

# EFFECT OF STUDENT FEEDBACK ON THE MOTIVATION OF INDIAN UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

By

ANANTA KUMAR JENA \*

PIYALI CHAKRABORTY \*\*

\* Assam University, Silchar-788011, Assam, India.

\*\* Radha Madhav College, Rangirkhari, Silchar, Assam, India.

## ABSTRACT

*The purpose of the study is to measure the motivation of the teachers of higher education towards students' feedback policy of National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) established by Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) for different Universities. By the help of questionnaires, the data were gathered, which were earlier sent to the participants, via e-mail for deep analysis and it was directed towards broad generalization of the population. One hundred University teachers were randomly selected as the sample from twelve departments of a university. These departments were: Ecology and Environmental science, Life Science, Chemistry, Physics, Mass Communication, Fine Arts, English, Sanskrit, Bengali, Commerce, Education, Social work. Teachers' Motivation Towards Student Feedback Inventory (TMTSFI) was administered among the samples and all the data sheets were scored and analyzed. It was found the overall motivation towards student feedback was strongly positive among university teachers and it significantly affected the teachers' classroom performance.*

*Keywords: Attitude; Internal Quality Assurance Cell; National Assessment and Accreditation Council Student Feedback.*

## INTRODUCTION

Now different countries of the world have initiated quality assurance mechanism of higher education, and more are in the process of developing the quality assurance strategy. Both at national and international levels, different countries are trying to provide quality education to the students (Stella, 2002). Recently, parents, educators, employers and the entire society have expressed serious concern about the quality of education. Especially in the university, students are blaming the poor quality of instruction and teachers' lack of interest and attitude towards teaching profession. Possibly, there is somewhere problem in the instruction, and teachers' motivation towards teaching learning process (Schmelkin, Spencer & Gellman, 1997). At present primary, secondary school, colleges and even in university levels, students are blaming the teachers (Shannon, Twale, & Hancock, 1996). They have doubts about the knowledge base, communication skills, sincerity and commitment, interest generation, ability to integrate content, accessibility both in and out of the classroom, ability to design test and their

provision to give feedback and sufficient time to their students. It is in debate and if they do so; what extent, and how frequently they are giving feedback to their students, how much depth of knowledge is within them, how many times they maintain sincerity are the questions (Renaud, & Murray, 2005). Quality education to the students, is now a day a, challenge (McDonald, 2001). University Grants Commission (UGC) has given an opportunity to the students to evaluate their own teachers through the student feedback system. Therefore, National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) has established the IQAC (Internal Quality Assurance Cell) in every university and colleges to ensure the quality of teachers i.e. API (Academic performance Index). IQAC is responsible to conduct time to time student feedback i.e. twice in a year Wegener (1995) stated that well over 90% of universities currently use student feedback to assess the teaching staff. Still this system is in question and often becomes an issue of debate.

## Review of Related Literature

The Indian Higher education system is one of the largest in

the world. The deterioration in the quality of higher education is a serious anxiety for all stakeholders. In 1994, the nationwide NAAC was established to ensure and enhance the quality of Indian higher education. However, continuous feedback from the beneficiaries of education determines the effectiveness of the council. The literature found, in the last 10 years of its reality, that NAAC has earned a lot of generosity and admiration from the learned community (Pillai & Srinivas, 2006). Internal IQAC has established much strategy to consider the quality of the educators in higher education institution. Amidst these schemes, scholars' response is the recent issue in India. Dialogue with numerous universities found that student feedback has a negative impact on the educator's presentation and motivation and mind-set (Mizoram University 2007; MANUU, 2010). Nevertheless, Assam University & Tezpur Universities, scholars have an affirmative response and mind-set towards their response to the teachers. Martin and Rich (1971) investigated on school motivation and attitude in the direction of scholar evaluation, and discovered student feedback help for advancement to the enhancement of teaching learning method. The abilities of different university have a favorable disposition in the direction of the use of student feedback and the teacher's feedback (Rich, 1976). Ryan, Anderson and Birchler (1980) found that introduction of mandatory use of student feedback directs to an important reduction of school lesson and job Satisfaction. Student feedback is a helpful method and it is a valid and dependable method to identify distinct issues in teaching-learning process (Ballantyne, 1999). However, Avi-Izhak and Kremer (1986) found that older teachers strongly fight against the use of student feedback and it had no worth for school improvement. But, Gillmore (1984) found that student response was significant and positive and if administered to the direction, aided the teachers to present better. Guichon, Betrancourt & Prié, (2012) investigated and found that most of the faculty did not seem to think that students ranking them have a contradictory effect on school moral and believe and they also examined that student feedback of instruction tend to have a more affirmative attitude about their use of

direction. Gordon (1990) argued student feedback for educators is not a good practice. The author also agreed that students are unable to assess the deepness of a teacher's knowledge and it should play an awful impact on the rapport between teachers and scholar. Tang, Jinlan; Harrison, Colin (2011) discovered that 23% of school answered the review, and the outcome is that scholar evaluation alters the production habit and the assignment of teachers. Adams 1997; Nasser & Fresko (2002) argued that student feedback to their teacher is an awful custom in higher education because learners have no dependable attitude and motivation in the direction of their teachers. Haskell (1997) found that learned freedom, tenure and scholar response are the components of professionalism. Chang (2002) discovered that student response has a positive effect on teacher's blame and it is a proper way amidst learners to grade the teachers. Duijnhouwer, Prins & Stokking (2012) investigated that both scholar and teacher have an affirmative effect towards student feedback policy. Marsh & Dunkin (1992) examined the validity of student feedback and they argued that it helps the educators to advance their educating scheme. Contrast to these, Yao, Weissinger and Grady (2003) found student feedback is a negative practice as reported by a small group of sample from 600 faculties. Chen, & Hoshower, 2003; Miller and Coll, 2007 found the students' feedback did not differ significantly at their end of semester feedback. Student feedback has significantly negative influence on learners' behavior as well as professional development (Peterson, and Kauchak, 1982). However, Hussain, Ali, Khan, Ramzan, Qadeer (2011) found from the study that academic staff displayed a significantly positive attitude towards student feedback. But, Schmelkin, Spencer, & Gellman (1997) found that all participants believed teaching evaluation had positive effect on teaching feedback and classroom behavior and it helps to improve the teaching skills.

### Significance of the Study

The present study was undertaken to determine the motivation of teachers after the student feedback on the following head:

- Teacher's depth of content knowledge

- Teacher's sincerity
- Teacher's way of interest, motivation
- Teacher's mood of integration of course material and learning environment
- Teacher's accessibility to the student and giving sufficient time for feedback to the student
- Teacher's assignment and evaluation to know the students' level of understanding and analytical ability
- Teacher's skill and analytical ability

## Questions

From the literature, it was not clear whether student feedback affects teachers' depth of content knowledge, sincerity, and motivation or not? Does the student's feedback integrate the course material with the learning environment directly? Do the assignments and giving sufficient time for students, teachers' manual skill and analytical ability have a significant relationship with teachers' quality of profession?

## Methodology

### *Design of the study*

The present study was a comparative case study and the purpose of the study was to understand the teacher's motivation and attitude at present in a higher educational institute. The result of the study can't be generalized, because a case study deals with only one person/event/group which can't ever be certain if conclusions drawn from this particular case apply in another place. The results of the study were not generalizable because it can't generalize a couple of person's motivation with the world of university educators' community. This was the opinion or motivation of a few samples of a little area or inside a university of India. The readers have the flexibility to generalize or they may not.

### *Participants*

Students can evaluate and submit their feedback to the IQAC of that institution to find out the Academic Performance Index (API) of the teacher. For that purpose, student provide their feedback on teachers' depth of content knowledge, sincerity, way of interest, motivation creation, mood of integration of course material and

learning environment, teacher's accessibility to the student and giving sufficient time for feedback to the student. Do the students have capacity to reach the teacher's level of understanding or does he/she have mastery in manual skill and analytical ability? That's why, it was a sensitive issue both for the teachers and the students. How students will provide their feedback, positive or negative against their own teachers and how teachers will feel after that, was the recent issue of the study. In the recent study, the researchers have followed Random Sampling Technique to choose the participants. They have selected an Indian Central University and the teachers from 12 departments like, Ecology and Environmental Science, Life Science, Chemistry, Physics, Mass Communication, Fine Arts, English, Sanskrit, Bengali, Commerce, Education, Social work were selected for the study. In this study, 100 University teachers are included and among them 11 from Ecology, 8 from Life science, 10 from Chemistry, 10 from Physics, 7 from Mass Communication, 9 from Fine Arts, 9 from English, 4 from Sanskrit, 10 from Bengali, 6 from Commerce, 8 from Education and 8 teachers from the Social work department formed for the sample of the study.

### *Instrumentation and Procedure of Data Collection*

From the very beginning of a semester on the 1st week of April 2011, the authors visited all twelve departments of an Indian University and they administered Teacher's Motivation towards Student Feedback Inventory (TMSFI) among the teachers as the pretest. At the end of the semester, IQAC supplied the student evaluation form in the hands of competent authority to different departments. The student also kept their response by following the parameters established by NAAC and UGC. After that, in the month of October 2011, teachers received their professional status from IQAC. IQAC interpreted the data and provided the teachers their professional status in a graphical manner. In the 2nd week of October 2011, the researcher again visited the departments and requested the teachers to give their response to the Teacher's Motivation towards Student Feedback Inventory (TMSFI) as the post test. That is why; a single inventory was developed and administrated upon

the sample, as the pre and post-test. The Inventory (TMSFI) had been corrected by four expert persons of the university and it was standardized by following all the standardized steps like planning, preparing, tryout and evaluation. Accordingly, the researchers finally prepared 10 items with 4 point response. The scale for teacher's motivation towards student feedback was a Likert's type scale and the response were Strongly Agree(S+), Agree(+), Disagree(-), and Strongly Disagree(S-). These responses were scored with 4,3,2,1 respectively. All the items in the scale are positive statement type with total 7 items and all are easy to respond and it takes 10 minutes to give the response. Item 1 and item 2 were directly linked, item 3 and 4 were also directly linked and item 5,6 and item 7 were similar in weight, that's why the researcher had scored these items separately. The average reliability and validity of the item was .65 and .67 respectively. However, maximum 10 minutes the participants took to respond to the whole items.

## Analysis and Result

Table 1 reveals that Sanskrit department teachers' have high motivation towards the overall scale, whereas Commerce department teachers strongly agreed that the students' may submit their feedback on the "teacher's depth of knowledge". It was found that both Life Science and Social work teachers' motivation were equal and they agreed "student may submit their feedback on teachers' sincerity and commitment". However, Bengali department teachers' mean motivation score (7.00) was favorable towards student feedback policy on the "teacher's way of interest and motivation creation". Similarly, Commerce and Physics department teachers' mean motivation score (3.33 & 3.30) were more and they strongly agreed. Teachers agreed on the students' feedback on the effectiveness of "teachers' mode of integration of course material with the learning environment". Except Social work department teachers (m=3.25) others were agreed that students have right to assess and submit their feedback on "teachers' accessibility to the students at both inside and outside of the department". English and Bengali department teachers' mean score (2.67 & 2.90) (i.e not agreed

towards student feedback) on "student's level of understanding" differed than other department teachers. Moreover, Sanskrit, Fine Arts, Mass Communication and English department teachers' mean motivation score were (.75, 1.33, 1.29 & 1.67) and showed negative attitude towards the student feedback on "teacher's manual skill and analytical ability".

*Research Q.1.* Whether the motivation of the teachers are affected after the student feedback on "teachers' depth of content knowledge?

The mean motivation score ranged from (7.00 of commerce department to 3.25 of Sanskrit). Commerce department teachers had highest and strongly positive degree of motivation towards the student feedback on "teacher's depth of knowledge". With reference to table 1a, 50%, 20%, 05% and 25% teachers' strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagreed. Table 1 interprets ANOVA of motivation score among University teachers' (n=100) towards the student's feedback policy on teachers' depth of knowledge. Here, the F value (df 11/88, 3.681,  $p < .001$ ) was significant at 0.001 level.

*Research Q.2.* To study the effect of student feedback regarding "teacher's sincerity and commitment" on the motivation of university teachers.

From the descriptive analysis, it was seen, Sanskrit department teachers mean motivation score ranged from 1.75 to 3.50. Table 1 shows that 45%, 45%, 05% and 05% teachers, showed strongly positive degree of motivation, positive, negative and strongly negative degree of motivation on student feedback regarding teacher's sincerity and commitment to the teaching – learning process. Table 2 interprets the ANOVA of 12 departments of University teachers' (n=100) degree of motivation towards the student's feedback policy of IQAC. Here the F value (df 11/88, 1.978,  $p < .001$ ) was significant at 0.01 level.

*Research Q.3.* To study the effect of student feedback regarding "recent teacher's way of interest, motivation, and creativity" on the motivation of university teachers

With reference to Table 1, it was found that the Bengali department teachers' mean motivation score (7.00) was

favorable towards student feedback on teacher's way of interest and motivation creation among students towards teaching learning process" than other department teachers. Here, 10%, 10%, 40% and 40% teachers responded strongly positive, positive, negative and strongly negative degree of motivation towards the student feedback on "teacher's way of interest and motivation creation among students towards teaching learning process" than other department teachers. Table 1 interprets ANOVA of 12 departments of University teachers (n=100) degree of motivation towards student's feedback. Here the F value (df 11/88, 1.229,  $p > .001$ ) was not significant at 0.001 level. There existed no significant difference among the teacher's degree of motivation towards student feedback on "teacher's way of interest and motivation creation among students towards teaching learning process".

*Research Q.4.* To study the effect of student feedback regarding "recent teacher's mood of integration of course material and learning environment" on the motivation of university teachers.

Here, Commerce and Physics Department teachers' mean motivation score (3.33 & 3.30) were more and they showed strongly positive degree of motivation towards "students' feedback on teachers' mode of integration of course material with learning environment". It is found from Table 1, that, 05%, 05%, 40% and 50% teachers have strongly positive, positive, negative and strongly negative degree of motivation towards students' feedback regarding, teachers' mode of integration of course material with learning environment. Table 1 interprets ANOVA of 12 departments of University teachers (n=100) motivation towards student feedback. Here the F value (df 11/88, 2.786,  $p > .001$ ) was not significant at 0.001 level (Table 1).

*Research Q.5.* To study the effect of student feedback regarding "teacher's accessibility to the student at both inside and outside of the department" on the motivation of university teachers".

Table-1, analyzed that except Social work department teachers' (m=3.25) all teachers have strong positive

degree of motivation towards student feedback on "teachers' accessibility to the students at both inside and outside of the department". With reference to Table 1, it was found, 40% and 35% teachers' have strongly positive and positive degree motivation respectively towards such feedback. ANOVA of 12 departments of University teachers (n=100) motivation towards student's feedback was significant. Here the F value (df 11/88, 4.389,  $p < .001$ ) was significant at 0.001 level (Table-2).

*Research Q.6.* To study the effect of student feedback regarding "teachers' knowledge of students' level of understanding" on the motivation of university teachers

English and Bengali department teachers' mean motivation score (2.67 & 2.90) were not positive towards student feedback on "teachers' knowledge of students' level of understanding" than other department teachers. Here, Table 1 stated, 40% teachers had strongly positive motivation, but 25%, 10% and 25% teachers showed positive, negative and strongly negative degree of motivation respectively on feedback on "teachers' assignment quality and is able to evaluate students' level of understanding". Table 1 interprets ANOVA of 12 departments of that University teachers (n=100) motivation towards student's feedback. Here the F value (df 11/88, 0.687,  $p < .001$ ) was significant at 0.01 level. It was found, there existed significant difference among the teacher's degree of motivation towards student feedback among the teachers of 12 department of University on teacher's assignment to know student's level of understanding.

*Research Q.7.* To study the effect of students feedback regarding "teacher's manual skill and analytical ability" on the motivation of university teachers".

Sanskrit, Fine Arts, Mass Communication and English department teachers mean motivation score were (.75, 1.33, 1.29 & 1.67) and showed negative degree of motivation towards the student feedback on "teacher's manual skill and analytical ability". With reference to Table 1, it was found, 45% teachers have strong positive degree of motivation. Student can give their feedback on teachers' manual skill and analytical ability, but 20%,

15%, and 20% teachers have positive, negative and strongly negative motivation respectively. Table 2 interprets ANOVA of 12 departments of University teachers (n= 100) motivation towards student's feedback. Here the F value (df 11/88, 2.304, p > .001) was not significant at 0.001 level (Table 2).

### Discussion and Recommendations

Teachers overall degree of motivation towards student feedback was strongly positive and Martin, and Rich (1971) supported this result. It was also found that there existed a significant difference among the motivation of teachers after the students' feedback on the teacher's depth of knowledge. The same result was concluded by (Haskell, 1997; Scheeler, McKinnon, Kathleen & Stout 2012). There existed a significant difference in the degree of motivation of teachers' towards students' feedback on teacher's sincerity and commitment to the teaching learning process (Chen & Hoshower, 2003). The study conducted by Ballentyne, 1999; Nasser and Fresko, 2002 earlier resulted that faculty attitude and their carrier increases by their sincerity and their commitment and this was the literature in support to the above result of the recent study. The present study also resulted that there existed no significant difference in the motivation of teachers towards the student feedback on the teacher's way of interest and motivation creation for the students

Variables:	Teachers' motivation			
	Strongly Agree(S+)	Agree(+)	Disagree(-)	Strongly Disagree(S-)
Teachers' depth of content knowledge	50(50%)	20( 20%)	5(5%)	25(25%)
Teacher's sincerity and commitment	15(15%)	45(45%)	10(10%)	30(30%)
Way of interest, motivation, Creation among students towards teaching learning process	10(10%)	10(10%)	40(12%)	40(40%)
Teacher's mood of integration of course material and learning environment	05(05%)	05 (05%)	40(40%)	50(50%)
Teacher's accessibility to the student and giving sufficient time for feedback to the student	40(40%)	35( 35%)	15(15%)	10(10%)
Evaluate students level of understanding	40(40%)	25(25%)	10(10%)	25(25%)
Teacher's manual skill and analytical ability	45(45%)	20( 20%)	15(15%)	20(20%)

Table 1. Teachers' motivation towards student feedback in percentage

learning process and the similar result was found by Tang & Harrison, 2011. Studies conducted by Haskell (1997) found that student feedback helps the teachers to integrate the learning material in the classroom. The same finding also has been drawn from the present study that there existed no significant difference in the motivation of teachers towards the students' feedback on the teacher's mode of integration of course material with the learning environment. It was also found that there existed a significant difference among the motivation of teachers towards the student feedback on teacher's accessibility to the student's at both inside and outside of the department. In support of this result there was no study conducted both in India and abroad. That is why the result needs further investigation. The researchers found that there existed a significant difference among the motivation of teachers after the students' feedback on teacher's assignment to know the level of understanding. Moreover, there existed no significant difference among

SI	Parameters		Sum of squares	df	Mean square F	p
1	Teachers' depth of content knowledge	Between Groups	108.68	11	9.88	3.68 P<.01
		Within Groups	236.22	88	2.68	
		Total	344.91	99		
2	Teachers' sincerity and commitment	Between Groups	27.35	11	2.48	1.97 P<.01
		Within Groups	110.64	88	1.25	
		Total	138.00	99		
3	Interest and motivation creation among students	Between Groups	19.72	11	1.79	1.22 p>.01
		Within Groups	128.38	88	1.45	
		Total	148.11	99		
4	Integration of course material with learning environment	Between Groups	26.10	11	2.37	2.78 P>.01
		Within Groups	74.94	88	.85	
		Total	101.04	99		
5	Accessibility to the students at both inside and outside of the department	Between Groups	101.07	11	9.18	4.38 P<.01
		Within Groups	184.23	88	2.09	
		Total	285.31	99		
6	Assignment to evaluate student's level of understanding	Between Groups	5.70	11	.51	.68 P<.01
		Within Groups	66.48	88	.75	
		Total	72.19	99		
7	Teachers' manual skill and analytical ability	Between Groups	25.69	11	2.33	2.30 p>.01
		Within Groups	89.21	88	1.01	
		Total	114.91	99		

Table 2. ANOVA of pre test post test score of teachers' motivation towards student feedback policy of IQAC

the University teachers towards the student feedback on teacher's manual skill and analytical ability. Similar to the above result, there was no significant evidence. It was recommended to study whether the students are able to evaluate their teachers' depth of knowledge or not. If so, a comparative study is necessary to study the relationship between sincerity and commitment of the teacher after student feedback. Similarly, the relationship between student feedback and its accuracy needs further study. The frequent manipulation of student feedback response by the teachers on different University needs further study. The strict guidelines of UGC to assess the teacher's academic performance through IQAC should be measured secretly, and needs further investigation. Nevertheless the study has a significant effect for the teaching learning process and teachers' professional ethics but the survey demotivated the teachers to provide the response, because few teachers are against the IQAC policy and student feedback system and they may not provide their actual response to the survey.

## Conclusion

Teaching is a holistic profession, which makes thousands of life for the future. Teacher's understanding, behaviors, depth of knowledge and his instructional activity helps the learner to understand better. It was also found that there existed a significant difference among the motivation of teachers towards students' feedback on the teacher's depth of knowledge. The same result was found by Haskell, 1997; Scheeler, McKinnon, Kathleen & Stout 2012. A live instruction of the teacher creates interest in the mind of the learners and motivates them to grasp knowledge within and outside of the classroom. That's why, many authors and psychologists have specified many teaching parameters. IQAC (2011) has provided 9 points parameter with 4 points response care, the general in courses 7 point parameters with 4 point response care for student feedback. In general student feedback form of IQAC, teacher's depth of course content including project work, learning value in terms of knowledge, concepts, manual skills, analytical abilities, clarity and relevance of the textual reading material, relevance of additional resource material including library are parameters. But, in

the recent study, parameters were included. It resulted that there existed a significant difference in the degree of motivation of teachers' after students' feedback on teacher's sincerity and commitment to the teaching learning process and the result was supported by Chen & Hoshower, 2003. From the analysis, on the student feedback regarding courses, it was very clear, that skill and competency of a teacher and their depth of course content regarding the content are essential for the teacher. That might motivate the students to give positive feedback regarding teachers teaching profession. Similarly, the extent of course coverage is the important aspect of the teaching profession. The teacher should complete the course material within the due date and should be well acquainted with such knowledge that the teacher can donate the student within and outside the classroom. In general we can say, teachers' knowledge, understanding, skill, application, analysis and synthesis, aspect of learning, should be utilized outside the classroom by learners and these things should be relevant to their real life situation. Teachers' learning value in terms of knowledge, concepts, manual skill, analytical ability and broadening prospective are the important issues in their teaching profession because these directly reflect their depth of knowledge and understanding and these are directly perceived by the student. Teacher's clarity and relevance of textual reading material should be significant. Relevance of additional source material from library should be encouraged by the teacher to follow these in their teaching learning activity.

## References

- [1]. Adams, J.V. (1997). Student Evaluation: The Rating Game, *Inquiry*, 1(2), 10-16.
- [2]. Assam University (2010). IQAC report.
- [3]. Avi-Itzhak, T., and Lya K. (1986). An investigation into the relationship between university faculty attitudes toward student rating and organizational and background factors, *Educational Research Quarterly*, 10, 31-38.
- [4]. Ballantyne, C. (1999). Improving University Teaching: Responding To Feedback From Students., Conference

paper – *Adult learning cultures: Challenges and Choices in times of change*. Ch. 11, p 155-165.

[5]. **Chang, P.A. (2002)**. Teachers college faculty attitude towards student rating : The comprarision between required policy and optional policy. *Journal of ping-b Dung Teachers College*, 16, 205-230.

[6]. **Chen, Y. & Hoshower, L.B. (2003)**. Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness: An assessment of student perception and motivation. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(1), 71-88.

[7]. **Delhi University (2009)**. Report of IQAC.

[8]. **Duijnhouwer, Hendrien; Prins, Fans J.; Stokking, Karel M. (2012)**. Feedback Providing Improvement Strategies and Reflection on feedback Use: Effects on Students' Writing Motivation, Process, and Performance. *Learning and Instruction*, 22(3), 171-184.

[9]. **Gardon, P.A.(1990)**. *Student Evaluation of College Instructions: An Overview*, As partial requirements for PSY 702: Conditions of Learning.

[10]. **Gillmore, G. (1984)**. Student ratings as a factor in faculty employment decisions and periodic review. *Journal of College and University Law*, 10, 557-576.

[11]. **Guichon, N.; Betrancourt, M.; Prié, Y. (2012)**. Managing Written and Oral Negative feedback in a Synchronous Online Teaching Situation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 25(2), 181-197.

[12]. **Haskell, R.E.(1997)**. Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Student Evaluation of Faculty: Galloping Polls In The 21st Century, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 5(16), 1-36.

[13]. **Hussain, S., Ali, R., Khan, M.S., Ramzan, M., Qadeer, M.Z.,(2011)**. Attitude of secondary school teachers towards teaching profession. *International Journal of academic research*.3(1).

[14]. **Mac Donald,I.(2001)**. The Teaching Community: Recreating university teaching, *Teaching in Higher Education* . 6(2),153-167.

[15]. **Marsh, H. W., & Dunkin, M. J. (1992)**. Students' evaluations of university teaching: A multidimensional perspective. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, 8, 143-233.

[16]. **Martin, J.A.M & Rich, H.E.(1971)**. Faculty Attitude Towards Student Evaluation On Teaching, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 62(3), 235-239.

[17]. **Miller,M.T & Coll,B. (2007)**. Instructor attitudes toward, and their use of, student ratings of teachers, *Assessment and Evaluation in higher education*, Volume 30.

[18]. **Mizoram University (2007)**. Tejjpur University, 2007); Tripura University (2008), Manipur University (2008), Report of IQAC.

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

[20]. **Peterson, K. and Kauchak, D.(1982)**. Teacher Evaluation: Perspectives, Practices, And Promises. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah University, *Center for Educational Practice*, ED 233 996.

[21]. **Pillai, K. N. M.; Srinivas, G.(2006)**. A Study of the Post-Accreditation Scenario in the North Eastern Region of India: A Meta-Evaluation of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council Processes and Procedures, *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(1), 95-106.

[22]. **Renaud, R.D. & Murray, H.G.(2005)**. Factorial validity of student ratings of instruction. *Research in higher education*. 46(8), 929-953.

[23]. **Rich, H. E. (1976)**. Attitudes of college and university faculty towards the use of student evaluation. *Educational Research quarterly*, 1, 17-27.

[24]. **Ryan, J. J., J.A. Anderson, and A.B. Birchler. (1980)**. Student evaluations: The faculty responds. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol.12 (December) 317-333

[25]. **Scheeler, Mary Catherine; McKinnon, Kathleen; Stout, Jonathan (2012)**. Effects of Immediate feedback Delivered via Webcam and Bug-in-Ear Technology on Preservice Teacher Performance .*Teacher Education and Special Education*, 35(1),77-90.

[26]. **Schmelkin, L. P., Spencer, K. J., & Gellman, E. S. (1997)**. Faculty perspectives on course and teacher evaluations. *Research in Higher Education*, 38 (5), 575-592.



[27]. Shannon, D.M, Twale, D.J., Hancock, G.R. (1996). Use of Instructional Feedback and Modification Methods among University Faculty. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*.21(1), 41-53.

[28]. Stella, A.(2002). External Quality Assurance in Indian Higher Education: Case Study of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC). *New Trends in Higher Education. ERIC project*.

[29]. Tang, J.; Harrison, C.(2011).Investigating University Tutor Perceptions of Assessment feedback: Three Types of Tutor Beliefs, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(5),583-604

[30]. Tezpur university(2007). IQAC

[31]. Wegener, T.C. (1995). Student evaluation of teaching: Some cautions and suggestions. *Teaching and sociology*, Vol. 64, 64-68.

[32]. Yao, Y., Weissinger, E.,Grady, M, (2003). Faculty use of student evaluation feedback, *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 8 (21). Retrieved October 11, 2011, from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=21>.

---

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

*Dr. Ananta Kumar Jena is presently working in the Department of Educational Sciences, Assam University, Silchar , India. He has completed M.Sc.(Botany) from North Orissa University, India and M.Ed. and Doctorate from Utkal University, India. He also has five years research experience in educational sciences.*



*Ms. Piyali Chakraborty is presently working in Radha Madhav College, Rangirkhari, Silchar, Assam, India. She is also a research scholar in the Department of Education, Assam University, Silchar, India.*

