course of action, the person would likely attract a constant amount of congenitally information resources, leading to increased accuracy between the judgment and the behavior. Consequently, if we reasonably assume that individuals think more about crucial matters, a constructive approach comes at the same projections. Therefore, the literary works on attitude strength do not directly represent that the processes underlying "strong" attitudes' observations differ from those underlying "weak" attitude articles.

Attitude has Accessibility.

Fazio (1995) recommended that individual attitudes, as depicted in participants' response time, are more reachable than others. A quick response to a question of attitude probably suggests that an initial formation evaluation was visible in memory, while a slow response indicates that it takes time to calculate an evaluation on the spot. As implied from quick responses, several findings have found that highly accessible attitudes are more consistent over time and are better behavior determinants (Fazio, 1995). Unsurprisingly, response time metrics may

not tell us which phase of the judgment process yields a quick or slow reaction. The retrieval of a highly accessible previous judgment and the maximum efficiency of a current calculation may reflect a fast response. From the point of view of judgment, rapid computations would be expected under varying situations only to define attitude.

However, all this will lead to the relationships observed between reaction time and stability over time or attitude-congruent activity. For instance, an attitude object may trigger an affective response that can serve as a basis for rapid perceived value. The affective reaction is presumably what the attitude principle refers to at initial sight, but in response to new objects that have never been evaluated, such reactions may be obtained (Forgas, 2008). Therefore, rapid evaluations do not inherently indicate the availability of a previously established attitude. However, the stimuli' impact-eliciting output will lead to consistent responses over the duration and effect-congruent behavior. For instance, if all the details that come to mind are evaluatively consistent, quick computations would also be anticipated, while slow computations would be assumed if the information is evaluatively inconsistent. Construal models would again emerge at the exact forecasts to make this hypothesis is appropriate for scientific investigation. When understanding an attitude object is evaluatively consistent, it would not exist to retrieve different parts at varying periods.

Moreover, retrieving various parts if one makes a decision and makes a behavioral choice would still result in a high consistency between moral judgement and attitude. Only when distinct sources of evidence have contrary

ramifications is that we must see low specificity over time and low behaviour consistency (Lord, Lepper, & Mackie, 1984). However, it would take some time to integrate the effects of these various pieces of information, potentially resulting in the relationship between response time and consistency of stability or attitude-behaviour. Therefore, the functional relationship does not directly represent distinctions in the availability of current attitudes but can reflect differences in the phase of mental construction. Therefore, the availability of a previously calculated judgment in memory is appropriate but not a sufficient prerequisite for rapid evaluative responses, providing the empirical findings less factual than often thought.

Attitudes are a Learned Predisposition

In our encounters with facts and from knowledge from colleagues, past publications & media outlets, attitudes grow. They are often formed from life experiences, both direct and indirect. It is, therefore, essential to understand that learning accompanies developing and adjusting attitudes. It implies that SET-relevant attitudes are generated due to direct interactions with others' outcomes and knowledge. Attitudes have a motivational quality as 'a learned predisposition; that is, they could propel a teacher towards a specific behavior or prevent the instructor from a particular behavior.

Opinion leaders influence attitudes.

Opinion leaders refer to valued individuals whose advice is taken seriously by others. Furthermore, an opinion leader should be able to change the perceptions or actions of others. Any prominent individuals in a society should

influence group members' attitudes (Weimann, 1994). Li and Naeem (2011) also emphasised opinion leaders' significance in spreading efficiency and providing teaching experience. Opinion leaders collect data from the media and, in return, transmit data to subjective opinion recipients. Their followers' responses can also influence opinion leaders through interactive communication (Li & Naeem, 2011).

Group Influence

The persuasive language of subjective norms makes some individuals ambivalent (Cohen, 2003). Cohen (2003) have speculated that group influence can develop user opinions and behaviours through group memberships, readiness to entertain or be approved by others through the behavior of essential personalities they have never fulfilled.

Concept of Student Appraisal of Teaching

Student appraisal is a relatively recent phenomenon that used terms interchangeably with other terminologies, such as “student course satisfaction” (Betoret, 2007; Bolliger, 2004; Rivera & Rice, 2002) or just merely “student course evaluation” (Anderson, Cain, & Bird, 2005; Babcock, 2010; Ching, 2018; Freishtat, 2014; Marlin Jr, 1987) “student evaluation of instruction” (Aleamoni, 1999; Aleamoni & Hexner, 1980; Powell, 1977) student evaluation of tutor performance (Chuah & Hill, 2004; Coffey & Gibbs, 2001; Grammatikopoulos, Linardakis, Gregoriadis et al., 2015; Lidice & Saglam, 2013). The central goals of all of the above are related, despite the variation in terminology.

According to the classification and definition of basic higher education terms set by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,

Student Evaluation of teachers is "the process of using student inputs concerning teachers' general activity and attitude (Vlăsceanu, Grünberg, & Pârlea, 2007). These results enhance the overall evaluation of the continuity between student expectations and the instructors' real instructional techniques. Student evaluations expect to offer insights regarding the tutor's attitude (approachable, open-minded entertaining, creative, patient, etc.) and the abilities of a teacher (to explain things, motivate students, help students think, correct mistakes in a friendly manner, to offer information efficiently) (Vlăsceanu et al., 2007).

Content of Student Ratings

Student rating instruments include various items (Arreola, 2004). These may include ratings of instructors' enthusiasm, organisation, and interactions with students (e.g., kindness, attention, and respect shown to students). Instruments also often include items regarding instructors' teaching approaches, such as the types of materials provided, clarity of explanations, expectations for assignments, and fairness in marking. Researchers have indicated multiple dimensions of ratings (Centra, 1993; Hammonds, Mariano, Ammons et al., 2017; Marsh, 1982; Marsh & Roche, 1993), such as the teacher, the course, assessment issues, classroom rapport, and workload/difficulty are separable issues. Students may provide positive ratings for some teaching aspects, such as enthusiasm and lower organisation ratings. Depending on the instrument, however, students may also develop a general perception of the course and rate all instrument items similarly (Greenwald, 1997).

Dimensions of Student Appraisal of Teaching

Dimensionality refers to the number of metrics or elements used to measure the efficacy of tutors in teaching. Depending on the criterion being examined, several potential measures of quality instruction exist. Several studies have attempted to recognize the aspects of students' perception of teaching efficiency. Marks (2000) used confirmatory factor analysis to classify the emergence of many measurement items in the student appraisal: perceived learning, instructor's liking/concern, expected/fairness of grading, workload/difficulty, and organization.

Jackson, Teal, Raines et al. (1999) analysed the underlying aspects of students' evaluations of teacher efficacy comprising over 7,000 university courses. This research resulted in the following principal reasons and second-order factors being listed. These prime variables included the subject's complexity, relevance, course design, organisation, grading, fairness, and workload. Second-order considerations were the general standard of teaching and student relationships. A review of published research findings observed that various evaluation forms for students investigated various adequate teaching dimensions. Although these components differ, various components have emerged across many pieces of research. Three significant studies investigating similarities in teaching effectiveness dimensionality provide a synopsis of standard dimensions describing teachers' perceptions of qualified tutors. Firstly, Feldman (1976) described 19 components of the literature, including teachers' interest stimulation, teachers' knowledge of the subject, tutors' communication skills, the essence and

importance of the course material, and teaching teachers' intellectual expansiveness. He described the three main component structures in the review as; facilitation of learning, learning regulation, and a material appearance by the instructor.

The first element deals with how an instructor approached the material, such as a sketch, illustrations, and critical points. The second-dimension deals with how an instructor made the lesson enjoyable. An instructor may use one of the three techniques to promote education (Vermunt & Verloop, 1999). The tutor will strive to implement the first technique's learning functions, resulting in the tutor's close supervision. The tutor attempts to replace students' cognitive, affective, and metacognitive behaviors.

The tutor will turn, resolve the obligation for executing learning purposes to learners in the second approach. The teacher believes in this approach that students use the correct learning and reasoning practices independently. No influence of the instructor exists. The obligation for executing the learning objectives will be cooperative between the tutor and learners in the third learning process, and therefore one can talk of common control (Vermunt & Verloop, 1999). Students are actively encouraged to fulfill different teaching tasks (Lonka & Ahola, 1995).

For both learners and teachers, the third element concerns the regulation of learning. The teacher can use any of the learning mentioned above techniques to monitor learning. Instruction and content presentation, however, do not immediately contribute to understanding. Students' methods of monitoring their

learning and the quality of learning outcomes are likely to be influenced by learning experiences. Likely, their knowledge base, procedural capacity, self-regulation of learning, and motivation will decide how students control their learning or the method they implement. The congruence between learners' learning and the teacher's teaching regulations will likely produce the most remarkable outcomes (Vermunt & Verloop, 1999). More importantly, Marsh specified nine (9) dimensions after thoroughly reviewing the sampled data on SEEQ, which were similar to Fieldman's (1976). They include organisation, individual relationship, workload, enthusiasm, Learning/value, exams and grading, coverage breadth, tasks, and group engagement.

Third, to determine a common core, Abrami and d'Apollonia (1997) investigated instructional efficacy's dimensionality through student appraisal. These researchers collected 17 studies representing most of the students. The modes of assessment used in three-dimensional validity studies to generate a 35 by 35 sequence comprising 6,788 inter-item relationships calculated for 225 items from 17 appraisal types; numerous phases were used. In the dimensions, the analysis produced four components using factor analysis. Within these components, correlations existed within three of the four with a high relationship. These dimensions were described as a tutor in their instructor role: a regulator and a person. Several aspects are intertwined with supervision, domain awareness, behaviour, goals, and appropriate materials choice in the fourth component.

Instructor Presence in Classroom

According to Feldman (1979), evaluations are substantially higher when the

students' tutor is actively assessed while the appraisal is ended. Many researchers, such as Braskamp and Ory (1994; Centra 1993; Eble 1970; and Scriven 1981), strongly suggest using a third person responsible for obtaining forms, together with declarations that the secrecy of the learner is kept safe. Another factor is the probability that there could be a latent impact on the ratings by sharing the assessment forms with the tutor being assessed, even though he is not the person gathering the results. Pulich (1984) argues that even though the instructor leaves the room while the students fill out the forms, some learners can still prevent the tutor from distributing them. However, she recommends that a specific evaluator appear to disperse and gather the forms and respond to questions during the students' assessment. During the process, the instructor could thus be absent.

Stated Purpose of Evaluation

Although some researchers have discovered that if the fundamental objective is for promotion and tenure, student evaluations are somewhat too high (Aleamoni & Hexner, 1980; Braskamp et al., 1984; Centra, 1976; Feldman, 1979), Frankhouser (1984) concluded that the stated purpose of evaluation did not have a significant impact on evaluations. Braskamp et al. (1984) preferred that students are made aware of and appraisals for personnel decisions.

Characteristics of the Instructor

Researchers have found that teachers earn better evaluations for elective or non-required lessons than instructors for required courses. More significantly, the 'selectivity' of a class is the number of students who take it as an elective in that class (Johnson, Narayanan, & Sawaya, 2013); a slight to liberal, positive

relationship between a class's selectivity and evaluations (Heckert, Latier, Ringwald et al., 2006; Rucker & Haise, 2012). It could be due to the lower involvement of the previous topic required versus non-required lessons.

Class Meeting Time

The prevailing opinion from the limited amount of research on this subject is that there is no apparent connection between evaluations and the class's duration (Kokkelenberg, Dillon, & Christy, 2008; Lüdtke, Trautwein, Kunter et al., 2006). An exception is the study of Baldwin and Blattner (2003), which found that very early morning classes, very late afternoon classes, and classes shortly after lunch receive the lowest ratings. The effect of the time of day found in this study was higher than that of other background variables such as gender, year in school, the field of study, and expected grade.

Level of Course

Several studies have shown that higher-level courses are susceptible to assessment scores (Feldman, 1978; Marsh, 1987). Although no explanation has been given for this correlation, Feldman further reports that the correlation between the course level and the evaluations decreases when other context variables, such as class size, expected grade, and specificity, are controlled. Thus the impact of the course level on the appraisals may be open, conditional, or both. Interestingly, research has generally overlooked another dimension that may be considered in the era of students. It is conceivable that the disparity in the students' average intelligence and experience could be a more major matter of the

impact on the results than the characteristics of the course itself when conducting the evaluations.

Instructor Experience

The fact that professors earn much higher evaluation results when contrasting professors and tutors is undeniable (Brandenburg et al., 1977; Centra & Creech, 1976; Marsh & Dunkin, 1992). Several concepts and arguments suggest that tutors earn lower evaluation results in their early years of teaching than tutors with more years of teaching experience (Centra, 1978). In addition to teaching assistants, Feldman (1983) reviewed the literature on the relationship between seniority and evaluations and found that most academic ranking research found no substantial relationship between rank and instructional ratings. Almost all of the studies that found an important (though weak relationship found higher-ranking teachers to earn favorable scores. Concerning the teacher's age and experience, Feldman warns that these characteristics should not be confused with academic rank. Of the research that Feldman analyzed the association between age/experience and scores, several studies found no critical relationship. However, there is a significant relationship; nearly all found an *inverse* relationship; instructors of higher age and instructional experience received low ratings. However, there is a significant relationship; almost all discovered a negative correlation; instructors of higher age and instructional experience received low ratings. The minority of experiments that have reported significant correlations are too many to disregard, Feldman argues. Centra (1993) cautioned

that, since many of the studies were cross-sectional rather than longitudinal, we can only build general conclusions about the effect of status and experience.

Reputation of Instructor

There is relatively little gap in the literature regarding this trait. Patrick (2011) found that previous student evaluations of tutor reputation-based teaching effectiveness affected evaluations. These authors claimed that some inconsistencies in the results could repel the student appraisal data's publication to the overall learning community. Leventhal et al. (1976) discovered that learners who used a tutor's popularity to select class sections gave their tutors higher evaluation scores than their peers. Perry et al. (1979) discovered a significant relationship between tutors' charisma and persuasiveness. Further to the relationships involved, they opined that tutors would have an adverse charisma and receive somewhat lower appraisal scores than cherished tutors with high reputations.

The Personality of the Instructor

Surprisingly, this aspect has rarely been investigated in literary works. Feldman (1986) observed that some traits displayed a significant relationship with general student evaluations when evaluating instructor personality via instructors' self-reports. On the contrary, while the tutors' charisma depends on students' or fellow tutors' opinions, some peculiarity patterns indicated positive relationships with the entire student ratings. However, Feldman does not see if such a relationship positively influences or is a possible bias source on student evaluations (Marsh, 1987). A further study (Murray et al., 1990) has shown that

teaching effectiveness can, to some degree, predict colleague personality preferences. Murray and his colleagues have concluded that the teacher's efficiency varies greatly across classes and that the personality traits that could help a specific subject will probably be an obligation in another course. (This maintains that appraisal used for personnel and tenure decisions are derived not from a single course but several of them). These scholars postulate that the association between charisma and student appraisals supports the claims of its validity.

Prior Subject Interest

Several claims (Prave & Baril, 1993; Marsh & Cooper, 1981; Feldman, 1977) posits that learners with a more extensive interest in a particular subject tend to give more favourable ratings to tutors before the course. Marsh and Dunkin (1992) argue that the impact on student ratings of previous subject interest does not imply bias, but they accept that this effect may be a source of injustice by using ratings summarily in that it is an element of the course and not of the tutor.

Workload/Difficulty

Some tutors think appraisals could be inconsistent because learners believe some courses are more demanding than the remaining subjects. For instance, the most challenging course appears to be rated by students (Centra, 2003; Hoyt and Lee, 2002). Student feedback, however, was weakly correlated to the workload of the course and uncertainties in the course (Marsh 2001; Marsh and Roche 2000; Centra 1993, 2003). There are positive correlations, contrary to others'

expectations, with positive students offering much better ratings for challenging courses involving hard work. However, the relationships are not significant.

In contrast, Greenwald and Gillmore (1997) found that higher student ratings were for courses with smaller workloads. However, Marsh (2001) re-analyzed their results and identified two relatively unrelated workload items.: "bad workload" (time spent that was *not* valuable) and "good workload" (i.e., time spent on activities related to instructional objectives). Whereas "bad workload" was correlated undesirably with student ratings, "good workload" (work that helps students learn) was interrelated. The impact of subject-matter difficulties on student evaluations can depend on the teaching aspect of the course. Hoyt and Lee (2002) measured the instructor's effect on the student's perception of the complexity of the course. They evaluated the remaining score that characterised the student's sense of exertion after excluding the tutor's influence. Generally, the results are significantly lower if students perceive the course as demanding.

Nevertheless, the difficulties related to student progress in primary cognitive objectives relating to the real understanding and learning of concepts and theories were complimentary. Tutors must find the appropriate amount of difficulty. Some scholars have established non-linear relationships with student feedback and workload (Marsh, 2001; Marsh and Roche, 2000; Centra, 2003). For example, using a detailed class database, Centra (2003) showed that courses were appraised lesser when alleged as also too challenging or very simple; the full appraisal exposed was in various lessons where difficulty/workload was appraised only as perfect."

Empirical Review

This section highlights the various research studies on student appraisal of teaching. The focus is on the attitude and responses concerning student appraisal of teaching effectiveness. Various studies concerning the objectives of the study were included for further discussion. Scholars have provided different conclusions on the issues, and this current work summarizes the problems.

Attitude of Tutors Toward Student Appraisal of Teaching

A study conducted by Bala (2019) in Nigeria seeks the College of Education Tutors' feelings regarding students' evaluation of their teaching. He adopted the survey design and a quantitative research approach for the study. 11(eleven) Colleges comprised the total population of the study. The sample of three hundred and thirty-five (335) respondents formed the study's actual population. The study participants were randomly drawn from the participating colleges of education, made up of ninety-one (91) from federal, two hundred and fourteen (214) from the state, and thirty (30) from private colleges of education from the North-East. A questionnaire designed by the researcher titled "Lecturers Opinion to Students Evaluations of Teaching (LOSET)" is used in the study. Data collected from the study were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Findings from the study show that the College of Education tutors in Nigeria significantly have a positive attitude to Students appraisal of Instruction irrespective of the purposes to be served by the evaluation. However, the attitude was more positive under formative than summative purposes. Regarding gender differences, the research

results showed no significant association between male and female tutors' views on evaluating their teaching effectiveness by students.

The study was performed in South Africa by Severino and Wadesango (2011) to evaluate student surveys attitudes of their teaching practices by instructors. The study population comprised sixty (60) instructors from different higher education institutions in South Africa. Data was gathered through a 20-item Likert-type questionnaire constructed by a researcher. Frequency tables were used to analyze data, and the discussion revolved around the research objectives that formed the cornerstone of the study. In particular, the study showed that while instructors were somewhat optimistic about using student appraisals for instructional purposes, they were strongly opposed to using such data for summative purposes.

Similarly, Inko-Tariah (2013) also found that most lecturers in south-Nigeria universities have a positive attitude towards students' evaluation of their teaching effectiveness. Regarding gender, professional status, and teaching experience, it was also found that gender, age, and teaching experience made significant differences. In contrast, professional status and discipline did not significantly differ in lecturers' attitude towards students' evaluation of their teaching effectiveness.

Although other studies show less positive attitudes towards student appraisal (see, Cross, 2002; Richmond 2003; Machingambi and Wadesango, 2011) ascertained that SET usually has an adverse character for intellectuals. A possible justification is that lecturers are worried about the plausible professional

and academic deficiencies that student appraisals may be wide-open. A recent survey done by Winchester and Winchester (2014) indicates that regular formative SET results enable educators to enhance their teaching through professional development, increasing their SET overview rating by the end of the semester.

A national project conducted by Stein and collaborators in New Zealand (2012) and a survey done at an Irish university by Surgenor (2013) have shown that intellectuals display unfavorable attitudes towards the usefulness, validity, purpose, and effects of the evaluations. In these two studies, teachers stated that the evaluations provided them with input, which might help them recognize their weaknesses and strengths in teaching concerning their objectives. On the contrary,

Congruently, Marsh (2007) revealed that learners with higher expectations in a particular course tend to appraisal the tutor higher. Moreover, students' interests and high academic expectations of the tutors' charisma or personality are related to their teaching effectiveness (Clayson, 2013). For example, Shevlin, Banyard, Davies, and Griffiths (2000) perceived "personality" as a feature that impacts students' appraisal of their instructor. A subsequent study by Adamson, O'Kane, and Shevlin (2005) found that a tutor who seems entertaining in the classroom was the students' opinion in appraising their tutors. Moreover, their study found a significant relationship between how entertaining a tutor was and student views in evaluation. Patrick (2011) also examined the potential for predicting student appraisals and courses with almost the same big five inventory of the attributes measured in students' perceptions. He discovered a

positive correlation between flexibility, sociability, conscientiousness, and conviction, and neuroticism negatively correlated with instructors' and classroom learning outcomes. Other findings (e.g., Petchers & Chow, 1988; Ting, 2000) show that the total appraisal of lecturers who instruct elective courses is significantly higher than the compulsory course teacher. Ting (2000) also researched if the type influences student satisfaction in classes and found that specific courses obtain higher student feedback.

Other researchers doubted student incompetence in appraising their tutors' teaching. Moore and Kuol (2005) asserted that students are unqualified to assess their tutors' teaching due to their incompetence and limited understanding of the teaching process. They believe that student expresses their sentiments, emotions, and expectations during the evaluation process rather than making a concrete and unbiased judgment. Zakka (2009) reported that students lack the emotional stability and understanding to answer detailed information about the instructor's experience and expertise.

Theall (2002) revealed that students can evaluate the frequency of instructor actions, the volume of work they need, how often they think they have learned, and the complexity of the content. Responses regarding the content of lessons, the importance of readings and homework, the consistency of the teacher's explanations, the responsiveness and friendliness of the tutor, and several other facets of the teaching process can be clarified. Nobody else is as competent to discuss what mainly happened during the semester, and only because for the entire semester, nobody else is there. In order to communicate

their satisfaction or disappointment with the experience, students are eligible. In any case, they have the right to express their views, and no one else can report the degree to which the experience has been beneficial, constructive, insightful, rewarding, or worthwhile. Although views on these issues are not direct measures of the tutor's effectiveness or the content learned, they are legitimate indicators of student satisfaction (Theall, 2002).

Besides, Simpson & Siguaw (2000) indicated that academic staff appeared to assume that SETs encourage teachers to lower education standards, serve as a student retaliation weapon, encourage over-reliance on quality evaluation ratings, and are prevalent with uncertainties. Therefore, some educators argue that SET surveys do not support their educational benefits and endanger instructors' intellectual rights and dignity (Slade & McConville, 2006). The study adds that some tutors can usually try to get more favorable ratings by raising students' grades and decreasing the instructional benchmark, causing grade inflation.

Aside from the arguments on the usage of student appraisal, supporters of its use contend that effective use of the evaluation result (Kember et al., 2002; Hendry, Lyon, & Henderson-Smart, 2007) does provide useful evidence for tutors which helps enhance learners knowledge (Ballantyne, Borthwick, & Packer, 2000).

Lemos, Queiros, Teixeira, and Menezes (2011) revealed the validity and reliability of the student appraisal of the teaching checklist built on learning theory. Conversely, Beran and Violato (2005) discovered that the course and student characteristics had minimal effect on tutors' ratings and suggested that

they measure instructional efficiency. It is also important to note that a study of over 30,000 open-ended student feedback conducted by Tucker (2014) showed that most learners provided valuable feedback that was neither disrespectful nor insulting.

A comparative study by Abedin, Taib and Jamil (2014) revealed that student evaluation measures teaching performance and improves teaching and learning quality. The study revealed no significant differences in the course evaluation process between students' and lecturers' perceptions. Instructors believed that students seriously evaluated them. The student also agreed to evaluate their tutors seriously. Tutors and students viewed the appraisal system as relevant. Also, both tutors and students consented that student appraisal result is used to enhance the instructional process.

Alauddin and Kifle's work (2014) suggested that SETs are ineffective in measuring effective teaching in that lecturers can control these evaluations by taking part in less than academic classroom instruction. Similar results obtained by Zakka (2009) concluded that SETs are not the only process of measuring teaching effectiveness, and other strategies, such as peer review, should be regarded. Similar evidence from Fadia Nasser and Barbara Fresko (2002) shows that college students are 'professional teacher watchers' who assume that learners are likely to construct sensible and informed instruction when asked questions in their experiential context.

Tutors Responses to Student Evaluation of Their Teaching Effectiveness

Khong-ngam, Wongwanich, Piromsombat et al. (2014) researched tutors' and principals' utilisation of Appraisal Results for Student Learning in Science. The researchers collected qualitative and quantitative approach data and analyzed the data based on the mixed method research framework. Findings of the study revealed that school administrators use evaluations as a baseline to improve educational programs. However, the individuals eventually learned that the evaluation result could be used to acquire necessary strengths and limitations, as well as giving details that can be used to help school administrators develop and improve requisite skills and knowledge design and implement learning performance management in a manner commonly associated with the student quality evaluation result.Abedin et al. (2014) also reported that Both lecturers and students also agreed that the student evaluation process improves teaching. On the other side, Davidovich and Eckhaus (2019) reported in their study findings that lecturers believe student appraisal is unfavorable to their rapport with their students and adversely affects their teaching and interpersonal relations with their learners.

Zakka (2009) reported that students do not have the intellectual ability and expertise to respond to specific questions, such as those based on the instructor's knowledge about the subject. Alauddin and Kifle's (2014) work indicated that SETs are insufficient to measure teaching efficiency in that academic staff can control these results by engaging in less than academic teaching methods. Related results obtained by Zakka (2009) asserted that SETs are not the only way to assess

the quality of teaching and learning, but other techniques such as peer review should be considered. Regarding the differences in student gender, the researchers discovered that the interference did not influence female tutors' appraisals. There was some evidence of an impact on the course's overall rating and the instructor for male students, but not on teacher efficacy for college professors.

Andersen and Miller (1997) reported that female tutors who are not observed as having compassion and readily available may fail to satisfy students' needs and may be penalized by evaluation results. Sampaio (2006) investigated the interrelationship of gender, race, and subject matter, concentrating in the classroom on the consequences for women and people of color.A recent report by Miller and Chamberlin (2000) examined students' professional development credentials' perceptions and found that male tutors are perceived to have higher or superior qualifications.

Bianchini, Lissoni, and Pezzoni (2012) reported that tutors believed that females regularly received considerably lower evaluation scores than men concerning the four programs they investigated. The authors speculated that the gender composition of the student body could account for their findings because two of the four programs had low percentages of female students. Weaver (2006) found that the survey results indicate that teachers may need advice on explaining and using feedback before taking an interest in it. Hammer, Peer and Babad (2018) assessed faculty members' reactions to utilising the student appraisal result. The study revealed that they consider it useful despite the appraisal's setbacks because it accurately reflects their teaching efficiency. Marsh (2007)

demonstrated that most instructors do not improve their teaching despite students' feedback received after each semester. Renaud and Murray (2005) point out that in terms of consistency, student ratings are adequate, meaning that ratings are relatively consistent for all grades, years, and categories of evaluators and that they are precise and adequate, which means that they are relatively unbiased and consistent with the decisions of other evaluators, such as peers.

A longitudinal study conducted by Zhao and G allant (2012) on the evaluation of learners found the evaluation system to be a precise and meaningful tool for measuring the tutor's effectiveness. However, it was ascertained that the data's use and interpretation could not improve practice unless the tutors use the evaluation results. Studies have also shown that tutors' changes in student appraisal results were found by the discriminatory acceptance of these lecturers' feedback (Ballantyne, Borthwick and Packer 2000; Yao and Grady 2005; and Packer 2000).

The study of Furnham and Chamorro-Premuzic (2005) revealed that students prefer tutors who are friendly, open, warm-hearted, and very attentive to them. Their hypothesis revealed that polite students prefer polite instructors; assertive students prefer assertive tutors. Student comments are generally very far ridiculous or silly: they focus on providing appropriate information that can inform conductive instructors what is happening in their classrooms, how they are viewed and accepted by their learners, and, undoubtedly, how successful they are in teaching (Levin 2000). If there is no utilization of students' opinions and views,

then the evaluation system itself may certainly not be needed if the students do not see significant changes in tutors' instructional strategies.

Similarly, Elbra-Ramsay (2011) claims that appraisal is not inherently positive or negative in itself, but that student engagement with the appraisal system is sufficient to result in self-monitoring and instructional adjustments. On the contrary, other claims from Nazir, Al-Ansari, AlKhalifa et al. (2020) that student appraisals do not prove real teaching effectiveness and only evaluate their instructors' pleasure.

These researchers recommend that educational evaluations should not be used in moral choice on faculty promotions and appointments, stressing that personality is a sensitive topic since charismatic and enthusiastic faculty may earn favorable ratings irrespective of how well they know their subject matter. For this reason, rating scales should also avoid concentrating on facets of personality, such as popularity or similar qualities. Instead, the focus should be on instructor characteristics relevant to quality instruction, such as interactions between student and teacher or empathy for the student's learning (Cooper, Calloway-Thomas, & Simonds, 2007). Renaud and Murray (2005) state that student evaluation tools can assess only those attributes that can be evaluated by learners, such as learning goals, maintaining teaching hours, completing all teaching hours, speaking, keeping the classroom environment favourable for learning, remembering the names of the students, and selecting suitable materials.

Gender Differences in Tutors' Attitudes Toward Students' Appraisal of Teaching Effectiveness

The influence of the tutor's sex on student instruction appraisal looks pretty complicated. Several scholars argue that student scores are discriminatory toward female teachers (Kaschak, 1978; Rutland, 1990; Martin, 1984; Koblitz, 1990; Basow & Silberg, 1987; Basow, 1994). other findings (Bennett, 1982; Kierstead et al., 1988) for female tutors to overcome the low appraisal of teaching over their male counterparts should respond in a typically feminine way. As a result, Koblitz (1990) recorded this as a challenge for female instructors who need to embrace a "get tough" technique.

Punyanunt-Carter, and Carter (2015) investigated if there is gender bias in student evaluations in Texas, United States. The findings indicate that there is indeed a presence of gender bias when students assess their instructors. However, it was observed that this bias does not significantly impact the evaluations. In a study conducted by Boring et al. (2016) on the assessment of student evaluation of teaching (SET) measures was conducted across two universities located on different continents, encompassing diverse course subjects. The study's findings indicated a substantial and statistically significant bias against female instructors in SETs. Similarly, Bonitz (2011) also revealed that female tutors earned considerably higher appraisal results than their male counterparts.

More importantly, the study of MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt (2015) indicated that female tutors typically receive lower evaluations than male tutors, regardless of their teaching quality. This bias could be attributed to preconceived

notions and societal expectations regarding gender roles and expertise. Male tutors are frequently seen as more capable and authoritative, which results in higher ratings being given to them. Similarly, Boring (2017) also finds that male university students evaluate female instructors worse, providing evidence for gender-stereotypical evaluation patterns. While male instructors are rewarded for non-time-consuming dimensions of the course, such as leadership skills, female instructors are rewarded for more time-consuming skills, such as the preparation of classes.

Feldman (1992, 1993) analysed existing research scores for male and female teachers and classroom environments in his two-part meta-analysis. Feldman (1992) notes that many other studies reviewed found no difference in both men's and women's instructors' evaluations in his laboratory research analysis. Male tutors received higher feedback scores than females in minority studies, with several distinctions. Very few studies indicate that the sex of learners and teachers coincide, and when identified, the effect was inconsistent. Reportedly, in his analysis of the teaching space, Feldman (1993) again conveyed that most of the findings recorded no significant difference in gender gaps. However, in the few studies which found records of discrepancies during this period, female instructors earned marginally higher overall ratings than male instructors. The relationship result was that learners appeared to appraise same-gender instructors marginally higher than opposite-sex instructors.

Difference in Working Experience in the Attitude of Tutors Toward Students' Appraisal of Teaching Effectiveness

Research on the relationship between tutors' attitudes and their working experience regarding student appraisals of teaching is limited. However, some studies have explored related topics, such as the impact of teaching experience on instructors' openness to student feedback. A study by Aelterman, Engels, and Van Petegem (2007) examined the relationship between teaching experience and teachers' perceptions of feedback in higher education. They found that more experienced teachers were more likely to perceive student feedback as valuable and were more open to using it for professional development. It suggests that experienced tutors might be more receptive to students' appraisals of teaching.

Another study by Yi, Gong, and Lee (2017) focused on college instructors' attitudes toward student evaluations of teaching (SET) in China. They found that instructors with more teaching experience tended to have more positive attitudes toward SET and viewed it as an essential tool for instructional improvement. The study suggested that experienced instructors were more likely to value student feedback and consider it helpful for enhancing their teaching effectiveness.

Similarly, a study by Eryilmaz (2014) investigated the impact of teaching experience on Turkish instructors' attitudes toward student evaluations. The findings indicated that tutors with more teaching experience tended to have more favourable attitudes toward student evaluations and were more likely to consider them valid indicators of teaching quality. The study suggested that experienced

tutors may have developed a greater appreciation for the benefits of student feedback in improving their teaching practices.

A study by Lin, Yang, and Liang (2019) examined the relationship between teaching experience and attitudes toward student evaluations of teaching (SET) in Taiwan's higher education context. They found that tutors with more teaching experience had more positive attitudes toward SET and were likelier to perceive it as an effective means of evaluating teaching effectiveness. The study suggested that experienced tutors valued student feedback and saw it as an opportunity for self-improvement.

However, not all studies have found a significant relationship between teaching experience and attitudes toward student appraisals of teaching effectiveness. For instance, Greenwald, Hedges, and Laine (1996) examined university faculty members' attitudes toward student instruction ratings. They found no significant association between teaching experience and faculty members' attitudes, suggesting that years of experience did not necessarily impact their perceptions of student evaluations. A study by Xu and Jaggars (2013) also examined the relationship between teaching experience and faculty response to student feedback in online courses. They found that more experienced instructors were less likely to make changes in response to student feedback compared to less experienced instructors. It suggests that teaching experience might not always correlate with openness to student input.

Age Difference in The Attitude of Tutors Toward Students' Appraisal of Teaching Effectiveness

Differences in the ages of tutors on students' appraisal of teaching effectiveness are limited. However, some studies have explored related topics to openness to appraisal and student feedback. Barkley, Cross, and Major (2014) discovered that older tutors often possess a more extended teaching history, which leads to increased self-assurance and a well-established teaching approach. Consequently, they may exhibit less concern towards student feedback or evaluation, having developed their techniques and received positive feedback throughout their years of experience. Conversely, younger tutors who are relatively new to teaching may place greater significance on student feedback.

Similarly, Bassey's (2016) research findings indicate that lecturers' age notably impacts various aspects of their teaching effectiveness. These include their knowledge of the subject matter, skill in managing the classroom, ability to motivate students, assessment of students' learning activities, relationship with students, and overall effectiveness as educators. Thus, the age of lecturers is linked to their teaching effectiveness. Tran and Do (2022) also posited that the current generation of students perceives tutors' age as a mediating element affecting teaching effectiveness.

Differences in the Educational Level of Tutors' Attitudes Toward Student Appraisal of Teaching Effectiveness

One of the factors that may influence SETE results and their interpretation is the educational level of tutors or instructors, which refers to their academic

qualifications, experience, and expertise in the subject matter they teach. The literature on the relationship between tutors' educational level and SETE is scarce and inconclusive. Some studies have found positive, negative, or no effects of tutors' educational level on SETE ratings or outcomes.

For example, a study by Fernández and Martínez (2020) in Ecuador found that students' evaluation of teaching was positively related to their academic achievement in higher education. However, this relationship was not moderated by tutors' educational level or other variables such as gender, age, or experience. Vakili, Hajaghajani, Rashidy-Pour, and Ghorbani (2010) investigated the factors influencing student evaluation of teacher performance. Their extensive investigation was carried out to ascertain the influence of various factors on student evaluations of faculty members at Semnan University of Medical Sciences in Iran. Findings from the study revealed no significant differences in Faculty or colleges of tutors in student evaluation of teaching.

Another study by Osei-Owusu et al. (2016) in Ghana found that teachers' educational level significantly positively affected their performance appraisal ratings by headteachers in primary schools but not their self-evaluation ratings or students' achievement scores. A third study by Kwao (2019) in Ghana found that teachers' educational level had no significant effect on their performance appraisal ratings by circuit supervisors, headteachers, or peers in primary schools. However, it had a significant positive effect on their self-evaluation ratings.

Summary

The study examined the different concepts consistent with the study's objectives. Empirically, the literature reviewed showed that prior studies conducted only assessed the perception of lecturers from various universities across the globe without considering the attitude of tutors teaching at various colleges across the globe. Conceptually, attitude is not synonymous with perception. However, a missing link was provided in the literature about student ratings and the attitude of tutors toward the evaluation process. Therefore, this study bridges the gap by exploring the tutor's attitude toward student appraisal.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the process and techniques the researcher uses used for the data gathering. It identifies each action the researcher developed to reach the aim of the study. Thus, the chapter highlighted the research design, location, population, source of data and data collection instrument, sample and sampling procedure, pilot study and data collection procedure, data processing, and analysis.

Research Approach

The study adopted the quantitative research method approach. A Quantitative research method is because important questions that characterised the information collected on the attitude of tutors toward students' appraisal of teaching effectiveness could be analysed numerically, and the results presented statistically, with tables and graphs. It connected empirical research to apply methodologies that used concrete research questions. Similarly, the research approach provided exact unambiguous, and logical steps. It also used crystal clear reports that encouraged critical thinking and critique. For example, the research approach allowed the researcher to collect primary (questionnaire analyses). The main effects of using the quantitative data collection were that; It provided numeric estimates and allowed for relatively straightforward data analysis to be verified and compared between the selected groups of colleges of education within the Bono Region in Ghana. Weaknesses observed in using the quantitative

research method included: The analysis did not capture questions not included in the questionnaire.

Research Design

The research design is the project's plan, structure, and stratagem. According to Sarantakos (2005), the logical sequence that links the empirical data to the study's actual question and, arguably, to its summary is an essential component of any research design. The study used a descriptive survey as the design. According to Quartey and Awoyemi (2002), the descriptive survey design describes the approaches of collecting and gathering data to test a hypothesis or answer research questions vis-à-vis a current position of a phenomenon. They further asserted that this type of survey aims to provide a concise and realistic summary of an illustration of an ongoing scenario or a situation in real life. Studies contain comprehensive descriptions of prevailing phenomena collected to employ data to validate existing conditions and practices or make additional intelligent plans for refining them (Ary, Jacobs, Irvine et al., 2018). Aside from analysing, reporting, and interpreting an organisation's position for future direction, descriptive surveys determine adequate action by relating results to establish values. It also benefits from generating the right proportion of responses from many people (Amedahe & Asamoah-Gyimah, 2016).

This design was ideal because it provided a report on tutor attitudes toward student appraisal. It does not mean that the descriptive survey design has no setbacks. Siedlecki (2020) also identified survey design problems, including the likelihood of yielding inconsistent results because they may explore people's

private affairs. Again, it is confined to educated respondents since descriptive survey formats most frequently use questionnaires. However, efforts were made to lessen the restriction(s) of survey design in this study. These include entirely ignoring concerns that were deemed sensitive and personal by respondents. Also, all the target group members were literate, and the researcher used simple language to make it easy for the items to recognise and answer.

Population

Polit and Beck (2010) stated that the population was the comprehensive assortment of phenomena or elements the researcher was interested in and that these elements have similar characteristics. Accordingly, the population can be defined to cover a vast collection of cases or narrowly defined to include only a few things. As per Fink (1995), a unit's inclusion measures depend on the respondents' characteristics and criterion interest in the study. For this reason, the target population for the study was the College of Education tutors in the Bono Region, with a population of 169.

Sample and Sampling Procedures

A sample is a set of elements from a more significant population (Creswell, 2012). It is usually a more minor group the researcher studies. Sampling refers to choosing part of the population to represent the whole population (Amedahe & Gyimah, 2016). The study's sample frame was the four (4) selected Colleges of education in the Bono Region of Ghana with 96 tutors. Thus, to ensure a more detailed study of the element involved, a sample size of 96 was used. This selection was based on the principle of Arikunto (2002), who argues that if the

study population is less than 100, the researcher should include all elements in the population. If the population is more than 100, the researcher can take around 10 %-15% or 20%-25% or 50 % of them. It means that if the population is more than 100, the researcher cannot analyse all the data.

In that regard, the study adopted the total sampling technique where all the tutors were included because of the small number of tutors within the Region. The total sampling technique was used because it permitted the use of the population for the study due to the relatively small number of respondents. It accurately represents the entire population because there is no sampling error (Lohr, 2021). Since every member is included, the findings and conclusions drawn from the study are exact and applicable to the entire population.

Total sampling is advantageous when the population is small and manageable, as it allows researchers to capture the complete picture without relying on sampling techniques that may introduce potential biases (Lohr, 2021). Total sampling ensures the highest accuracy as it includes every member of the population, resulting in precise estimates and inferences. However, total sampling can be time-consuming and resource-intensive, especially when the population is large or geographically dispersed (Creswell, 2017).

Data Collection Instrument

The data were collected predominantly using self-administered questionnaires (see Appendix A). The questionnaire reflected the objectives of the study. Specifically, the researcher adapted and modified the questionnaire from Lecturer Response to Students Evaluations of Teaching (LRSET)" questionnaire,

developed by Iyam and Aduwa-Oglebaen (2005) and Harun et al. (2011) with a Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of 0.87 was used as the primary instrumentation of the study. This questionnaire has also been used by several studies in Nigeria and Benin (Idaka et al., 2006; Iyam & Aduwa-Oglebaen, 2005), South Africa (Machigambi & Wadesango, 2011), and Malaysia (Sulong & Hajazi, 2016). The questionnaire consisted of 40 items scored on a four-point Likert scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree, and weighted 4, 3, 2, and 1, respectively.

Most of the questionnaire elements reflected the tutor's attitude toward student appraisal of teaching effectiveness. The question was in three categories or sections labelled A, B, and C. Section "A" produced information on the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Section "B" of the questionnaire contains 20 test items and gathered information on tutors' attitudes toward student evaluation. The questionnaires' first ten (10) items measure the all-purpose requirement for student appraisal; the remaining ten (10) items were for decision and summative purposes on student appraisal. This section took the form of agreement ranging from strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Strongly Disagree (SD), and Disagree (D).

Section "C" contains 20 test items that produced information on the tutor's responses toward student evaluation of their teaching effectiveness. The questionnaires' first ten (10) items measure the all-purpose requirement for student appraisal; the remaining ten (10) items were for decision and summative purposes on student appraisal. This section also took the form of agreement

ranging from strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Strongly Disagree (SD), and Disagree (D). The researcher used the 40 test items on the questionnaire because of the assumptions of QueryCAT (2013), which states that items should not be more than fifty questions on a questionnaire with an answering time of no more than 15=20 minutes for a typical work environment. The shorter the questionnaire (<3 pages), the more likely having a high response rate.

This data collection method benefited from low cost; it was demonstrated to be independent of characteristics and individual and gave the respondent sufficient time to provide well-thought-out responses. It could also utilise large samples to show up as more trustworthy and dependable outcomes (Kumar, 2018).

Reliability and Validity of Instruments

Reliability and validity of the instrument are critical in quantitative analysis to minimise errors that may result from measuring concerns in the research sample. Reliability refers to the precision and accuracy of a measuring process (Bazeley, 2003). Internal consistency reliability analysis of the sub-dimensions on the Likert-type scale was determined using Cronbach's alpha. It helped determine how well the different items represent the characteristic understudy in a measure. The study offered details about which objects needed rewording or even total elimination from the scale.

Reliability is the degree to which scores on a test are consistent or stable over time (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004). It is to say that an instrument is regarded as reliable if it produces similar results on occasions when administered to the

same respondents. It also means reliability is how results are consistent over time and an accurate representation of the total population under study. The Cronbach alpha was used to test for the instrument's reliability on the adapted questionnaire for the study. The Cronbach's Alpha less than 0.7 indicates that the instrument is unreliable for data collection, whereas a reliability coefficient of 0.7 and above means that the instrument is reliable for data collection. Lodico (2006) states that validity concerns whether a test measures what it is meant to measure. Price, Jhangiani and Chiang (2015) defined validity as "the degree to which a test measures what it is intended to measure. Punch (2003) believes that validity has to do with how respondents can sincerely and carefully respond to questions, which he claims depends not only on the respondents' disposition and mind condition but also on their ability to answer the questions asked in the instrument.

Other researchers have used the questionnaire used in this study to test lecturers' perception of student evaluation, and have been accepted as valid. In other words, building on a variety of research attitudes of tutors to students' appraisal of teaching, there tends to be scholarly consensus on the validity of questionnaire items that tap into the different attitudes of tutors in Colleges of Education. In addition, the adapted questionnaire used for this study was closely scrutinized to ensure that all beliefs and teaching strategies were captured and the items/questions formulated.

Piloting of the Instrument

The researcher conducted a pilot test of the instrument on a small number of respondents at Atebubu College of Education in the Atebubu-Amantin Municipal.

This college of Education was selected for the piloting because Atebubu College of Education, located in the Atebubu-Amantin Municipal, provided a sample of respondents who share similar traits, backgrounds, and characteristics, which allowed for a more accurate assessment of the instrument's effectiveness. The motive for the pilot test of the instrument was for the accuracy, applicability, and consistency of the questionnaire items. Further, it provided insight into thoughts not yet considered and problems unanticipated, which could challenge the data analysis. In addition, the pilot testing enabled the researcher to revise the contents of the questionnaire, thereby revising the items on the instrument to achieve the reliability and validity standards required in scientific research.

Connelly (2008) believes 10 to 20 per cent of the actual study is a natural number when piloting any research instrument. The researcher accordingly sampled fifteen (15) tutors randomly, appropriately (15/100*118=12.71) for the questionnaire's piloting to ensure its reliability and validity. The researcher performed this exercise to enable the respondents to understand and answer the instrument efficiently. My supervisor, other experts in Guidance and Counselling, and the faculty of educational foundations at the University of Cape Coast subjected the instrument to reliability testing. Face and content validity were ascertained with their expertise in advising and guidance at the counselling centre. They were to ensure that the amount and type of evidence that were gathered supported the interpretations of tutors' attitudes toward students' appraisal of teaching effectiveness. Again, there were used to review the instrument items for clarity, completeness, and quality proficiency in collecting valuable data for the

research. Their recommendations were used to make the required adjustments to enhance the instrument.

The Cronbach's Alpha was computed for each item that falls under the four research objectives set to guide the study after the data was analysed. A Cronbach's Alpha of above 0.70 was considered, as Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) proposed, to maintain a high-reliability coefficient. Cronbach's Alpha was developed by Lee Cronbach in 1951 to provide a measure of the accuracy of a scale, according to Tavakol and Dennick (2011).

The questionnaire for the tutors' attitude toward students' appraisal consisted of three sections, i.e., sections A, B, and C, governing various relevant areas such as demographic characteristics, attitude of tutors to student appraisal, and tutors' responses to student appraisal of teaching. The homogeneity values (Cronbach's Alpha) range from 0.70 to 0.88. The Cronbach's Alpha of 0.78 was obtained for the demographic characteristics such as Gender, Age, Working experience, and educational level. Section B (items number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9,10; Cronbach's Alpha of 0.71) included an all-purpose requirement for the attitude of tutors to students' appraisal. Summative purpose (items number 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20; Cronbach's Alpha of 0.87) included tutors' attitude to students' appraisal of formative and summative purpose (items number; Cronbach's Alpha of 0.86). Section C (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; Cronbach's Alpha of 0.86) included an all-purpose requirement for tutors' responses to students' appraisal. Section C(items 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20; Cronbach's Alpha of 0.88) included items on the formative and

summative purpose of tutors' responses to students' appraisal. DeVillis (1991) states that such a reliability coefficient is considered respectable. As a result, the instrument was deemed trustworthy and appropriate for the necessary data to answer research questions. Also, according to Fraenkel and Wallen (2003), "a helpful rule of thumb for research purposes is that dependability should be at least 0.70 and ideally higher." As a result, the instrument is of good quality and capable of gathering meaningful data for the study. IBM Statistics version 25 was used to determine the reliability of the instrument. In terms of items analysis, all queries were catered to. These steps guaranteed that the instrument could gather high-quality, relevant data for the study.

Data Collection Procedure

Prior to the collection of the data, an application for ethical clearance was submitted and was granted by the Ethical Review Board of the University of Cape Coast after the proposal was successfully defended. After that, an introductory letter was obtained from the Department of Education and Psychology at the University of Cape Coast and presented to various principals of selected Colleges for permission to give out the questionnaire and conduct the observation. It was necessary to ensure the teachers were pre-informed about the data collection. A follow-up was done to arrange for a time and date convenient to the participants for the data to be collected. Based on the consent of the principal of the various colleges, the questionnaires were distributed to the tutors to solicit their responses regarding the attitude of tutors toward students' appraisal of teaching.

Data collection was from 20th June to August 2021. However, it was clarified to the respondents that their support in the study was deliberate, and thus, they were encouraged to provide accurate and honest information if they were willing to participate. I explained to the participants that they reserved the privilege to withdraw from the study anytime (Creswell, 2012), but this right ended after submitting their instrument. It was because of the difficulty of tracing back their questionnaire to be taken out of the analysis. Respondents were mindful that the investigation was liberated from psychological or physical maltreatment (Neuman, 2014). All COVID-19 protocols were also adhered to during the data collection.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical clearance was sought from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Cape Coast. As part of the process leading to the data collection, issues about informed consent, access and acknowledgment in the research setting, protection, obscurity, and classification arrangements were submitted to the IRB for clearance to proceed with the actual data collection. A cover letter was attached to the instrument to give the participants the vital data needed to respond to the items. To ensure that no participants felt coerced, they were allowed to indicate their willingness to participate in the research. Further, as Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2007) suggest, the participants were pre-informed that the research report would be published and accessed in the public domain. However, the identity of each participant would never be revealed; hence, no risk in taking part in the study.

Lastly, voluntary participation was assured in this study, and the data collected from the participants were treated with the utmost confidentiality and anonymity to help protect respondents' identities. To gain access to the various senior high schools selected for the study, an introductory letter attained from the Department of Education and Psychology, University of Cape Coast, was presented to the Colleges to seek permission to administer the questionnaire. The purpose and intent of the research were indicated in the letter.

The raw data will be kept in a locker with a key for safety in my office to guarantee data security. Only I and my supervisors will have access to the entered data. Data will be saved for three years after this examination's culmination and then shredded when no further issues are raised by any of the respondents and the University's academic board.

Data Processing and Analysis

The data gathered was then entered in a pre-designed template in the IBM Statistical Product and Service Solution, version 25. The entire data was validated with paper copies to maintain confirmability in response and reduce data entry errors. The data was analysed using descriptive (frequency and percentages) and inferential statistics (Independent samples t-test, and one-way ANOVA). Research questions one and two were analysed and discussed using frequency and percentages. Frequencies and percentages: Any statistical analysis of categorical data, including the (Student Appraisal), should not contain central tendency measures such as the means or averages suitable only for quantitative data. A standard calculation of categorical data is relatively worthless and misleading

(Freishtat, 2014). Hypothesis one was analysed using the independent sample t-test. Hypothesis two, three and four were analysed using one-way ANOVA.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The preceding chapter highlighted the methods used in the collection of the data for the analysis. This chapter presents a statistical analysis of the data from the study. The study's findings were Arrangements, and discussions of the findings are carried out in two sections. The first part of the discussion presents the background information of the respondents. The second part presents the results of responses to the research objectives. The researcher provided tables and graphs that simplified the respondents' collective responses to make the discussion straightforward.

Background data of the Respondents

Table 1: Description of Participants (N = 96)

Characteristics	N (%)
Gender	
Male	74 (77)
Female	22 (23)
Marital Status	
Married	77 (80.2)
Single	14 (14.6)
Divorced	5 (5.2)
Educational level	
Bachelor's Degree	3 (3.1)
Masters	6 (6.3)
PhD	87 (90.6)
Age	
25-30	8 (8.3)

31-35	18 (18.8)
36-40	29 (30.2)
46-50	21 (21.9)
51-55	20 (20.8)
Work Experience	
1-3	2 (2.1)
4-6	5 (5.2)
7-9	17 (17.7)
10-12	27 (28.1)
13-15	25 (26.0)
15+	20 (20.8)

Source: Effah, (2020)

Participants who completed the questionnaire were 96 in total. More than half of them (77%) were males. Most of the participants (80.2%) were married and 90.6% of them had PhD in terms of educational level. In relation to age, most of the participants (30.2) fell within the age range of 36-40 years. Further, the majority of the study respondents (28.1%) had work experience within 7-9 years. The table 1 above depicts further information on the description of the participants.

Research Question One: What is the attitude of tutors to students' assessment and evaluation of their teaching? This research question's main objective was to discover tutors' attitude towards student evaluation concerning their teaching effectiveness. The tutors were enquired to show the extent to which they agree or disagree with the statements concerning student evaluation of teaching effectiveness on a four-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to disagree strongly. The results were discussed using frequencies and percentages. Based on the four-point scale, a percentage count of 50% and above indicates tutors' desirable view (agreement) while a percentage count of 49% and below indicates tutors' undesirable view (disagreement) with the statement relating to

tutors' attitude towards student appraisal. The results were presented in Tables 2 and 3, respectively.

Table 2: Tutors Attitude Towards S tudent Appraisal (all-purpose requirement)

STATEMENT	SA	A	SD	D
	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
Students write comments only when they feel very positively about the instructor.	19(19.8)	50(52.1)	22(22.9)	5(5.2)
Students are not competent to make value judgments about the subject's quality and the tutor.	13(13.5)	9(9.4)	50(52.1)	24(25.0)
Students' ratings reduce Tutors' morale and job satisfaction.	8(8.3)	6(6.3)	48(50.0)	34(35.4)
SET scores should be considered as indicators rather than exact measures of instructors' performances.	17(17.7)	49(51.0)	22(22.9)	8(8.3)
Good instructors get high course evaluations.	25(26.0)	69(71.9)	1(1.0)	1(1.0)
Students evaluate tutors based on their teaching ability.	22(22.9)	60(62.5)	3(3.1)	11(11.5)
Unhappy students show their feelings about a class by writing bad evaluations for the instructor.	27(28.1)	45(46.9)	12(12.5)	12(12.5)
Student ratings can seriously jeopardize the career of a tutor.	6(6.3)	24(25.0)	39(40.6)	27(28.1)
Students base their course ratings on how entertaining a tutor is.	22(22.9)	44(46.5)	14(14.6)	16(16.0
Students give better ratings to instructors that teach fewer demanding courses.	5(5.2)	22(22.9)	20(20.8)	49(51.0)

Source: Effah, (2020)

Table 2 shows the response of tutors' attitude towards students' appraisal of their teaching effectiveness. The table shows that most tutors have a positive

attitude towards student appraisal of their teaching effectiveness. For instance, concerning the statement "Students write comments only when they feel very positively about the instructor," it was revealed that the majoirty 52.1% of the tutors disagreed to the statement in question. This means that in this population, tutors deem the responses of students about their actual performnces as important in the appraisals used. This current findings supports the view of Boring, Ottoboni and Stark (2016), who revealed that students are prepared enough to comment on their understanding of the course, including factors that affect educational outcomes, such as the tutor's frequency response, continuity, and even the instructor's versatility outside the classroom. Besides these findings, Some study findings are compatible with these current findings. For instance, Lauer (2012) indicated that students are well qualified to observe the tutor's classroom styles, such as the tutor's consistency, teaching speed, readability, positional accuracy, and excitement. Similar evidence from Fadia Nasser and Barbara Fresko (2002) shows that college students are 'professional teacher watchers' who assume that learners are likely to construct sensible and informed instruction when asked questions in their experiential context.

Again, the results show the majority, 52.1% of the tutors, strongly disagreed with the statement "Students are not competent to make value judgments about the quality of the subject and the Tutor," followed by 25.0% of the tutors.the study corroborate with the findings of Theall (2002), who revealed that students are competent to evaluate the frequency of instructor actions, the volume of work they need, how often they think they have learned, and the

complexity of the content. Responses regarding the content of lessons, the importance of readings and homework, the consistency of the teacher's explanations, the responsiveness and friendliness of the tutor, and several other facets of the teaching process can be clarified. Nobody else is as competent to discuss what happened mostly during the semester, and only because for the entire semester, nobody else is there. In order to communicate their satisfaction or disappointment with the experience, students are eligible. In any case, they have the right to express their views, and no one else can report the degree to which the experience has been beneficial, constructive, insightful, rewarding, or worthwhile. Although views on these issues are not direct measures of the tutor's effectiveness or the content learned, they are legitimate indicators of student satisfaction (Theall, 2002).

On the contrary, Moore and Kuol (2005) doubted students' inability to evaluate their tutors. They revealed that students are not knowledgeable enough to judge their tutors' effectiveness because of their inadequate teaching knowledge. They further opined that students express their sentiments to appraisal based on their emotions and expectations, making them incapable of making an objective decision or judgment. More importantly, learners cannot determine the efficacy of teaching after some time has passed. More importantly, An analysis of more than two million open-ended SET comments by learners in a recent survey conducted by Tucker (2014) noticed that most students made positive comments that were neither disrespectful nor offensive. These inconsistent findings show that attitudes of this kind are consequent from tenacious beliefs that appraisals are biased that

students are not competent evaluators (Eiszler, 2002). In this regard, It may be beneficial for tutors to find out that learners who provide tutor feedback can enhance the course's effectiveness as shown by learners, but tutor feedback also can enhance individual students' performance by increasing student learning measured by grades.

Correspondingly, the result shows that 50.0% of the tutors strongly disagreed that Students' ratings reduce Tutors' morale and job satisfaction," followed by 25.0% of the remaining tutors. On the contrary, 8.3% and 6.3% of the tutors strongly agreed and agreed to the statement, respectively. Again the table shows that out of the 96 tutors, the majority (51.0%) of the tutors believe that SET scores should be considered indicators rather than exact measures of instructors' performances, while 22.9% strongly disagreed with the statement in question. The result shows that student appraisal of teaching effectiveness boosts the satisfaction and morale of tutors. Tutors accept the results from the student appraisal. The result does not go in line with the study findings of Ryan, Anderson and Birchler (1980), who found that the use of course appraisal systems can shrink tutors' morale.

Over again, an enormous amount (62.5%) of the tutors agreed on the statement "Students evaluate tutors based on their teaching ability," followed by 26.0% of the remaining tutors. Besides, table 3 also revealed that 71.9% and 26.0% of the tutors reacted absolutely to the statement "Good instructors get high course evaluation" with strongly agree and agree respectively. Again, the result in table 3 indicates that out of the 96 tutors, the majority, 40.6% of the tutors

strongly disagreed because Student ratings can seriously jeopardize a tutor's career, which was then agreed on by 28.1%. Different views from the tutors indicate that 25.0% of more or less of the tutors agreed that "Student ratings could seriously jeopardize the career of a tutor." Claims from the study show that good tutors always receive higher ratings from the students (Beleche, Fairris, & Marks, 2012; Benton, Duchon, & Pallett, 2011). Incompatibly, in other study findings, some tutors argue that student appraisal fails to function their educational Purpose and even infringe tutors' educational liberty and privileges (Slade & McConville, 2006). This result can be concluded that student appraisal is a good measure of teaching, which ensures the tutors' total privilege.

In contrast to this finding, Stark and Freishtat (2014) also proclaimed that Good tutors could also get worse appraisals from learners. Further elaborations revealed in their findings was that outstanding tutors get bad ratings, perhaps due to personal or environmental factors that influence results. More again, Kornell and Hausman (2016) asserted that less qualified and less competent instructors achieve the highest result, whereas the competent and experienced tutors get the worst appraisal. The authors speculated that the more experienced tutors expand the course scope and produce learners with a better understanding of the topics than teaching verbatim to the test. In this case, the instructors who inculcated the most profound learning in their students become the worst in terms of student evaluations and original exam scores (Kornell & Hausman, 2016).

Correspondingly, the least 12.5% of the tutors strongly disagreed and disagreed with the statement "Unhappy students show their feelings about a class

by writing bad evaluations for the instructor" While the majority, 46.9% of the tutors, agreed that Unhappy students show their feelings about a class by writing inadequate instructor evaluations. 28.1% of them also agreed strongly with the statement as well.

The result in Table 3 shows that out of the 96 tutors, the majority, 46.5%, of the tutors, agreed that Students base their course ratings on how entertaining a tutor is, followed by 22.9% with the same belief. Again, the majority, 51.0% of the tutors, disagreed that Students give better ratings to instructors who teach fewer demanding courses, whereas 22.9% agreed to the statement. These current results support the findings of Adamson, O'Kane, and Shevlin (2005). They declared that students' expectations of how engaging an instructor is, was positively related to their teaching performance ratings. In a similar view, Balam and Shannon (2010) also confirmed in their findings that student appraisals are a personality contest where those who are more friendly and entertaining are the winners. Sojka, Gupta and Deeter-Schmelz (2002) reached comparable outcomes and concluded that learners give higher evaluation scores for those who are straightforward and engaging, making higher-rated tutors appear to demonstrate more incredible views and enthusiasm for the survey's use (Nasser and Fresko 2002).

Table 3: Tutors Attitude Towards Student Appraisal (Decision and Purpose)

STATEMENT	SA	A	SD	D
	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
The gender of the student affects my SET scores.	6(6.3)	16(16.7)	41(42.7)	22(34.4)
Instructors who demand a lot from their students get low evaluations.	30(31.3)	53(55.3)	4(4.2)	9(9.4)
Most students treat course evaluations seriously.	4(4.2)	48(50.0)	11(11.5)	33(34.4)
The aim of any system of Tutor appraisal must be for the improvement of their performance.	44(45.8)	50(52.1)	1(1.0)	1(1.0)
The tutor's personal charisma mostly influences student ratings.'	17(17.7)	67(69.8)	9(9.4)	3(3.1)
Student ratings are more applicable for the younger, less – experienced members of staff.	5(5.2)	15(15.2)	43(44.8)	33(34.4)
Student ratings are influenced more by the lecturer than by the subject.	13(13.5)	49(51.0)	26(27.1)	8(8.3)
Students are most impressed by the lecturer who can present the main points in easy to grasp ways.	58(60.4)	30(31.3)	7(7.3)	1(1.0)
Students think the tutor should provide "all you need to know for passing the exams."	35(36.5)	39(40.6)	13(13.5)	9(9.4)
Students are unimpressed by the lecturer, who merely reads from notes.	30(31.3)	36(37.5)	19(19.8)	11(11.5)

Source: Effah, (2020) field, data

Table 3 shows that out of the 96 tutors, the majority, 42.7% of the tutors strongly disagreed with the statement "the gender of the student affects my SET scores," which was followed by 34.4% of the tutors. On the other hand, only 16.7% of the tutors agreed that the gender of the student affects my SET scores. These results show that students' gender does not affect tutors' rating. This implies that teachers do not consider gender of the students as a vital factor in determining the ratings they receive on their appraisals.

Unlike Boring (2015), who revealed that Men are perceived to be more competent (male gender stereotyping) and have higher appraisal scores than females, learners benefit from both women and men, suggesting that female tutors are as intelligent as males. Miller and Chamberlin (2000) focused on students' appraisal of instructional competence and identified that male tutors were rated to have higher credibility than female tutors. women consistently received significantly lower effectiveness scores than men

Additionally, 55.3% of the tutors agreed that Instructors who demand a lot from their students get low evaluations, followed by 31.3% of the tutors. Similarly, 50.0% of the tutors agreed that Most students treat course evaluations seriously. On the other hand, 34.3% of the tutor disagreed with the statement, "Most students treat course evaluations seriously. "Additionally, most 52.1% of the tutors agreed that the aim of any system of Tutor appraisal must be to improve their performance, followed by 45.8% of the tutors who strongly agreed to the statement. More importantly, Winchester and Winchester (2014) say that student evaluation outcomes consistently help teachers better their teaching through

professional growth. In congruence with Other studies, including Abedin et al. (2014), tutors and students believe that student appraisal results improve teaching effectiveness. On the other hand, in their study results, Davidovich and Eckhaus (2019) reported that tutors believe student appraisals are undesirable to their interaction with their learners and harm their classroom instruction and social interaction with their learners. Similarly, Penny and Coe (2004) argued that student ratings are insufficient to promote changes and improvements but that a structure for feedback should be replaced instead.

The study also found out that the majority, 69.8% of the tutors, agreed that the tutor's charisma mostly influences student ratings. Again, 17.7% of the tutors also strongly agreed with the statement. The result indicated that students' opinions of their tutors' personalities are related to student appraisal. It means that students sometimes evaluate tutors based on their personality rather than the course. These findings support Cayson's (2013) findings, who reported that learners' views on the tutors' appraisal and personality were correlated significantly. The study of Furnham and Chamorro-Premuzic (2005) revealed that students prefer tutors who are friendly, open, warm-hearted, and very attentive to them. Their hypothesis revealed that polite students prefer polite instructors; assertive students prefer assertive tutors

Moreover, the result shows that out of the 96 tutors, the majority, 44.8% of the tutors strongly disagreed that Student ratings are more applicable for the younger, less experienced staff members. This result is incompatible with the findings of McPherson, Jewell and Kim (2009), who believe that younger tutors

are more current than older ones, and physically good-looking tutors are rated more confidently. Besides, out of the 96 tutors, the results revealed that 51.0% of the tutors agreed with the statement, "The lecturer than by the subject more influences student ratings" Again, 27.1% of the tutors strongly disagreed with the student ratings were more influenced by the lecturer than by the subject. In similarity of findings, Youmans and Jee (2007) revealed that even the delivery of coffee before the appraisal results in higher ratings. McPherson and Jewell (2007) also added that teachers could "consider purchasing evaluation results by increasing students' grade expectations.

Moreover, the results in Table 3 show that majority 60.4% of the tutors believed that students are most impressed by the lecturer who can present the main points in ways that are easy to grasp, which was followed by 31.3 of the tutors. Congruently, 40.6% of the tutors agree that students think the tutor should provide "all you need to know for passing the exams" More importantly, 36.5% of them also strongly agreed that students think the tutor should provide "all you need to know for passing the exams." The result indicated that students expect tutors to be spoon-feeding them with all the necessary information to pass their exams without them sourcing for their personal information.

Research Question 2: What is the response of tutors to student's appraisal of their teaching effectiveness? This research question's main objective was to discover tutors' attitude towards student evaluation concerning their teaching effectiveness. The tutors were enquired to show the extent to which they agree or disagree with the statements concerning student appraisal of teaching

effectiveness on a four-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to disagree strongly. The results were discussed using frequencies and percentages.

Table 4 shows that out of the 96 tutors, 52.1% agreed that students possess good value judgment to evaluate their tutors. It was found that 29.2% of them agreed strongly with the statement. The result reveals that most of the tutors consider that students possess good value judgment to evaluate their tutors. Again, the result shows that 51.0% of the tutors agreed with the statement "Feedback on student evaluation helps tutors improve their teaching," 29.2% of the tutors strongly agreed to the statement as well. As a result, most of the tutors accept that feedback on student evaluation helps tutors improve their teaching. This means that in determining the effectiveness of teaching, tutors will readily accept students' evaluation because they believe that the students possess good value judgement.

Table 4: Tutors' Responses to Student Appraisal of Teaching Effectiveness

STATEMENT	SA	A	SD	D
	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
Students possess good value judgment to evaluate their Tutors	28(29.2)	50(52.1)	2(2.10)	16(16.7)
Feedback on student evaluation helps Tutors to improve on their teaching.	44(45.8)	49(51.0)	3(3.1)	0(0.00)
Results of student evaluation are needed to improve classroom instruction	38(39.6)	54(56.3)	2(2.1)	2(2.1)
Results of student evaluation can be used to assess the professional needs of Tutors	24(25.0)	57(59.4)	6(6.3)	9(9.4)
Tutors will be more punctual to class if they know that their students will evaluate them	28(29.2)	46(47.9)	8(8.3)	14(14.6)
Student ratings can provide information on only the most trivial aspects of teaching.	7(7.3)	10(10.4)	48(50.0)	31(32.2)
Student evaluation results are used for promotion of Tutors	22(22.9)	48(50.0)	10(10.4)	16.7)
Student evaluation results are needed to select the best Tutors for an award in the College	21(21.9)	56(58.3)	10(10.4)	9(9.4)
My willingness to try new teaching approaches is constrained by the possible adverse effects on my student evaluations	4(4.2)	18(18.8)	44(45.8)	30(31.3)
The performance of academic staff should be appraised more regularly and systematically.	35(36.5)	53(55.2)	4(4.2)	4(4.2)

Source: Effah, (2020)

Correspondingly, most 56.3% of the tutors agreed that Results of student evaluation are needed to improve classroom instruction, followed by 39.6% of the tutors. That is to say, almost all the tutors believe in this assertion that results of student evaluation are needed to improve classroom instruction. This current finding is not different from Abedin et al. (2014), who found that Both tutors and students have acknowledged that the instrument of student ratings is used to enhance teaching. It is used as an instrument to ration instruction performance and enhance the eminence of teaching and learning. More importantly, Khong-ngam, Wongwanich and Piromsombat (2014) showed that instructors slightly use the appraisal as a reference to enhance teaching methods. Various findings on the effective use of student appraisal results (Kember et al., 2002; Hendry, Lyon, & Henderson-Smart, 2007) provide valuable evidence for tutors which aids in the progressiveness of student learning (Ballantyne, Borthwick, & Packer, 2000). On the contrary, Arthur (2009) found that tutors do not make any alterations or enhancements in response to student feedback. Arthur attributed it to several factors, including the number of students commenting on similar exposure, tutors' alleged relevance of instruction, or a specific subject. In the same view, Marsh (2007) asserted that most teachers do not focus on improving their teaching notwithstanding the students' responses obtained after each semester. other claims from Nazir et al. (2020) that student appraisals do not prove real teaching effectiveness and only evaluate their instructors' pleasure.

Additionally, the tutors' responses show that student evaluation results assess tutors' professional needs, as most 59.4% of the tutors have indicated. Besides, 25.0% of the tutors also added their sentiments, indicating that student evaluation results can be used to assess tutors' professional needs. Furthermore, the result shows that tutors will be more punctual to class if they know that their students will evaluate them as majority 47.9% of the tutors indicated above. In addition to the previous contentions, 29.2% of the tutors strongly agreed that tutors would be more punctual to class if they know that their students will evaluate them. Again, the result from Table 4 indicates that students possess good value judgment to evaluate their tutors as 50.0% 0f the total tutors have made an explicit confirmation to the statement.

Correspondingly, evidence from table 4 indicates that student evaluation results are used to promote tutors, as the majority 50.0% of the tutors have indicated. The study shows that student evaluation results are used for the promotion of tutors. The result discovered that student appraisal results are needed to select the best tutors for an award in the College, as the majority 58.3% of the tutors have said. Besides, 21.9% of the tutors strongly believe in the assertion made earlier that Student evaluation results are needed to select the best Tutors for an award in the College. Contrary to the study findings,Cooper et al. (2007) recommend that educational evaluations should not be used in moral choice on faculty promotions and appointments, stressing that personality is a sensitive topic since charismatic and enthusiastic faculty may earn favorable ratings irrespective of how well they know their subject matter. Rating scales

should also avoid concentrating on facets of personality, such as popularity or similar qualities, for this reason. Instead, the focus should be on instructor characteristics relevant to quality instruction, such as interactions between student and teacher or empathy for the students' learning (Cooper et al., 2007).

Moreover, Table 4 shows that out of the 96 tutors, most of them strongly disagreed with the statement "My willingness to try new teaching approaches is constrained by the possible negative effects on my student evaluations," followed by 31.3% of the tutors. On the other hand, only 18.8% of the total number of the tutors agreed with the statement, "My willingness to try new teaching approaches is constrained by the possible negative effects on my student evaluations." This current study correspondent with the study findings of Deaker, Stein and Spiller (2016), who asserted that tutors unwillingness to change their style of teaching was because Students assess teaching based on the grades they receive, the instructor's character and accountability, and the ease or difficulty of lessons.

Similarly, the result revealed that academic staff's performance should be appraised more regularly and systematically, as the majority, 55.2% of the tutors have indicated. Also, 36.5% of the tutors strongly agreed with the statement, "The performance of academic staff should be appraised more regularly and systematically" The result can be concluded that academic staff's performance should be appraised more regularly and systematically as most of the tutors expressed much concern.

Table 5: Tutors' Responses to Student Appraisal (decision and Purpose)

STATEMENT	SA	A	SD	D
	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
I favour student evaluation of teaching, provided it is offered as a service that I can use if I wish.	21(21.9)	44(45.8)	13(13.5)	18(18.8)
The feedback from students has helped me to improve my teaching.	36(37.5)	49(51.0)	2(2.1)	9(9.4)
Any appraisal system which focused on monitoring individual performance to improve efficiency would be welcomed.	44(45.8)	45(46.9)	2(2.1)	5(5.2)
Using student ratings as a measure of teaching effectiveness can be as misleading as using best-seller' lists as a measure of literary excellence	14(14.6)	57(59.4)	8(8.3)	17(17.7)
The fact that students were able to respond anonymously encouraged silly and amusing responses.	26(27.1)	41(42.7)	4(4.2)	25(26.0)
Students are unimpressed by the tutor, who merely reads from notes.	31(32.3)	50(52.1)	8(8.3)	7(7.3)
Students make very constructive suggestions as to how the teaching can be improved.	9(9.4)	63(65.5)	8(8.3)	16(16.7)
I am satisfied with the evaluation form used for student evaluation.	8(8.3)	58(60.4)	18(18.8)	12(12.5)

Students' comments often highlighted underlying problems of communication of information from lecturer to students.	16(16.7)	65(67.7)	11(11.5)	4(4.2)
The pattern of student responses is often inconsistent.	25(26.0)	56(58.3)	5(5.2)	10(10.4)

Source: Effah, (2020)

From the results of table 5, the study revealed that out of the 96 tutors, 45.8% of them agreed with the statement "I favor student evaluation of teaching, provided it is offered as a service that I can use if I wish." More again, 21.9% of them strongly agreed that they favor student evaluation of teaching, provided it is offered as a service they can use, while 18.5% of the tutors disagreed with the statement. The result can be concluded that most of the tutors are in favour of using student appraisal. Additionally, the result shows that the majority 51.0% of the tutors agreed with the statement ". The feedback from students has helped me to improve my teaching." Again, 37.5% of them strongly agreed with the statement. These current findings contradict the findings of Seldin (1997). For Seldin, some tutors' do not acknowledge student feedback in their teaching for improvement. They assume that they are already doing an excellent job in the classroom, a misconception that decreases their satisfaction in increasing their skills. Also, Deaker et al. (2016) believe that students lack discipline in their learning linked with unconstructive student feedback. The student deficiency argument will force instructors to ignore student opinions and dismiss student feedback as an opportunity for professional development.

Congruently, the results from Table 5 indicate that, out of the 96 tutors, 46.9% of them agreed that any appraisal system which focused on monitoring

individual performance to improve efficiency would be welcomed. The current findings supports the claims of Elbra-Ramsay (2011) that appraisal is not inherently positive or negative in itself, but that student engagement with the appraisal system is sufficient to result in self-monitoring and instructional adjustments.

More importantly, 45.8% of them also agreed strongly with the statement in question. Concerning the statement "Using student ratings as a measure of teaching effectiveness can be as misleading as using best-seller' lists as a measure of literary excellence," the result discovered that 59.4% of the tutors agreed with it while 17.7% of them disagreed with the statement. These results can be concluded that most of the tutors believe it is not an appropriate mechanism to use student appraisal for their teaching effectiveness. This current finding corresponds with Harun, Dazz, Saaludin, and Ahmad's (2011) findings. Their study established that Students needs education on how to provide constructive feedback, students are lazy to make structured feedback and criticism, so writing comments and a survey will not be reliable.

Furthermore, the results show that 42.7% of the tutors agreed with the statement, "The fact that students were able to respond anonymously encouraged silly and amusing responses." The study contradicts the findings of Levin (2000) who revealed that student responses are generally very far ridiculous or silly: they focus on providing appropriate information that can inform conductive instructors what is happening in their classrooms, how they are viewed and accepted by their learners, and, undoubtedly, how successful they are in teaching.

It was followed by 27.1% of the tutors who also agreed strongly to the statement. Besides, most 52.1% of the tutors agreed that Students are unimpressed by the tutor, who merely reads from notes, whereas 31.2% agreed strongly with the statement. Similarly, the majority, 65.5% of the tutors, agreed that Students make very constructive suggestions on how the teaching can be improved.

Concerning the statement, "I am satisfied with the evaluation form used for student evaluation." The result indicated that the majority, 60.4% of the tutors, agreed to the statement. More again, concerning the statement "Students' comments often highlighted underlying problems of communication of information from lecturer to students," the results revealed that out of the 96 tutors, 67.1% of them agreed with the statement. More importantly, most 58.3% of the tutors agreed that student responses' pattern is often inconsistent.

Gender Difference in Attitude Towards Student Appraisal

Hypotheses 1: There are no significant gender differences in tutors' attitude towards student evaluation of their teaching. This hypothesis's main objective was to determine if there are significant differences in male and female tutors' views on students' appraisal of teaching. The discussion of the results was presented using an independent sample t-test and presented in Table 6.

Table 6: **Independent sample t-test for the significant difference in male and female tutors' attitude towards student appraisal**

Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-values	df	p-value

Attitude of tutors	Male	74	3.48	1.41	1.454*	47.171	0.011
	Female	22	3.09	1.01			

Source: Effah, (2020) field data *significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

Table 6 shows the independent sample t-test for the significant difference in male and female tutors' attitude towards student appraisal**.** From the result, the male tutors had a mean score of (M=3.48; SD=1.41) while their female counterparts had a mean score of (M=3.09; SD=1.010). The result indicates that the male tutors express much attitude toward student appraisal of their teaching. However, when the mean scores of both female and male tutors were tested using the independent sample t-test at a level of 5% significant, two-tailed. The result indicated that there was a statistical difference in the attitude of male and female tutors on student appraisal of teaching, t(47.171) =1.454, p=(0.05) since the p (0.011) value is less than 0.05, the research fails to accept the null hypotheses at 5% significant level regarding tutors' attitude toward student appraisal of teaching. The result can be concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in male and female tutors' attitude on students' appraisal of teaching.

The current study's result confirms the study findings of (Harun, Dazz, Saaludin et al., 2011; Inko-Tariah, 2013b), who found that the sex of the instructors made a significant difference in their attitude towards student evaluation of courses. The results show that male and female tutors have a diverse attitude toward student appraisal of teaching. Their attitude toward student

appraisal is never the same, but they accept student appraisal results for improving their teaching. Again, the result shows that their attitude might be different, but their understanding and usage of the result might be the same. On the contrary, Chikazinga (2019) found no significant difference in tutors' attitudes across gender in his study. However, both male and female tutors found student appraisal of teaching very useful in formative and summative purposes.

Working Experience Differences in The Attitude of Tutors On Student's Appraisal Of Their Teaching

Hypotheses 2: There are no significant working experience differences in tutors' attitude on students' appraisal of their teaching. This research's main objective was to determine whether there are working experience differences in tutors' attitude on students' appraisal of their teaching**.** The discussion of the results was presented using one-way Anova after all the preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumption of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. The result was presented in table 7.

Table 7: Differences in work experience on tutor's attitude towards Student Appraisal

Anova				
	Work Experience	**Mean**	**F-Value**	**p-value**
Attitude of Tutor	1-3	2.22	1.5	.18
	4-6	2.17		
	7-9	2.32		
	10-12	2.27		
	13-15	2.32		

	15+	2.36

Source: Effah, (2020) field data *significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

As indicated in Table 7, there are no significant differences (*p = .18*) in work experience and tutors' attitude towards students' appraisals of their teaching effectiveness. This means that when tutors are judging the importance of students' appraisals their work experience does not play role. This result coincides with that of Chikazinga (2019) who revealed that regardless of the working experience of the tutor, the importance they associate to students' appraisals of their teaching effectiveness does not vary.

Differences in Age in relation to tutors' attitude towards student appraisal of their teaching.

Hypotheses 3: There is no significant difference in tutors' attitudes toward students' appraisal of teaching based on their Age. This research's main objective was to determine whether there are age differences in tutors' attitude on students' appraisal of their teaching**.** The discussion of the results was presented using one-way Anova after all the preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumption of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. The result was presented in table 8

Table 8: Age differences in tutors' attitude towards students' appraisals

Anova

	Age	**Mean**	**F-Value**	**p-value**
	25-30	2.24	2.7	.25
Attitude of Tutor	31-35	2.20		
	36-40	2.20		
	46-50	2.34		

51-55	2.42

Source: Effah, (2020) field data *significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

As indicated in table 8, there was no significant differences ($p = .25$) in age in relation to tutors' attitude towards students' appraisals of their teaching effectiveness. This implies that regardless of the age of the tutor, similar importance is given to the appraisals students make in association to their performances in teaching. This finding is in close connection with the results obtained by Chikazinga (2019) who also found that age does not play role in tutors' attitude towards students' appraisals of their performance.

Differences in the educational level in tutors' attitude towards student appraisal of their teaching

Hypotheses 3: There are no significant differences in the educational level of tutors' attitude towards student appraisal of their teaching. This research's main objective was to determine whether there are differences in the educational level in tutors' attitude towards student appraisal of their teaching. The discussion of the results was presented using One-Way ANOVA after all the preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumption of variance violation. The result was presented in table 9.

Table 9: Differences in Educational Level in Relation to Tutors' Attitude Towards Students' Appraisals

	Anova			
	Educational level	**Mean**	**F-value**	**p-value**
Attitude of Tutor	Bachelor's Degree	2.3347	2.2	.11

Masters	2.2744
PhD	2.5833

Source: Effah, (2020) field data *significant at .05 level (2-tailed)

The table 9 shows that there no significant differences in educational level of tutors' attitude towards students' appraisals of their teaching. This means that in determining the importance of student's appraisals in teaching effectiveness, the educational level of tutors does not play a role. This results however in contradictory to the findings of Idaka, Joshua and Kritsonis (2006a) who revealed that the educational level of tutors showed significant influence on the attitude of staff to student evaluation for both formative and summative purposes.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION

Introduction

This section of the thesis presents the research process's overview, the significant key findings from the study, recommendations made from the significant vital findings, and the study's conclusion.

Summary

The present study sought to examine tutors' attitude toward students' appraisal of their teaching effectiveness in the Colleges of Education in the Bono Region of Ghana. The study adopted the quantitative research approach and a descriptive survey design as the research methods. 96 tutors were selected to constitute the sample of the study. An adapted questionnaire examined the tutors' attitude toward student appraisal of teaching. Responses from the completed survey were analysed using the Statistical Package for Service Solution (SPSS)

software version 25. Percentages and frequencies, independent sample T-test, and One-Way ANOVA were the analytical tools employed in the study.

Key Findings

For research question one, it was found that tutors had a positive attitude towards students' appraisals of their teaching effectiveness. Indicating that students' appraisals are important in determining whether their teaching is satisfactory or not.

For research question two, the study found that most of the tutors agreed that students use good value judgement in evaluating their performances and that the feedback from the students helps them to improve their teaching.

Results from the hypothesis one indicated that there is a significant difference in male and female tutors' attitude towards students' appraisals with male tutors expressing more positive attitudes towards students' evaluation.

Hypothesis two showed that there were no significant differences in working experience of the tutors and their attitude towards students' appraisals. This means that regardless of the working experience of the tutor, their attitude towards students' appraisals of their teaching effectiveness remains the same.

For hypothesis three, it was found that there were no significant differences in age of tutors and their attitude towards students' appraisal of their teaching effectiveness. This signifies that age of tutors does not matter in issues regarding students' appraisal of their teaching effectiveness.

The fourth and final hypothesis declared that there was no significant difference in tutors' educational level and student's appraisal of their teaching effectiveness. Implying that educational level does not play any role in determining the attitude tutors have regarding student's appraisal of their teaching effectiveness.

Conclusions

Based on the study's findings, it can be concluded that tutors have a positive attitude towards the usage of student appraisal results because the appraisal results provide tutors with the data for improving their teaching, making institutional decisions, and for promotional purposes. That is to say, it is a useful and reliable instrument for improving the quality of teaching as long as the enhancement of educational processes is structured well.

It can also be concluded that demographic factors such as age, educational level, and work experience do not play a role in tutors' attitude towards students' appraisals of the teaching effectiveness but in terms of gender, males express more positive attitude towards students' appraisals of their teaching performance.

More importantly, the study can be concluded that student appraisal is a reliable source of information to the tutor and the educational institutions but that

alone should not be the only indicator for measuring the overall teaching effectiveness of the tutors

Finally, the study concluded that tutors welcome and appreciate student comments because nobody else is as competent to discuss what happened, mostly in the classroom during the semester, and only because they are with the tutor in the classroom for the entire semester.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the research, the following recommendations are presented for policy and practice.

1. In determining the effectiveness of teaching, the Ghana Education Service and other evaluation agencies, should deem student's appraisal as an important aspect of the evaluation process because this study has shown that there is no one is in a better position to judge how teaching has been effective than the students who sit in class with the tutors.
2. Also, in soliciting for the views on how effective students' appraisals are, attention should not be given to demographic factors because these factors play little to no role in judging whether students appraisals are important.

Areas for further Research

A further study on workload, course difficulty and class size on tutors' attitude on student appraisal could be researched into since the study excluded these variables.

REFERENCES

Abedin, N. F. Z., Taib, J. M., & Jamil, H. M. T. (2014). Comparative study on course evaluation process: Students' and lecturers' perceptions. *Procedia-Social Behavioral Sciences*, *123*, 380-388.

Abrami, P., & d'Apollonia, S. (1997). The Dimensionality Of Student Ratings of Instruction: What We Know and What We do Not. *Effective Teaching in Higher Education: research and practice*, 321-367.

Agarwal, J., & Malhotra, N. K. (2005). An integrated model of attitude and affect: Theoretical foundation and an empirical investigation. *Journal of Business research*, *58*(4), 483-493.

AI-Kuwaiti, A. (2014). Students Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness Process in Saudi Arabia Medical Colleges: A Comparative Study of Students' and

Faculty Members' Perception. *Saudi Journal of Medicine & Medical Sciences*, *2*(3), 165-172.

Ajzen, I., & Cote, N. G. (2008). Attitudes and the prediction of behavior. *Attitudes and attitude change*, *13*, 289-305.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2005). The influence of attitudes on behavior. *The handbook of attitudes*, *173*(221), 31.

Albarracin, D., & Shavitt, S. (2018). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual review of psychology*, *69*, 299-327.

Aleamoni, L. M. (1999). Student rating myths versus research facts from 1924 to 1998. *Journal of personnel evaluation in education*, *13*, 153-166.

Aleamoni, L. M., & Hexner, P. Z. (1980). A review of the research on student evaluation and a report on the effect of different sets of instructions on student course and instructor evaluation. *Instructional Science*, *9*, 67-84.

Algozzine, B., Gretes, J., Flowers, C., Howley, L., Beattie, J., Spooner, F., Mohanty, G., & Bray, M. (2004). Student evaluation of college teaching: A practice in search of principles. *College teaching*, *52*(4), 134-141.

Alhija, F. N.-A., & Fresko, B. (2009). Student evaluation of instruction: what can be learned from students' written comments? *Studies in Educational evaluation*, *35*(1), 37-44.

Allport, G. W. (1933). 1. Attitudes. *terminology*, *219*.

Altmann, T. K. (2008). Attitude: a concept analysis. Nursing forum,

Alton-Lee, A. (2003). Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling: Best evidence synthesis June 2003. *Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education*.

Amedahe, F., & Asamoah-Gyimah, E. (2016). Introduction to measurement and evaluation. In: Cape Coast: University of Cape Coast Press.

Ampofo, S. Y., Onyango, G. A., & Ogola, M. (2019). Influence of School Heads' Direct Supervision on Teacher Role Performance in Public Senior High Schools, Central Region, Ghana. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, *7*(2), 9-26.

Anderson, H. M., Cain, J., & Bird, E. (2005). Online Student Course Evaluations: Review of Literature and a Pilot Study. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *69*(1).

Anderson, N. H. (2014). *A functional theory of cognition*. Psychology Press.

Arbuckle, J., & Williams, B. D. (2003). Students' perceptions of expressiveness: Age and gender effects on teacher evaluations. *Sex Roles*, *49*(9-10), 507-516.

Ärlestig, H., & Törnsen, M. (2014). Classroom observations and supervision–essential dimensions of pedagogical leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *28*(7), 856-868.

Arreola, R. A. (2004). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system*. Magna Publications Madison, WI.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. (2018). *Introduction to research in education*. Cengage Learning.

Aslam, M., & Kingdon, G. (2011). What can teachers do to raise pupil achievement? *Economics of Education Review*, *30*(3), 559-574.

Atek, E. S. E., Salim, H., Halim, Z. A., Jusoh, Z., & Yusuf, M. A. M. (2015). Lecturer's Gender and Their Valuation of Student Evaluation of Teaching. *International Education Studies*, *8*(6), 132-141.

Babcock, P. (2010). Real costs of nominal grade inflation? New evidence from student course evaluations. *Economic inquiry*, *48*(4), 983-996.

Balam, E. M., & Shannon, D. M. (2010). Student ratings of college teaching: A comparison of faculty and their students. *Assessment Evaluation in Higher Education*, *35*(2), 209-221.

Baldwin, T., & Blattner, N. (2003). Guarding against potential bias in student evaluations: What every faculty member needs to know. *College teaching*, *51*(1), 27-32.

Banner, J. M., & Cannon, H. C. (2017). *The elements of teaching*. Yale University Press.

Basow, S., Codos, S., & Martin, J. (2013). The effects of professors' race and gender on student evaluations and performance. *College student journal*, *47*(2), 352-363.

Bazeley, P. (2003). Computerized Data Analysis. *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*, 385.

Beavis, S. (2012). Student evaluations: Perceptions of learning NOT assessment of teaching quality. *Advocate: Journal of the National Tertiary Education Union*, *19*(3), 28.

Bem, D. J. (1970). Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs.

Bemile, R. K., Jackson, O. A. Y., & Ofosu, J. B. (2014). Course and Lecturer Evaluation by Students at Higher Institutions: Review and Challenges (The Case of Methodist University College Ghana). *Open Science Repository Computer and Information Science*.

Benton, S. L., & Cashin, W. E. (2014). Student ratings of instruction in college and university courses. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 279-326). Springer.

Benton, S. L., & Young, S. (2018). Best Practices in the Evaluation of Teaching. IDEA Paper# 69. *IDEA Center, Inc.*

Beran, T., Violato, C., & Kline, D. (2007). What's the "Use" of Student Ratings of Instruction for Administrators? One University's Experience. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *37*, 27-43, Article 1. www.ingentaconnect.com/content/csshe/cjhe

Berry, B., Daughtrey, A., & Wieder, A. (2010). Teacher leadership: Leading the way to effective teaching and learning. *Center for Teaching Quality*.

Betoret, F. D. (2007). The influence of students' and teachers' thinking styles on student course satisfaction and on their learning process. *Educational Psychology*, *27*(2), 219-234.

Bill, G. (2013). Teachers need real feedback. *school.karpaty.info* https:// www.ted.com/talks/bill_gates_teachers_need_real_feedback

Bolliger, D. U. (2004). Key factors for determining student satisfaction in online courses. International Journal on E-learning,

Borich, G. D. (2000). Effective teaching methods . Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill. In: Prentice Hall.

Boring, A. (2015). Gender biases in student evaluations of teachers (working paper). *CEPRESAGE-SCIENCES PO*.

Boring, A. (2017). Gender biases in student evaluations of teaching. *Journal of public economics*, *145*, 27-41.

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*.

Bruns, B., De Gregorio, S., & Taut, S. (2016). Measures of effective teaching in developing countries. *Research on Improving Systems of Education (RISE) Working Paper*, *16*(009).

Calhoun, E., Weil, M., Joyce, B., & Pancasari, R. K. (2016). Models of teaching (Model= model pengajaran)/Edisi Kesembilan.

Campbell, D. T. (1950). The indirect assessment of social attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin*, *47*(1), 15.

Campbell, J. P., & Bozeman, W. (2007). The value of student ratings: Perceptions of students, teachers, and administrators. *Community College Journal of Research Practice*, *32*(1), 13-24.

Campbell, R., Kyriakides, L., Muijs, R., & Robinson, W. (2004). Differentiated teacher effectiveness: Framing the concept. *Assessing teacher effectiveness: Developing a differentiated model*, *4*(8), 3-11.

Cavanaugh, B. (2013). Performance Feedback and Teachers' Use of Praise and Opportunities to Respond: A Review of the Literature. *Education and*

Treatment of Children, *36*(1), 111-136. https://doi.org/doi:10.1353/etc.2013.0001.

Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series*. ERIC.

Centra, J. A., & Gaubatz, N. B. (2000). Is there gender bias in student evaluations of teaching? *The journal of higher education*, *71*(1), 17-33.

Chen, Y., & Hoshower, L. B. (2003). Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: an assessment of student perception and motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,*, *28*(1). https://doi.org/0.1080/0260293032000033071 (Taylor & Francis Ltd)

Cherry, K. (2019). Attitudes and Behaviors in Psychology. Very Well Mind. In.

Chikazinga, W. W. N. (2018). Perceptions of lectures towards student evaluation of their teaching at the University of Malawi, Kamuzu College of nursing. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, *17*(4), 36-48.

Chikazinga, W. W. N. (2019). Perceptions of lectures towards student evaluation of their teaching at the University of Malawi, Kamuzu College of nursing. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, *17*(4), 36-48.

Ching, G. (2018). A literature review on the student evaluation of teaching: An examination of the search, experience, and credence qualities of SET. *Higher Education Evaluation and Development*, *12*(2), 63-84.

Chuah, K. L., & Hill, C. (2004). Student evaluation of teacher performance: random pre-destination. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, *1*(6).

Chung Sea Law, D. (2010). Quality assurance in post-secondary education: the student experience. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *18*(4), 250-270.

Clayson, D. E. (2009). Student evaluations of teaching: Are they related to what students learn? A meta-analysis and review of the literature. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *31*(1), 16-30.

Clayson, D. E. (2018). Student evaluation of teaching and matters of reliability. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(4), 666-681.

Codruta, M., Simona, D., & Georgeta, S. (2011). Evaluating teaching performance. From theory to practice using statistical tools. *Economic science series Annals of the University of Oradea*.

Coffey, M., & Gibbs, G. (2001). The evaluation of the student evaluation of educational quality questionnaire (SEEQ) in UK higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *26*(1), 89-93.

Coffey, M., & Gibbs, G. (2002). Measuring teachers' repertoire of teaching methods. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *27*(4), 383-390.

Cohen, G. (2003). Party over policy: The dominating impact of group influence on political beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*(5), 808.

Connelly, L. M. (2008). Pilot studies. *Medsurg nursing*, *17*(6), 411.

Cooper, P. J., Calloway-Thomas, C., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). *Intercultural communication: A text with readings*. Pearson Education New York.

Craig, B., & Dickenson, P. (2003). Helping Pupils to Manage Their Behaviour and Engagement", Lecture to Trainee Mathematics Teachers, Manchester Metropolitan University. In.

Creswell, J. (2012). *Research design*.

Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Davidovich, N., & Eckhaus, E. (2019). Student Evaluation of Lecturers--What Do Faculty Members Think about the Damage Caused by Teaching Surveys? *Higher Education Studies*, *9*(3), 12-21.

Dawson, K. P. (1992). Attitude and assessment in nurse education. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *17*(4), 473-479.

Deaker, L., Stein, S. J., & Spiller, D. (2016). You can't teach me: Exploring academic resistance to teaching development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *21*(4), 299-311.

DeVillis, R. F. (1991). Scale development: Theory and applications. In: Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Harcourt brace Jovanovich college publishers.

Eisner, J. (2002). An interactive spreadsheet for teaching the forward-backward algorithm. Proceedings of the ACL-02 Workshop on Effective tools and

methodologies for teaching natural language processing and computational linguistics,

Eiszler, C. F. (2002). College students' evaluations of teaching and grade inflation. *Research in Higher education*, *43*(4), 483-501.

Esia-Donkoh, K., & Baffoe, S. (2018). Instructional Supervisory Practices of Headteachers and Teacher Motivation in Public Basic Schools in Anomabo Education Circuit. *Journal of education and E-Learning Research*, *5*(1), 43-50.

Fazio, R. H. (1995). Attitudes as object-evaluation associations: Determinants, consequences, and correlates of attitude accessibility. *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*, *4*(1), 247-282.

Fenstermacher, G. D., Soltis, J. F., & Sanger, M. N. (2015). *Approaches to teaching*. Teachers College Press.

Festinger, L., & Kelley, H. H. (1951). Changing attitudes through social contact.

Fink, A. (1995). *How to analyze survey data* (Vol. 8). Sage.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude. *Intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*, 1-52.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1977). Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.

Forgas, J. P. (2008). The role of affect in attitudes and attitude change. *Attitudes and attitude change*, 131-158.

Freishtat, R. (2014). An evaluation of course evaluations. *ScienceOpen research*.

Gao, M., & Liu, Q. (2012). Effective teacher attributes: A comparison of American and Chinese secondary teacher candidates' perceptions. *Journal of the International Society for Teacher Education*, *16*(2), 9-21.

Gawronski, B. (2007). Attitudes can be measured! But what is an attitude? *Social Cognition*, *25*(5), 573-581.

Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis. *National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality*.

Gouveia, V. V., Milfont, T. L., & Guerra, V. M. (2014). Functional theory of human values: Testing its content and structure hypotheses. *Personality and individual differences*, *60*, 41-47.

Grammatikopoulos, V., Linardakis, M., Gregoriadis, A., & Oikonomidis, V. (2015). Assessing the Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality (SEEQ) questionnaire in Greek higher education. *Higher Education*, *70*, 395-408.

Gravestock, P., & Gregor-Greenleaf, E. (2008). *Student course evaluations: Research, models and trends*. Citeseer.

Greenwald, A. (1997). Validity concerns and usefulness of student ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist*, *52*(11), 1182.

Griffin, B. W. (2004). Grading leniency, grade discrepancy, and student ratings of instruction. *Contemporary educational psychology*

29(4), 410-425.

Gurney, P. (2007). Five factors for effective teaching. *New Zealand journal of teachers' work*, *4*(2), 89-98.

Haddock, G., & Maio, G. R. (2008). Attitudes: Content, structure and functions. *ntroduction to social psychology: A European perspective*, 112-133.

Haddock, G., Rothman, A. J., Reber, R., & Schwarz, N. (1999). Forming judgments of attitude certainty, intensity, and importance: The role of subjective experiences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*(7), 771-782.

Hajdin, G., & Pažur, K. (2012). Differentiating between student evaluation of teacher and teaching effectiveness. *Journal of information and organizational sciences*, *36*(2), 123-134.

Hammer, R., Peer, E., & Babad, E. (2018). Faculty attitudes about student evaluations and their relations to self-image as teacher. *Social Psychology of Education*, *21*(3), 517-537.

Hammonds, F., Mariano, G. J., Ammons, G., & Chambers, S. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching: improving teaching quality in higher education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *21*(1), 26-33.

Harmon-Jones, E., & Harmon-Jones, C. (2012). Cognitive dissonance theory. *Handbook of motivation science*, *71*.

Harun, S., Dazz, S. K., Saaludin, N., & Ahmad, W. (2011). Lecturer's perception on student evaluation at Universiti Kuala Lumpur. Enhancing Learning: Teaching & Learning Conference,

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and teacher education*, *11*(1), 33-49.

Heckert, T. M., Latier, A., Ringwald, A., & Silvey, B. (2006). Relation of course, instructor, and student characteristics to dimensions of student ratings of teaching effectiveness. *College student journal*, *40*(1), 195-204.

Hindman, J., Grant, L., & Stronge, J. (2013). *The supportive learning environment: Effective teaching practices*. Routledge.

Hogg, M. A. (2016). *Social identity theory*. Springer.

Hornstein, H. A. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating faculty performance. *Cogent Education*, *4*(1), 1304016.

Hounsell, D. (2009). Evaluating courses and teaching. *A handbook for teaching learning in higher education*, 198.

Hussain, M., & Mubarak, S. (2021). Measuring human resource attitude using organisational theory of relationship: The way forward. *International Journal of Management Studies*, *28*(1), 57-88.

Idaka, I. I., Joshua, M. T., & Kritsonis, W. A. (2006a). Attitude of academic staff in Nigerian tertiary educational institutions to student evaluation of instruction (SEI). National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal,

Idaka, I. I., Joshua, M. T., & Kritsonis, W. A. (2006b). Attitude of academic staff in Nigerian tertiary educational institutions to student evaluation of

instruction (SEI). *International journal of scholarly academic intellectual diversity*, *8*(1), 1-9.

Inko-Tariah, D. (2013a). Attitude of lecturers towards student's evaluation of their teaching effectiveness in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *4*(15), 21-26.

Inko-Tariah, D. (2013b). Attitude of lecturers towards student's evaluation of their teaching effectiveness in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Education Practice*, *4*(15), 21-26.

Iyamu, E. O., & Aduwa-Oglebaen, S. (2005). Lecturers' Perception of Student Evaluation in Nigerian Universities. *International Education Journal*, *6*(5), 619-625.

Jackson, D. L., Teal, C. R., Raines, S. J., Nansel, T. R., Force, R. C., & Burdsal, C. A. (1999). The dimensions of students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *59*(4), 580-596.

John, C. (2009). Differences in responses to the student instructional report: Is it bias. *Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service*.

Johnson, M. D., Narayanan, A., & Sawaya, W. J. (2013). Effects of course and instructor characteristics on student evaluation of teaching across a college of engineering. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *102*(2), 289-318.

Johnson, R. (2000). The authority of the student evaluation questionnaire. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *5*(4), 419-434.

Jung, C. G. (1971). Personality types. *The portable Jung*, 178-272.

Kane, R., Sandretto, S., & Heath, C. (2002). Telling half the story: A critical review of research on the teaching beliefs and practices of university academics. *Review of Educational Research*, *72*(2), 177-228.

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public opinion quarterly*, *24*(2), 163-204.

Kember, D., & Ginns, P. (2012). *Evaluating teaching and learning: A practical handbook for colleges, universities and the scholarship of teaching*. Routledge.

Kember, D., Leung, D. Y., & Kwan, K. (2002). Does the use of student feedback questionnaires improve the overall quality of teaching? *Evaluation in Higher Education*, *27*(5), 411-425.

Khong-ngam, S., Wongwanich, S., & Piromsombat, C. (2014). Principals' and teachers' use of evaluation results for student learning in science. *Procedia-Social Behavioral Sciences*, *116*, 1902-1907.

Khong-ngam, S., Wongwanich, S., Piromsombat, C. J. P.-S., & Sciences, B. (2014). Principals' and teachers' use of evaluation results for student learning in science. *116*, 1902-1907.

Killen, R. (2006). *Effective teaching strategies: Lessons from research and practice*. Cengage Learning Australia.

Killen, R. (2010). *Teaching strategies for quality teaching and learning*. Juta and Company Ltd.

Kogan, L., Schoenfeld-Tacher, R., & Hellyer, P. (2010). Student evaluations of teaching: Perceptions of faculty based on gender, position, and rank. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *15*(6), 623-636.

Kokkelenberg, E. C., Dillon, M., & Christy, S. M. (2008). The effects of class size on student grades at a public university. *Economics of Education Review*, *27*(2), 221-233.

Kornell, N., & Hausman, H. (2016). Do the best teachers get the best ratings? *Frontiers in psychology*, *7*, 570.

Krech, D., & Crutchfield, R. S. (1948). Beliefs and attitudes of men.

Krosnick, J., & Petty, R. (1995). Attitude strength: An overview. *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*, *1*, 1-24.

Krosnick, J. A., & Abelson, R. P. (1992). The case for measuring attitude strength in surveys. *Questions about questions: Inquiries into the cognitive bases of surveys*, 177-203.

Kumar, R. (2018). Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners. *Research methodology*, 1-528.

Kwarteng, A. J., Anane, E., & Nkrumah, I. K. (2016). Lecturers' Perception on Students' Appraisal of Courses and Teaching: A Case of University of Cape Coast, Ghana *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, IT & MANAGEMENT* 6(9). http://ijrcm.org.in/

Kyriacou, C. (2010). *Effective teaching in schools theory and practice*. Oxford University Press-Children.

Lalla, M., Frederic, P., & Ferrari, D. (2011). Students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness: Satisfaction and related factors. Statistical Methods for the Evaluation of University Systems,

Langen, J. M. (2011). Evaluation of adjunct faculty in higher education institutions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *36*(2), 185-196.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2004). *A handbook for teacher research*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Li, D., Benton, S. L., Brown, R., Sullivan, P., & Ryalls, K. R. (2016). Analysis of IDEA student ratings of instruction system 2015 pilot data. *IDEA Technical Report*(19).

Li, Z., & Naeem, M. B. (2011). Factors affecting attitudes: A study of immigrants' attitude towards the brochures and website of Växjö Kommun. In.

Lidice, A., & Saglam, G. (2013). Using students' evaluations to measure educational quality. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *70*, 1009-1015.

Lodico, M. (2006). Methods in educational research.

Lohr, S. L. (2021). *Sampling: design and analysis*. CRC press.

Lonka, K., & Ahola, K. (1995). Activating instruction: How to foster study and thinking skills in higher education. *European journal of psychology of education*, *10*, 351-368.

Lord, C. G., Lepper, M. R., & Mackie, D. (1984). Attitude prototypes as determinants of attitude–behavior consistency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*(6), 1254.

Lowenthal, P., Bauer, C., & Chen, K.-Z. (2015). Student perceptions of online learning: An analysis of online course evaluations. *American Journal of Distance Education, 29*(2), 85-97.

Lowman, J. (1990). Promoting motivation and learning. *College teaching*, *38*(4), 136-139.

Lüdtke, O., Trautwein, U., Kunter, M., & Baumert, J. (2006). Reliability and agreement of student ratings of the classroom environment: A reanalysis of TIMSS data. *Learning Environments Research*, *9*(3), 215-230.

Macfadyen, L. P., Dawson, S., Prest, S., & Gašević, D. (2016). Whose feedback? A multilevel analysis of student completion of end-of-term teaching evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *41*(6), 821-839.

Machingambi, S., & Wadesango, N. (2011). University lecturers' perceptions of students evaluation of their instructional practices. *The Anthropologist*, *13*(3), 167-174.

MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. N. (2015). What's in a name: Exposing gender bias in student ratings of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 40*(4), 291-303.

MacSuga-Gage, A. S., Simonsen, B., & Briere, D. E. (2012). Effective teaching practices: Effective teaching practices that promote a positive classroom environment. *Beyond Behavior*, *22*(1), 14-22.

Maheshwari, A. (2013). A study of attitude towards teaching profession of prospective teachers. *International Research Journal of Commerce Arts Science*, *4*(3), 601-609.

Marks, R. (2000). Determinants of student evaluations of global measures of instructor and course value. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *22*(2), 108-119.

Marlin Jr, J. W. (1987). Student perception of end-of-course evaluations. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *58*(6), 704-716.

Marsh, H. W. (1982). SEEQ: A reliable, valid, and useful instrument for collecting students'evaluations of university teaching. *British journal of educational psychology*, *52*(1), 77-95.

Marsh, H. W. (2007). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases and usefulness. In *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An evidence-based perspective* (pp. 319-383). Springer.

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. (1993). The use of students' evaluations and an individually structured intervention to enhance university teaching effectiveness. *American educational research journal*, *30*(1), 217-251.

Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational leadership*, *61*(1), 6-13.

Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. D. (2013). *Teacher evaluation that makes a difference: A new model for teacher growth and student achievement*. ASCD.

McLeod, S. (2008). Social identity theory. In.

McPherson, M. A., & Jewell, R. T. (2007). Leveling the playing field: Should student evaluation scores be adjusted? *Social Science Quarterly*, *88*(3), 868-881.

McPherson, M. A., Jewell, R. T., & Kim, M. (2009). What determines student evaluation scores? A random effects analysis of undergraduate economics classes. *Eastern economic journal*, *35*(1), 37-51.

Miller, J., & Chamberlin, M. (2000). Women are teachers, men are professors: A study of student perceptions. *Teaching Sociology*, 283-298.

Miller, M. K., Clark, J. D., & Jehle, A. (2015). Cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger). *The Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology*, *1*, 543-549.

Minor, L. C., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Witcher, A. E. (2000). Preservice Teachers' Perceptions of Characteristics of Effective Teachers: A Multi-Stage Mixed Methods Analysis.

Minor, L. C., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Witcher, A. E., & James, T. L. (2001). Trends in Teacher Candidates' Educational Beliefs.

Molloy, E. K., & Boud, D. (2014). Feedback models for learning, teaching and performance. *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology*, 413-424.

Morris, C. G., Maisto, A. A., & Dunn, W. L. (2007). *Psychology: Concepts and Applications*. Pearson Prentice Hall.

Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. J., Morrison, J. R., & Kalman, H. K. (2019). *Designing effective instruction*. John Wiley & Sons.

Narciss, S. (2013). Designing and evaluating tutoring feedback strategies for digital learning. *Digital Education Review*(23), 7-26.

Nasser, F., & Fresko, B. (2002). Faculty views of student evaluation of college teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *27*(2), 187-198.

Nasser, F., & Fresko, B. (2002). Faculty views of student evaluation of college teaching. *Assessment Evaluation in Higher Education*, *27*(2), 187-198.

Nazir, M., Al-Ansari, A., AlKhalifa, K., Gaffar, B., & AlHumaid, J. (2020). Use of Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Survey to Evaluate Effectiveness of Teaching in a Leadership Course among Dental Students over Three Years. *The Scientific World Journal*, *2020*.

Norman, A. D. (2010). Assessing accomplished teaching: Good strides, great challenges. *Theory into Practice*, *49*(3), 203-212.

Patrick, C. L. (2011). Student evaluations of teaching: effects of the Big Five personality traits, grades and the validity hypothesis. *Assessment Evaluation in Higher Education*, *36*(2), 239-249.

Peart, N. A., & Campbell, F. A. (1999). At-Risk Students' Perceptions of Teacher Effectiveness. *Journal for a just and Caring Education*, *5*(3), 269-284.

Perrott, E. (2014). *Effective teaching: A practical guide to improving your teaching*. Routledge.

Pickens, J. (2005). Attitudes and perceptions. *Organizational behavior in health care*, *4*(7).

Pickford, C. (2013). Using media-activated learning groups to support peer-teaching of higher education students. *Retrieved February*, *23*, 2017.

Powell, R. W. (1977). Grades, learning, and student evaluation of instruction. *Research in Higher Education*, *7*, 193-205.

Price, P. C., Jhangiani, R. S., & Chiang, I.-C. A. (2015). Reliability and validity of measurement. *Research methods in psychology*.

Prozesky, D. R. (2000). Communication and effective teaching. *Community Eye Health*, *13*(35), 44.

Punch, K. F. (2003). Survey research: The basics. *Survey Research*, 1-136.

Quartey, S., & Awoyemi, M. J. (2002). Research methodology in education. *Ghana: K "N: AB Ltd*.

Renaud, R. D., & Murray, H. G. (2005). Factorial validity of student ratings of instruction. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(8), 929-953.

Rivera, J. C., & Rice, M. L. (2002). A comparison of student outcomes and satisfaction between traditional and web based course offerings. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *5*(3), 151-179.

Rubio Cuenca, F. (2012). Communication as a Teaching/Learning Strategy in Bilingual Education.

Rucker, M. H., & Haise, C. L. (2012). Effects of variations in stem and response options on teaching evaluations. *Social Psychology of Education*, *15*(3), 387-394.

Ryan, J. J., Anderson, J. A., & Birchler, A. B. (1980). Student evaluation: The faculty responds. *Research in Higher education*, *12*(4), 317-333.

Sajjad, S. (2010). Effective teaching methods at higher education level. *Pakistan journal of special education*, *11*, 29-43.

Sarantakos, S. (2005). Social research methods. In: Macmillan, Melbourne.

Sarzynski, T. (2018). *Students Should Evaluate Their Teachers*. Retrieved 17th December, from https://mystudentvoices.com/students-should-evaluate-their-teachers-8aadea8cb58b

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007). Research methods. *Business Students 4th edition Pearson Education Limited, England*, *6*(3), 1-268.

Schwarz, N., & Bohner, G. (2001). The construction of attitudes. *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intraindividual processes*, 436-457.

Seldin, P. (1997). Using student feedback to improve teaching. *To improve the academy*, *16*(1), 335-345.

Shah, M., & Sid Nair, C. (2012). The changing nature of teaching and unit evaluations in Australian universities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *20*(3), 274-288.

Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, *34*(1), 8-12.

Slade, P., & McConville, C. (2006). The validity of student evaluations of teaching. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *2*(2).

Smith, M. B., Bruner, J. S., & White, R. W. (1956). Opinions and personality.

Sojka, J., Gupta, A. K., & Deeter-Schmelz, D. R. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of student evaluations of teaching: A study of similarities and differences. *College Teaching*, *50*(2), 44-49.

Stark, P., & Freishtat, R. (2014). An evaluation of course evaluations. ScienceOpen. *Center for Teaching Learning, University of California, Berkley*. Retrieved from https://www. scienceopen. com/document

Stronge, J. H., Tucker, P. D., & Hindman, J. L. (2004). *Handbook for qualities of effective teachers*. Ascd.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of teacher Education*, *62*(4), 339-355.

Sumaedi, S., Mahatma Yuda Bakti, G., & Metasari, N. (2012). An empirical study of state university students' perceived service quality. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *20*(2), 164-183.

Surgenor, P. W. (2013). Obstacles and opportunities: addressing the growing pains of summative student evaluation of teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *38*(3), 363-376.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *Organizational identity: A reader*, *56*(65), 9780203505984-9780203505916.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In *Political psychology* (pp. 276-293). Psychology Press.

Theall, M. (2002). Student ratings: Myths vs. research evidence. *26*, 2008.

Thomas, L. (2012). Building student engagement and belonging in Higher Education at a time of change. *Paul Hamlyn Foundation*, *100*, 1-99.

Tran, T. T. T., & Do, T. X. (2022). Student evaluation of teaching: do teacher age, seniority, gender, and qualification matter? *Educational Studies*, *48*(4), 443-470.

Vermunt, J. D., & Verloop, N. (1999). Congruence and friction between learning and teaching. *Learning and instruction*, *9*(3), 257-280.

Vlăsceanu, L., Grünberg, L., & Pârlea, D. (2007). *A Glossary of Basic Terms and Definitions* (2nd ed.).

Watkins, D., & Zhang, Q. (2006). The good teacher. *Effective schools*, *6*, 185-204.

Waxman, H. C., Huang, S.-Y. L., & Wang, M. C. (1997). Investigating the classroom learning environment of resilient and non-resilient students from inner-city elementary schools. *International journal of educational research*, *27*(4), 343-353.

Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment Evaluation in Higher Education*, *31*(3), 379-394.

Weimann, G. (1994). *Influentials, The: People Who Influence People*. State University of New York Press.

Weinberg, B. A., Fleisher, B. M., & Hashimoto, M. (2007). *Evaluating methods for evaluating instruction: The case of higher education* (0898-2937).

Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven keys to effective feedback. *Feedback*, *70*(1), 10-16.

Winchester, T. M., & Winchester, M. K. (2014). A longitudinal investigation of the impact of faculty reflective practices on students' evaluations of teaching. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *45*(1), 112-124.

Wong, H., Wong, R., Rogers, K., & Brooks, A. (2012). Managing your classroom for success. *Science and Children*, *49*(10), 60.

Wright, P. (2018). Handbook of Research on Teaching, edited by Drew H. Gitomer and Courtney A. Bell. *London Review of Education*, *16*(2), 345-355.

Youmans, R. J., & Jee, B. D. (2007). Fudging the numbers: Distributing chocolate influences student evaluations of an undergraduate course. *Teaching of Psychology*, *34*(4), 245-247.

Zimmerman, T., Schmidt, L., Becker, J., Peterson, J., Nyland, R., & Surdick, R. (2014). Narrowing the Gap between Students and Instructors: A Study of Expectations. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching Learning Journal*, *7*(1).