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ABSTRACT

THE ATTITUDES OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION IN A SELECTED UNIVERSITY IN THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(May 1984)

Shun-Fen Chen, B.Ed., National Taiwan Normal University, M.A., M.Ed., Teachers College, Columbia University Ed.D. University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Professor Sheryl Riechmann-Hruska

Nine years ago at Tamkang University (an institution in the Republic of China) a system of student evaluation was adopted. The responses of its faculty and administration to this innovation had not been surveyed before. This study was designed to answer the following research questions: (1) What are the attitudes of faculty members at Tamkang University toward student evaluation of instruction? (2) What are the attitudes of department chairpersons at Tamkang University toward student evaluation of instruction? (3) How do the attitudes of faculty members compare with those of department chairpersons concerning student evaluation of instruction? (4) Are the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons toward student evaluation associated with selected characteristics (such as rank, field)?

Standardized open-ended interviews were conducted with a stratified random sample of 24 faculty members and 8 department chairpersons at Tamkang University. Interview questions were organized into four topical areas: (1) content of student evaluation, (2) usage
of student evaluation, (3) impact of student evaluation, and (4) support/non-support of student evaluation.

Results revealed that there was little difference between the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons toward student evaluation. About the content of student evaluation, subjects in general considered the 8 proposed categories of the evaluation form appropriate except for the categories of instructor's subject knowledge and global ratings. Subjects generally approved the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement, but not for student course selection. Their approval of the use for personnel decisions was largely subject to the accuracy of the evaluation data. It was also found that subjects perceived no significant impact on teacher-student relationship, faculty morale, or the quality of instruction as a result of student evaluation at Tamkang University. Finally, subjects' opinions regarding the arguments for or against student evaluation showed that they generally supported the idea of student evaluation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Student evaluation is the most significant component of evaluating college teaching in the United States (Miller, 1974). It originated in the early twenties mainly for the purpose of teaching improvement. Although it encountered some resistance, student evaluation of college instruction became widespread in the last twenty years, largely due to the forces of student pressure, fiscal constraints, and teacher accountability. In addition to teaching improvement, the usage of student evaluation today also includes personnel decisions and student course selection.

Voluminous research has been conducted on student evaluation in this country. Of those studies, most have focused on the dimensions of student evaluation, its reliability and validity, and the factors correlating with it. Overall, studies supported the use of student evaluation, especially when a well-constructed instrument was used (e.g., Aubrecht, 1981; Centra, 1981; Marsh, 1982; McKeachie, 1979; Selden, 1980).

The idea of student evaluation was first introduced to the Republic of China eighteen years ago through a private four-year institution—Tamkang College of Arts and Sciences, which today has
become Tamkang University. After a short period of experiments, however, the college gave up the innovation due to unsatisfactory effects and strong resistance.

In 1975, after developing a new instrument, Tamkang College readopted the practice of student evaluation and continued to implement it for the purpose of teaching improvement.

In the past eight years, Tamkang University has revised the evaluation questionnaire several times and has analyzed the results of student evaluation for almost every academic year. Tamkang University's attempt to evaluate instruction by students merits attention since it is the only known systematic effort made on the evaluation of college teaching in the institutions of higher learning in the Republic of China.

**Purpose of the Study**

The present study has been designed to add to a cross-cultural understanding of issues in student evaluation of college teaching. More specifically, the purposes of the study were (1) to explore the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons at Tamkang University toward student evaluation of college instruction, and (2) to compare the attitudes of these two groups at Tamkang University toward student evaluation of instruction.

Following are the specific research questions. These were developed on the basis of topics found to be particularly salient in
the U.S.A. research literature and also on an awareness of Chinese cultural perspectives regarding the role of teachers vis-a-vis students.

1. What are the attitudes of faculty members at Tamkang University toward student evaluation of instruction?
   a. What are the faculty member's viewpoints regarding the content of student evaluation?
   b. What are the faculty member's viewpoints regarding the usage of student evaluation?
   c. What are the faculty member's perceptions of the impact of student evaluation?
   d. How supportive are the faculty members toward student evaluation?

2. What are the attitudes of department chairpersons at Tamkang University toward student evaluation?
   a. What are the department chairpersons' viewpoints regarding the content of student evaluation?
   b. What are the department chairpersons' viewpoints regarding the usage of student evaluation?
   c. What are the department chairpersons' perceptions of the impact of student evaluation?
   d. How supportive are the department chairpersons toward student evaluation?
3. How do the attitudes of faculty members compare with those of department chairpersons at Tamkang University concerning student evaluation?

4. Are the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons toward student evaluation associated with selected characteristics (such as rank, field)?

**Definition of Terms**

Faculty members: Persons in an institution of higher education who have teaching responsibilities but no principal administrative assignments. It should be noted that there is no such rank as assistant professor in the Republic of China. In this study, faculty members will include full-time professors, associate professors, and instructors.

Department chairpersons: A person who, in addition to performing the usual duties of teaching in a department, has been designated to preside over staff meetings and to carry on certain administrative duties involved in managing the affairs of the department.

Attitude: The predisposition or tendency to react specifically toward an object, situation, or value; usually accompanied by feelings and emotions. It cannot be directly observed but must be inferred from overt behavior, both verbal and nonverbal (Good, 1973).

Student evaluation of instruction: Any type of evaluation of teachers or teaching, systematically made by college students, for the purpose of teaching improvement, personnel decisions, or student course selection.
Delimitation of the Study

1. The study was limited to one institution, i.e., Tamkang University, since it is the only known one that has implemented student evaluation in the Republic of China.

2. The study was limited to student evaluation at the undergraduate level day session of Tamkang University. The evaluation at graduate level or evening session was not included.

3. The subjects were restricted to full-time faculty members and department chairpersons. Part-time faculty members were excluded for two major reasons: first, they teach only a few hours per week at Tamkang University and thus are difficult to reach; second, teaching at Tamkang University is not the major career of these persons, so they probably lack interest in this study. The study also excludes data from students and upper administrators (e.g., the president, deans), for the purpose of manageability.

Basic Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. Teaching is a primary responsibility of faculty members at undergraduate level of colleges and universities in the Republic of China.

2. There exists a need for evaluating college teaching in the Republic of China.
3. The concerns of Chinese faculty and administration regarding student evaluation are different from those of American faculty and administration.

Significance of the Study

This study may be significant both theoretically and practically, and may contribute to higher education in the Republic of China as well as in the United States.

First, student evaluation of college instruction was originated and developed in the United States. Although it has become a way of life on many American campuses, whether it can be accepted in a society with different cultural context, such as the Republic of China, is unclear. A study on the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons at Tamkang University toward student evaluation may expand our knowledge of the transferability of student evaluation from the United States to the Republic of China.

Secondly, the opinions of American faculty and administration regarding student evaluation has been extensively studied. However, little is known about the attitudes of faculty and administration toward student evaluation outside the United States. This study may increase our understanding of the reactions of faculty and administration to student course evaluation from a cross-cultural perspective.

Finally, faculty members and department chairpersons are the persons directly involved in teacher evaluation at colleges and universities. Their opinions and concerns regarding the evaluation
method are important in determining the success of the evaluation and its continued use. By providing both qualitative and quantitative information about the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons at Tamkang University toward student evaluation, this study may contribute not only to the development of student evaluation at the said university but also to the future development of college teaching evaluation in the Republic of China.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

**Initial Considerations for Evaluating College Teaching**

The Responsibilities of College Professors

Generally speaking, a college professor is expected to play three roles: he is a teacher, a scholar, and a faculty member (Woodring, 1968). As a teacher, a professor's task is to teach students; as a scholar his task is to do research; as a faculty member his task is to provide service to the department and college or university to which he belongs.

Of the three roles, the first two are relatively significant and sometimes in conflict with each other. Some professors who identify themselves as researchers devote little time to teaching, while some who define themselves as teachers have no interest in research or publication. This conflict is not always the case, however.

The workload of teaching and research by professors is, at least theoretically, decided by the nature and purpose of the institution (Miller, 1972). At large universities, where the advancement of knowledge is highly valued, research is deemed more important than teaching. At smaller colleges, where the transmission of knowledge is emphasized, teaching is viewed as a primary activity. At the community
or the junior college, teaching can be an exclusive activity of the professor (Henderson & Henderson, 1975).

The relative importance of teaching and research in different types of institutions can be reflected by the teaching load of the professors and the percentage of professors with published books or articles. At large universities, professors, on average, teach fewer hours per week and publish more books or articles than their counterparts in other types of institutions. At the other extreme, professors of community or junior colleges usually have the heaviest teaching load and the lowest rate of publication (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1978).

Complexity of Teaching Effectiveness

While many professors can choose to avoid research and publication, almost all professors have to teach. However, teaching has been the least well defined and the most inadequately judged component of a professor's major responsibilities (Eble, 1970). There is no definite and universal answer to the question "what is a good college teacher?" or "what constitutes effective college teaching?"

Riley, Ryan, and Lifshitz (1960, p. 5) point out, "The role of the professor is not simply that of a learned man. He is a learned man who can transmit his learning. Beyond that he is a learned man who must do more than transmit; he must stimulate, inspire, and instill values." Such a description reflects the fact that teaching is an activity which
requires interaction between teachers and students. To judge individuals on the basis of their interaction with other people is unsurprisingly more difficult than to judge individuals on the basis of some tangible criteria, such as papers they publish (Jencks & Riesman, 1977).

In spite of the difficulty in defining or judging teaching, much effort has been made to identify the attributes of good college teachers.

Combining the results of more than twenty studies on the opinions of students, faculty members, administrators, and alumni, Cole (1940) came up with a list of traits of the good college teacher, as shown in Table 1. Cole (1940) points out that few teachers are superior in every possible attribute, but good college teachers stand well above the average in all attributes and are outstanding in some. It would not be difficult for one to portray a good college teacher from Cole’s list, although a universal definition of good teaching is still not derived.

Within the last three decades, more studies in this area have been conducted and there seems to be considerable agreement on a limited number of the most important characteristics of effective teaching.

Wotruba and Wright (1975) summarized twenty-one studies in which different groups had been asked to identify the traits of effective teaching. The ten most frequently named characteristics were as follows: communication skill, favorable attitudes toward students, knowledge of subject, good organization of subject matter and course,
TABLE 1
TRAITS OF THE GOOD TEACHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Scholarship</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. He knows his subject matter thoroughly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. He is interested in his profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. He never stops studying and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. He shows mental growth from year to year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Handling of class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. He is orderly, systematic, and careful to have details properly arranged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. He organizes his courses; uses syllabi, summaries, and outlines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. He is always prepared for class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. He uses various methods of teaching, adapting them to the subject matter under consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. He has definite standards of work and holds his students responsible for meeting them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. His assignments are clear and varied; he emphasizes the purpose of the work and leaves enough time to make his assignment properly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. He uses many illustrations; whenever possible he shows the relation of his work to daily life; he has a bulletin board, chart, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. His tests are fair; he grades papers accurately and carefully; he gives examinations frequently and keeps students informed of their standing; he returns papers promptly and discusses them; he gives adequate time for review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. His conduct of the class is informal; he lets students participate in the classwork and express their opinions freely; he gives them a chance to think; he knows his students individually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. He keeps work adjusted to the learning capacities and comprehension of his students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. He constantly analyzes errors, does remedial teaching, and individualizes his instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. He speaks clearly and has no annoying mannerism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Personality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. He is kind, human, friendly, sociable, willing to see students outside of class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. He is polite, tolerant, mature, objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. He is enthusiastic, interesting, and vital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. He is intellectually honest and willing to admit his own shortcomings and errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. He has a sense of humor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. He is neat in appearance and orderly in his habits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

enthusiasm about subject, fairness in examinations and grading, willingness to experiment, encouragement of students to think for themselves, pleasant personality and interesting lectures.

Feldman (1976a) synthesized more than seventy studies on students' views of superior college teachers. Five characteristics were found to be consistently associated with best teachers. They were: stimulation of interest; clarity and understandableness; knowledge of subject matter; preparation for, and organization of, the course; and enthusiasm for the subject matter and for teaching. Personality traits such as friendliness, helpfulness, and openness to others' opinions were also preferred, but were less important than the characteristics of pedagogical skills and subject mastery stated previously in determining effective teaching as reflected in actual student ratings.

In sum, although good teaching is hard to define, characteristics of good teaching can be identified. A widely used method in this kind of study is to collect and analyze the opinions of various groups such as students, teachers, administrators, and alumni. Studies have shown considerable agreement among these groups on the important characteristics of good college teachers (e.g., Cole, 1940; Wotruba & Wright, 1975), which makes the evaluation of teaching performance of college professors more acceptable.

Purposes of Evaluating Teaching

There are several reasons for evaluating the teaching performance of college professors:
To improve teaching performance

One purpose of evaluating teaching is to provide faculty members with information about their teaching effectiveness and thus assist them to improve. It is assumed that such feedback can motivate faculty members to change. This kind of evaluation is constructive in nature and thus encounters little resistance.

For personnel decisions

Another reason for assessing teaching performance is to provide data for personnel decisions on tenure, salary, and promotion. In recent years, this has become the major purpose of teacher evaluation at many institutions facing severe financial retrenchment and demands for accountability and cost effectiveness (Genova, Madoff, Chin, & Thomas, 1976). Since this purpose is threatening to faculty members, it is often resisted by them.

For student selection of courses

An additional purpose for evaluating teaching is to provide students with a guide for selecting courses and instructors. Evaluation for this purpose is often administered by students, and the results of it are typically printed in a handbook and distributed to students as a course selection guide. Such student sponsored ratings are potentially threatening to the faculty members and sometimes result in their hostility or resentment, especially when the evaluation is based on inadequate samples, or emphasizes some of the more critical comments about teachers.
Ways of Assessing Teaching Effectiveness

There are a number of ways to evaluate teaching. Following are the most frequently discussed methods in the literature:

**Colleague evaluation based on classroom visitation**

Classroom visitation may be done in a variety of ways. Usually from one to three faculty peers visits a teacher's class once or twice per semester, and report to the department head their evaluation of the teacher's teaching (Kulik & McKeachie, 1975).

Some researchers such as Miller believe that classroom visitation can provide helpful and useful information on teaching performance (see Seldin, 1980). However, there are at least two serious problems with classroom visitation: First, information based on a limited number of visits by a few people cannot be expected to produce a statistically reliable judgment (French-Lazovik, 1976; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975). Second, such observation is obtrusive and will almost certainly influence the phenomenon observed (Dressel, 1976; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975).

**Colleague evaluation based on examining course material**

Although faculty peers seldom observe classroom teaching of their colleagues directly, they do have the background to judge the accuracy and currentness of their colleagues' knowledge and the appropriateness of the course content. This can be done through reviewing such data as...
course syllabus, statements of objectives, textbook and handouts, reading lists, homework assignments, and examinations.

No one would deny the fact that colleagues and department chairpersons are in a good position to assess the said material. However, if the anonymity and independence of the rater cannot be guaranteed, the results of the evaluation may be questionable.

Self-evaluation

When narrowly defined, self-evaluation means that teachers rate their effectiveness on a scaled form or provide a written assessment of their teaching. Broadly defined self-evaluation includes not only the assessment data but also teacher's descriptive report of their performance (Centra, 1981).

It is true that faculty members know most about the amount of effort they have expended and the activities pursued. However, since self-evaluations are made by a single individual, their personal disposition would inevitably influence the results (Kulik & McKeachie, 1975). Therefore, self-evaluation is not recommended as a means of teacher evaluation for personnel purposes. What is most rewarding is probably the reflection stimulated by evaluating one's own performance (Genova et al., 1976).

Student evaluation

A teacher's students are the only direct observers of his daily teaching performance. They can thus provide unique information about a teacher's teaching effectiveness that other groups cannot.
Compared to the previous evaluation methods, student evaluation has been studied most extensively. It is also the one most frequently talked about and disputed. The following section is a detailed discussion on this topic.

**Student Evaluation of Instruction in the USA**

**Historical Development**

**Early experiments**

The development of student evaluation of faculty teaching can be traced from the 1920s.

As early as 1922, the School of Education of Oklahoma A&M University distributed questionnaires among students in order to obtain some supervision of college teaching (Riley, Ryan, & Lifshitz, 1950). In 1924 Harvard students published the first course evaluation booklet, "A Confidential Guide to Courses" (Kent, 1967). Since 1925, the University of Washington has conducted campus-wide student course evaluations. It is the oldest ongoing student appraisal program in the United States (Seldin, 1980). During the latter part of the twenties, experiments with such evaluations were undertaken on a limited scale at the University of Texas and Purdue University. Still other institutions, such as Bennington, Michigan State University, etc., have long conducted such programs (Kent, 1967).

The first recorded attempt to use student evaluation for administrative decisions was an experiment at the University of Michigan in 1948. As a result, the five lowest rated faculty members...
were released or reassigned (Riley et al., 1950). However, during its early stages of development, student evaluation was typically used for the improvement of teaching and the use of such evaluations was left to the discretion of the individual faculty members (Kent, 1967).

**Development after the midsixties**

A revolutionary change occurred in the midsixties. The social consciousness of American students was awakened and students sought to make their voices heard on campus. Student evaluation of teaching was one expression of their desires (Kent, 1967). Since then, such evaluation has become a way of life at many colleges and universities. Student evaluation of instruction has become a more common personnel tool since the 1970s. There are two major reasons for this.

1. Fiscal constraints: Because of tightened budgets, some existing college teaching positions need to be eliminated. Making such decisions is difficult and thus requires a broad and sound base. Student ratings of teaching performance can serve as one source of information (Miller, 1973).

2. Teacher accountability: Precise accountability requires some systematic means of gathering, analyzing and evaluating data. As a result, recent pressure for greater teacher accountability has accelerated the use of uniform student rating scales for assessing teaching effectiveness (Miller, 1973).
Survey data

The trends in the use of student ratings of instruction can be discovered in the results of several surveys conducted in the past six decades.

In the late twenties, Douglass (1928) requested the deans of some thirty colleges and universities to provide information concerning evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Half of these institutions indicated the department head was the sole or chief judge of teaching effectiveness of faculty members. Some institutions mentioned student opinion as a source of data. However, as the investigator pointed out, such opinion was informal in nature, and to do formal student evaluations "would seem to offend the dignity of many college professors" (p. 195).

About twenty years later, the concept of formal student ratings became widespread. A survey (Mueller, 1951) conducted in 1949 showed that thirty-seven percent of the colleges and universities had had actual experience with student evaluation; thirty-five percent of the institutions had considered but not adopted such evaluation; and only twenty-eight percent had given no consideration to it. The researcher predicted that the trends in student ratings of faculty would be increasing.

However, in the sixties there appeared a decline in the use of student ratings in official assessment of faculty. The American Council on Education conducted a survey in 1961 and reported that only twenty-four percent of the colleges indicated that they used formal student ratings as part of their evaluation procedure (see Flood Page,
The figure dropped to twelve percent in a similar survey conducted by the same organization five years later (Gustad, 1967; Kent, 1967). Such a substantial decline, according to Gustad (1967), was probably due to lack of sound information on the validity of the instruments.

After the mid-sixties, the trends in student evaluation of college instruction began increasing. A survey (Seldin, 1980) in 1973 reported that twenty-nine percent of the institutions cited student ratings as a criterion always used in evaluating teaching performance. The percentage increased to fifty-four in the 1978 survey conducted by the same researcher (Seldin, 1980). Meanwhile, in 1976, another survey (Centra, 1981) revealed that college department heads believed that student evaluation of instruction should be given more weight than it already had in considering faculty teaching effectiveness.

Summary

The history of student evaluation of instruction in the United States is not very long. Early experiments in this area began in the 1920s for the purpose of teaching improvement. The practice was not adopted widely until the midsixties. Fiscal constraints and teacher accountability in the seventies have further encouraged the interest in the personnel use of student evaluation. According to the recent survey data, continued growth in the use of student evaluation can be expected.
Content of Student Evaluation Forms

According to Doyle (1975), questions which appear in most student rating forms can be broadly divided into three kinds.

1. Trait ratings: items reporting instructor's traits or behaviors, course materials, or classroom events.
2. Outcome ratings: items reporting the student's perception of his or her achievement of course goals.
3. Personal data of the respondent: information used only for analyzing the responses.

A large number of factor analyses have demonstrated that student ratings involve several dimensions.

The first work in this area was done by Smalzreid and Remmers (1943). They found two factors in the ten-item Purdue Rating Scale. The two factors were labeled Empathy and Professional Maturity. This finding was later confirmed by Creager (1950) and Bendig (1954).

Gibb (1955) identified four factors in his teacher behavior scale: Friendly Democratic Behavior, Communication Behavior, Organization of Behavior, and Academic Emphasis. The first two apparently corresponded to the two factors found by Smalzreid and Remmers.

Isaacson, McKeachie, Milholland, Lin, Hofeller, Baerwaldt, and Zinn (1964) found six factors existing in the student ratings. These factors were called General Teaching Skills, Student/Teacher Rapport, Course Structure, Workload or Overload, Feedback to Students, and Group Interaction. The first four of them appeared to correspond to the ones found by Gibb.
Hildebrand and Wilson (see Eble, 1970) studied the items describing effective teaching by factor analysis, and found the following five components: Analytical/Synthetic Approach, Organization/Clarity, Instructor-Group Interaction, Instructor-Individual Student Interaction, and Dynamic/Enthusiasm. There was also much overlap between the findings of this study and those of the previous one.

In sum, the following four factors have been mentioned most frequently by reviewers (Aubrecht, 1979; Kulik & Kulik, 1974; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975):

1. Skill: interesting presentation of material, intellectual stimulation, and clarity.
2. Rapport: concern for students, and classroom interaction.
4. Difficulty: amount of work demanded.

Among these four factors, "skill" relates most highly to global ratings of teaching ability or course value (Aubrecht, 1979). Kulik and McKeachie (1975) reported that over half of the items in their studies load on this factor, while less than one tenth of the items load on each of the other factors. Another study by Frey (1978) identified "skill" and "rapport" as two global factors. It is reported that the two factors taken together account for three-fourths of the total variance.

Existence of different dimensions in student rating forms means that students are able to rate teachers on several important aspects rather than simply make a "good—bad" evaluation (Aubrecht, 1979;
Kulik & Kulik, 1974). Students' ability of rating instruction can thus be supported. Furthermore, since student evaluation can provide information on different facets of teaching, its use for teaching improvement can also be supported.

Reliability of Student Evaluation

Reliability refers to the consistency of measurement, that is, to how consistent evaluation results are from one measure to another (Gronlund, 1981). There are two chief methods of measuring reliability of student ratings: consistency and stability. The former can be further divided into internal consistency and inter-rater consistency.

Internal consistency

Internal consistency is an index of content similarity, or agreement across items (Doyle, 1975). It is often determined by using the split-half method or by applying the Kuder-Richardson formula.

After reviewing major studies on internal consistency of student ratings, Doyle (1975) concludes that student ratings are very reliable in terms of internal consistency. (Commonly these reliability coefficients range from .80s to .90s.) But he warns that "simply computing the internal consistency of an entire questionnaire would be inappropriate unless the whole instrument were intended to measure a single quality" (p. 35). Frey (1978, p. 85) also points out that "since there is ample evidence that instructional rating forms are not unidimensional in character, this internal consistency test does not seem to be very meaningful."
It is true that internal consistency is not a good indicator of the reliability of multidimensional instruments, because different dimensions do not necessarily correlate well with each other. It would be more appropriate to compute the internal consistency coefficients for different dimensions and report them separately.

Inter-rater consistency

Another way to measure consistency of student ratings is by examining the agreement among raters. According to Aubrecht (1981), one good estimate of such inter-rater consistency is based on the average correlation among all pairs of students within the real class; another estimate comes from dividing the class in half and then correlating the mean responses on each item for the two halves. After reviewing the related studies, Aubrecht concludes that inter-rater consistency of student ratings is in the .80's and .90's for classes of twenty or more.

Stability

Stability indicates agreement in ratings of the same rater over time. It is estimated by the so-called test-retest method. According to several reviewers (Aubrecht, 1981; Costin, Greeneough, & Menges, 1971; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975; Doyle, 1975; McKeachie, 1979; Seldin, 1980), student ratings once obtained tend to correlate fairly with those obtained later on. (In most studies, the stability coefficient is in the .50s or higher.)
Summary

There is considerable agreement that student ratings are quite reliable in terms of both consistency and stability. However, internal consistency needs to be reviewed cautiously. If the rating form is multidimensional, merely computing a single internal consistency coefficient would be inappropriate.

Validity of Student Evaluation

Validity refers to the extent to which the results of an evaluation procedure serve the particular use for which they are intended.

Validity studies of student evaluation focus on two of the major uses of student ratings: personnel decisions and teaching improvement. For the former use, one expects student ratings to represent teaching effectiveness. For the latter use, one should like them to provide information valid for diagnosing teaching problems and, perhaps, for prescribing solutions (McKeachie, 1979). No studies have been found on the validity of student ratings with respect to student uses for course selection.

Do student ratings measure teaching effectiveness

To answer the first question, researchers have sought to demonstrate that student ratings are related to a variety of other measures assumed to be indicators of teaching effectiveness. The criteria that have been used to validate student ratings include:
student learning, alumni ratings, colleague ratings, administrator ratings, and instructor self-ratings.

Student learning

Measures of student learning could be grades, objective achievement, and student perceived learning.

**Student ratings and grades.** According to Feldman (1976b), most of the studies correlating grades and student ratings report correlations from the mid .10s to just below .30. Since student learning is also affected by many other factors, e.g., students' ability, motivation, etc., such a modest positive relationship could support the validity of student ratings. However, the positive relationship between grades and student ratings could also reflect a bias of grading leniency. Therefore, grades may not be a good indicator of student learning.

**Student ratings and objective achievement.** To correlate student ratings and objective achievement, a large multisection course with a common examination is required. One study employing the multisection methodology has found a strong negative relationship (Rodin & Rodin, 1972). It is often cited as an evidence of invalidity of student ratings. However, the methodology of this study was questionable. It was the teaching assistants in recitation sections, rather than the professor in charge of the course, that were evaluated by the students. In addition, students' achievement in this study was based on their performance on problems given at the end of each segment, and students were allowed to retake the problems up to six times. With these methodological problems, the conclusion of the study—"Students rate
most highly instructors from whom they learn least" (Rodin & Rodin, 1972, p. 1164)—can hardly be justified.

Later replications of this study which have improved the said weaknesses do not support the findings of Rodin and Rodin (Frey, 1973; Gessner, 1973; Sulliban & Skanes, 1974). In addition, many other studies correlating student ratings and objective achievement do find a positive relationship between the two (see Marsh, Fleiner, & Thomas, 1975; Feldman, 1976b).

Table 2 lists the major review on the student rating/achievement relationship. Although the reviewers use somewhat different sets of studies, they come to similar conclusions: a low to modest correlation between student ratings and achievement.

A recent meta-analysis of multisection validity studies by Cohen (1981) also provides support for the validity of student ratings (a meta-analysis is a statistical analysis of a large collection of analyses for the purpose of integrating the findings). By integrating data from forty-one independent validity studies, the researcher found that the average correlation between an overall instructor rating and student achievement was .43, and that the average correlation between an overall course rating and student achievement was .47.

As indicated before, teaching is only one of the factors affecting student learning, and it is not expected that student achievement would correlate highly with teacher's ratings by students. Cohen's findings provide enough support for the validity of student evaluation. Furthermore, the relationship between student ratings and student achievement demonstrated by this study is slightly higher than was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Multi-section Validity Studies</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centra (1979)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Relationship between ratings and achievement significant, but limited range of both variables may suppress correlations</td>
<td>Some studies use grades as achievement criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costin, Greenough, &amp; Menges (1971)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No comment on the rating/achievement relationship</td>
<td>Not all studies use class as unit of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No distinction between rating dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No account for study feature effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle (1975)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fairly consistent low-to-moderate positive correlation between general ratings and student learning</td>
<td>No account for study feature effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Multi-section Validity Studies</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follman (1974)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Relationship between ratings and achievement about 0.40 across all school levels a &quot;low&quot; relationship</td>
<td>Not all studies use class as unit of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No distinction between rating dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No account for study feature effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage (1974)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Correlations between ratings and achievement are positive and low to medium in magnitude</td>
<td>Not all studies use class as unit of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings are valid as indicators of student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulik &amp; Kulik (1974)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inconsistency of results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median correlation 0.27 (adjusted), 0.23 (unadjusted) for overall rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tendency for students of highly rated teachers to outscore students of low-rated teachers on final exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulik &amp; McKeachie (1975)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inconsistency of results</td>
<td>No account for study feature effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh (1980)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Overall ratings show low to moderate correlations with achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of consistency of which evaluation factors most highly related to learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

concluded by previous reviewers. It seems that we can be more confident in the validity of student ratings than what was thought appropriate before.

Student ratings and student perceived learning. Student perceived learning also serves as a measure of student learning. Feldman (1976, p. 91) points out, "Students may have little idea of how well they did or did not do on a standardized examination. It would be expected . . . that students' own judgments of how much they have learned in a course . . . would be strongly associated with course evaluations." After reviewing related studies, he concludes that the correlation between perceived learning and overall ratings of teachers and courses are high, generally in the .40s, .50s, and .60s. Aubrecht (1979, p. 3) notes, "Student self reports [of learning] are well correlated with student learning and seem to be an accurate measure of actual achievement. They also avoid difficulties . . . in the use of achievement data or grades, especially in the comparisons across fields." For these reasons, according to Aubrecht, the well-known IDEA system of Kansas State University uses students' perceptions of their own learning as the measure of student progress.

Alumni ratings

It is sometimes suggested that alumni, with a broader perspective, increased maturity, and greater real-world experience, are in a better position than current students to evaluate teachers (Doyle, 1975). Studies correlating student ratings and alumni ratings consistently show substantial agreement between the two (see Aubrecht, 1981; Centra,
The correlation coefficients range from .40 to .75.

College or administrator ratings

According to the Kulik and McKeachie review (1975), the correlations between student ratings and colleague ratings are generally high, the percentage of reliable variation shared by these two ratings ranges from 40 to 55.

The said review also concludes that administrator ratings agree substantially with student ratings. The reviewers point out that administrator ratings are nearly interchangeable with colleague ratings, but neither of them are interchangeable with student ratings because neither of them agree with student ratings completely.

Meanwhile, Doyle (1975, p. 72) states, "When students and colleagues or administrators are asked to nominate, for example, the ten best instructors, there is a high degree of similarity among the lists of names. But when more detailed comparisons are made . . . the agreement seems to be modest at best." It seems reasonable that colleagues, administrators, and students agree with one another concerning general impression on faculty's teaching ability, but students know better about specific classroom behavior of their teachers.

In sum, the positive relationship between student ratings and colleague or administrator ratings supports the validity of student ratings, while the suggestion that student evaluation is not
interchangeable with the other two implies that student evaluation has its unique contribution.

Instructor self-ratings

The results of studies on the relationship between student ratings and instructor self-ratings are somewhat inconsistent.

Two studies (Blackburn & Clark, 1975; Centra, 1973) reported correlations of about .20 between faculty self-evaluations and student ratings. However, higher correlations have been shown in other studies (see Braskamp, Caulley, & Costin, 1979; Marsh, 1982a; Marsh, Overall, & Kesler, 1979a). Among them, the Marsh et al. study was considered by Aubrecht (1981) a very important contribution in this area. The study, reporting a median validity coefficient of .49 for all evaluation factors, showed good agreement between instructors and students on the items in student rating forms. It also demonstrated that the underlying dimensions of the rating form were basically the same for students and for faculty (Marsh et al., 1979a).

The appropriateness of using instructor self-ratings as a criterion for validating student ratings is also controversial. Two articles highlight this controversy. Marsh et al. (1979a) believe that instructor self-ratings are a good criterion because they are not limited to a specialized setting (e.g., a large multisection course), and because they are unlikely to be labeled as inappropriate by faculty members. However, Kulik and McKeachie (1975) do not view self-ratings as a good indicator of effective teaching, because self-ratings are
ratings made by only one rater and thus tend to be distorted by personal idiosyncrasies.

It seems that self-ratings can be persuasive to faculty members themselves but not others. The inconsistency of the relationship between instructor self-ratings and student ratings also suggests that more studies are needed in this area.

Summary

Student evaluation has been validated against a number of criteria assumed to reflect effective teaching. Except for student grades and instructor self-ratings, the use of which is inappropriate or controversial, all the criteria show positive correlation with student ratings. The correlation coefficients range from modest (e.g., objective achievement as the criterion) to high (e.g., student perceived learning as the criterion). Explanations for these coefficients are also reasonable. We can thus conclude that student evaluation of teaching is valid as a measure of teaching effectiveness.

Can student ratings help teachers improve

The answers to this question made by major reviewers have until recently been disappointing. For example, Aubrecht (1979, p. 4) concludes, "In all, student ratings taken alone, without assistance in interpretation, seem to be of limited help to a teacher wishing to improve instruction." Seldin (1980, p. 38) notes, "On balance, however, enough hard evidence is lacking to prove that student evaluations automatically improve classroom teaching. At most, it is
safe to say that student ratings tend to focus attention on possible teaching deficiencies."

However, in a recent meta-analysis by Cohen (1980) the results were exciting. By integrating findings from seventeen studies which contained twenty-two separate comparisons on student-rating feedback versus no feedback, Cohen found an improvement effect for student rating alone, and a larger effect when consultation accompanied the ratings. According to the study, a typical instructor receiving midterm ratings accompanied with consultation was performing (at the end of the semester) at the 74th percentile, compared with the 58th percentile for a typical instructor receiving only student ratings and the 50th percentile for a typical instructor receiving no mid-semester feedback. It was also found that student ratings did not lead to significant increases in all teaching dimensions. For the two dimensions, skill and feedback to students, mid-term student rating feedback had a significant impact on end-of-term rating. For the dimensions of rapport, structure, difficulty, and interaction, however, midterm feedback did not lead to significant increases in end-of-term ratings.

It seems that the validity of student ratings with respect to teaching improvement is less satisfactory than that of student ratings as a measure of teaching effectiveness. Student ratings alone, in general, can help teachers improve to a limited extent. For a greater effect on teaching improvement, student ratings need to be accompanied by consultation.
Factors Correlating with Student Evaluation

The above discussion shows that students can provide valid information for determining teaching effectiveness and for improving instruction. However, there still exist some factors which correlate with the results of student ratings and may need to be considered when one is interpreting the results of such ratings. Such factors can be divided into four categories.

Student characteristics

In general, students' age, sex, class level, grade point average, and major have little effect upon student ratings of teaching (see Centra, 1981; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975; McKeachie, 1979; Seldin, 1980). Only prior subject interest is found to be a powerful factor related to students.

Prior subject interest and motivation

Citing about a dozen studies, Feldman (1977) concludes that there is a positive association between student ratings and student's reports of their liking for or interest in the subject matter of the course. The IDEA system research of Kansas State University also indicates that this factor is sufficiently powerful that it is used in combination with another factor (class size) to establish norm groups for comparison purposes.

The relationship between prior subject interest and student ratings is quite explainable. According to psychological principles, motivation is an important facilitating factor in the learning process.
It follows that, other things being equal, students with prior subject interest will produce better learning, and will probably rate the instructor higher than those without prior interest in the subject. Since teachers should not be responsible for student's prior subject interest, this factor needs to be taken into consideration when student evaluation is used for personnel purposes. In other words, courses with apparently different levels of student prior subject interest should not be compared together.

Expected grades

Many studies have found a positive relationship between expected grades and student ratings, while a number of studies have found no relationship. In an extensive review of research, Feldman (1976b) concludes that college students' expected grades in class are positively related to their evaluation of their courses, but he anticipates a large part of the expected grade effect is attributable to prior subject interest.

Recently the Marsh study (1980) found expected grades to be an influential factor next to prior subject interest in importance. By controlling the variable of prior subject interest, however, Marsh (1980) found that the effect of expected grades was reduced by one-third.

Many people viewed the positive relationship between expected grades and student evaluation as a bias of grading leniency, i.e., teachers can obtain high ratings by assigning good grades to students. However, such an argument can hardly be justified. On the contrary,
Marsh (1982b) has found that better grades reflect better learning of students, not grading leniency. In other words, students who learn better usually expect higher grades, get higher grades, and also rate the instructor more favorably.

Based on the above discussions, it seems that with other factors controlled, expected grades only account for a small amount of the variance in student ratings. There is also little evidence showing that expected grades reflect grading leniency. Therefore, special effort to exclude the influence of this factor from teacher evaluation seems unnecessary. In other words, the factor of expected grades need not be controlled in comparison of teacher's data.

Teacher characteristics

Research shows relatively small or no effects of most instructor characteristics, such as sex, rank, research productivity, and teaching load (see Centra, 1981; McKeachie, 1979). According to Centra (1981), teaching experience is the only instructor characteristic which has been found to be influential.

Teaching experience

By analyzing the ratings of overall teaching effectiveness for more than eight thousand teachers with varying years of teaching experience, Centra and Creech reported that first-year teachers generally received the poorest ratings (see Centra, 1981). Teachers with one or two years of experience and those with more than twelve years received similar ratings; teachers in the three- to twelve-year range received highest ratings (see Centra, 1981).
It is quite explainable that teachers will improve their teaching based on experiences. Therefore, teachers of different levels of teaching experience need to be compared separately, otherwise the less experienced teachers can be unduly penalized. The poorer ratings of teachers with more than twelve years may show that teachers become bored or indifferent in the later years of their teaching career. Just as Centra (1981) suggests, this fact implies the need for faculty development programs.

Course characteristics

The size of a class, whether the course is required, academic field, and the number of times the course has been taught are the variables which may influence the results of student ratings.

Class size

The findings in this area are inconsistent. Of more than fifty studies reviewed by Feldman (1978), about one-fifth have found no relationship between student ratings and class size, others have reported that there is some relationship between the two (generally explaining 1% to 8% of the variance in class ratings). Among the latter, most have found a negative relationship (the larger the class size, the lower the class rating), some have found a U-shaped curvilinear relationship (with the lowest ratings going to medium sized classes), and a few have reported an inverted U-shaped relationship.

Feldman (1978) further points out that although the U-shaped relationship has not been found as often as the inverse relationship, the extent of its existence may be underestimated by the fact that many
studies in this area have assumed a linear relationship between class size and ratings.

A recent study (Marsh, Overall, & Kesler, 1979b) analyzing ratings from 1341 classes, confirms that small and large classes were generally rated more favorably, although the effect of class size tends to be weak.

Frey (1978) tries to explain the inconsistent findings in this area by correlating class size with different dimensions of student ratings. Using skill and rapport, which were identified as two global factors, he has found that there is a relatively strong, negative relationship ($r = -0.40$) between class size and ratings of rapport, while the skill factor is not strongly influenced by the class size ($r = 0.07$). The researcher points out that the inconsistent findings of previous research may result from an inappropriate unidimensional analysis of ratings which should be examined in terms of two or more separate dimensions.

The Marsh et al. study (1979b) also found that the class-size effect was quite large for the factor of Group Interaction (explaining for over 10% of the variance in the said factor), but was small for other components of the rating forms.

The findings of both Frey (1978) and Marsh et al. (1979b) studies are quite convincing because class size is most logically connected to the factor of rapport or interaction. Therefore, when the factor of rapport is stressed in the student evaluation form, it is necessary to construct separate norms for class size in interpreting the results of ratings.
Elective versus required

Several studies have found that teachers of elective courses receive somewhat higher ratings than do teachers of required courses, while a few studies report no difference between students' ratings of required courses and elective courses (see Aleamoni, 1981; Feldman, 1978; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975).

In fact, the possible rating difference between the required course and elective course may not be due to the "requiredness" or the "electivity" of the course, but due to students' interests in the course. The Marsh study (1980) has shown that when the variable of student interest is controlled, whether the course is an elective is unrelated to student ratings. Therefore, when interpreting the results of student ratings, if student prior subject interest has been taken into consideration, the factor of electivity can be ignored.

Academic field

Feldman (1978) summarized eleven studies of academic areas with respect to class ratings of instructors, and concludes that teachers of courses in humanities, fine arts, and languages tend to receive somewhat higher ratings than do teachers of social science or of physical science, mathematics and engineering.

Based on the above findings, it is recommended that separate norms be set up for teachers in the more favorably rated fields and those in the less favorably rated fields when interpreting the results of student ratings.
In a recent study (Marsh, 1982b) comparing the ratings of same courses taught by same instructors on different occasions, it was found that the ratings tended to be better when the course was taught the second time. However, the said study was not able to determine whether or not there was a strictly linear relationship between student ratings and the number of times the course had been taught by the same instructor.

The time variable has scarcely been studied before. Nevertheless, Doyle (1975, p. 77) has discussed it as follows: "if an instructor has just completely revised a course or is teaching it for the first time, his evaluations there might be expected to be less favorable than in another more established course." He then suggests, "A thorough evaluation should portray a representation of his teaching, and so one should pay attention to those courses in which evaluations are most likely to portray the instructor as he typically is."

Although studies in this area are very few, most people would agree with Doyle's points of view. If we especially want teachers to be innovative, they should not be discouraged by being reviewed on the less favorable ratings of newly established courses.

Administrative characteristics

Factors related to the administering of the rating forms could also influence the results of ratings. These factors can usually be controlled by making rating conditions uniform.
Anonymity of student raters

In Feldman's 1979 review, seven studies were cited which showed that nonanonymouse ratings were somewhat higher than the anonymous ones, while three studies were cited which found little or no differences in ratings made under the two conditions of ratings. The reviewer points out that the crucial factor which makes a difference may not be identification itself, but identification with the implication that students may be called upon either to justify or to elaborate upon their ratings to the person being rated. It is generally believed that rating forms should be kept anonymous so that students will not be penalized for giving low ratings and thus may be more willing to participate in the evaluation (Centra, 1981; Doyle, 1975).

Stated purpose of ratings

Some studies have shown that students' ratings of their teachers are somewhat higher when the results of ratings are to be used for personnel decisions than otherwise (see Feldman, 1979). Feldman (1979) did not draw a firm conclusion in this area due to the fact that the studies are relatively few and some of them contain certain ambiguities. In the meanwhile, Centra (1981) points out that students are generally not influenced by written instructions, and that instructor's oral directions, especially those appealing to generosity, could influence their ratings favorably.

Presence of instructors during ratings

Literature in this area is sparse. In Feldman's review (1979), only two studies were cited in this area. Both of them have found that
student ratings are higher when the instructor is present rather than absent during the evaluation session.

**Background variables considered simultaneously**

The relationship between student ratings and the combination of the above factors could be different from the sum of the relationship between student ratings and each individual variable. This is because these variables may not be independent of one another.

Using multiple regression analyses, Marsh (1980) explored the relationship between student ratings of teacher effectiveness and a set of 16 background variables, including student, course, and instructor characteristics. Student ratings in 511 undergraduate courses taught by a total of 221 different instructors were analyzed in this study. The results indicated that less than 14% of the variance in the student ratings could be explained by the entire set of 16 background variables. The most influential factor was student prior subject interest, which accounted for 5% of the total variance in student ratings.

Another study by Stumpf, Freedman, and Aguanno (1979) also found a minor relationship between student ratings and several important background variables.

The findings of the above studies suggest that student evaluation of instruction is not seriously affected by background variables. In other words, we may have confidence in the use of student ratings, although some type of control over the influence of a few important
variables may be necessary in order to assure fairness in comparing teachers (e.g., student prior subject interest).

Summary

A number of variables have been found to correlate with the results of student ratings. The influence of the administrative characteristics, such as anonymity of the raters, stated purpose of ratings, and presence of instructors during ratings, can be controlled in advance; while the variables related students, teachers, and courses need to be taken into consideration when interpreting the results of ratings. The latter includes prior subject interest of students, teaching experience of instructors, class size, and academic field.

Multiple regression studies have found minor influence of combined background variables on student ratings. This suggests that student ratings are not seriously affected by background variables. Perhaps less caution is needed than previously thought.

Summary and Conclusion for the Section

Student evaluation is a significant component of evaluating college teaching in the United States. It began in the early twenties, mainly for the purpose of teaching improvement, and became widespread within the last twenty years due to the forces of student movement, fiscal constraints, and teacher accountability. In addition to its use in teaching improvement, the major uses of student evaluation also include personnel decisions, and student course selection.
Research on evaluation of college instruction is voluminous, most of which has focused on the dimensions of student evaluation, the reliability and validity of it, and the factors correlating with it.

Researchers have found more than one dimension in most student rating forms. Four dimensions appeared most frequently in the literature: skill, rapport, structure, and workload.

The reliability of student ratings is usually high in terms of either inter-rater consistency or stability. If the reliability is measured in terms of internal consistency, the results should be examined cautiously. It is not appropriate to compute a single coefficient of internal consistency if the instrument contains more than one dimension.

The validation studies can be categorized into two kinds. One focuses on the validity of student ratings as a measure of teaching effectiveness; another explores the validity of student ratings as a tool of teaching improvement.

The first kind of validation studies usually correlate student ratings with other criteria which are assumed to reflect teaching effectiveness. These criteria include: student learning (measured by grades, objective achievement, or student perceived learning), colleague ratings, administrator ratings, alumni ratings, and instructor self-ratings.

Among these criteria, grades and instructor self-ratings are controversial. The former may be influenced by teacher's grading policy and thus not necessarily reflect student learning, while the latter is only a single rating which is statistically unreliable.
Except for the above two, other criteria correlate with student ratings at least modestly. Since the criteria used to validate student evaluations do not reflect teaching effectiveness perfectly, the modest relationship between student ratings and these criteria could support the validity of student evaluation as a measure of teaching effectiveness.

The second kind of validation studies usually compare two groups of teachers. In the first group, teachers have gotten feedback from previous student ratings, while teachers in the second group have not. Effects on teaching performance are then examined. Results here suggest that, in general, student ratings alone can help teachers improve to a limited extent. If the ratings are accompanied by consultation, the effect on teaching improvement is substantial.

Factors correlating with student evaluation (some researchers label these factors "bias") can be categorized into four kinds: student characteristics, teacher characteristics, course characteristics, and administrative characteristics.

Important student variables include prior subject interest. Influential teacher variables involve teaching experience only. Important course characteristics include class size, academic field, and the times the course was taught by the same instructor. Major administrative variables include anonymity of student raters, stated purpose of ratings, and presence of the instructor during ratings.

When using student evaluation data, the influences of these variables on the results need to be considered, especially when the results are used for the comparison of teachers. However, multiple
regression studies have shown that although a few background variables are related with student ratings, the combined influence of these variables does not affect the ratings seriously.

In conclusion, properly constructed student evaluation instruments can reflect multiple dimensions of teaching process, are not significantly influenced by background variables, and are reliable and valid for the uses of teaching evaluation and teaching improvement.

Faculty and Administration Attitudes toward Student Evaluation

Systematic research on faculty and administration attitudes toward student evaluation was rare prior to 1970. Most studies on this subject have been done within the last decade. The findings of eight studies will be discussed in this section.

Wheeler, 1972

The first extensive study on faculty and administration attitudes toward student evaluation was conducted by Wheeler. In this study, eighty faculty members and administrators at four selected liberal arts colleges were interviewed. Following are the hypotheses generated from the findings of this exploratory study (Wheeler, 1972, pp. 1-2).

1. The administration, including department chairmen, are strongly in favor of student rating programs.
2. A majority of faculty members who have had experience with mandated student rating accept such programs with reservations, and approve their continuation.
3. Attitudes that strongly oppose or favor student rating are associated with certain academic disciplines, the departments of mathematics, natural sciences, and languages tending to be most critical and the social sciences to be most positive.
4. Young, untenured faculty members do not constitute a bloc of favorable opinion, but approximate tenured faculty in the qualified and mixed acceptance of student rating.

5. A majority of the faculty and administration, after experience with evaluation programs, approve the application of student rating data to decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and salary increment.

6. Training and counseling of young instructors to help them improve their teaching are seen as important administrative functions at non-affluent colleges, and student rating data are considered valuable counseling aids.

7. The majority of faculty and administration accept student rating data as sufficiently valid to provide useful information.

8. The principal barrier to the utilization of student ratings in personnel decisions is uncertainty regarding interpretation and weighting of data by the administration.

Rich, 1976

This study examined faculty attitudes toward student evaluation at four categories of institutions of higher education in California: the junior college, the small private college, the state college and the research university. Two representative institutions were selected from among each of the four categories. The effects of rank, age, gender, discipline, and number of publications on faculty attitudes were also investigated. Questionnaires were distributed to 75 faculty members at each of the eight schools during the Spring of 1975.

General findings

A majority of faculty members were found to agree that teaching effectiveness should be taken into consideration in tenure and promotion decisions, and that student evaluation should be used in such personnel decisions.
Category of institutions

The more the mission of a school was defined as teaching, the less favorable the faculty members were toward student evaluations.

Research and Publication

Within each category of schools, the more articles one had published, and the more one preferred research over teaching, the less positive the attitudes were toward student evaluation.

Age

It was found that younger faculty members tended to be more favorable toward the use of student evaluation than older ones.

Rank, gender, and field

No discernible relationship was found between rank, gender, or field and attitudes toward student evaluation.

Guion and others, 1977

In 1976, an ad hoc committee at Bowling Green State University interviewed the department chairpersons and distributed questionnaires to faculty and staff to study the uses of and faculty attitudes toward student evaluation. The committee came up with two major conclusions: first, faculty members preferred to use student ratings for instructional improvement rather than as a basis for personnel decision-making; second, the mandatory use of university-wide or college-wide student rating procedure was strongly opposed by a majority of the 420 faculty and staff who responded (Guion et al., 1977).
Blank, 1978

Using data from the 1972-73 ACE survey of teaching faculty, Blank (1978) conducted a study to explain differences in faculty attitudes toward teaching performance as a means of evaluations.

Faculty role dominance

This study found that the dominant role of faculty members explained their support for utilizing teaching effectiveness as a basis for promotion. That is, faculty members with a dominant teaching role were more likely to support the use of teaching performance as a means of evaluating faculty than those research-oriented faculty members.

Faculty status and security

The status and security of faculty members, on the other hand, explained their attitudes toward utilizing student evaluations in personnel decisions. In other words, faculty members with high status and security in the institutions, usually resulting from publications, were more likely to support student evaluation than low-status faculty members. According to Blank, it was probably because the overall performance of the former was less likely to be affected by the innovation than that of the latter.

Gross and Small, 1979

Attitudes of 328 faculty members, both full and part-time, at George Mason University were surveyed in the Spring of 1966. The questionnaire covered background information, opinions about the evaluation and publication of individual ratings, and objective knowledge of the instrument (Gross & Small, 1979).
General findings

It was found that a majority of the faculty members supported the idea of having student evaluation, while tenured faculty members were more favorable to the use of student evaluation than non-tenured faculty members.

Effect of student evaluation

Most of the respondents indicated that evaluation information led to improved teaching. On the other hand, about thirty-five percent of the sample felt that the academic rigor was reduced by the use of student evaluation, and more than half of the faculty saw student evaluation as contributing to grade inflation. As to job satisfaction, although half of the respondents indicated that it was increased by the use of student evaluations, a sizable minority (about 20%) reported that it was reduced.

Validity of the instrument

The respondents were evenly split on the students' ability in evaluating teachers. Many of them believed that student evaluation primarily reflected the popularity of the instructors. Nevertheless, the faculty members seemed to agree that student evaluation should be used in some way to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

Faculty right

Over sixty percent of the sample felt that publication of evaluation results did not violate civil rights or ethical principles, while about one-third felt that it did.
McMartin and Rich, 1979

All full-time, tenure-track faculty members at a predominantly teaching-oriented state university were surveyed in the Spring of 1976. The study concluded that faculty opinions regarding various uses of student evaluation depended upon the respondent's frame of reference regarding the validity of evaluation instruments. To be specific, those who believed in the validity of student evaluation (the pro-validity group) had more favorable attitudes toward varying uses of student evaluation than the con-validity group or the uncommitted group (those who did not have strong feelings regarding the validity of student evaluation).

It was also found that faculty in the natural sciences were most favorably disposed toward student evaluation, whereas faculty in the fine arts and humanities were most opposed to student evaluation (McMartin & Rich, 1979).

Mahfous, 1979

Mahfous distributed questionnaires to 1,190 faculty members and 410 administrators selected from each category of higher education (including research institutions, comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and specialized institutions) in Maryland.

General findings

Overall, academicians (faculty and administration) in higher education tended to favor student evaluation, while administrators tended to note the worth of student evaluation. The latter favored
broadening its scope and sought to use the results in personnel decisions more than would the faculty members.

Category of institution

The faculty and administrators who worked at research institutions favored the use of student evaluation results in personnel decisions more than do those who worked at liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and specialized institutions.

Age

Younger faculty and administrators tended to agree on the importance and value of student evaluation, and favored the use of student evaluation in personnel decisions more than older ones.

Teaching experience

Those who spent between six and ten years in teaching favored the use of student evaluation results for development of teaching and in personnel decisions more than those with teaching experience less than six years or more than ten years.

Other variables

Title of position, status of position, tenure, sex, degree, degree major, and area of teaching of faculty and administration were not related to attitudes toward student evaluation.

Ryan, Anderson, and Birchler, 1980

At the University of Wisconsin--La Cross, all 300 faculty members were surveyed when a student evaluation of instruction (SEI) policy had
been in effect there for four years. The policy required that SEI ratings be collected from all classes of each faculty member for one semester each year. A single overall instructor evaluation item was averaged across all students in the classes of each instructor and was used as one of the indices in all personnel decisions: retention, promotion, tenure, and merit ratings.

Effect of student evaluation

The study showed that over ninety percent of the faculty members believed that the policy had reduced faculty morale in general. Meanwhile, three-fourths of the faculty members reported that the policy had decreased their personal confidence in the university administration.

The most frequently reported changes in instructional activities by the faculty were those that reduced coursework demands on students. Some of these changes—e.g., explicit specification of course objectives, provision of handouts, and attention to organization of course content—seemed to be appropriate and desirable, while some of the changes—e.g., lowering of difficulty level or grading standards—appeared to be unintended or undesirable. Furthermore, a strong majority of the subjects believed that one or more faculty acquaintances had attempted to improve their SEI ratings by engaging in academically irrelevant or inappropriate activities.

Use of student evaluation

The use of SEI ratings for instructional improvement was clearly favored by nearly eighty percent of the respondents. However, there
was much less approval and consensus about the use for personnel decisions.

Validity of student evaluation

About one-third of the faculty members believed that undergraduates in general were incapable of evaluating the performance of their instructors. The other two-thirds of the respondents believed that students were "somewhat capable" or "very capable" of evaluating instruction.

Analysis and summary

All of the studies cited above aim at ascertaining the attitudes of faculty members and administrators toward student evaluation. Although they are not really comparable due to different designs, the findings of these studies, some agreeing and some conflicting with each other, provide valuable information about faculty and administration attitudes toward student evaluation for future studies on this subject.

Attitude patterns

Some aspects of faculty and administration attitudes were supported by more than one study with no conflicting findings reported in the other studies. This fact suggests the existence of some pattern in the attitudes among faculty and administration.

First, the attitudes of administrators toward student evaluation are more favorable than those of faculty members (Mahfous, 1979; Wheeler, 1972). Next, attitudes of faculty members at research universities are more favorable than those of faculty members at other
teaching-oriented institutions (Mahfous, 1979; Rich, 1976). Finally, faculty members in general support the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement (Gross & Small, 1979; Guion et al., 1977; Mahfous, 1979; Ryan et al., 1980).

Inconsistent findings

Some findings about faculty attitudes or variables which may affect attitudes are inconsistent among different studies.

**Administrative use of student evaluation.** Findings regarding faculty attitudes toward the use of student evaluation are conflicting. Two studies report favorable attitudes of faculty toward this use (Rich, 1976; Wheeler, 1972), while another two find that this is not the case (Guion et al., 1977; Ryan et al., 1980).

**Tenure status.** One study finds that tenured faculty members are more favorable toward the use of student evaluation than non-tenured ones (Gross & Small, 1979). Two other studies, however, find that there exists no relationship between tenure status and faculty attitudes (Mahfous, 1979; Wheeler, 1972).

**Age.** Two studies report that younger faculty members are more positive toward student evaluation than older ones (Mahfous, 1979; Rich, 1976). Another finds that age is not related to faculty attitudes (Wheeler, 1972).

**Number of publications.** One study finds that the more articles one has published, the more positive he is toward student evaluation (Blank, 1978). Another study, however, reports an opposite finding (Rich, 1976).
**Academic field.** One study reports no relationship between field and attitudes of faculty members toward student evaluation (Mahfous, 1979). Two other studies, on the contrary, do show a relationship between the two variables. One of them finds that the faculty members in natural sciences are most favorably disposed toward student evaluation, whereas those in the fine arts and humanities are most opposed to student evaluation (McMartin & Rich, 1976). The other reports that the department of mathematics, natural sciences, and languages tend to be most critical and the social sciences to be most positive (Wheeler, 1972).

**Negligible variables**

Sex and rank of faculty members are found in two studies to be variables not related to faculty attitudes toward student evaluation (Mahfous, 1979; Rich, 1976). No conflicting findings have been reported in the other studies. It is tentatively concluded that these variables are negligible in determining faculty attitudes toward student evaluation.

---

**Student Evaluation of Instruction in the ROC**

**Background of Student Evaluation**

**A brief history of Chinese education**

According to Wang (1957), the history of Chinese education can be divided into three phases.
Phase one—education of the ancient China (2223 B.C.—247 B.C.)

This period covered about two thousand years, beginning in Yu Dynasty and terminating at the end of Chou Dynasty. According to limited documents, the political system in this period evolved gradually from tribal settlement to feudalism, and the economical system developed from pastoral to agriculture (see Wang, 1957).

The earliest Chinese education emerged in Yu Dynasty as a part of governmental tasks. Teachers at that time were also government officials and very highly respected. The education was informal in nature and targeted to the common people. The content of education included human relations and music (Wang, 1957).

In order to cultivate prospective officials, formal institutions of education were established, which admitted the younger generation of the ruling class, as well as the children of commoners on a selective basis (Chia, 1979). Private lecturing also came into existence since the period of Confucius (Wang, 1957). It was about five centuries before Christ.

Phase two—education of the imperial China (246 B.C.—1861 A.D.)

This period started in Chin Dynasty and ended in the declining years of Ching Dynasty, covering about two thousand and one hundred years.

Beginning at Chin Dynasty, feudalism was abolished, and the governing power of the country was centralized in the imperial government. In order to build a great empire, the First Emperor of the
Chin Dynasty standardized such matters as forms of writing, codes of law, coinage, and even the axle length of vehicles (see Hsia, 1960). Although Chin was a short dynasty, the systems set up by it were followed by its successors.

In the second century before Christ, the Chinese government adopted the thought of Confucius as the national ideology. Confucius believed that every human being was educable and that the influence of learning upon people would be substantial. He underscored the importance of moral education and laid great stress upon the relationships among human beings. For more than two thousand years, the classics of Confucianism have been the standard curriculum throughout the country (although it is not the case in Communist China).

Since the seventh century A.D., a civil service examination system has been adopted by the government. Those who passed the said examinations were recognized as scholars and were usually offered governmental positions.

Although formal school education supported by the government coexisted with the examinations for civil service, its role became less and less important. People could prepare for the said examinations at home without going to formal schools. The content of education since the seventh century was determined by the content of civil service examination, which was based upon Confucian philosophy and was essentially humanistic in orientation (Hsia, 1960).
Phase three—modern Chinese education (1862 B.C.—present)

Before the contact with the West in the nineteenth century, traditional education seemed sufficient for Chinese needs. Since the Opium War of 1839-1842, China has suffered from the humiliation of being defeated by foreign countries. Confronted with Western forces and civilization, the Chinese society could no longer remain unchanged. The need for educational reform thus seemed apparent (Jackson, 1971).

The "new education" began in 1862 when the first modern school was established. Following that, the government of Ching Dynasty set up more modern schools, introduced Western science into the curriculum, and selected students to study abroad (Wang, 1957).

The first complete system including elementary, secondary, and higher education was established in 1903, which was modeled primarily after Japanese education. In order to facilitate the development of new schools, the government finally abolished the civil service examination system in 1905 (Wang, 1975).

In 1911, the imperial government was overthrown by the Nationalists led by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. The republic government continued to promote the "new education." In 1922, the Ministry of Education revised the educational system and introduced the practice of compulsory education in the lower grades of elementary schools (Wang, 1957). The new system, with six-year elementary education, six-year secondary education, and four-year undergraduate education, was primarily modeled after American prototypes.
When the communist regime took over mainland China in 1949, the Nationalist government moved to Taiwan. The current Chinese educational system in Taiwan is basically the same as that put into practice in 1922.

The next section describes in more detail the current educational system in Taiwan. The education in Communist China will be omitted.

Current educational system in the Republic of China

Educational administrative system

**Constitutional basis.** According to Chapter Ten of the constitution on "Powers of the Central and Local Governments," the Central Government shall have the power of legislation and administration over the educational system, or delegate the power of administration to the Provincial and county/city governments; the Provinces shall have the power of legislation and administration over provincial education or delegate the power of administration to the county; the county shall have the power of legislation and administration over county education ("China yearbook," 1979). This principle was generally interpreted as: (1) the Central government has the sole power over higher education; (2) the Provincial governments and special municipality governments have primary responsibility for the secondary education under their jurisdiction; (3) the county governments have primary responsibility for the elementary education under their jurisdiction (Jackson, 1971).
Organization of educational administration. Administration of the Chinese educational system is divided into three levels: (1) Ministry of Education on the national level, (2) Provincial Departments of Education or Special Municipality Bureaus of Education, and (3) County/City Bureaus of Education.

The Ministry of Education formulates policy and standards for all forms of education and is responsible for all matters relating to higher education. It is one of the eight Ministries within the Executive Yuan (Cabinet), and is headed by a minister, assisted by one political vice-minister and two administrative vice-ministers. The main units under the minister and vice-ministers include: counsellors' office; inspectors' office; departments of higher education, technological and vocational education, secondary education, national education (nine-year free education including elementary and junior high education), social education and physical education; bureau of international cultural and educational relations; bureau of military training; and the office of science and technology (Ministry of Education, 1981a).

The Provincial Department of Education or the Special Municipality Bureau of Education promotes and supervises educational matters at the provincial or municipal level. The Taiwan Provincial Department of Education is organized under the Taiwan Provincial Government, and is headed by a Commissioner, assisted by a Deputy Commissioner. The main units within the department include: the first division (junior college education), the second division (secondary education), the third division (vocational education), the fourth division (national
education), the fifth division (social education), the sixth division (health and physical education), the inspectors' office and the student military training office. The Taipei and Kaohsiung Special Municipality Bureaus of Education are responsible, respectively, to the Taipei and Kaohsiung Municipal Government, which are directly controlled by the Executive Yuan. The Bureau of Education is under the supervision of a director and a deputy director. The main units within the bureau are similar to those within the provincial department of education, except for the omission of the division of junior college education (Ministry of Education, 1981a).

The County Bureau of Education promotes and supervises educational matters at the county level. It is headed by a director. The main units within the Bureau include the sections of school administration, basic education, social education, and physical education (Ministry of Education, 1981a).

School system

Figure 1 shows the overall structure of the current school system in the Republic of China. The total period of study from kindergarten to graduate school is at least twenty-two years, including two years for pre-school education; six years for elementary education; three years for junior high school; three years for senior high school; four to seven years for college or university; at least two years for a Master's degree, and at least two years for getting a doctorate.

**Pre-school education.** Kindergarten education is optional. Children between the ages of four to six are admitted to study one or
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two years. In the school year of 1980-81, there were 178,216 pupils in 1,186 kindergartens, of which 404 were public and 782 were private (Ministry of Education, 1981b).

**Elementary education.** Elementary education is free and compulsory for children aged six to twelve. In the school year of 1980-81, a total of 2,233,706 pupils were enrolled in 2,428 elementary schools, most of which were public. The attendance rate was 99.72 percent (Ministry of Education, 1981b).

**Secondary education.** Secondary education in the Republic of China is divided into three categories: junior high schools, senior high schools, and vocational schools. Three-year junior high school education, like elementary education, is free and compulsory. The term "national education" is used to denote the combined nine-year free education. According to Ministry of Education (1981b), in the school year of 1980-81, 96.78 percent of elementary school graduates attended junior high schools, and 54.86 percent of junior high school graduates were admitted to the next level of schooling.

Education beyond junior high school is not compulsory. Students have to pass an entrance examination in order to receive education at the senior high level. The period of study for either senior high school or vocational high school is three years.

In the school year of 1980-81, there were 648 junior high schools with a total enrollment of 1,975,532 students; 184 senior high schools with 180,665 students; and 191 vocational high schools with 394,138 students (Ministry of Education, 1981b).
Higher education. Institutions of higher learning include junior colleges, independent colleges, and universities.

There are three types of junior colleges: five-year junior colleges admit graduates from the junior high schools who have passed the Joint 5-year Junior College Examination; two-year junior colleges admit graduates from the vocational high schools who have passed the Joint 2-year Junior College Entrance Examination; and three-year junior colleges admit graduates from the senior high schools who have passed the Joint 3-year Junior College Entrance Examination. Most of the junior colleges are private.

A university must have at least three colleges. Institutions with one or two colleges are called independent colleges. The number of public colleges and universities is slightly more than that of the private ones. Graduates of either the senior high school or the senior vocational high school are admitted to the four-year colleges and universities after passing the competitive Joint Entrance Examination of Colleges and Universities. The acceptance rate is about 25% (Ministry of Education, 1981b).

In the school year of 1980-81, there were 104 institutions providing higher education. Of these, sixteen were universities, eleven colleges, and seventy-seven junior colleges. During this period, students in higher education numbered 342,528, with 183,134 in junior colleges, 159,394 in colleges and universities. Of all the students in colleges and universities, about four percent were graduate students (Ministry of Education, 1981b).
Table 3 summarizes the number of schools and the number of students for each level of education. The categories of schools, types of control, qualification for admission, period of study, and graduation requirements are shown in Table 4.

### TABLE 3

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS BY CATEGORY AND CONTROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Schools</th>
<th>Types of Control</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>178,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>44,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>133,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>2,233,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>2,208,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>1,075,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1,028,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior high school</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>180,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>141,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>39,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational high school</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>349,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>143,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>205,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior college</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>183,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>140,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>159,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Established Body</th>
<th>Qualifications of Admission</th>
<th>Period of Study</th>
<th>Conditions of Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Age 4-6</td>
<td>1 or 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Age 6 or over</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Satisfactorily completed 6 yrs. of schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Age 12 or over &amp;</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Satisfactorily completed 3 yrs. of schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>graduated from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>elementary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>Age 15 or over &amp;</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>-Same-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>graduated from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>junior high school;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>having passed senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>secondary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>entrance examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational School</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>Age 15 or over &amp;</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Satisfactorily completed 5 yrs. of schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>graduated from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>junior high school;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>having passed senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>college entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Age 18 or over &amp;</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Having earned 80-90 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>graduated from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>senior vocational school;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>having passed senior college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>entrance examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age 18 or over &amp;</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Having earned 106-128 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>graduated from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>senior secondary school;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>having passed senior college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>entrance examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Established Body</td>
<td>Qualifications of Period of Conditions of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admission Study Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year Technical College</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Graduated from junior college, &amp; completed military training; having passed technical college entrance exam</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Having earned 90 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduated from senior vocational school, and having passed technical college entrance examination</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Having earned 128 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or College</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Age 18 or over &amp; graduated from senior secondary school; having passed the university &amp; college entrance examination</td>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>Having earned 128 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School for master's degree</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Holder of bachelor's degree; passed graduate school entrance examination</td>
<td>Minimum 2 years</td>
<td>Having earned 28 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holder of master's degree; passed graduate school entrance examination</td>
<td>Minimum 2 years</td>
<td>Having earned 10 credits with thesis and passed oral exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values related to teachers and teaching and their cultural context

The role of education

There is a well-known Chinese saying—"Jade must be cut and chiseled to make it a useful vessel." It means that a person must be disciplined and educated before he can become a useful citizen.

What is reflected by this saying is the wide recognition of the importance of education for people. Today parents in the Republic of China usually pay great attention to their children's education. Even if the parents have very few years of education, they still hope that the young generation can receive college education. Thus they try hard for their children to realize it. It would not be unusual to learn that a son of an illiterate and poor father earned a Ph.D. degree, and that the whole family, even the whole village, felt proud of the son's achievement.

Why do the Chinese consider education or learning so important? The answer can be found in the history of Chinese education.

In ancient China, education was viewed as a primary obligation of the ruler. According to Chinese political philosophy, civilizing the masses by education is necessary in order to establish an ideal country (Chia, 1979). Education was thus considered an important task of the government.

Since the Han Dynasty (about the second century B.C.), Confucian thought has been the dominant ideology of the Chinese society. As indicated before, Confucius and his followers stressed the importance
of education, especially moral education. They believed that human
begins were educable and the effects of education would be tremendous.

The civil service examination system, existing between the seventh
and nineteenth centuries, had further influence on the Chinese view of
education. Since the persons passing the said examinations were
recognized as scholars and were usually offered governmental positions,
the examination system became the avenue to power and prestige for
everyone. In assessing the extent and depth of penetration of the
prestige of education in old China, Hsia (1960, p. 410) notes, "Entry
into the ranks of scholars was for a long time the only path that led
to political influence, high status, and wealth, irrespective of the
changing fortunes of dynasties. It was an achievement devoutly desired
for every young man, no matter what the social and economic position of
his parents."

Although the civil service examination system of the old China was
abolished at the beginning of the twentieth century, people in the
Republic of China still consider learning the noblest of human
pursuits. Some old people even view the diplomas or degrees of formal
schools comparable to the titles earned through passing the civil
service examination in old times.

The concept of teacher

The image of an ideal teacher in Chinese society comes from
Confucius, who is referred to as "the greatest sage and teacher" or
"the paragon for all generations." It is reported that Confucius
provided education for all people without discrimination; that he taught without weariness; that he led students gradually and patiently on the right path; that he set examples by his own action; and that he was morally lofty, not interested in fame and wealth. For more than two thousand years, the paragon set by Confucius has been considered the criteria of a good teacher.

Chinese also distinguish "a teacher of man" from "a teacher of classics." The former refers to a paragon of virtue, who influences students by personal examples. The latter refers to a teacher whose sole concern is to impart book learning. The teacher of man has been considered more respectable than the teacher of classics, but is usually more difficult to find.

The concept of teacher in old China continues to exist in the Republic of China. The Chinese teacher is still expected to be a paragon of both virtue and learning. He must be perfect in his personal character and knows almost everything in his own field. Although this is quite impossible for today's teacher, the society hardly changes its expectation of the teacher.

The social status of teachers

According to a recent study (see Kuo, 1980), the current status of teachers in the Republic of China is pretty high. It is found that, among thirty-seven occupations, college professors rank second, college presidents fourth, high school principals eighth, elementary school principals eleventh, high school teachers fourteenth, and elementary school teachers sixteenth. According to the study, the occupational
reputation of college professors is higher than that of engineers and physicians, that of high school teachers is higher than that of lawyers, and that of elementary school teachers is higher than that of judges in local courts (see Kuo, 1980).

Recognizing the role of education and the concept of teachers in Chinese society, such a high status possessed by teachers is not surprising. Exploring the social structure of old China can also provide some explanation for the social status of current teachers.

Traditional Chinese society, although open, can be divided into four classes: the scholar, the farmer, the artisan, and the merchant. The social status of each class was in the same order. Teachers, of course, belonged to the class of scholars and thus possessed high social status. Furthermore, in old China, teachers were one of the five most respected elements in life. The other four were: the heaven, the earth, the emperor, and parents. Consequently, when one formally became a pupil or apprentice to a master in a solemn ceremony, the most respectful form of salute was applied; that is, the student knelt and kowtowed to his teacher (Wu, 1979).

Chinese society, however, has undergone huge changes since the late nineteenth century. The traditional four classes no longer exist. Today in Taiwan, every occupation is officially to be considered equal. Teaching is, therefore, merely one of the occupations which has lost its unique status.

Although the study mentioned previously showed that the occupational reputation of teaching was high, it might just reflect people's nostalgia or aspiration for traditional values (Chen, 1980).
Within the last thirty years, industrialization has significantly changed the structure of the society, as well as the value of people in the Republic of China. Many people have observed that money is an important factor in determining people's social status. Because of limited salary, teaching is perceived as a low-valued occupation by many people (Chia, 1979). This is especially true for elementary and secondary school teaching. In other words, ideally the status of today's teachers remains high, but in reality their status has declined.

The teacher-student relationship

In the Republic of China, students are taught to respect their teachers. From elementary schools to senior high schools and also in some colleges, students bow to the teachers at the beginning and the end of each class session, showing their respect and appreciation. Students view teachers as their senior generation even if they are only a few years younger than the teacher. Students should not call the teacher by his or her first name, since this can only be done among intimate peers or by the senior. When attending classes, students are not supposed to arrive later than the teacher, neither should they make any noise, loiter, eat, or drink. Students view teachers as a fountain of knowledge; what the teacher says is deemed correct by the students. Even if an apparent mistake is made by the teacher, students will not point it out directly, but state their doubts without offending the teacher's dignity. Sometimes they may even ignore it intentionally.
On the other hand, teachers need to be highly aware of their own behavior in order to fulfill the expectation of being a model. They must dress formally, speak gently, and act nobly. They usually do not consider themselves friends of students. Instead, they treat students as their younger generation. If a student misbehaves, teachers have the right to correct and scold him. If a student severely offends his teacher, the former may be given a demerit if the teacher deems it necessary.

The teacher–student relationship can be explained in terms of age. In Chinese society, age is an important factor in determining a person's position in relation to others. The young must show respect for the old, and the old must take care of the young. Generally teachers are older than students, which results in the distinct status of the two groups.

Furthermore, the Chinese, especially in the old days, usually considered the contribution of teachers to be comparable to that of their parents. Subsequently, these Chinese believed that "one should respect his teacher as if he were the father even if the teacher–student relationship has existed for only a single day."

Since teacher–student relationship is somewhat comparable to parent–child relationship, it is, therefore, understandable why Chinese students are generally submissive to teachers. Most Chinese students dare not dispute with their teachers; just as most Chinese children dare not talk back to their parents. In fact, teachers and parents are two major authorities in Chinese society even today.
The effects of the values on current Chinese education

As mentioned previously, in Chinese society, teaching is a respectable profession. Teachers are viewed as a fountain of knowledge and a paragon of virtue. They are highly esteemed by the students. The relationship between teachers and students is comparable to that of parents and children. All of these factors create a special situation in which teaching-learning activity takes place.

Since students respect the teacher and are submissive to his instruction, they are serious about learning. This is a major reason why Chinese students generally concentrate on course work and show few disciplinary problems.

On the other hand, teachers, being respected by students and the public, consider their jobs highly rewarding. This gives them an added desire to stay in the teaching profession despite their relatively low salaries.

However, this type of situation has its disadvantages. Since the authority of teachers is emphasized, the needs of students are often overlooked. Secondly, being submissive to the teacher causes the student to play a passive role in the teaching-learning process. Thirdly, students lack the opportunity to develop independent thinking because they are accustomed to following the models set up by the teachers.

Along with this, teachers lack the stimuli to improve themselves because they are viewed as authorities. In addition, since the traditional expectation is too high for teachers, the latter can be
criticized by the public for minor flaws in personality or behavior.
Finally, in order to fulfill the expectation of being experts, teachers
hardly admit their ignorance of some questions in their field; this can
be detrimental to whole academia.

Practice of Student Evaluation in the
Republic of China

Tamkang University—the early adopter

Among the 104 institutions of higher learning in the Republic of
China, Tamkang University is the only one which has adopted systematic
student evaluation.

Tamkang is a private institution with an enrollment of more than
15,000 students. It offers 29 undergraduate programs and 11 graduate
programs. The undergraduate level has both day and evening sessions.
There are five colleges at the day session undergraduate level:
College of Liberal Arts, College of Sciences, College of Engineering,
College of Business, and College of Management. The evening session is
called Evening College. Figure 2 displays the organization of Tamkang
University.

The history of implementing student
evaluation at Tamkang University

In 1966, Tamkang College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, predecessor
of Tamkang University, conducted the first survey on student opinion of
professors' instruction. Three years later, in 1969, a similar survey
was done. However, the results of the two surveys were not
satisfactory (Educational Science Institute, 1983).
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Being determined to improve the quality of instruction at Tamkang University, President Clement C. P. Chang readopted the practice of student evaluation in 1975. The instrument for the third survey, which contained sixty-six items, was adapted from a questionnaire used by an American university.

In the following year, an ad hoc committee was formed to design a new student evaluation instrument. The committee consisted of fifteen members representative of various fields. As a result, five different forms of student evaluation were developed for the use of Liberal Arts, Sciences, Engineering, Business, and general courses, respectively.

The questionnaires were administered by the instructors of the courses and the results were analyzed by the ad hoc committee with the assistance of the University Computing Center. Each instructor received a computer printout of the results for each of the courses he/she taught.

In the spring semester of 1977, the five forms were evolved into nine forms, one for each of the following units:

1. Division of Liberal Arts excluding Department of Oriental Language and Literature
2. Department of Oriental Language and Literature
3. Department of Mathematics
4. Department of Physics
5. Department of Chemistry
6. Division of Engineering
7. Laboratory courses in the Division of Engineering
8. Division of Business
9. General courses

The first fifteen items in each of the nine forms were the same. The items in those forms could be categorized into the following four groups: teaching behavior of instructors, learning attitudes of students, overall ratings, and accomplishment of students.

The results of student evaluations in Spring, 1977 were analyzed by a professor and then publicized in "Tamkang Weekly," a University publication. The nine forms were slightly revised respectively in the following year, and were used until 1980.

The current student evaluation form and the reporting of it

In 1980, a new unit, the Educational Science Institute was established under the Secretariate of the University. The nine forms of student evaluation were integrated by the Institute into a "Tamkang Rating Scale for Instruction" with a total of forty items. The new scale has been used since 1980 (see Table 5).

Except for four items which aim at soliciting background information of students, the items on the current scale can be divided into two major categories: teaching behavior and learning behavior. The former contains five dimensions: knowledge of subjects and attitudes toward teaching (5 items), teaching skill (5 items), arrangement of subject matter (5 items), classroom atmosphere (4 items), and examinations and grading (5 items). The latter, learning behavior, includes two dimensions: learning attitude (5 items) and learning accomplishment (5 items).
### TABLE 5
THE TAMKANG RATING SCALE FOR INSTRUCTION
(ENGLISH TRANSLATION)

**DIRECTIONS:**

1. This scale aims to provide the instructor with your perception of this course for further improvement.

2. Your answers will help to improve teaching. Please give frank and thoughtful answers to each item. Thank you for your cooperation.

3. A five-point scale has been used for most of the items as follows: A = strongly agree; B = agree; C = partly agree; D = disagree; E = strongly disagree. Indicate the response closest to your view by blackening the appropriate block with a No. 2 pencil.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The instructor knew his subject matter thoroughly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor kept current with development in his field and published books or articles often.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor seemed to feel proud of being engaged in teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor made earnest efforts in teaching, never meeting class late or leaving early for no reason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor was well-prepared for each class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The instructor spoke audibly, clearly, and fluently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The instructor used a variety of methods to make the subject interesting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The instructor presented materials in orderly arrangement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The instructor changed approaches or materials to meet the different abilities of the students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The instructor often asked thought-provoking questions, and led the students to solve problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The material was well-organized enough for students to learn easily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The material was of adequate amount and suitable for learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The material was of the right level of difficulty to meet the abilities of the students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Assignments were of reasonable length.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The content of the material was sufficient and appropriate to course objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The instructor was relaxed and informal with students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The instructor was friendly toward students, encouraged students to ask questions, and was willing to answer them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The students were involved in learning and discussions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Discussions often continued after the regular class period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The content of the exams measured the students' knowledge of the course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The instructor assigned grades fairly and impartially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The instructor explained mistakes students had made on quizzes or assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The instructor gave appropriate assignments and assigned grades on this basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The instructor seemed to know when students didn't understand the material and gave full explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I never attended class late or left early for no reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>In class, I concentrated on learning and participated in discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>After class, I reviewed the material and finished the assignments by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I'm always looking forward to class meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I felt pleasant and fulfilled while in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I can memorize the fundamental knowledge of this course (e.g., terminology, notation, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I can explain the important knowledge of this course (e.g., concepts, principles, theories, etc.) in simple, clear ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I can interpret the important knowledge or theories of this course by illustration or some other ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I can analyze the important contents and theories of this course and expound the relationships between them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I can integrate the knowledge of the course and give my own viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>The lectures helped to build up my philosophy of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I learned a lot about how to behave from this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Sex: A = male; B = female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>College: A = school of graduate studies; B = college of arts; C = college of sciences; D = college of engineering; E = college of business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>(Continued) A = college of management; B = evening college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>My grade in this course is: A = over 80 points; B = 70-79 points; C = 60-69 points; D = Fail; E = No grade so far.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Educational Science Institute, *A study on the teaching evaluation at Tamkang University.* Taipei: Tamkang University, 1983.
The results of the evaluations are reported to both individual faculty members and administrators, i.e., president, vice president, dean of academic affairs, department chairpersons, and director of the Educational Science Institute (Educational Science Institute, 1983).

Problems with student evaluation at Tamkang University

Since the first adoption of student evaluation, the university has encountered many problems. According to the analysis of the Educational Science Institute, problems with student evaluation come from four sources (Educational Science Institute, 1983).

First, many faculty members are resistant to student course evaluation. Some of them believe that student evaluation goes against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers, some believe that student evaluation shows the University's distrust of faculty. The negative attitudes of these people often influence students' understanding of the functions of such evaluation, and further affect the reliability of students' responses to the evaluation forms.

Some other problems come from students. It is difficult to collect all the opinions of students because of student absenteeism. Of those forms collected from students, many are casually or carelessly filled out. This is probably because these students think the evaluation is merely a formality and thus do not take it seriously.

Another kind of problem comes from the procedures in administering the evaluation forms. To be specific, the people responsible for the said procedures (usually the teaching assistants in each department) do not always act according to the guidelines prepared by the University
when administering the forms. The unstandardized procedures also affect the results of the evaluation.

The last source of problems lies in the evaluation instrument itself. There are several shortcomings with the current scale which need to be overcome. For example, there are too many items, some items are ambiguous or inappropriate for certain courses.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Design of the Study

Survey research was utilized to explore the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons at one university in the Republic of China toward student evaluation of instruction. Using a stratified sampling procedure, twenty-four faculty members and eight department chairpersons were selected as subjects. Standardized open-ended interviews were conducted as the primary means of data gathering. Additional information was acquired through a short questionnaire. The investigation was restricted to Tamkang University since it is the only institution of higher education which has implemented systematic student evaluation in the Republic of China. For the purpose of tractability and clarity, the study was further limited to undergraduate level day session department chairpersons and full-time faculty members with college affiliations.

Subjects

Population

The population of this study consisted of two contrasting groups at the day session undergraduate level of Tamkang University. Twenty-eight department chairpersons made up the first group. One hundred
and seventy full-time faculty members affiliated with the five colleges, including professors, associate professors, and instructors, composed the second group. This second group did not include teaching assistants, or those full-time faculty on administrative assignments. Teaching assistants generally did not assume major teaching responsibility, and therefore were not the target of this study. Administrative faculty were not included because they usually taught fewer hours than normal full-time faculty members and they probably possessed different points of view regarding student evaluation from those whose major responsibility was teaching. The second group also excluded full-time faculty members without college affiliations, since the majority of them were teachers of physical education, a subject usually not considered an academic discipline in the Republic of China.

Sample selection

The sample size in an interview study is typically small (Gay, 1981). In the present study, it was determined that eight department chairpersons and twenty-four faculty members were an appropriate number of subjects to provide an overview of disciplines through interviews by one interviewer within a month, the available time for the study.

All the department chairpersons and full-time faculty members with college affiliations were first chosen from the roster of Tamkang University published in Spring 1983. The group of department chairpersons was classified into two sub-groups according to the variable of field (Liberal Arts/Business and Sciences/Engineering), while the
faculty group was categorized into six sub-groups based on two variables, field (Liberal Arts/Business and Sciences/Engineering) and rank (professor, associate professor, and instructor).

It has been found that academic field relates to faculty and administration attitudes toward student evaluation (McMartin & Rich, 1976; Wheeler, 1972). As reviewed in Chapter II, one study has found that faculty members in the natural sciences are most favorable toward student evaluation, while those in the fine arts and humanities are most opposed to student evaluation (McMartin & Rich, 1976). The other study has found the social sciences to be the most positive and the departments of mathematics, natural sciences and language to be most critical (Wheeler, 1972).

There are twenty-eight departments affiliated with five different colleges in Tamkang University (8 departments in liberal arts, 4 in business, 3 in management, 3 in sciences, and 10 in engineering). In the present study, the investigator combined liberal arts, business, and management as one broad area, since these three were branches of broadly-defined "social sciences" in the Republic of China. Sciences and engineering were treated as another area. Equal size samples were then drawn from these two broad fields.

Although literature did not suggest that academic rank would be a factor related to faculty attitudes toward student evaluation, this variable was thought to very likely be connected with the status or security of faculty members in the Republic of China where there is no tenure system as in this country. It was the assumption of the
researcher that the status of full professors in the Republic of China, especially those in the private institutions, was similar to that of the tenured faculty in the United States. In addition, rank can be a rough indicator of teaching experience, a factor related to faculty attitudes toward student evaluation reported in one study (Mahfous, 1979). Using rank as a variable of interest in selecting faculty samples was based on the above considerations.

After the population was classified, members in the sub-groups were consecutively numbered. Using a table of random numbers, four persons were selected from each stratum. The total subjects thus consisted of eight department chairpersons and twenty-four faculty members. Six additional department chairpersons and eighteen faculty members (three from each stratum) were drawn as substitutes. Table 6 and 7 display the distribution of the sample of department chairpersons and faculty members, respectively, as just described.

**TABLE 6**

SAMPLE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS BY FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts/Business</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences/Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7

SAMPLE OF FACULTY MEMBERS BY RANK AND FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Field</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts/Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences/Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instrumentation**

Two instruments, an interview schedule and a questionnaire, were used for data collection.

**Interview schedule**

The interview schedule consisted of twenty-five major open-ended questions in four topical areas—content of student evaluation, usage of student evaluation, impact of student evaluation, and support/non-support of student evaluation (see Appendix A). Among the 25 major questions, four had sub-questions in order to solicit more specific answers. A supplementary question, appearing at the end of each topical area, acquired additional information. All questions were developed by the researcher based on a review of literature both in the United States and in the Republic of China. Although a few questions inquired about knowledge or experience of the subjects, most of the
questions were aimed at understanding the interviewees' opinions regarding student evaluation.

**Questionnaire**

A 19-item questionnaire was designed to solicit participants' personal data, perceptions concerning teacher evaluation, prior experience or knowledge regarding student evaluation, and the overall attitude toward student evaluation practice at Tamkang University (see Appendix B). All of the items on the questionnaire were close-ended questions. This questionnaire and the interview schedule were both pilot tested.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted in early September, 1983, in order to (1) determine the appropriateness of the interview schedule and the questionnaire, (2) refine the tentative coding form, and (3) assess the possibility of tape recording the interviews.

Two department chairpersons and two faculty members, chosen from among the substitutes drawn in the sampling process, participated in the pilot study. The pilot interviews followed basically the same sequence as the interviews in the actual studies, while at the end of the interviews the respondents were asked an extra question regarding the feasibility of tape recording the interview process.

As a result of pilot interview experience, a few alternatives in the questionnaire were reworded. Major modifications were made in the interview schedule with two questions omitted and one added. The
tentative coding form was also revised, including changes in categories and rewording of several category labels.

As to the opinions regarding taping the interviews, two of the interviewees believed that it would not inhibit the subjects, one held the opposite position, and another believed it would inhibit only those professors in the area of liberal arts. Based on the above opinions, the researcher decided it would not hamper the study to request consent for tape recording interviews.

**Procedure**

**Contacting the university**

In March 1983, a letter was sent to the President of Tamkang University exploring the feasibility of conducting a study on student evaluation at his university (a copy of this letter plus an English translation appear in Appendix C). Authorized by the President, the Director of the Educational Science Institute replied promptly showing cooperation.

In the middle of June, the researcher made an overseas telephone call to Dr. Fred Fwu-tyan Ho, Director of the said institute at Tamkang University, requesting more information about the practice of student evaluation at that university, and also discussing the possible time and procedure of conducting the study.

Two documents, "Tamkang University Bulletin" and "A Study on the Teaching Evaluation at Tamkang University," were obtained in mid-July. The information in these two documents was utilized as part of the basis of the research plan.
A roster of faculty members and administrators at Tamkang University, published in Spring 1983, was obtained from the Educational Science Institute after the researcher arrived at the university in early September, 1983. It was used for selecting the subjects of this study.

Contacting the subjects

In early September, 1983, selected samples were contacted by the researcher either through phone calls or personal visits. Among these samples, six faculty members and one department chairperson were no longer with the university at that time. A faculty member and a department chairperson did not accept an interview stating unavailability. Another department chairperson had chaired the department for only one year and had no experience in dealing with the student evaluation results of the faculty in his department. The above ten persons were replaced by appropriate substitutes in the corresponding stratum of samples.

Having obtained the cooperation of the subjects, the researcher arranged appointments with them. A letter was then sent to each of the subjects (see Appendix D). The purposes of the letter were, first, to confirm and remind the subjects of the time and place of the interview; second, to explain the nature of the study; and finally, to assure subjects the confidentiality of their contributions to the study.

Conducting the interview

Thirty-two interviews were conducted within a period of one month. While most of the interviews were finished within one hour and
ten minutes, the length of each interview varied from forty-five minutes to two hours. Each interview followed a prescribed sequence:

1. Introductory explanation of the study, establishment of rapport, and reiteration of confidentiality and access to findings from the study.
2. The standardized open-ended interview.
3. The short questionnaire.

All the interviews were recorded by notetaking. Eighteen were also tape recorded with consent of the interviewees, although there were unexpected problems with one tape.

Data Analysis

Data collected through interviews and questionnaires were treated by the following steps:

Transcribing tape-recorded interviews

Seventeen tape-recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim. Since the task was time consuming (at least nine hours were spent to transcribe one taped interview), it was accomplished by several different people. The scripts were neatly written by hand without typing. The researcher then checked each transcribed interview while listening to the tape and reading the notes in order to ensure accuracy. The single taped interview of which two-thirds was lost was not transcribed.
Coding the interview information

The second step in data analysis was to transform raw data obtained through interviews into a fixed-alternative response format for quantitative treatment.

According to Crittenden (1970, p. 220), the coding task involves five elements: first, a set of data, second, a specification of the size of the units of data to be taken into consideration for each part of the coding task, third, a set of categories, fourth, a set of code designations, one for each category, and fifth, a set of rules for assigning the data to the categories.

The set of data to be coded in the present study consisted of the scripts of transcribed interviews and the notes taken for those interviews without tape-recording plus the one of which the tape was largely unusable. Two units of analysis were specified for the coding process. For each coding item, the recording unit, defined by Berelson as "the smallest body of content in which the appearance of a reference is counted" (1952, p. 135), was the answer to a particular question or sub-question. The content unit, defined also by Berelson as "the largest body of content that may be examined by the coder in categorizing a recording unit" (1952, p. 135), was the entire interview. The designation of such a content unit meant that the coder had to read the complete script or notes of an interview prior to coding any items. This procedure may have sometimes lowered the reliability of coding (Cartwright, 1953). However, in view of the fact that the correct meaning of an answer to a certain question was sometimes perceived only by reference to responses to other questions,
such a decision could have increased the accuracy of the coded information.

Except for the supplementary questions, which were not directly related to subjects' attitudes toward student evaluation and thus excluded from coding procedures, a set of nominal response categories were developed for each question listed in the interview schedule. This was accomplished through the researcher's previous experience and suggestions from related studies, taking into account the logical criteria for classifying data: coding categories must be mutually exclusive and exhaustive (Selltiz, Wrightsman, & Cook, 1981).

To make the categories exhaustive, the researcher utilized alternatives such as "other," "not applicable," and "need not ask" (only used in questions appearing in the first topical area) as residual categories when necessary. The principle of mutual exclusiveness was not difficult to meet in most of the coding items, in which one code for each coding item was a natural condition. In certain items of which multiple responses were of primary interest (e.g., list of preferences or reasons), an alternative scheme was employed—each of the options was specified and the coder was asked to judge whether it had been mentioned or not. Such a scheme might be more objective, although qualitative differentiation between responses would not be possible (Crittenden, 1970).

Integer numbers were used for the set of code designations. Those categories listed in more than one coding item were designated by the same code. For example, "others" was consistently designated by 9. A complete interview coding form is listed in Appendix E. To facilitate
assigning data to the proper categories, coding guidelines were developed for the majority of the questions (see Appendix F).

Determining the intercoder reliability

All of the thirty-two interviews were coded by the researcher. For the purpose of examining the objectivity of the coding process, a sociology graduate was selected as a second coder to code some of the interviews independently.

The researcher first coded a taped interview simultaneously with the second coder after introducing the nature of the study and the coding task to the latter. Then the second coder proceeded to code independently ten more interviews, of which five were tape-recorded and another five were not.

Scott's pi ($\pi$), a coefficient of interjudge agreement for nominal scales, was calculated to determine the reliability of the coding procedure (Scott, 1955). The coefficient stands for the "extent to which the coding reliability exceeds chance" (Scott, 1955, p. 323).

The intercoder reliability of each item calculated based on the five tape-recorded interviews was not found to be systematically lower or higher than that of the corresponding item based on the other five interviews without tape-recording. In view of this fact, the final intercoder reliability was calculated by combining these two groups of interviews in order to make the sample size relatively larger.

Table 8 displays the observed (uncorrected) and corrected agreement ($\pi$) for the twenty-five major interview questions. Intercoder reliability ranges from 1.00 to .47, with 19 out of 25 items...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Observed Agreement</th>
<th>Scott's pi (π)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 To what degree do you think students are capable of answering this type of question?</strong></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?</strong></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?</strong></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in the student evaluation forms?</strong></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 How do you think student evaluation should be used?</strong></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Who do you think is eligible to utilize the results of student evaluation?</strong></td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 What is your opinion about the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement?</strong></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4 Has the evaluation information been used by the institution as a criterion for personnel decisions regarding promotion or reappointment?</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5 What do you think about the use of student evaluation for personnel decisions?</strong></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.6 What would you think about the use of student evaluation for course selection?</strong></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Were you aware of the results of student evaluation of your instruction from each class you taught?</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 What do you usually do after you are aware of the results of student evaluation of your instruction?</strong></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 Is student evaluation helpful in directing your teaching performance?</strong></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4 If yes, in what aspect?</strong></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.5 If no, what are the possible reasons?</strong></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.6 How do you deal with the results of student evaluation of teachers in your department after you receive the report?</strong></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.7 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on the teacher-student relationship?</strong></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Observed Agreement</td>
<td>Scott's pi (π)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on faculty morale?</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation of the quality of the whole university?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Some people think that student evaluation can provide opportunities for students to express their opinions regarding their own education. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Some people think that student evaluations are against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Some people think that student evaluations can stimulate less qualified professors to improve themselves. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Some people think that student evaluation provides universities control over faculty members. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Some people think that student evaluation can provide democratic training for both professors and students. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Some people think that students do not have the right to evaluate professors, regardless of student's ability to do so. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
falling above .70. The mean pi's for items in the first, second, third, and fourth topical area was .82, .82, .86, and .62, respectively. The items in the last topical area were designed to ascertain the respondent's opinions through their comments on certain arguments for or against student evaluation. The indirect nature of these items was a possible reason for the relatively low reliability level.

In addition, the distribution of category frequencies for some of these items were quite uneven, which resulted in great effect of chance correction on the uncorrected scores (see Frick & Semmel, 1978). This fact also accounted for the relatively low pi's in the last topical area. Another type of intercoder reliability developed by Cohen (1960) was also calculated for each major question. The results and a discussion are included in Appendix G.

Analyzing the coded responses

All the codes for both questionnaires (which were precoded) and interviews were keyed into the IBM computer. SPSS subprogram "FREQUENCIES" (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975) was utilized to obtain basic distribution information on the variables in this study. Another subprogram, "CROSSTABS," was employed to examine the relationship between selected variables. Due to the small sample size, statistical analysis was limited to the descriptive level. Cramer's index of contingency was calculated for each pair of variables crosstabulated. Those with the said index greater than .40 were
further inspected. Possible relationships between certain variables were then suggested for future study.

**Comparing the findings with those found in the United States**

Although the present study is not a replicate of any previous studies of faculty and administration attitudes toward student evaluation, the findings are compared with studies in the United States having similar themes. References were made to the analysis of those studies on this topic reviewed in Chapter II, section two (pp. 54-56).
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Thirty-two standardized open-ended interviews were conducted to assess the attitudes of department chairpersons and faculty members at Tamkang University. A questionnaire was administered immediately after each interview to solicit additional information. The findings of the study are reported through tables of frequency distribution and direct quotations from the interviews.

This chapter contains seven sections. The first one presents the background information of the subjects in order to provide readers a frame of reference for the study results. (These data were obtained through the questionnaire. The relationship between each background variable with subjects' overall attitude was examined in Section Six.) Sections two through five report the results of the four topical areas of the interview, respectively, under the headings of "content of student evaluation," "usage of student evaluation," "impact of student evaluation," and "support/non-support of student evaluation." The next section reports the overall attitude of the subjects (acquired from the last item of the questionnaire), and its correlating variables. The last section compares the present findings to previous studies.
Background Information of the Subjects

Sex

As shown in Table 9, the majority of the subjects (71.9%) were male. Although 9 out of 32 interviewees were female, only one was in the group of department chairpersons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
<td>23 (71.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

Table 10 shows the distribution of department chairpersons and faculty members according to their age range. As can be seen in the Table, over half of both groups were in the range of 35 to 49. There were more faculty members under 35 than those aged 50 or over, while only one department chairperson was under 35.
TABLE 10
AGE OF SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>12 (50.0%)</td>
<td>17 (53.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank

The faculty rank has been taken into consideration in the design of this study, i.e., there were an equal number of professors, associate professors, and instructors. However, rank was not a variable for selecting department chairpersons. The information on department chairpersons is given in Table 11, which indicates the breakdown by rank for individual and combined groups.

TABLE 11
RANK OF SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>8 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College affiliation

Each subject was asked to indicate their college affiliation. As shown in Table 12, five colleges were represented by both groups of department chairpersons and faculty members. In the sampling procedure, colleges of liberal arts, business, and management were combined as one broad academic field, while the other two colleges were treated as another field. An equal number of subjects (4 department chairpersons and 12 faculty members) were chosen from each of these two broad areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highest Degree

With the exception of one faculty member, all the interviewees reported the highest degree they held (see Table 13). Combining faculty and department chairpersons, 38.7% of the subjects held doctorates, 38.7% master's degree, while 16.1% bachelor's. Two other subjects checked the category "other," with one noting that he was a doctoral candidate; another had studied in the doctoral program for four years.

TABLE 13
HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>7 (30.4%)</td>
<td>12 (38.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>10 (43.5%)</td>
<td>12 (38.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (21.7%)</td>
<td>5 (16.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (4.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>23 (100.0%)</td>
<td>31 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: One faculty member did not answer this item, making a total number of 31.

Locality where highest degree received

Subjects were also requested to indicate the location of the institution where they earned their highest degrees. As displayed in
Table 14, 43.8% of the subjects received their highest degrees from North American countries, 40.6% from China (including mainland China and Taiwan), while only a few subjects earned their degrees in European countries or other Asian areas.

In the process of data analysis, the attitudes of the 14 subjects with highest degrees received from North American countries were compared with the attitudes of the other 18 who were combined as one group. The purpose was to find out whether the experience in the North American countries had any influence on subjects’ attitudes toward student evaluation.

### TABLE 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China (Taiwan or mainland)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>12 (50.0%)</td>
<td>13 (40.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian Area</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>3 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
<td>14 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years of teaching experience at institutions of higher education

Table 15 shows the teaching experience of the interviewees at institutions of higher education (not restricted to Tamkang University). As indicated in this table, slightly fewer than 20% of the subjects had taught for 13 years or more, 69% of the interviewees had teaching experience from 3 to 12 years, and 13% had taught less than 3 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 or more</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
<td>22 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 3</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of teaching experience at Tamkang University

Table 16 lists the teaching experience of subjects at Tamkang University. As indicated in this table, 37.5% of the subjects had
taught at Tamkang for more than 9 years and had experienced the beginning and revising of student evaluation. Slightly over 30% of the subjects fell in the three- to eight-year range, thereby experiencing at least one revision of the student evaluation form. The same percentage reported that they had taught at Tamkang less than three years. They seemed to have the least experience with Tamkang's student evaluation practice.

### TABLE 16

SUBJECTS' TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT TAMKANG UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 or more</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>10 (41.7%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 3</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Role**

Of the 32 subjects, 8 were department chairpersons, and 24 were faculty members. This distribution was decided before the sample was selected. Among the 24 faculty members, 3 reported that they had chaired the department before.
Teaching load at Tamkang University in Spring 1983

The majority of the subjects taught six to ten hours per week in Spring 1983 (see Table 17). One department chairperson and 7 faculty members taught eleven hours or more per week. Only one department chairperson's teaching load was fewer than six hours per week.

**TABLE 17**

SUBJECTS' TEACHING LOAD AT TAMKANG UNIVERSITY IN SPRING 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours/Week</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>8 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>6 (75.5%)</td>
<td>17 (70.8%)</td>
<td>23 (71.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 6</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching load at institutions other than Tamkang in Spring 1983

Table 18 indicates subjects' teaching load at institutions other than Tamkang University in Spring 1983. As shown in the table, about two-thirds of the subjects did not teach at institutions other than Tamkang in Spring 1983. Three department chairpersons and four faculty members taught one to three hours per week, and another four faculty members taught four hours or more per week.
TABLE 18

SUBJECTS' TEACHING AT INSTITUTIONS OTHER THAN TAMKANG IN SPRING 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours/Week</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
<td>21 (65.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Books published

As shown in Table 19, nearly half of the subjects reported they had not published a book in the past three years. Slightly more than one-third of the interviewees had published one or two books, while 16.7% had published 3 or more books.

TABLE 19

NUMBER OF BOOKS PUBLISHED BY SUBJECTS IN THE PAST THREE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Books</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>2 (8.7%)</td>
<td>5 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>10 (43.5%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>11 (47.8%)</td>
<td>14 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>23 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: One department chairperson and one faculty member did not answer this item, making a total number of 30.
Articles published

Subjects were also asked the number of articles they had published in the past three years. As Table 20 indicates, over half of the interviewees had published 3 or more articles, about one-third had published one or two articles, and 9.7% had published none.

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED BY SUBJECTS IN THE PAST THREE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
<td>10 (43.5%)</td>
<td>17 (54.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>10 (43.5%)</td>
<td>11 (35.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (13.0%)</td>
<td>3 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>23 (100.0%)</td>
<td>31 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: One faculty member did not answer this item, making a total number of 31.

Perceptions concerning teacher evaluation in general

The following two items were formulated to solicit subjects' perceptions concerning teacher evaluation in general: (1) If teaching has to be evaluated, who do you think is in the best position to evaluate a professor's teaching performance? (2) Circle one to three most important factors in determining faculty promotion at Tamkang University.
Best evaluator of teaching. Although the first item listed above was designed to choose one answer, a few respondents checked more than one alternative. As can be seen in Table 21, students were considered the best evaluators of teaching performance by the majority of the subjects (59.4%), while 28% of the subjects selected department chairpersons as the best evaluators.

TABLE 21
BEST EVALUATOR(S) OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE PERCEIVED BY SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator(s)</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Academic affairs</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School dean</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chairperson</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor himself</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (16.6%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
<td>19 (59.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors determining faculty promotion. Table 22 displays the one to three factors perceived most important in promotion decisions. As indicated by the table, research and publication was mentioned by most of the subjects (84.4%). It was followed by teaching performance (37.5%), length of service in rank (28.1%), service to department and institution (25.0%), academic degree (18.8%), personal attributes (12.5%), and other (3.1%).

**TABLE 22**

**FACTORS DETERMINING FACULTY PROMOTION PERCEIVED BY SUBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; publication</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
<td>20 (83.3%)</td>
<td>27 (84.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching performance</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to dept. &amp; inst.</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
<td>8 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service in rank</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic degree</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing right people</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions concerning student evaluation in particular

The last two items of the questionnaire asked perceptions concerning student evaluation in particular. They were: (1) Have you heard of student evaluation before it was implemented at Tamkang University? (2) How much do you know about the research on student evaluation?

Past experience with student evaluation. About one-third of the subjects reported they had not heard of student evaluation before Tamkang University started this system (see Table 23). A slightly higher percentage had heard of student evaluation, but had never filled out any student evaluation form. Approximately 28% of the subjects had completed such evaluation forms before.

TABLE 23
SUBJECTS' PAST EXPERIENCE WITH STUDENT EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Experience</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in evaluation</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with but no participation</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of evaluation</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>10 (41.7%)</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge about research on student evaluation. As Table 24 indicates, over one-half of the subjects were not aware of any research on student evaluation. Nearly 40% of the respondents had some research information, while 6.5% were well acquainted with student evaluation studies.

**TABLE 24**

**SUBJECTS' KNOWLEDGE ABOUT RESEARCH ON STUDENT EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Known</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considerable</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>12 (38.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost none</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
<td>17 (54.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>31 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: One department chairperson did not answer this item, making a total number of 31.

The above background data about subjects present possible factors correlating with the attitudes toward student evaluation, although only five of them—age, academic field, teaching experience, role, and number of publications—have been found to be associated with attitudes in the previous studies in the United States. These background variables were crosstabulated with the overall attitude of subjects toward student evaluation. The findings are reported in Section Six.
The following four sections present the results of the interviews. Since there was little difference between faculty and department chairperson responses to each question (Cramer's indexes of contingency ranged from 0.0 to 0.38). These two groups were combined in discussion for the purpose of simplification.

First Topical Area of Interview: Content of Student Evaluation

As indicated before, the interview items focused on four areas. The first one concerned the content of student evaluation. The purpose was to find which items were desirable or undesirable based on the perspectives of those who were evaluated. Major questions in this topical area dealt with: (1) students' capability in answering evaluation items, (2) usefulness of evaluation results to teachers, (3) usefulness of evaluation results to departments (applicable only to department chairpersons sampled), and (4) suitability of student evaluation items. If students' capability in a certain aspect was denied by an interviewee, there was no need to ask further questions since negative answers could be expected.

The student evaluation form generally involves different categories of items reflecting various dimensions of teaching. In view of this fact, answers to the four major questions above were obtained through a series of sub-questions. Each solicited subjects' opinions regarding a specific category of items.

Eight categories, each followed by a few sample items (most of them were adopted from Centra, 1981, p. 23), were presented separately
to the interviewees. Of these eight, seven were cited by Centra (1981) as common dimensions of student evaluation. Another category, number 1 (instructor's knowledge of subject), was added because it was also found in the evaluation form of Tamkang University. Below are the eight categories:

1. Instructor's knowledge of subject
2. Organization, structure, or clarity
3. Teacher-student interaction or rapport
4. Teaching skill, communication, or lecturing ability
5. Workload, course difficulty
6. Grading, examinations
7. Impact on students, student self-rated accomplishments
8. Global, overall ratings

An overview of the results of the first topical area are presented in the beginning of this section. It is followed by the reports of subjects' responses to individual categories of items.

**Overview of subjects' responses to the four major questions**

In order to highlight the major findings of the first topical area, "content of student evaluation," the percentages of positive answers to individual sub-questions (including the first two response categories, e.g., "quite capable" and "somewhat capable") were compared for each of the major questions. For the purpose of clarification, the researcher assigned different percentage ranges to various support levels of the subjects. The principle utilized is as follows: 75% or
more positive answers are designated as "high" support level, from 40% to 74% as "moderate," and below 40% as "low."

**Students' capability in answering items.** The present study has found that students' capability in answering evaluation items as perceived by faculty and department chairpersons varies according to the type of questions asked. As shown in Table 25, students' capability in answering items related to teaching skill, teacher-student rapport, and course structure were highly supported by the subjects. Students' judgment concerning the categories of workload, impact on students, and grading and examinations were confirmed by a moderate percentage of interviewees. Instructors' knowledge of subject and global ratings were the two categories which fell in the low support level.
### TABLE 25

STUDENTS' CAPABILITY IN ANSWERING EACH CATEGORY OF ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Items</th>
<th>% of Positive Responses</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching skill</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student rapport</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course structure</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on students</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading &amp; exams</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global ratings</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Positive responses included answers classified as "quite capable and "somewhat capable."

**Usefulness of items to teachers.** Table 26 displays the usefulness of the eight dimensions to teachers. As can be seen in the table, none of the eight categories was highly supported by the subjects as useful. The first six categories fell in the moderate support level. They are course structure, teaching skill, teacher-student rapport, impact on students, grading and examinations, and workload. The other two categories, knowledge of subject and global ratings, were considered helpful only by a limited percentage of interviewees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Items</th>
<th>% of Positive Responses</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course structure</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching skill</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student rapport</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on students</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading &amp; exams</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global ratings</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Positive responses included answers classified as "quite useful" and "somewhat useful."

Usefulness of items to departments. Table 27 lists summarized information regarding the usefulness of each category of items to departments. It should be noted that the phrase "usefulness to departments" was not limited to decisions concerning the reappointment and promotion of faculty members. It also involved the improvement of instructors' teaching, the improvement of programs, etc., according to the interview conversations of department chairpersons.
TABLE 27

USEFULNESS OF EACH CATEGORY OF ITEMS TO DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Items</th>
<th>% of Positive Responses</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course structure</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching skill</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student rapport</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on students</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading &amp; exams</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global ratings</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Positive responses included answers classified as "quite useful" and "somewhat useful."

As shown in Table 27, two categories, course structure and teaching skill, were considered useful to departments by a high percentage of respondents. Only one category, knowledge of subject, fell in low support level. The usefulness of the other five dimensions to departments were confirmed by a moderate percentage of department chairpersons.

Appropriateness of items. Summarized information concerning the appropriateness of each category of items is displayed in Table 28. As can be seen in the table, the first three categories of items--course structure, teaching skill, and teacher-student rapport--were supported
by three-fourths or more of the subjects. Items related to impact on students, workload, and grading and examinations fell in the moderate support level. The other two categories—knowledge of subjects and global ratings—were considered appropriate by only a limited number of subjects.

**TABLE 28**

**APPROPRIATENESS OF EACH CATEGORY OF ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Items</th>
<th>% of Positive Responses</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course structure</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching skill</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student rapport</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on students</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading &amp; exams</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global ratings</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Positive responses included answers classified as "quite appropriate" and "appropriate."
Subjects' opinions regarding individual categories of items

Knowledge of subject. Knowledge of subject is an important characteristic of good teachers. This has been verified by many researchers (e.g., Cole, 1940; Feldman, 1976a; Wotruba & Wright, 1975). However, very few studies have found it to be a factor appearing in common student evaluation forms. It is probably because students are not thought to be in a good position to evaluate instructors' knowledge of subject. As mentioned earlier, items related to teachers' knowledge of subject were, however, included on the Tamkang form, so the category was discussed in the interviews. Unsurprisingly, the present study has found that the majority of the subjects believed students were not capable of judging instructors' knowledge of subject.

TABLE 29

STUDENTS' CAPABILITY IN ANSWERING KNOWLEDGE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite capable</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat capable</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost incapable</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
<td>20 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: One subject contended that students were not able to evaluate an instructor's year-long performance in a questionnaire within a few minutes, regardless of the content of questions asked. His answer to each sub-question was thus coded as "need not ask."
As displayed in Table 29, no subjects thought that students were "quite capable" of answering such questions. Over 60% of the interviewees believed that students were "almost incapable" of judging instructor's knowledge of subjects.

The person who evaluates ought to be more experienced or knowledgeable than the one being evaluated. Singing competition is one example. However, it is just the opposite in the university. Students, who have no ability at all, are asked to judge professor's knowledge of subject. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Students answer this kind of question merely based on how much they have learned. If they have learned a lot, they will rate the professor as highly knowledgeable. However, giving lectures which are easy to learn does not necessarily mean that the knowledge level of the instructor is high. It also reflects the teaching skill and experience of the instructor. (Science/Engineering department chairperson)

Some subjects also mentioned that college students generally do not know about professors' publications, a sample item listed under the dimension of subject knowledge.

Sometimes an instructor's subject knowledge cannot be fully presented in a course. ... Students just start to learn from the instructor; it would be very difficult for them to judge his knowledge of subject. As to publications of professors. ... The course which a professor offers is not necessarily what he specializes, especially those courses required by the Ministry of Education. In this case, the publications of the professor may not relate to the course itself [and students won't know about them]. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

We often wonder why certain questions are listed on the evaluation form. For example, students are asked whether or not the professor publishes frequently. The problem is. ... It is better to ask graduate students such a question than to ask undergraduates, since the latter usually do not pay attention to this [professor's publications]. Is the question formulated just as a check to locate those students who fill out the forms casually? ... If the purpose is to keep records of faculty's publication, the institution may ask the faculty members directly. Why bother to ask students? ...
As to the question of subject knowledge . . . at least half of the students are not able to judge what the instructor taught is good or bad until they have taken advanced courses in the same area. . . . Generally speaking, students do not have such an ability. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

About one-third of the interviewees believed that students were "somewhat capable" of answering this category of items. In other words, their opinions were positive but with some reservations.

From taking the course, students are able to know whether or not the instructor knows his subject thoroughly. They can also know whether or not he keeps current with development in his field. . . . Undergraduates have no source of information regarding instructor's publication unless the instructor tells them or shows to them. . . . Once when students were completing the evaluation form in my class, some of them asked me directly, "professor, do you have any publication?" . . . It was hard for me to answer, and I replied, "you need to fill out this form based on your own judgment. I am not supposed to explain anything to you." As a result, some students just left the item blank. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

The present study has also found that generally students' opinions regarding instructor's subject knowledge were not considered useful to teachers. As shown in Table 30, no subjects considered such items "quite useful," and only approximately one-third of them believed that these items were "somewhat useful" to teachers. This was also the case in the opinions of department chairpersons regarding the usefulness of knowledge items to their departments (see Table 31).
## TABLE 30

**USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING KNOWLEDGE ITEMS TO TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
<td>21 (65.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TABLE 31

**USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING KNOWLEDGE ITEMS TO DEPARTMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Only department chairpersons were asked this sub-question.
Comparing Table 29, 30, and 31, we can find that those who believed students were somewhat capable of answering knowledge items also considered these items somewhat useful to teachers or departments. In the meanwhile, their answers concerning the appropriateness of these items were still positive. The only exception is one faculty member who thought such items were "inappropriate" because teachers themselves knew better than students in this aspect. The frequency and percentage of subjects' responses regarding the appropriateness of including the knowledge items in the evaluation form are shown in Table 32.

**TABLE 32**

**APPROPRIATENESS OF KNOWLEDGE ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite appropriate</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
<td>21 (65.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Structure**

The opinions of subjects regarding students' capability of answering questions related to the dimension of course structure are quite positive.
As shown in Table 33, more than 50% of the interviewees, either department chairpersons or faculty members, considered students "quite capable" of answering structure items. In general, these subjects felt that such items were specific enough to be answered by the students.

I think more than 90% of the college students can judge [this type of question], although I dare not say 100% of them have the ability. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

Students have sufficient ability to answer these questions. It is because questions concerning the organization of the course, preparation for the class, or spending of class time are very specific. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

Twenty-eight percent of the subjects answered affirmatively but with some reservations regarding students' ability to judge course structure items.
Anyway the instructors have learned the subject matter already . . . while the students have just started to learn the course. . . . Students' evaluation can only represent the perspectives of students. It cannot reflect the real situation of the arrangement of subject matter. As to the instructor's preparation for the course, I believe that students have that kind of feeling. . . . (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

It would be easy for students to judge the soundness of course organization. . . . Students are also clear about whether class time is well spent. . . . Generally, students accept all that the instructor taught; they are not able to find out the level of preparation of the instructor, unless the instructor did not prepare at all, and just tries to kill time. However, this is an extreme case. . . . I don't think students have the ability to tell well-prepared classes from those classes where the instructor's preparation is only to a limited extent. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

Two faculty members' opinions were classified as "other." One of them reported that freshmen did not have the ability to judge course structure items because they were accustomed to the schooling before college, in which almost every course followed one textbook; while students after the first year would possess such ability after one year of training. The other believed that those students who cut class frequently were not able to judge since they did not know much about the course and the instructor.

Only a very small number of subjects thought that students were not able to answer questions regarding course structure. They pointed out either that these items were subjective and difficult to answer, or that most students did not work hard, and therefore were not capable of judging.
TABLE 34
USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING STRUCTURE ITEMS TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the usefulness of structure items to teachers, responses of the interviewees were also mostly positive (see Table 34). Nearly 40% of the subjects believed that students' opinions concerning course structure were "quite useful" to teachers.

These opinions are helpful to teachers. There is a gap between teaching and learning, and we can narrow the gap based on students' responses. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Students' opinions in this aspect are a very good source of information [to teachers]. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

About one-third of the interviews reported that students' responses to structure items were "somewhat useful" to teachers. A few of these people believed that these items would alert or remind the instructor to be careful in preparing the course material and spending...
of class time. Others thought that students' opinions in this regard could help teachers to a limited extent.

Answers of three subjects were coded as "almost useless." One stated that it would be too late for teachers to change the course structure when they were aware of the results of student evaluation. Another believed that teachers themselves knew whether or not the course was well organized and there was no need to ask students. The other mentioned that the reports of student evaluation which teachers received did not provide each evaluation item, and therefore students' opinions on individual items did not benefit teachers.

Department chairpersons' viewpoints regarding the usefulness of students' opinions related to course structure are also positive in general (see Table 35).

TABLE 35
USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING STRUCTURE ITEMS TO DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>6 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Only department chairpersons were asked this sub-question.
As shown in Table 35, three-fourths of the department chairpersons confirmed the usefulness of structure items to departments without any reservations.

The department chairpersons also receive a copy of the student evaluation report. . . . If they find anything unusual, they may talk with students [about the problem], then discuss with the faculty members. . . . In the department meeting, we often discuss how to raise the motivation of students . . . including arrangement of course material, preparation for the class, etc. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

In deciding the reappointment of faculty members, the department chairperson takes into consideration the student evaluation results including the soundness of teaching methods, subject matter. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

We can understand the response of the students [through evaluation], and we hope that the faculty member can change. If he or she does not change, we need to solve the problem. As administrators, we cannot discuss this in public. We will make efforts through private channels with an expectation that the teacher will change. . . . (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

As to the appropriateness of structure items, the responses of four subjects were coded as "need not ask," since they thought students were incapable of answering these items. Except for these four, all of the other interviewees are positive about the inclusion of structure items in student evaluation forms (see Table 36). Since most subjects responded positively to the previous three questions, such favorable attitudes toward the appropriateness of these items are almost predictable.
Teacher-student rapport. As stated in Chapter two, teacher-student rapport is a dimension frequently found in common student evaluation forms. As shown in Table 37, the majority of the interviewees, either department chairpersons or faculty members, agreed that students were "quite capable" in answering rapport questions.

I think they [students] can answer these items accurately. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

These items are very good. . . . I think students are able to answer. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Students can answer these questions according to their own feeling. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

I think students' responses [to rapport items] reflect the real situation. . . . It is out of question. . . . (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

About 20% of the subjects, although responded positively, held some reservations.
I feel that college students in Taiwan usually do not ask questions, neither express their opinions voluntarily. Therefore, I have some reservations on this sample item [requesting whether students feel free to ask questions or express opinions]. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

If students never try to contact instructors after class, how could they know whether or not instructors are accessible to students out of class? You cannot get correct information from these students. Other sample items are all right. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

Only a few subjects believed that students' responses to rapport items were subjective and could possibly be affected by the grades they received (see Table 37).

### TABLE 37

**STUDENTS' CAPABILITY IN ANSWERING RAPPORT ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite capable</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
<td>20 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat capable</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost incapable</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects' opinions regarding the usefulness of rapport items to teachers were largely positive, although not as strong as those concerning students' capability in answering these items (see Table 38).
It can be found that quite a few subjects who considered students very capable of answering rapport items did not think such opinions were very useful to teachers. Some of them reported that students' opinions in this regard would help instructors only to a limited extent, since it was not so easy to change teacher-student relationship. Responses of this kind were coded as "somewhat useful." Some believed that the usefulness of rapport items varied according to the personality of the instructor. To be specific, changing attitudes toward students to improve teacher-student relationship was only possible for people with a certain kind of personality. Responses such as this were coded as "other."
Only three subjects answered negatively. The following quotation expresses the opinions of these people.

Students' responses can only give the instructor an impression, i.e., what students think of them . . . . It is impossible to change the natural disposition of the instructor through student evaluation. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

The usefulness of students' opinions regarding rapport items to departments was summarized in Table 39. The answers of department chairpersons seemed to reflect different philosophies concerning the rights of faculty and the role of chairperson. In general, those who viewed students' opinions about rapport items as useful based their answers on the reason that department chairpersons had the responsibility to improve teacher-student relationship and students' opinions contributed to such improvement. Those who gave non-positive answers, however, maintained that instructors' own way of dealing with students must be honored.

**TABLE 39**

**USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING RAPPORT ITEMS TO DEPARTMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 (100.0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Only department chairpersons were asked this sub-question.
Having discussed the usefulness of students' opinions related to teacher-student relationship, the interviewees were asked the appropriateness of including this category of items in student evaluations. Table 40 displays the frequency and percentage of coded answers to this question.

TABLE 40
APPROPRIATENESS OF RAPPORT ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite appropriate</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>14 (58.3%)</td>
<td>22 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 40, five interviewees who did not think students were capable of answering the rapport items were classified as "need not ask." Except for this, most of the interviewees thought the rapport items were "appropriate" in student evaluation forms.

I think these items can be included. They do not hurt anyone. . . . One usually cannot see everything about himself. He especially cannot know what the expectation of him by so many people. . . . These items can help instructors know the expectation of these people [students]. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)
I think these items can be listed [in student rating forms]. They must be as concrete as possible. For example, "feel free to ask questions or express opinions" is a very concrete item. But items such as "instructor was friendly toward students" are more abstract, and more ambiguous. . . . It is very possible that two people feel or think differently on the same attitude [of the instructor]. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

I think the item "students feel free to ask questions" can be omitted [because students usually do not ask questions]. Items related to teachers' attitudes, or whether the instructor is actively helpful to students, are appropriate. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

Teaching skill. The fourth dimension of student evaluation discussed in the first topical area was teaching skill. Table 41 displays the frequency and percentage for subjects' responses to the question of students' capability in answering skill items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite capable</td>
<td>6 (75.0%)</td>
<td>12 (50.0%)</td>
<td>18 (56.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat capable</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost incapable</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 41, the majority of the subjects believed that students were "quite capable" of answering skill items.
They [students] can answer because it [teaching skill] is a fact. . . . (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

I think . . . students can answer clearly. The four sample items are very concrete. They [students] are able to know whether those statements are true or not. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

This [teaching skill] can be judged [by students] . . . . I should say that it [students' judgment] is 100% correct. It is because nowadays students are very smart. If your teaching skill is not good, students will not come to your class. Instead they sit in the class of another professor who teaches the same course. . . . It is hard for the department chairperson to handle this situation. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

This [teaching skill] relates to whether or not students understand the course material. As long as they understand the material, and they have learned something, their responses to the skill items must be positive . . . regardless of their academic qualifications. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

About 30% of the interviews responded positively but with some reservations.

Students are able to answer first sample item "instructor used examples to clarify the material." They also know exactly whether or not the instructor spoke clearly. There should be no problem with the fourth item, "instructor summarized major points in lectures." Only the third item, "instructor presented material clearly," relates to the academic qualification of students. Sometime a less qualified student may feel that the instructor did not present course material clearly. Actually, the instructor wants the students to ponder over something themselves; so he skips those points on purpose. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

The first item ["instructor used examples to clarify the material"] can be included [in the evaluation form]. . . . Students can have the feeling whether the instructor spoke clearly, and so on. However, the item "instructor presented material clearly" is questionable. It is because students are of different qualifications. Good students may think that the instructor has explained the material clearly enough, and is still wasting time to repeat the same points; however, the less qualified students may consider such repetition necessary. . . . Therefore, the item "instructor presented material clearly" can only be used as an indicator of student's qualification by the instructor. (Sciences/Engineering professor)
TABLE 42
USEFULNESS OF STUDENT OPINIONS REGARDING
SKILL ITEMS TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The usefulness of students' opinions regarding teaching skill to teachers was less strongly supported by the subjects than students' capability in answering those items.

Although the majority of the subjects answered positively, six interviewees gave negative responses (see Table 42). In general, those who viewed teaching skill as improvable believed that students' opinions in this regard were useful to teachers. Quite a few of them held reservations on the improvability of certain teaching skills. Their answers were coded as "somewhat useful." For example, many subjects mentioned that the item "instructor spoke clearly" did not help those professors with strong accents. Interestingly enough, the two subjects of this study who had strong accents reported that the above item was useful to them. One stated that this specific item
alerted teachers to repress their accent, and practice speaking as correctly as possible. Another said that the accent was a defect, but he tried to make students understand him better by writing key words on the blackboard. Both of them considered student opinions regarding teaching skill "quite useful" to teachers.

Those whose answers were coded as "almost useless" based their arguments on different grounds. One reported that unless the university offered training on teaching methods, it would be difficult for instructors themselves to improve. Another mentioned that no instructors used exactly the same method to teach, and that a method useful to one instructor was not necessarily suitable for another. Other negative opinions can be represented by the following quotation:

In fact you may change something like course structure. However, it is very hard to improve your teaching skill. . . . Even though the instructors want to change, they are limited by their own ability. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Department chairpersons' viewpoints concerning the usefulness of skill items to departments were mostly positive (see Table 43).
TABLE 43
USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING SKILL ITEMS TO DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Only department chairpersons were asked this sub-question.

In general, those who considered students' opinions regarding teaching skills useful were the chairpersons who tried to help faculty members to improve their teaching methods, either directly or indirectly. On the other hand, the one whose answer was negative maintained that teaching was an art which had no criteria at all, and could not be taught or improved.

Although several subjects were negative about the usefulness of student opinions regarding teaching skill, some of them reported that it was all right to include skill items in student evaluation forms. Only two people considered such items "inappropriate" (see Table 44).
TABLE 44

APPROPRIATENESS OF SKILL ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite appropriate</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>6 (75.0%)</td>
<td>14 (58.3%)</td>
<td>20 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workload. Students' capability in answering workload items was also supported by the majority of the subjects (see Table 45).

TABLE 45

STUDENTS' CAPABILITY IN ANSWERING WORKLOAD ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite capable</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>13 (54.2%)</td>
<td>17 (53.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat capable</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost incapable</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 45, more than 50% of the interviewees believed that students were "quite capable" in answering workload questions. In general, these people thought course workload directly affected students and there was no problem for students to report their own feelings about it.

About 20% of the interviewees considered students "somewhat capable" of answering workload items. Their opinions were also positive, but with some reservations. For example, some were doubtful about the objectivity of students' answers to the sample item concerning reading assignment. Meanwhile, approximately 15% of the respondents gave conditional answers, which were coded as "other." Such subjects tended to believe that only the students who worked hard on the course work were able to answer the items of workload. Another similar viewpoint was that workload items would be meaningful only for the courses related to students' major.
TABLE 46
USEFULNESS OF STUDENT OPINIONS REGARDING WORKLOAD ITEMS TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 46, there was no real consensus among subjects as to the usefulness of students' opinions regarding workload to teachers. About 12% of the interviewees gave strong positive answers. They believed that instructors could adjust the course difficulty according to students' opinions expressed in workload items. Thirty-one percent of the answers were coded as "somewhat useful." These people, in general, felt that students' opinions in this regard could help the instructors only to a limited extent. The following quotation is an example:

The reading assignment may be too difficult for students, because the instructor overestimated the level of students. Then he or she may assign readings which are easier. However, if students feel that the workload is heavy compared to other courses . . . this does not help the instructor much . . . . The nature of the courses varies; some are easy, while some are difficult and take time to understand. If students feel that the workload is heavy, some instructors may not be able to
change it since it is the nature of the course. . . .
(Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

About 28% of the interviewees considered students' opinions regarding workload "almost useless" to teachers. Some of them reported that most students expected as light a workload as possible, and that the instructor would not adopt such opinions. Some mentioned that the workload of the course was decided by the department or the university so that the instructor was not able to change it. Still some others believed that the instructor knew the workload of the course without asking students. In addition to the subjects whose answers were classified as "almost useless," 12.5% of the interviewees were assumed to respond negatively, since they did not even think students were able to answer workload questions.

Conditional answers were given by five interviewees and were coded as "other." In general, they thought that students' opinions on workload items would be useful to a certain kind of instructor, while useless to another kind of professor.

This [the usefulness of student opinions regarding workload] depends. Some instructors will reduce the workload if students feel it is too heavy. Some will not accept students' opinions. They may even increase the workload. Therefore, the usefulness to teachers varies. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Table 47 sums up the usefulness of student opinions regarding workload to departments as reported by the group of department chairpersons.
TABLE 47
USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING
REGARDING WORKLOAD ITEMS TO DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Only department chairpersons were asked this sub-question.

Students' opinions concerning course workload seemed to be more useful to departments than to teachers. As shown in Table 47, 62.5% of the department chairpersons considered students' opinions in this regard "quite useful" to departments.

If we find that the workload is too heavy, we need to trace the reason. Is it because the instructor is too demanding, or the instructor overestimates students' qualifications? . . . (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

If the workload is found to be too light, we need to review the course and discuss. . . . We may want to adjust the course content, or the class hours may be shortened if necessary. . . . (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

When designing a program for students, these opinions are helpful. . . . For example, if the workloads of several junior courses are found to be heavy, we will try to rearrange them a little bit, say, offer one of those courses in the sophomore or senior year. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Three department chairpersons thought students' opinions regarding workload were "almost useless" to the department. One of them stated
that the department had already known the workload of each course it offered. The other two reported that their departments never took into account such opinions in deciding the course workload.

When asked about the appropriateness of including workload items in student evaluation forms, the majority of the subjects responded positively. As shown in Table 48, over 60% of the answers were coded as "quite appropriate" or "somewhat appropriate." These people generally agreed that such items would provide some desirable information, regardless how useful the information was. Only three people considered workload items "inappropriate."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite appropriate</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>14 (58.3%)</td>
<td>17 (53.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five subjects believed that workload items were appropriate under a certain condition, while inappropriate under another condition. Such answers were coded as "other."
Whether or not these items are appropriate depends on the purpose of the evaluation form. If the form is used to grade teachers...it is not necessary to include these items. If the purpose is to provide instructors with some information about students' learning, these items are very good.... In fact, the teaching effectiveness of instructors should not be based on these [workload items]. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

If the student evaluation is administered and used by the instructor only, I will one hundred percent approve [the inclusion of workload items]. If the university wants to get some information from the evaluation form.... I am afraid that there will be an undesirable effect.... For example, if the students think the workload of a course is not heavy in relation to other courses, the instructor of the course may want to increase the workload.... since these items imply what teachers should do.... Finally, students will be overloaded. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

It seemed that the function of workload items was not very clear to some subjects. The following quotation shows a contradictory viewpoint to the previous one:

The four sample items here give me a feeling that heavy workload or difficult reading assignment...is undesirable.... In fact, I think different people will have different views on this [whether heavy workload is good or not].... Here the items imply that pushing students too hard is not good.... I think such implication is questionable. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

In short, the implication of workload items to the two faculty members was totally different. One felt that the items suggested that the instructor push students as hard as possible, while another thought that those items discouraged the instructor from being demanding.
Grading and examinations. There was less agreement among the subjects about students' capability in answering items related to grading and examination. The responses of most subjects scattered into the first three coding categories: "quite capable," "somewhat capable," and "almost incapable," with a percentage of 22, 38, and 28, respectively (see Table 49).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite capable</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat capable</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost incapable</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>7 (28.1%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (9.4%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects who believed that students were quite capable of answering grading and examination items usually gave succinct positive responses. Some of the interviewees whose answers were classified as "somewhat capable" held reservations on students' ability to judge whether examinations reflected the important aspects of the course.
Some reported that it would be difficult for students to make such judgment before the final examination was administered.

Usually students completed those evaluation forms before the final examination. . . . It is the most important examination. . . . Students can only respond to the items according to mid-term exam and quizzes. . . . The final grade has not been released. . . . They could not know the fairness of the grades [for the whole semester]. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Students are able to answer objectively. However, . . . the student evaluation is administered before the end of the semester. . . . Therefore, it would be difficult for them to answer items related to grades. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Nine interviewees thought that students were almost incapable of answering grading items. The following quotations express their points of view.

If the students did not do well on the examination, they may retaliate against the instructor. . . . [They thought] the failure is because the examination did not reflect the major aspects of the course, or the instructor was partial. . . . Such opinions cannot be objective. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

It is human nature. The higher grade [the student gets] the better [the instructor is]. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

I don't think students can judge whether the examination reflected the major aspects of the course . . . because they are not experts. . . . They are in the process of learning. Only teachers can understand what are the major aspects of the course. . . . Every instructor has his own grading criterion. . . . Students often predict their scores incorrectly. . . . They thought they would get high scores, actually they failed the examination. . . . Then they argued with the instructor. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Interviewees' opinions regarding the usefulness of students' responses to grading items are summarized in Tables 50 and 51.
TABLE 50
USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING GRADING ITEMS TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 51
USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING GRADING ITEMS TO DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Only department chairpersons were asked this sub-question.
It can be found that the number of positive responses ("quite useful" and "somewhat useful") are approximately equal to that of negative ones ("almost useless" and "need not ask") in both tables. In other words, the interviewees split in their viewpoints concerning the usefulness of grading items, either to teachers or to departments.

The coded responses of subjects to the appropriateness of grading items are displayed in Table 52. As shown in the table, only one person considered grading items "quite appropriate." About 40% of the interviewees believed the inclusion of such items in student evaluation forms was "appropriate." People with answers coded as "inappropriate" and "need not ask" comprised of 12% and 31% of the subjects, respectively. In other words, 43% of the subjects were negative about the appropriateness of grading items, almost the same as the percentage of people who took positive positions. Another 4 persons gave uncertain or conditional answers and were coded as "other."

**TABLE 52**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite appropriate</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
<td>13 (40.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>10 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact on students. The seventh dimension of student evaluation questionnaires discussed in the first topical area was "impact on students." As shown in Table 53, nearly 60% of the subjects answered positively without any reservations. About 9% of the responses were coded as "somewhat capable." Combining these two categories, it was found that over two-thirds of the interviewees were positive about students' capability in answering impact items.

**TABLE 53**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite capable</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>14 (58.3%)</td>
<td>19 (59.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat capable</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost incapable</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opinions of some subjects who considered students were "almost incapable" merit attention. One department chairperson reported:

Students, in general, take courses for earning a degree rather than for their own interests, especially lower-class students. As to higher-class students, I think... about ten percent of them take courses for their own interests. Only these students know what they have learned... Students' judgment [on impact items] will be more subjective and inaccurate. ... We offer many required courses... Students tend to answer [impact items] negatively because too much is demanded of them... They do not think they had
learned anything. . . . Is it true? I doubt. (Sciences/ Engineering department chairperson)

Another similar opinion was that most Tamkang students were less qualified and did not work hard; therefore, their answers to these questions were undependable.

A few subjects mentioned that students' capability in answering impact items depended on the nature of the subject. These answers were coded as "other." For example, one interviewee maintained that certain subjects were dull and hardly appealing to students. Students of such courses tended to give negative answers to the impact items; however, this was not the fault of the instructor. Another subject reported that students of certain general courses required by the Ministry of Education usually just wanted to pass the course without making any effort, and their answers to the impact items would not be dependable.

Table 54 summarizes the usefulness of students' opinions regarding impact items to teachers. Half of the subjects believed such opinions were "quite useful." In general, they viewed students' opinions in this regard as overall feedback to instructors' teaching.

I think they [students' opinions] help [teachers] a great deal. If the students . . . become very interested in the course and want to take more work in that area, the instructor will be highly encouraged. . . . This is almost a rating of instructors' overall performance. . . . If students respond poorly to impact items, the instructor needs to review the course and his performance . . . and find out the problems. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

This [students' opinions in this regard] can be an evaluation of your teaching. You can find out whether students understand what you have taught, or whether they have learned a lot. . . . On the other hand, such opinions may also reflect whether the textbook is good or not. If the textbook is poorly written, students' accomplishment in the course will be lower. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)
TABLE 54
USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING IMPACT ITEMS TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>12 (50.0%)</td>
<td>10 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the answers were coded as "almost useless." Such people maintained that impact items reflected students' own learning which had little to do with the instructor. Another six opinions were assumed to be negative, since they believed that students were almost incapable of answering impact items.

About 16% of the answers were classified as "other." One subject reported that students' opinions regarding impact items were useful to instructors of courses related to students' major, while useless to those of courses outside students' major. Another maintained that instructors of courses which were dull in themselves could not benefit from such opinions, while teachers of more interesting courses could benefit. These opinions apparently connected to their viewpoints regarding students' capability in answering these items. Another common argument was that instructors would be inspired if students
responded positively to impact items, while discouraged if they responded negatively.

The group of department chairpersons were further asked about the usefulness of students' opinions regarding course impact to departments. Over 60% of them answered positively without any reservations (see Table 55). In general, they found that such opinions reflected the popularity of the courses and could be used as a basis for revising the program. However, one department chairperson maintained that such opinions were useful only when electives were concerned. He reported as follows:

If these opinions are about electives . . . students are interested in the course, we may offer this popular elective every semester. . . . Therefore, they [students' opinions] can affect whether the elective is offered or not. . . . We will not try to change the way the instructor teaches the course. If the course is required, such opinions are not useful at all.

(Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

| TABLE 55 |
| USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING IMPACT ITEMS TO DEPARTMENTS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 56 shows the responses of subjects regarding the appropriateness of impact items. It can be found that such items were supported by the majority of the interviewees. Except for six people who were assumed to be negative because they did not think students were capable of answering impact items, only one believed that such items were inappropriate for inclusion in the student evaluation form.

**TABLE 56**

**APPROPRIATENESS OF IMPACT ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite appropriate</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>12 (50.0%)</td>
<td>16 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (18.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global ratings. Global ratings are items which aim at evaluating the overall effectiveness of the instructor or the course. They are often used in American student evaluation forms for summative purpose. This category of items is not included in the current Tamkang form, although it appeared in the former questionnaire. The present study has shown that such items were rejected by the majority of the interviewees (see Table 57).
As shown in Table 57, less than 10% of the subjects considered students were "quite capable" of answering global rating items. These people generally thought that students had direct feelings about the overall effectiveness of the instructor or the course. One-fourth of the interviewees answered positively but with some reservations. The following quotation is an example:

Students are able to answer [global items], but you need to give them definition for those response categories, such as "excellent," "good," etc. Otherwise they may not answer properly. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

Over 50% of the subjects believed that students were almost incapable of answering global items. The opinions of these people can roughly be divided into several types. Some of these subjects believed that global ratings by students would be biased by other factors.
I feel that students' ability [in answering global items] is not sufficient. Such ability is also affected by their experience in being graded. Students have no experience in grading others. They have always been graded. . . . Since they seldom get perfect scores, they hardly grade teachers as perfect. . . . In addition, students dare not rate prestigious professors, senior professors, or professors with many publications, because the students feel that they are not qualified to evaluate such professors. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

Sometimes the instructor himself is good, but teaches poorly. Students may still rate him high. . . . They mix instructor's teaching performance with his personality. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

Students are not knowledgeable. How can they rate instructors' overall performance? This can only be done by colleagues in the same field. . . . Usually if the instructor grades leniently, he will be rated high by students. This seems to be the case in other countries, too. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Students cannot be objective. Their opinions [regarding global items] are biased by the instructor's grading policy. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

One interviewee believed that students were not able to answer global items due to the lack of references.

It would be better to evaluate the overall performance [of teachers] by another person, another educational agency, or another group of experts. I think that students do not have such ability. . . . They only take the course with one instructor. . . . Unless the students have taken the same course with three different instructors, they are not able to rate the overall performance of the instructor. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

A few subjects maintained that overall ratings had to be obtained by some way more complex.

If you ask students specifically, say, whether class time is well spent, they can answer the question according to the fact. At the end you ask whether the instructor teaches effectively. They may answer from their general impression of the teacher which is emotional. . . . Such answers are
questionable. . . . In fact they don't have the ability to evaluate instructors' overall performance. Even the person who is in charge of the student evaluation is not able to find out [the overall performance of an instructor] by just collecting students' ratings. All data needs to be analyzed thoroughly by the computer. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

In general, American students are more objective, although some of them are not. . . . Chinese students, I feel, hardly communicate with the instructor during the semester. But at certain times, e. g., when student evaluation is administered, they do respond in a certain way. . . . Some of them are opposed to the instructor. . . . For example, if students have done well, they may be more objective. However, if they are almost flunked, they may intentionally rate the instructor's overall performance as "poor" in order to defend themselves. . . . Generally speaking, global items are more subjective . . . we may skillfully define several factors and find out the overall performance ourselves instead of asking those completing the evaluation forms. It is because they do not know which items are more important than others. . . . (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

When rating the global performance of an instructor . . . the designer of the questionnaire need to specify a certain points for each item . . . and the overall ratings can be obtained by calculating those numbers. Such results are more accurate [than collecting students' responsive to global items]. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

Some interviewees responded negatively by emphasizing the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers without further discussing students' incapability in answering these items.

It is better not to "grade" teachers. This will hurt their dignity. . . . Students may not be able to answer global rating items. The instructor who is good in every aspect except for grading students rigorously may possibly be rated as "poor" by students. This is . . . against the principle of respecting teachers. The goal of education cannot be achieved this way. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

In schools it is the teachers that rate students as "excellent," "good," etc. If we let students rate teachers in the same way, teachers and students will be of equal status. This is absolutely against the tradition of respecting teachers. . . . The most controversial items in student
evaluation are global ratings. . . . Students' answers may not be true. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Subjects' opinions regarding the usefulness of global items to teachers were largely negative (see Table 58). As shown in Table 58, only 3 interviewees felt that students' opinions concerning instructors' overall performance were "quite useful" to teachers. About 16% of the subjects considered such opinions "somewhat useful" to teachers.

The average [of global ratings] can be a source of information, although it may not be very accurate. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

If you rate me as "good," I may just follow the way I taught before. However, if you rate me as "poor," I will not know why I am poor. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

Three of the subjects responded that students' capability in answering global items were "somewhat useful" or "other." They thought students' opinions were "almost useless" to teachers. They reported that global rating items did not provide teachers with any specific information. Nearly 60% of the responses were assumed to be negative and were coded as "need not ask." By combining this category with the previous one, "almost useless," it is found that over two-thirds of the interviewees were negative about the usefulness of global rating items to teachers.
TABLE 58
USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING GLOBAL ITEMS TO TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
<td>19 (59.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The usefulness of students' opinions regarding global items to departments is summarized in Table 59.

Those department chairpersons whose answers were coded as "quite useful" reported that such information was helpful in deciding the reappointment of faculty members. Two department chairpersons believed that students' responses were "somewhat useful" to departments. One of them maintained that such global ratings were taken into account only in the reappointment of part-time faculty members; they did not affect full-time faculty except in extreme cases. Another mentioned that students' opinions in this regard helped the department to know the overall performance of its faculty members only to a certain degree. The one whose answer was classified as "almost useless" stated that
global items did not offer any concrete information and the department could not do anything with it.

**TABLE 59**

**USEFULNESS OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS REGARDING GLOBAL ITEMS TO DEPARTMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Only department chairpersons were asked this sub-question.

Subjects' opinions regarding the appropriateness of global items are summarized in Table 60. As indicated in this table, only one-fourth of the subjects thought that such items were "quite appropriate." On the other hand, over 70% of the responses were negative, which reflects that interviewees generally do not support the inclusion of global rating items in the student evaluation form.
TABLE 60
APPROPRIATENESS OF GLOBAL ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite appropriate</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need not ask</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
<td>19 (59.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.1%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other findings

In addition to the eight categories interviewees were asked to give additional opinions regarding the evaluation items. Twenty-one subjects responded to this supplementary question.

Some interviewees mentioned that the item asking if the instructor spoke humorously was undesirable. They thought that such a trait reflected the personality of the instructor and had nothing to do with effective teaching.

Four subjects suggested that open-ended or essay-type questions be added at the end of the evaluation form so students can express their opinions freely. A few subjects proposed different items be formulated to meet the needs of different fields or colleges instead of using a uniform instrument throughout the university. Other supplementary opinions suggested by only one or two interviewees are omitted here.
Second Topical Area of Interview:  
Usage of Student Evaluation

The second topical area discussed in the interview was the usage of student evaluation. The first two questions solicited preferences about uses of student evaluation data and about persons eligible to utilize these results. The next three questions dealt with individual uses of student evaluation found in the literature, including teaching improvement, personnel decisions, and student course selection. A supplementary question was asked at the end to seek additional information. The results of this second topical area are discussed according to the sequence in which questions were asked.

Preferences about uses of student evaluation

Before discussing any specific usage of student evaluation, interviewees were asked for what purposes they thought student evaluation should be used. Table 61 displays the frequency and percentage of different uses mentioned by the subjects. It can be found that most people (87.5%) mentioned the use for teaching improvement, while only one-third of the interviewees suggested the use for personnel decisions. Other usages, supported by a limited number of subjects, included the improvement of the program, the improvement of teaching-learning environment, etc.
TABLE 61

USAGE OF STUDENT EVALUATION MENTIONED BY SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of teaching</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>20 (83.3%)</td>
<td>28 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of the program</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of teaching-learning</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel decisions</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preferences about persons utilizing the results

When asked to state persons eligible to utilize the evaluation results, about 90% of the subjects mentioned "faculty being evaluated," 75% mentioned department chairpersons, and 44% mentioned president of the university. This was followed by school deans (38%), deans of academic affairs (34%), vice president for academic affairs (19%), and personnel committees (19%) (see Table 62). In the meanwhile, five persons contended that the evaluation results could be open to the public. This was included in the coding category "other."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>10 (41.7%)</td>
<td>14 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. president for aca. affairs</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of aca. affairs</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School dean</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. chairperson</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
<td>24 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty being evaluated</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>21 (87.5%)</td>
<td>29 (90.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel committee</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 63

OPINIONS REGARDING THE USE OF STUDENT EVALUATION
FOR TEACHING IMPROVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly approve</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>9 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>11 (45.8%)</td>
<td>14 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither approve nor disapprove</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disapprove</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use for teaching improvement**

In order to further ascertain subject's attitudes toward different uses of student evaluation, four more questions were asked. Table 63 shows the coded responses of subjects to the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement. Nearly 30% of the interviewees strongly supported the use for teaching improvement.

I feel it is very helpful. You know that traditionally Chinese professors possess the highest status in the classroom; they are unapproachable. . . . When Tamkang implemented student evaluation, many faculty members were opposed to it. . . . But the university did not give up. . . . I personally think that the evaluation ought to be adopted. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)
I strongly approve. Students' opinions are useful sources of information regardless of whether they are positive or negative. Even though students complete the form casually, the answers still reflect their subconscious feelings. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

I feel it is very good. . . . Every instructor has his own strengths and weaknesses in teaching. If you know what your strengths are, you can bring them into full play. If you know your weaknesses, you can try to improve. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

Over 40% of the responses were coded as "approve." These answers were positive but not as strong as those in the previous category.

I feel it is worthwhile to do so, although sometimes we found students' responses to be undependable. If the items are well formulated, students won't answer them casually. They answer casually only when they don't understand why the item is listed there. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Students' opinions can be used as one source of information, although teachers need to know students' reactions in class sessions, which is most direct. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Three subjects disapproved the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement based on different reasons. One of them reported that the evaluation was mandatory and thus went against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers. Another mentioned that he did not find the evaluation to be helpful to teachers since students generally answered questions as they pleased. The other's viewpoint was quoted as follows:

Students do not honor this evaluation because it has become a formality. . . . Chinese students generally have a lower ability of independent thinking than American students. . . . Even if students honored such evaluations, and were able to think independently, it would still be impossible for them to rate the year-long performance of an instructor within a few minutes. . . . (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)
Use for personnel decisions

Interviewees were first asked whether the student evaluation at Tamkang had been used for personnel decisions in the past. About two-thirds (66%) of the subjects gave positive answers, 12.5% responded negatively and 21.9% reported that they did not know (see Table 64).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
<td>14 (58.3%)</td>
<td>21 (65.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, department chairpersons answered this question positively without any hesitation, while many faculty members responded based on indirect sources of information and were not very sure about the policy of the university in this aspect. Although the stated purpose of student evaluation appearing on the rating instrument was teaching improvement only, it did not seem to convince the subjects. This was confirmed by the reports of many subjects that the evaluation information had been used for personnel decisions.
Subjects were further asked their opinions regarding the use of student evaluation for personnel decisions. The coded responses of the interviewees to this question are displayed in Table 65. As can be seen in the table, one-half of the subjects were positive about using student evaluation results for personnel decisions, with 9.4% of this group approving this usage strongly. Following are excerpts illustrating the viewpoints of those answers coded as "strongly approve:"

I approve. . . . Teaching is a very important function of a university. The object of teaching is students. . . . Therefore, I think that students are the "boss" of both the university and the department. Other people [such as administration] are hired by the "boss" to run the university. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)
Whether a professor is good or not is decided by two indicators: research and teaching. . . . I personally feel that many college teachers do not value teaching. . . . How much the students have learned has little to do with these teachers. On the other hand, research is more challenging to them. . . . If teaching effectiveness can be considered in personnel decisions, it will be very good. A university is not only a research institution. . . . Transmission of knowledge is its basic function. . . . (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

About 40% of the responses were coded as "approve." In general, these people were positive about the use of student evaluation for personnel decisions, although some of them held slight reservations.

It is all right to do so. . . . Teachers are just like employees of government or factories. A system of evaluation or management is necessary for progress. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

I think it [student evaluation] can be used for personnel decisions as long as it is not used as the only criterion for such decisions. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

The president has the right to use such information [of student evaluation for personnel decisions]. . . . Even though the faculty members are uncomfortable about this, he still has such a right. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

Of course it [student evaluation] can be used as a source of information for personnel decisions. However, the faculty should be given opportunities to defend themselves, or to appeal the case. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

The less emphasis [of student evaluation in determining personnel decisions], the better. . . . It [student evaluation] accounted for 15 percent in the past. . . . I think it was too much. . . . Probably 10 percent is better. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Over one-fourth of the interviewees expressed negative attitudes toward the use of student evaluation for personnel decisions.

I don't approve. . . . The results [of student evaluation] may not be objective, . . . so it is unfair to use them for personnel decisions. . . . Students may subconsciously disrespect the instructors, which would damage
the tradition of venerating teachers.  (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

Those figures [in the student evaluation] do not present any clues for personnel decisions. . . . The evaluation can only provide students responses to the instructors.  (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

There will be an undesirable effect on students' quality. Instructors dare not grade rigorously. . . . It is unfair to those who love teaching passionately. . . . The university stresses elimination of the inferior [by strict grading], but such instructors are rejected [by the university].  (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

Instructors will take a shortcut. . . . They may try to please students by grading leniently. . . . The university will shelter [from unfavorable personnel decisions] those faculty members who were appointed because of their personal relationship with the leadership. . . . Therefore, it is worthless to use student evaluation for personnel decisions. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

This [using student evaluation for personnel decisions] may probably result in an undesirable effect. . . . Those instructors with rigorous grading policies may get poor ratings, while those who try to please students, on the contrary, may be rated higher. . . . Most students merely want to get a degree. Only 10 to 20 percent of the students really want to learn. If the instructor of a senior elective flunks students . . . few students will take this course in the following years. . . . If such a student attitude remains unchanged, it will be unfair to use student evaluation for personnel decisions. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

About 16% of the subjects gave conditional answers. In general, they were positive about using reliable or objective results of student evaluation for personnel decisions. However, they were opposed to using student evaluation information for personnel decisions if its reliability or objectivity was questionable. Another similar opinion was that student evaluation could be used for personnel decisions only
if students took it seriously. One subject held a different point of view:

It is not reasonable [to use student evaluation for personnel decisions] since the evaluation results can hardly be accurate. However, . . . if faculty members were given opportunities to defend themselves, . . . it would be feasible [to use for personnel decisions]. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

Use for student course selection

The third and last use of student evaluation discussed in the second topical area was student course selection. Subjects, in general, were negative about this usage (see Table 66).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lccc}
\hline
\textbf{Response Category} & \textbf{Department Chairperson} & \textbf{Faculty Member} & \textbf{Combined} \\
\hline
Strongly approve & 0 (0.0\%) & 3 (12.5\%) & 3 (9.4\%) \\
Approve & 0 (0.0\%) & 4 (16.7\%) & 4 (12.5\%) \\
Neither approve nor disapprove & 0 (0.0\%) & 0 (0.0\%) & 0 (0.0\%) \\
Disapprove & 7 (87.5\%) & 13 (54.2\%) & 20 (62.5\%) \\
Strongly disapprove & 0 (0.0\%) & 0 (0.0\%) & 0 (0.0\%) \\
Other & 1 (12.5\%) & 4 (16.7\%) & 5 (15.6\%) \\
Total & 8 (100.0\%) & 24 (100.0\%) & 32 (100.0\%) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{OPINIONS REGARDING THE USE OF STUDENT EVALUATION FOR STUDENT COURSE SELECTION}
\end{table}
As indicated in Table 66, less than 20% of the subjects approved the use of student evaluation for student course selection. Following are two excerpts of strong positive opinions.

[Such a use is] very good. Through student evaluation . . . students are able to understand other students' responses to a course before he takes the course . . . . He can decide which courses to take, and will not waste a whole year [to sit in a wrong course]. This can also stimulate the instructors who offer the same course to improve. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

I think it is very good. Students always want to take courses with instructors who teach well and assign grades impartially. Presently they seek the opinions of those students who have taken the course in order to make course selection. It will be more helpful if the information collected through student evaluation is made accessible to them. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Over 60% of the interviewees, on the other hand, did not approve the use of student evaluation for student course selection. A major reason proposed was that students tended to take easy courses instead of good ones.

This is not good. . . . Students in general tend to select so-called "nutritious credits" [effortless courses which are good for accumulating required graduation credits]. . . . If the instructor grades rigorously, students will probably not take his course. (Sciences/Engineering department chairpersons)

A lot of students will crowd into easy courses, while strict courses may be forced to cancel because of insufficient enrollment. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

I haven't thought about such a usage before. . . . If the course is required, students have no choice. If it is elective . . . the question will be whether students should select the subject or the instructor. . . . If two instructors offer the same course and all students want to take a particular one, the other section has to be cancelled. The instructor of the cancelled section may not carry the required teaching load because of this, which is a big problem at private universities. . . . I think it is better not to make student evaluation information accessible to students. (Sciences/Engineering professor)
A few respondents were skeptical about students' ability to utilize evaluation information for course selection.

I feel it is not good . . . especially in our country . . . . Students in general tend to believe everything other people have said, especially if in written form . . . . Such a use of student evaluation may cause unnecessary trouble . . . . For example, instructors may be upset if their ratings are poor [and made known to students]. In addition, students' decisions in selecting courses may be unduly affected by the student evaluation results. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

I feel it is unnecessary to make student rating results accessible to students. Students generally are not able to analyze [the rating information] thoroughly . . . . Perhaps the instructor keeps improving himself. If students merely look at the evaluation results from one or two years ago, it will be unfair to that instructor. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Another type of negative opinion emphasized that the students' responses of one class did not necessarily apply to another class.

Sometimes the instructor's personality or teaching method did not fit the class last year. But it may fit the class this year. . . . I feel the use of student evaluation for student course selection is not good, because the objects of teaching are different. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

It is not good. . . . Sometimes the students are not used to a certain instructor's performance. But this does not mean that the performance is bad. . . . It is probably good to different kinds of students. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Other uses

A supplementary question was asked at the end of the second topical area for additional opinions regarding the usage of student evaluation. Three interviewees maintained that student evaluation should not be used as the only criterion for decisions concerning
faculty reappointments. Another two maintained that student evaluation should not be used as a weapon of retaliation by students. In conclusion, subjects' responses to the supplementary question reflected their concerns about misuses of student evaluation.

Summary

When the subjects freely described their preferred uses of student evaluation, nearly 90% mentioned teaching improvement, about 34% spoke of personnel decisions, while none cited student course selection. When they responded to questions concerning the above three individual uses, more than 70% were positive about the use for teaching improvement, one half approved the use for personnel decisions, and approximately 22% support the use for student course selection. Based on subjects' responses to the above questions, it was found that only the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement was supported by the subjects in general.

Third Topical Area of Interview: Impact of Student Evaluation

The third topical area of the interviews focused on the impact of student evaluation. The first six questions asked subjects' immediate experience with the student evaluation practice at Tamkang University. The next three questions solicited subjects' opinions regarding overall effects of student evaluation on teacher-student relationship, faculty morale, and quality of instruction, respectively. The tenth and last question aimed at collecting additional opinions on the impact of
student evaluation. The results of this topical area are presented based on the order each question was asked.

**Awareness of student evaluation results**

Faculty awareness of the evaluation results seems to be a necessary condition for the student evaluation system to exert its function. Two kinds of student evaluation reports were developed at Tamkang University (Educational Science Institute, 1983). One is to be used by faculty members, and another is for administrative use. In the present study, however, it was found that a substantial proportion of the subjects were not aware of the student evaluation results for some or all of the courses they taught (see Table 67).

**TABLE 67**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of all</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
<td>13 (54.2%)</td>
<td>20 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of some</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>8 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the interviewees received the reports of student evaluation through campus mail. Some did not receive any report, but
reviewed the results of the student evaluation at the department office. Among the above two groups, eight were aware of the results from part of the courses they taught, but were not interested in finding out why the results from the other courses were missing. Another four subjects were totally unaware of the results of student evaluation. Their teaching experience at Tamkang happened to be fewer than three years.

**Individual professors' reactions to the reports of student evaluation from their own classes**

The 28 interviewees who were aware of all or some of the results of student evaluation were further asked their usual reactions to the said results. Table 68 displays the coded answers to this question.

**TABLE 68**

SUBJECTS' REACTIONS TO THE RESULTS OF STUDENT EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness with action</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>4 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness without action</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>10 (50.0%)</td>
<td>14 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read only</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>7 (35.0%)</td>
<td>8 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disregard</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>20 (100.0%)</td>
<td>28 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The four subjects who were not aware of the evaluation results did not answer this question, making a total number of 28.
Approximately two-thirds of the subjects took the results of the student evaluation from their classes seriously. Four of them reported that they did take certain actions when they were aware of the results. The following quotations express their opinions:

First I would find out which items get higher points, and which items get lower points. . . . For those items with low points, I would review my own performance [in those areas] and make needed improvement next semester. For example, if [from the evaluation I learned that] the assignments were too difficult, I would give the students more questions, and let them choose some. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

I would compare the results of student evaluation this year with those of last year to see whether I have made progress in certain areas or not. . . . For example, . . . we have tried to use different approaches to teach students. . . . We can sense which approach students like best [from the results of student evaluation]. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

One half of the subjects were serious about the results of student evaluation, but no specific actions were taken.

I read the reports. . . . I would be free of anxiety if the scores look good. . . . I would feel bad if the scores are low. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

I check the results, and think about them. . . . When the scores look impossible, the students must have rated [the items] casually. I also reviewed my own performance open-mindedly. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

I look at [the results] seriously, and see which items get A's, and which items get B's. . . . They are merely a source of information. . . . Usually I trust what students have told me after class more than the reports of student evaluation. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Nearly 30% of the respondents mentioned they read the results casually.
Usually I read them a little bit. I don't think they are important. . . . The accuracy [of the results] is questionable. On the other hand, I am not familiar with the items. Since my score was above average [compared to the ratings of others], I did not pay much attention to it. Usually I don't revise the course or teaching method based on this [student evaluation]. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

I do read them. . . . Suppose the average score of "teaching behavior" for all the faculty members is 7.97, and I receive 6.2, I don't know where my faults are. . . . There is [an average score for] "learning attitude". I don't understand why we [teachers] have "learning attitude". It should be students who have learning attitude. But here I think it refers to teachers. . . . If confusions like this cannot be made clear, it [student evaluation] will be useless. Probably because I don't really understand them, I just read them casually. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

The "learning attitude" mentioned by the above subject actually referred to students, obtained by averaging several items related to students themselves on the evaluation form. However, this is not made clear on the report and the subject was apparently confused. Another interviewee expressed the similar concern:

I seldom read them carefully, because I don't understand the meaning of those figures . . . such as "z values". . . . I don't trust these results. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

One subject's response was coded as "disregard." He reported that he threw the reports into a drawer without looking through them. He did not think they meant anything. An interviewee whose answer was classified as "other" reported as follows:

After reading the reports, I improve what I am able to, such as the audibility. . . . I am not interested in certain items, such as teaching effectiveness. I don't even look at them. (Sciences/Engineering professor)
Usefulness of evaluation to the interviewees

The same twenty-eight interviewees were asked whether they found the evaluation helpful in directing their teaching. Table 72 lists the coded responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite useful</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3 (15.0%)</td>
<td>7 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>10 (50.0%)</td>
<td>12 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost useless</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>7 (35.0%)</td>
<td>9 (32.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>20 (100.0%)</td>
<td>28 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The four subjects who were not aware of the evaluation results did not answer this question, making a total number of 28.

As shown in Table 69, 19 out of the 28 subjects (slightly more than two-thirds) believed that student evaluations were either "quite useful" or "somewhat useful" in directing their teaching. They were further asked to specify the aspects which benefited from the evaluation results. As can be seen in Table 70, over 50% of the subjects who responded to this question reported that student evaluations were helpful in directing their teaching skills. Five out
of the 19 respondents mentioned the aspect of course structure, only two or three thought the aspects of workload, teacher-student rapport, or grading and examination had been improved based on student evaluation information. Another six respondents were not able to specify any aspect; their answers were coded as "other."

TABLE 70
ASPECTS BENEFITED FROM STUDENT EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course structure</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
<td>5 (26.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching skill</td>
<td>3 (50.0%)</td>
<td>7 (53.8%)</td>
<td>10 (52.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>2 (15.4%)</td>
<td>3 (15.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading &amp; exams</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (15.4%)</td>
<td>2 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>4 (30.8%)</td>
<td>6 (31.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The total number of respondents was 19 (6 department chairpersons and 13 faculty members). Some respondents proposed more than one aspect.
Nine out of the 28 subjects reported that student evaluations were not helpful in directing their teaching (see Table 69). The reasons given are indicated in Table 71.

### Table 71

**Reasons for Uselessness of Student Evaluation in Directing Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching can hardly improve</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation items are inappropriate</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student judgment is not dependable</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>4 (44.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation report is hard to understand</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know how to improve</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>4 (44.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The total number of respondents was 9 (2 department chairpersons and 7 faculty members). Some respondents proposed more than one reason.

**Department chairpersons' reactions to the reports of student evaluation of their faculty members**

All the 8 department chairpersons were asked an extra question regarding their reactions to the reports of student evaluation of their
faculty members. The answers could be divided into two categories. Six out of the 8 department chairpersons took certain actions if necessary after they received the reports.

I usually skim all the reports, paying attention only to two kinds of faculty members, . . . those with scores under 70 or above 90. . . . I might talk to the faculty members with low ratings [under 70] privately, and announce those with high ratings [above 90] in the department meetings. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

I deal with the reports in two ways. I give the reports to the instructors immediately [after I receive them], if students' responses on the reports are good. For those reports with poor student responses, I ask my assistant not to show them to the instructors until I have met with them. . . . I try to let the instructors understand the fact without hurting their feelings. . . . The most important thing is to maintain the sense of self-esteem of those faculty members. . . . If the student evaluation does not reflect the reality, I might speak to the students on the importance of respecting teachers, and teacher-student cooperation . . . in order to minimize the opposition between teachers and students. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

If the instructor [with low ratings] was appointed by another department, . . . I would copy the reports and send them to the chairperson of that department, and ask for sending another instructor to teach the same course in the following semester. . . . If the instructor is affiliated with this department, I would talk to the students first, trying to find out the problem. . . . Then I would talk to the instructor. . . . for those instructors with good student ratings, I merely send the reports to them. They will be pleased when they are aware of the results. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Two department chairpersons reported that they did not take any actions after receiving the student evaluation reports of the faculty members.

I give them [the reports] to the faculty members . . . after reading them. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

I read them, getting a rough idea whether a certain instructor is above or below average. Then I give them to the faculty members. . . . I do not make any effort to remember
who is above average. . . . For part-time teachers, I do not even give the reports to them. Many of the part-time teachers do not work for money, but as a favor. They are paid for only two or three hours of instruction. However, they spend two hours of travelling to and from the university. What they gain cannot offset the losses. If I give them these [reports], it seems that I don't respect them. Therefore, I just keep the reports of part-time faculty members. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

Impact on teacher-student relationship

The adoption of student evaluation may have certain impacts on academia, either desirable or undesirable. Three possible effects of such evaluations were discussed in the third topical area. Subjects' opinions regarding the overall impact of student ratings on teacher-student relationships are summarized in Table 72.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little impact</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
<td>18 (56.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much worse</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 72, the majority (56.3%) of the subjects believed that student evaluation had little or no impact on the teacher-student relationship. Many of them contended that the evaluation was aimed at teaching, and, therefore, had little to do with teacher-student relationship. Some pointed out that student evaluation at Tamkang had become a formality, and students did not take it seriously. There would be no impact on teacher-student relationship in such a situation.

Nearly 20% of the subjects reported that teacher-student relationship became better as a result of student evaluation. About the same percentage of the interviewees believed that student evaluation had undesirable impact on teacher-student rapport.

Impact on faculty morale

Table 73 displays the coded responses of the subjects concerning the impact of student evaluation on faculty morale. As shown in the table, no subject believed that faculty morale became much higher because of student evaluation. Approximately 10% of the responses were coded as "higher."

In other countries, students may chat with the instructor during the break. In this way, the instructor has the students' feedback. . . . But here [in Taiwan] this [student evaluation] is the only feedback [to the instructor]. I feel this is good. . . . If teachers get no feedback [from students], they will feel frustrated. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

I think the impact [on faculty morale] is good. [Because of this impact,] Tamkang's professors teach most earnestly, compared to professors at other universities. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)
TABLE 73
IMPACT OF STUDENT EVALUATION ON
FACULTY MORALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much higher</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little impact</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
<td>7 (21.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much lower</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37.5% of the interviewees reported that there was little impact on faculty morale as a result of student evaluation. Approximately a quarter of the subjects believed that there was a negative effect on faculty morale. Seven out of the 8 negative opinions were coded as "lower."

There is probably an undesirable effect. . . . Faculty members feel uncomfortable. Those who teach earnestly are discouraged [because they often get low ratings]. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Faculty members are restrained [because of student evaluation]. They are not able to bring their skills into full play. They may feel repressed, although the feeling is not very strong. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

If the evaluation results reflect the fact, there would be no [adverse] impact on faculty morale. But in the past . . .
faculty members were unhappy with it [student evaluation]. The major reason was that they found a discrepancy between the results and reality. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Faculty members have no confidence in the university. They feel that the university does not respect them. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

One interviewee reported that faculty members were discouraged, discontent, and frustrated because of the implementation of student evaluation. This particular answer was coded as "much lower."

Six opinions were classified as "other." In general, these subjects believed that the morale was lower for a certain group of faculty members, while higher or unchanged for another group.

I feel there is no problem [of faculty morale] in this college. . . . In another college . . . faculty members may feel it [student evaluation] is against the principle of respecting teachers, and there was some problem [with faculty morale] when Tamkang implemented the evaluation. . . . In this college . . . we feel that student evaluation is good. It is a way of management and communication. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

It [impact on faculty morale] varies. For those who teach earnestly, no evaluation will affect their morale [negatively]. . . . But certain teachers who are just fooling around may have unnecessary suspicions about the evaluation. Their morale will become lower. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

The morale of those teachers who tend to resist new concepts would be lower. . . . There is no impact on the morale of those who tend to accept new concepts. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Another three interviewees reported that they were not aware of the overall impact of student evaluation on faculty morale at Tamkang University. These answers were coded as "don't know."
**Impact on the quality of the instruction**

The third possible effect of student evaluation discussed in the interviews related to the quality of instruction of the whole university. Subjects' responses are summarized in Table 74.

**TABLE 74**

**IMPACT OF STUDENT EVALUATION ON THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much higher</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little impact</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much lower</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 74, one subject believed that the quality of teaching became much higher as a result of student evaluation. About one-third of the interviewees considered the quality of instruction "higher" than before.
The quality of instruction can be improved a little. The major factors for the improvement of teaching do not lie in this [student evaluation]. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

There is no obvious improvement [in the quality of instruction], but I feel there must have been some. [Pushed by student evaluation,] you [professors] need to study ways to revise your subject matter and teaching methods at all times. . . (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

The quality of instruction is higher. Such an effect may be expanded if the university deals with the evaluation results in different ways. . . . For example, reward those teachers with higher ratings. . . . (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Other subjects with positive opinions maintained that student evaluation alerted the professors, which contributed to the improvement of instructional quality.

Slightly more than 20% of the subjects reported that the student evaluation at Tamkang had little impact on the quality of teaching of the whole university. Only two of those interviewed believed the instructional quality was lowered. They pointed out that many instructors lowered the course standards in order to please students.

About 15% of the interviewees gave conditional or uncertain answers. Both types of responses were coded as "other." Nearly 20% of the subjects said that they had no idea whether the quality of instruction of the whole university had been affected by the student evaluation.

Other impacts

Ten out of the 32 subjects gave additional opinions on the impact of student evaluation. Three of them mentioned that the adoption of student evaluation at Tamkang had some influences on other
institutions, i.e., some universities intended to implement student evaluation based on Tamkang's experiences. Three others reported that faculty members were dissatisfied with the administration as a result of student evaluation.

Summary

Slightly over 60% of the subjects were aware of all the student evaluation results from the classes they taught. One quarter of the subjects reported that they knew the results from only part of the classes they taught. It seemed that different departments dealt with the reports of student evaluation differently. This was confirmed in department chairpersons' statements concerning their reactions to the student evaluation reports of their faculty members.

The majority of the 28 subjects who had access to all or some of the evaluation reports were serious about the results, although they might not take any actions. However, nearly one-third of these 28 interviewees merely skimmed the reports or put them aside.

As to the usefulness of student evaluation results in directing their teaching, two-thirds of the responses were positive and one-third were negative. Teaching skill was frequently mentioned as an aspect benefited from student evaluation. Those who did not think student evaluation was helpful to their teaching proposed different reasons. Lack of confidence in students' judgment appeared to be the major one.

When faculty perceptions of individual effects of student evaluation were discussed, the practice of student evaluation was reported not to result in any evident impact on teacher-student
relationship, faculty morale, or the quality of instruction, either positively or negatively. There was a small reported effect on the improvement of instructional quality and lowering of faculty morale.

Fourth Topical Area of Interview: Support/Non-Support of Student Evaluation

The last topical area in the interviews focused on arguments for or against student evaluation of college instruction. The purpose was to find out the grounds of subjects' attitudes toward student ratings. All the six major questions were worded so interviewees would respond candidly. To be specific, the interviewer first indicated that others held a certain viewpoint, and then asked the opinion of the interviewee. Such indirect questions were designed to minimize the ego defense of the subjects (Maccoby and Maccoby, 1954).

Three arguments for and three arguments against student evaluation were presented alternately. A supplementary question at the end solicited additional opinions, as in other sections. The results of this topical area are arranged according to the type of argument discussed, rather than the order of the questions.

Arguments for student evaluation

Three arguments for student evaluation were discussed in the last topical area, including:
1. student evaluation can provide opportunities for students to express opinions regarding their own education,

2. student evaluation can stimulate less qualified professors to improve, and

3. student evaluation can provide democratic training for both professors and students.

**First argument for student evaluation.** Table 75 displays the coded responses of subjects to the statement that student evaluation can provide opportunities for students to express opinions regarding their own education. As can be seen in the table, 6.3% of the responses were coded as "strongly agree," and over 50% of the respondents agreed with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>2 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>12 (50.0%)</td>
<td>17 (53.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>8 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most positive responses viewed student evaluation as an obvious means of expressing opinions. Others gave further explanations.

This is right. In fact we need to provide opportunities for students to express opinions not only through student evaluation, but through administrative meetings. . . . (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

I agree. . . . Except for this [student evaluation], students have few opportunities to express [opinions]. . . . Through this type of response, students need not face the instructors. This is one thing. . . . If students need to face the professors, they may not be able to express opinions freely. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Approximately 15% of the interviewees felt student evaluation could not provide opportunities for students to express opinions regarding their own education.

According to my observation, filling out the evaluation form is a real chore for students. They are not interested in that. They never consider it an opportunity to express opinions regarding their own education. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

I don't agree. . . . Without student evaluation, students are still able to express opinions at all times and places. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

Opportunities for students to express opinions are not limited to this [student evaluation]. . . . This is not an ideal method. What students want to express is not limited to items on student evaluations. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

One-fourth of the responses were coded as "other." In general, these subjects gave conditional or uncertain answers without taking a definite position.

It depends on whether students honor the evaluation or not. If they don't honor it, it is no use to provide opportunities to express opinions. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)
I agree, but it is correct only when applied to good students. It doesn't work when applied to students who are merely fooling around (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

It should be the case. . . . Teachers are not authorities. However, it is affected by the capability of students, and the accuracy of the results. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

Second argument for student evaluation. The second argument for student evaluation discussed in interviews was that student evaluation can stimulate less qualified professors to improve. Subjects' responses to this argument are summarized in Table 76.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>14 (58.3%)</td>
<td>17 (53.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>12 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in Table 79, slightly more than one half of the subjects agreed with this statement. (None strongly agreed.) They believed student evaluation served this function. Less than 10% of the interviewees disagree with the argument. Two of them mentioned it would not be possible for instructors to improve merely based on the information from student evaluation. The other reported that students might not be able to tell which professor was "less qualified." 37.5% of the responses were coded as "other." Different reasons were proposed by these subjects who gave conditional answers.

It depends on the environment. If most teachers are performing well, he [the less qualified professor] would feel that he lags behind [and is stimulated to improve]. But if he is in the environment in which most teachers are poor, he would think it is all right to remain unchanged. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

I think it is impossible. . . . What does it mean by "less qualified"? . . . If it refers to the knowledge, I think it is very difficult to improve. If it refers to the skill of teaching, perhaps it can be improved. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

There is an effect of stimulation, but not necessarily. It depends on the personality and thoughts of the instructor. If his personality is dominating, there will be an undesirable effect. If he is open-minded, he may think that he needs to improve. . . . (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

If the evaluation is carried out properly, this would be the case. Those less qualified professors will be stimulated. . . . But if the evaluation is enforced unproperly, even those qualified professors will be adversely affected; they may feel uneasy or have unnecessary suspicions. . . . My opinion is that the issue of student evaluation is how it is carried out rather than if it is desirable. (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

Third argument for student evaluation. Table 77 summarizes the coded responses of subjects to the argument that student evaluation
provided democratic training for both teachers and students. As shown in the table, none of the subjects strongly agreed but 17 out of 32 subjects agreed with this statement. They believed that expressing opinions and accepting the opinions of the majority were two elements of democracy, and student evaluation could provide this training.

**TABLE 77**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPINIONS REGARDING THIRD ARGUMENT FOR STUDENT EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fewer than 20% of the interviewees did not think student course evaluation could provide democratic training. Some believed there were many ways of democratic training in universities, while student evaluation did not have such a function. One subject thought the term "democratic" seemed an excuse for discarding tradition, and believed the country should keep its tradition of respecting teachers. Another
contended the most important principle in a democratic society was that the minority should obey the majority and it could not be applied to academic setting.

28% of the responses were coded as "other." Most of them were conditional answers. For example, two subjects maintained student evaluation could provide democratic training only if students were serious about it. Another mentioned that the evaluation provided democratic training only to qualified students.

**Arguments against student evaluation**

The following statements against the use of student evaluation were proposed to the interviewees:

1. Student evaluation goes against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers.

2. Student evaluation provides universities control over faculty members.

3. Students do not have the right to evaluate professors regardless of their capability to do so.
First argument against student evaluation. Table 78 summarizes the responses of the interviewees to the argument that student evaluation goes against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers. As shown in the table, slightly over 20% of the respondents agreed with the above statement. Following are excerpts of their comments:

Presently students oppose instructors by using this [student evaluation] as a tool. If too much is demanded of them, they will retaliate against the instructors at the end of the semester [through student evaluation]. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

I agree. Although students feel the university should not do so [implementing student evaluation], they have subconsciously acquired a thought which is against the tradition of respecting teachers, which is gradually displayed in their behavior. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

It is against the principle of respecting teachers. . . . If the university wants to raise its academic quality, it
should have been serious in appointing the faculty members... Many teachers were appointed because of personal relationships with the leadership [which had lowered the academic quality]. Then the university adopted the student evaluation [trying to improve it]. It [student evaluation] unnecessarily affected other [qualified] teachers. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

Approximately 44% of the interviewees' responses were coded as "disagree." In other words, they didn't think student evaluation went against the tradition of respecting teachers.

I don't think so... Students simply express feelings on the questionnaire, which they dare not express orally. This is not against the tradition of respecting teachers since students do not express insulting behavior such as hitting or spitting on instructor. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

It [student evaluation] has nothing to do with the tradition of respecting teachers... it merely represents students' feelings about learning, and their expectations of the instructor... Students do not curse the instructor... (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

I don't feel like that. Chinese students evaluated teachers since old times, although it was clandestine... Filling out the questionnaire [of student evaluation] will not affect the principle of respecting teachers. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

It is not [against the tradition]. If you teach well, students will surely respect you. If you are not responsible for your job, [e.g.,] not prepare for the class, or late for the class without an excuse, how can students respect you? . . . Actually this [student evaluation] is the way of respecting teachers. If you are rated high [by students], it means you have made an effort in teaching, and students have learned from you. Students will respect teachers like you. This is the way of respecting teachers. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

I don't think so... I feel students have the right to express opinions regarding the course. This is... reasonable... We should not repress students in freely expressing opinions with the excuse of respecting teachers, especially in the university, a place cultivating the ability of students in independent thinking and expressing opinions. (Sciences/Engineering instructor)
The tradition of respecting teachers should be maintained. However, if we treat teachers as absolute authorities, it is an undesirable effect of the said tradition. Such evaluations can lessen this undesirable effect. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

I disagree. It is hard to define the principle of respecting teachers. . . . We need to consider whether we should respect the learning [the instructor possesses] . . . or we should respect the instructor because he is a teacher . . . . We don't respect someone merely because his job is teaching, because there are both good teachers and bad teachers. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

Teaching is one kind of occupation. . . . Of course it will be good if teachers are respected. This is the tradition. However, if the teacher cannot earn the respect of others, . . . he must not be qualified for this job. I don't think he can use such an excuse . . . . For example, if he does not like student evaluation, he may say this is against the principle of respecting teachers. I don't think it is appropriate to do so. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

Two subjects strongly disagreed with the argument that student evaluation went against the tradition of respecting teachers. They used stronger words to describe their thoughts.

What does it mean by respecting teachers? Do students respect teachers merely because of the title or status of teachers? Can you ask others to respect you based on the title or status you have? This is totally a hackneyed thought! . . . If you perform well, or have good ability, students will respect you. If you don't have such performance or ability, you can't ask students to respect you regardless of whether you are a senior professor, a doctor, or a graduate of prestigious universities. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

This is an obsolete concept. If the instructor is poor, should the students be taught by him forever? It is not fair to students if they don't have the opportunity to express their opinions. . . . (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

About 19% of the opinions were coded as "other." Three kinds of conditional answers were involved. Three subjects believed student evaluation went against the tradition of respecting teachers only when
its results were used for personnel decisions. Two interviewees considered the rating items on overall performance of the instructor against the tradition. Another two reported student evaluation was all right, but the practice might go against the principle of respecting teachers if students answered those items casually, if the evaluation was used to retaliate against instructors, or if the evaluation results were treated secretly. One interviewee's answer included these three conditions:

Many people in this country think it is against the tradition of respecting teachers. This is not the fault of the system itself. I personally feel we implemented the evaluation poorly. . . . Don't give teachers scores, or rate them with grades. Don't use the results as the only criterion of faculty reappointment. Don't let the students have the idea they are going to retaliate against professors. Don't let the professors feel that students are grading them. Otherwise, there will be two kinds of undesirable effects. . . . Those teachers with backbone will leave in anger. Another kind of teacher who does not want to quit will change attitudes completely. They start pleasing students. This is not the way student evaluation should be. . . . Students feel the evaluation is unnecessary, and is merely a burden, while instructors feel they are not respected. . . . There is almost no positive effect resulting from student course evaluation. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)
Second argument against student evaluation. Subjects' responses to the second argument against student evaluation are displayed in Table 79. As can be seen in the table, no respondents strongly agreed with the statement that student evaluation provided universities control over faculty members. One-fourth of the interviewees agreed with it. In general, these interviewees believed student evaluation provided written data on faculty members, which could be used as excuses for not reappointing professors.

This is probably true. I don't know whether the university will not reappoint the instructor if he is rated poor by students. But the university is able to do this. In the decision of reappointment, the university [upper
administration] has the right to reverse the recommendations of department chairpersons. If this happens, student ratings can probably be used as an excuse. . . . Or the president may keep the results of student evaluations. . . . If he wants to find fault with someone, he may look for the records of this person and further analyze them. . . . Since this kind of information exists, he has the chance to dig it out for certain purposes. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

Faculty members are under pressure. . . . There are concrete figures [on the student evaluation reports]. They can be used as a formal excuse sometimes. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

I think it is the case. . . . If the university does not want to reappoint a certain faculty member, his records on student evaluation can probably be used as an excuse. It is because the whole procedure is not open to the public, and faculty members have no chance to defend themselves. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

I have that kind of feeling. . . . The university is insidiously telling all the faculty members that they ought to be careful, otherwise they may be fired for "justifiable" reason. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

Students often think so, and they retaliate against the instructor based on that belief. . . . I personally also think this is the case. . . . (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

One subject reported he had no opinion about this argument. This single response was classified as "neither agree nor disagree." About 44% of the answers were coded as "disagree." They reported the university did not control faculty members through student evaluation, but used it to improve teaching and justify administrative decisions.

Some people do think so. . . . But I believe the president adopted student evaluation for the purpose of improving teaching effectiveness, rather than controlling faculty members. (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

It is easy to count how many articles a professor has published. But there is no better method to evaluate teaching than this [student evaluation]. . . . It is not a means of controlling faculty members, its function is like quality control. (Sciences/Engineering professor)
This [student evaluation] can help teachers improve. If teachers do not improve, it can be grounds for eliminating unqualified teachers. I feel this is good. Otherwise you have no reason to eliminate those teachers. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

I believe this is not true. As far as I know, those dismissed by the university were all extreme cases. . . . There were undeniable facts for their dismissal. . . . Only one or two professors were dismissed in the last seven or eight years. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Others may think so. But I think this is a necessary administrative measure. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

Two subjects strongly disagree with the argument. Their opinions were quoted as follows:

The university cannot control the faculty members at all [through student evaluation]. . . . You cannot dismiss a full-time faculty member unless he is immoral. . . . This is stipulated by the Ministry of Education. If the faculty member teaches poorly, the university can only provide some assistance, and ask him to improve. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

I don't think so. Up to now no faculty member was dismissed because of poor teaching. How could the university control the faculty members [through student evaluation]? . . . Generally the university may not continue to appoint a faculty member if he was poor in research and teaching. . . . If there exists a student evaluation system which provides more objective information, it would be more difficult for the university to dismiss a faculty member [arbitrarily]. . . . It is just the opposite. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Almost 16% of the responses were conditional and coded as "other." These subjects maintained that student evaluation could be used as a means of controlling faculty members if the evaluation results were used for certain purposes, such as merit pay or surveillance of faculty teaching. They were not sure whether this had happened at Tamkang
University. Another two subjects' answers were coded as "don't know." They did not give further opinions on this argument.

Third argument against student evaluation. The last argument regarding student evaluation discussed in the fourth topical area was that students had no right to evaluate professors, regardless of their ability to do so. Subjects' responses to this statement were mostly negative (see Table 80).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>18 (75.0%)</td>
<td>22 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
<td>32 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 80, only one interviewee agreed with the said argument. Another subject had no opinion. Nearly 70% of the responses were coded as "disagree."
I think basically students have the right to evaluate teaching. . . . But they may not have such an ability. As a result, their responses may not be objective. . . . Administrators need to cultivate students' ability in this aspect. . . . (Sciences/Engineering instructor)

I don't think so. Teaching is a kind of communication. I think students should express their opinions, but their ability and attitudes need to be trained. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

I don't think so. Students have such a right. They come for learning. Of course they have the right to obtain what they want. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

Such an opinion is not objective. Students are most competent in judging instructors' teaching. They know whether or not they have learned something. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

Approximately 16% of the interviewees strongly disagreed with the argument. The following excerpts are two examples:

I object. Students are the recipients of teaching. Of course they can express their opinions [about teaching]. How can you say that they don't have such a right? This is incorrect. (Liberal Arts/Business department chairperson)

I strongly disagree. Generally the instructor gives lectures in class and students listen to him. . . . If there is no student evaluation, it would be difficult for the instructor to know the responses of the whole class. Therefore this [student evaluation] should be adopted. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Three subjects gave conditional answers. They would have agreed with the argument if the term "evaluate" meant "judge," "criticize" or "grade." However, they would have disagreed with the statement if the term was interpreted as "communicate," or "express opinions."

Other Arguments

At the end of the interview, subjects were asked if there were additional grounds for their viewpoint regarding student evaluation.
Following are several statements supporting the use of student evaluation:

An instructor who teaches a course a whole year with great effort must be eager to know how much students have learned [from the course]. Student evaluation can provide such information. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

From the examination or the questions students ask, I can sense whether students really understand [what I taught], and which aspect of teaching needs improvement. But this way is indirect. If students can respond through a direct channel, such as a well-designed questionnaire, it will be more helpful to me. . . . (Sciences/Engineering department chairperson)

Teaching effectiveness is determined by how much students have learned. This [student evaluation] provides a direct measure, and, therefore, merits adoption. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

Student evaluation can also provide training in thinking or judging. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

Criticism leads to progress. . . . We ought to accept new ideas, and may get used to them after a period of time. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

These scores [from student evaluation] are a rough indicator. But they are meaningless if treated as absolute proof. . . . I think student evaluation is worth adoption if it is used only as a rough estimation. (Sciences/Engineering department chairpersons)

On the other hand, some subjects mentioned the problem of objectivity or accuracy of student evaluation. Their major concern was students' casual manner in completing the questionnaire. Such a concern was found throughout many interviews.

Based on my understanding, at least 50% of the students completed the questionnaires casually. (Liberal Arts/Business professor)

Students filled out answers as they pleased. Some were joking, while some were retaliating against the instructor. (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)
Student evaluation at Tamkang has become a formality. It is administered every year for every course. . . . Some students merely marked the answers [on the computer cards] without looking at the question sheets. . . . They even arranged the positions of answers in a way which displayed a certain geometric figure. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business associate professor)

Every year the same kind of questionnaires are administered. . . . The format is also the same for each subject. . . . Students do not honor this evaluation because it has become a formality. . . . When the rating forms were distributed to students [in my class], they laughed at them. . . . Some of them did not answer the questions; some passed the blank cards to the class leader, who marked the answers for them. . . . (Sciences/Engineering associate professor)

A few subjects reported their observations on the administering of student evaluation at Tamkang, which revealed some clues for students' casual attitudes.

The evaluation was administered to the students [in one of my classes] during the break. Some students left the classroom, and some took a nap. . . . The students did not receive their own question sheets. It was the class leader who read the items one by one to his classmates. Since he read very fast, some students did not follow him. . . . The classroom was noisy and disorderly. (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)

Some students did not bring a 2B pencil [which was required to mark the answers]. . . . They borrowed the pencil from others who had completed the forms, and also copied the answers of others. (Sciences/Engineering professor)

Students were required to bring a 2B pencil with them to mark the answers. . . . Those who forgot to bring the said pencil either did not complete the questionnaire or worked on the same form with somebody else who had a 2B pencil. . . . Only ten minutes was allowed for students to answer the questions, so the situation was disorderly. . . . Furthermore, the number of questionnaires was sometimes insufficient. . . . The department received only about 60 questionnaires [including questions only], which needed to be used repeatedly in different classes. . . . (Liberal Arts/Business instructor)
The students' attitudes in completing the evaluation form was not a predetermined item on the interview schedule. However, 15 subjects (46.9% of the total samples) mentioned on their own initiative that students in general were not serious about the evaluation. Another 3 pointed out that half of the students were serious while half were not.

In addition to students' casual attitudes, a few subjects reported they had noticed teaching assistants sometimes filled out answers for the students on a pile of computer cards. This increased their distrust in the results of student evaluation. One pointed out that the above case happened when the response rate of students was too low and the teaching assistants responsible for collecting the forms were afraid they would be censured by the administration. Others did not provide explanations.

Summary

Three arguments for and three against student evaluation were discussed in the fourth topical area. Table 81 shows a summary of subjects' opinions about those statements. It was found that over 50% of the subjects were positive about the three arguments for student evaluation, while less than 20% were negative. As to the three statements against student evaluation, at least half of the subjects took negative positions, and no more than one-fourth were positive about them. Meanwhile, about 15 to 35 percent of the subjects did not take a position or had mixed reactions in each question (including the coded answers of "neither agree nor disagree," "don't know," and "other").
### TABLE 81
OPINIONS REGARDING DIFFERENT ARGUMENTS CONCERNING STUDENT EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>% of Positive Responses</th>
<th>% of Negative Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation can provide opportunities for students to express their opinions</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation can stimulate less qualified professors to improve</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation can provide democratic training for both teachers and students</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation goes against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation provides universities control over faculty members</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have no right to evaluate professors regardless of their ability to do so</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Positive responses included "strongly agree" and "agree," while negative responses included "strongly disagree" and "disagree."

Subjects' opinions on the six arguments have shown that at least half the subjects felt that student evaluation of teachers was appropriate and useful. The concerns of many subjects about student evaluation focused on the way student evaluation was administered. Students' casual manner in filling out the forms was perceived by some to be a big problem with the trustworthiness and usefulness of evaluation.
Overall Attitude and Correlating Variables

The four topical areas in the interviews discussed above solicited subjects' opinions about different aspects of student evaluation. At the end of the interview participants were asked to complete a short questionnaire. Results from this questionnaire have been reported in the first section of this chapter except for the last item, which requested subjects' overall attitude toward the practice of student evaluation at Tamkang University. Since the questionnaire was administered immediately after the interview, answers to this overall item can be viewed as a conclusion made by the subjects. Table 82 indicates the frequency and percentage of subjects' responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly approve</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>4 (18.2%)</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>9 (40.9%)</td>
<td>12 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (13.6%)</td>
<td>3 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>6 (27.3%)</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disapprove</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>22 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Two subjects did not answer this question, making a total number of 30 who did complete the item.
As can be seen in Table 82, with the exception of the two subjects who did not answer the question, 23% of the respondents strongly approved the practice of student evaluation at Tamkang, 40% approved, 10% had no opinion, 27% disapproved, and none strongly disapproved. Combining the first two alternatives, 63% of the respondents held positive overall attitudes toward student evaluation. The results of this overall item was consistent with the researcher's general impression on subjects' attitudes displayed in the interviews.

Subjects' attitude and taping of interviews

As mentioned in the previous chapter, 18 out of the 32 interviews were taped with the consent of interviewees, while the other interviews were recorded only by notetaking. This fact shows that taping of interviews has not been widely accepted in the Republic of China. In order to assess the difference between taped and untaped results, subjects' overall attitude toward student evaluation was crosstabulated with the factor of taping (see Table 83).
As shown in Table 83, over 80% of the subjects who agreed to tape the interviews were positive (either "strongly approve" or "approve") about the student evaluation at Tamkang, while less than 40% of those who did not accept taping fell in the same category. It appeared that the overall attitude was moderately associated with the factor of taping. There were three possible reasons for this finding:

1. Subjects were more reluctant to show negative attitudes when the interview was taped than when it was not taped.

2. Subjects with positive attitudes toward student evaluation were more willing to accept taping than those with negative attitudes. Those with negative attitudes were less willing, perhaps distrusting the usage of with the tapes.
3. Subjects who accepted new technology such as taping were also more likely to approve innovations such as student evaluation than those who rejected taping.

Background variables correlated with attitude

The relationship between the subjects' overall attitude and their background variables obtained through the questionnaire were examined. (Cramer's index of contingency was calculated for each pair of variables crosstabulated, while no test of significance was done due to the small sample size.) Two variables, rank and academic field, were found to be associated with subjects' overall attitude toward student evaluation practice at Tamkang University. As indicated in Table 84, more than 90% of the full professors were positive (either "strongly approve" or "approve") about student evaluation at Tamkang, while 50% or less of the associate professors or instructors fell in the same category. The correlation between overall attitudes and rank remained discernible when other variables were held constant.
TABLE 84
OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10 (90.9%)</td>
<td>5 (45.5%)</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
<td>6 (54.5%)</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (100.0%)</td>
<td>11 (100.0%)</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Positive overall attitude included "strongly approve" and "approve," while "non-positive" included "no opinion," "disapprove," and "strongly disapprove." Two subjects who did not answer the overall attitude item were excluded, making a total number of 30.

As suggested in the previous chapter, the status of full professor in the Republic of China is somewhat comparable to that of the tenured professor in this country. In addition, full professors have already passed all the promotion decisions. They would be least likely to be affected by the adoption of student evaluation. Their favorable attitudes were easily understood.

Academic field was not found to be a variable correlating with subjects' overall attitudes when liberal arts and business were combined as one broad field. However, when the above two areas were separated, the relationship became discernible (see Table 85). To be specific, the subjects in liberal arts were most opposed to the practice of student evaluation, those in sciences or engineering were positive about it, and those in business were most favorable toward it. The relationship held when other variables were made constant.
TABLE 85
OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Sciences/Engineering</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>6 (100.0%)</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>7 (77.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (100.0%)</td>
<td>6 (100.0%)</td>
<td>15 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Positive overall attitude included "strongly approve" and "approve," while "non-positive" included "no opinion," "disapprove," and "strongly disapprove." Two subjects who did not answer the overall attitude item were excluded, making a total number of 30.

The decision of combining liberal arts with business in selecting samples was based on the Chinese custom of treating these two as broadly defined "social sciences," as opposed to "natural sciences," which usually includes sciences and engineering. However, it turned out that the attitudes of subjects in liberal arts and business toward student evaluation were quite different. A possible explanation is that people in business are more pragmatic, and find student evaluation a useful tool for fulfilling desired purposes. Meanwhile, people in liberal arts are more tradition-oriented, which results in conservative attitudes toward novelty.

The positive attitude shown by the subjects in sciences or engineering was also evident in the present study. This was probably
because they tended to analyze events on a rational basis and thus were more open to new ideas than those in liberal arts.

Such background variables as sex, age, degree, locality where highest degree received, teaching experience, teaching load, or number of publications had negligible effect on subjects' overall attitude toward the practice of student evaluation at Tamkang. There was also little difference between the attitude of faculty members and department chairpersons. Whether subjects had heard of student evaluation, or how much they had known about the research findings made little difference in their overall attitude. Tables presenting the relationship between the overall attitude with the above negligible variables appear in Appendix H.

The casual manner of students in completing the evaluation questionnaires presented another variable correlating with the overall attitude of subjects toward the practice of student evaluation at Tamkang. Table 88 shows the crosstabulation of these two variables.
As indicated in Table 86, among subjects who believed that forms were completed casually, 44% were positive about the student evaluation practice at Tamkang, whereas 92% of those not mentioning this casual manner were positive about the evaluation. Students' casualness most likely affected the accuracy of the evaluation results. This made some subjects suspicious about the worth of student ratings, and thus probably influenced the attitude toward such evaluation.

Findings Compared to Previous Studies

While the present investigation studied the attitude of Chinese faculty members and administration, its findings were compared with research in this country with similar themes. This section presents the conclusion of this comparison.
Similar findings

The results of the current study are congruent with previous research in four aspects.

First, faculty members in general support the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement. The same conclusion has been made by four other studies (Gross & Small, 1979; Guion et al., 1977; Mahfous, 1979; Ryan et al., 1980).

Second, there is a relationship between academic field and attitudes of faculty members and administration toward student evaluation. The present study has found that faculty members and department chairpersons in the field of liberal arts tend to be negative about student evaluation, while those in the business, science, and engineering areas are more favorable toward student evaluation. Similar results have been reported in McMartin and Rich's study (1976), in which faculty members in the natural sciences are most favorably disposed toward student evaluation, whereas those in fine arts and humanities are most opposed to it.

Third, sex is found to be a negligible variable in determining the attitude of faculty members or department chairpersons toward student evaluation. Two former studies (Mahfous, 1979; Rich, 1976) have come to the same conclusion.

Fourth, age is not related to faculty attitude toward student evaluation. The same result has been reported in Wheeler's study (1972).
Different findings

Certain results of the present study are different from those reported in former studies done in the U.S.A. First, there is little difference between the attitude of faculty members and department chairpersons toward student evaluation. However, in two former studies (Mahfous, 1979; Wheeler, 1976), the attitude of administrators toward student evaluation was found more favorable than that of faculty members. It should be noted that these two studies compared the attitude of faculty members with that of administrators, including central administrators and department chairpersons. In other words, the roles of subjects selected by these two studies are somewhat different from those in the present study. Wheeler (1972) found that the attitude of department chairpersons toward student evaluation tends to be less favorable than that of central administrators. In view of this, the negligible difference between faculty and department chairpersons' attitudes in this study is not surprising.

Another difference is that rank correlates with faculty attitude toward student evaluation. To be specific, full professors are more favorably disposed toward student evaluation than associate professors and instructors. However, two former studies (Mahfous, 1979; Rich, 1976) have found the variable of rank to be negligible. As suggested previously, the association between faculty attitude and rank may result from the reality that full professors in the Republic of China possess high status and security, which makes them less likely to be
affected by the use of student evaluation. In other words, status and security may be the "true" variable which accounts for the difference in faculty attitudes.

A third difference between the results of the present study and previous ones is the relationship between the number of publications and attitudes of academicians toward student evaluation. As reviewed in Chapter II, one study (Blank, 1978) has found that the more articles one has published, the more positive he is toward student evaluation. Another study by Rich (1976) has reported an opposite finding. In the current study, the number of publications was not related to the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons toward student evaluation.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons toward student evaluation of college instruction at Tamkang University, the only known institution adopting student ratings in the Republic of China. Thirty-two qualitative interviews were conducted as the major method of data collection.

The sample consisted of twenty-four faculty members and eight department chairpersons at the said university, chosen through stratified sampling procedures. Each subject was asked basically the same set of open-ended questions, covering four topical areas—content of student evaluation, usage of student evaluation, impact of student evaluation, and support/non-support of student evaluation. A nineteen-item questionnaire was administered immediately after each interview soliciting background information and the overall attitude of the interviewees.

Most interview sessions lasted approximately seventy minutes, which was longer than what the subjects were asked to set aside. All the interviews were recorded by notetaking, while eighteen were also tape-recorded with the consent of the interviewees.
In general, subjects were interested in the topic of the interview, and were willing to talk. Certain unexpected findings were uncovered through the active participation of the subjects. Although the study was not aimed at assessing the effectiveness of the student rating system at Tamkang University, some subjects were eager to express perspectives in this aspect. This would not be surprising, since the subjects generally knew little about student evaluation systems outside their university. Furthermore, they were directly affected by this system; such experience was unique among Chinese teachers.

The results of this study are summarized as follows:

Content of student evaluation

Over eighty percent of the subjects believed that students were capable of answering questions under three major dimensions of student evaluation—teaching skill, teacher-student rapport, and course organization. About sixty to seventy percent thought students were able to answer items related to workload, impact on students, and grading and examinations. Subjects in general considered students incapable of rating instructors' subject knowledge or overall teaching performance.

The majority of the subjects viewed students' responses to items regarding instructors' subject knowledge or overall performance as useless to teachers. However, students' opinions regarding the other categories of items were deemed useful to teachers by approximately forty-five to seventy percent of the subjects. The usefulness of these
items to departments were somewhat similar as reported by the group of department chairpersons. The major difference was that fifty percent of this group believed that students' responses to global rating items were useful to departments.

The perceived appropriateness of each category of items was largely predictable based on the knowledge of students' capability in answering them. That is, over three-fourths of the subjects believed it was appropriate to include items regarding course structure, teaching skill, and teacher-student relationship. The categories of impact on students, workload, and grading and examinations were considered appropriate by about forty-five to seventy percent. Subjects in general rejected the inclusion of items related to the instructors' subject knowledge or overall performance in the student evaluation form.

Usage of student evaluation

Subjects in general preferred the use of student evaluation for the purpose of teaching improvement. Nearly two-thirds of the subjects believed that the evaluation results had been used for personnel decisions, while only one half approved such a use. Many subjects held reservations on this use because they were not sure about the reliability or accuracy of the evaluation results. No subject proposed the use of student evaluation for student course selection on their own initiative. When asked about this particular use, only twenty percent were positive about it.
Impact of student evaluation

Approximately sixty percent of the subjects were aware of the results of student evaluation from all the classes they taught. One-fourth were informed of only part of the results. The others were unaware of the results.

Among those who were aware of all or part of the rating results, nearly two-thirds were serious about the information, while one-third simply read the reports casually. The reactions of department chairpersons to the student evaluation reports were somewhat more active than faculty members. Three-fourths of them took certain actions to help the poorly rated instructors, while one-fourth did not do so.

No evident impact of student evaluation on teacher-student relationship, faculty morale, or quality of instruction was reported by the majority of the subjects. Meanwhile, one-fourth of the subjects believed faculty morale was lowered, and nearly forty percent believed the quality of instruction was raised as a result of student evaluation.

Support/non-support of student evaluation

Over one half of the subjects agreed that student evaluation provided opportunities for students to express opinions, stimulated less qualified professors to improve, or provided democratic training for both teachers and students. Less than twenty percent disagreed with the above three statements.
One half of the subjects disagreed that student evaluation went against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers, or that it provided universities control over faculty members. One quarter or less agreed with these two arguments.

Only one subject believed students did not have the right to evaluate professors. Most subjects disagreed with this argument.

The concerns of many subjects about student evaluation focused on its administration, especially the casual manner of students in completing the form. More than one half of the subjects mentioned students' casualness as a major problem of student evaluation.

Overall attitude

With the exclusion of two subjects who did not express their overall attitude toward the practice of student evaluation at Tamkang University, sixty-three percent of the respondents reported a positive overall attitude, while the others had no opinion or were negative about the practice of student evaluation.

In general, there was little difference between the overall attitude of department chairpersons and faculty members toward student evaluation. Such background variables as sex, age, highest degree, locality where highest degree received, teaching experience, teaching load, or number of publications were also negligible in determining the attitudes toward student evaluation.

Rank and academic field appeared to be two background variables associated with subjects' attitudes toward student evaluation. In general, the attitudes of full professors toward student evaluation
were more positive than those of associate professors or instructors. The subjects in business, science, and engineering were more favorably disposed toward student evaluation than those in liberal arts.

The overall attitude of subjects toward student evaluation was also correlated with the students' manner in completing the forms. Those subjects who mentioned students' casualness tended to be more critical of student evaluation.

Results compared to previous research

This study has found that subjects in general support the use of student evaluation for the purpose of teaching improvement, which is the same conclusion made by four previous studies. This study has also confirmed the former findings that faculty attitudes are correlated with their academic field, while unrelated to sex or age. However, the moderate relationship between attitudes and rank found in the present study is different from that reported earlier in the United States. The negligible relationship between attitudes and role or number of publications is also inconsistent with previous findings.

Discussions and Conclusions

It would be difficult to draw firm generalizations from the present study due to the small sample size. Nevertheless, the following four major findings suggest the tendency for the population:

First, subjects generally believed that students were capable of answering most items appearing in common evaluation questionnaires. They thought such opinions were useful to teachers and departments.
Second, subjects generally believed that student evaluation could be used for teaching improvement regardless of its reliability or accuracy. However, many of them held reservations on the use for personnel decisions if the evaluation results were unreliable or biased. The use of student evaluation for student course selection was totally out of place to most subjects.

Third, limited effect on the improvement of instructional quality was inferred from subjects' reports as a result of the practice of student evaluation at Tamkang.

Fourth, the major concerns expressed by subjects in general included students' casual manner in completing the forms and possible bias of the evaluation results by certain factors such as grading leniency.

In conclusion, the idea of student evaluation was supported by subjects in general after its nine years of adoption at Tamkang University. Chinese values related to teachers and teaching did not seem to block the acceptance of this idea. Nevertheless, subjects were concerned about how the evaluation was administered and used.

Implications for the Student Evaluation in the Republic of China

The findings of the present study hold several implications for the student evaluation in the Republic of China. First, if one can generalize from this study, then it would be desirable and feasible to implement student course evaluation in the institutions of higher education in the said country. Faculty members and department
chairpersons at Tamkang University sampled did not reject the evaluation on the grounds of cultural variables such as need to show respect for professors. On the contrary, they believed students have the right to evaluate professors and also the capability to answer most rating items. Although a minority thought student evaluation went against the Chinese tradition, more than half felt student evaluation provided opportunities to express opinions, stimulated less qualified professors to improve, and provided democratic training for both teachers and students.

Second, student evaluation needs to be accompanied with consultation for a better effect on teaching improvement. The present study found that many subjects did not know how to utilize the evaluation results or did not even receive the results. Some reported they did not understand the meaning of those figures on the evaluation report. Some mentioned they did not even know what questions were asked in the evaluation form. Still some complained they did not know how to improve. Further explanation of the reports and/or diagnosis of teaching problems and/or direct teaching improvement help seems desirable.

Third, students need to be provided with sufficient tools for evaluation. The present study has found that minor problems with evaluation tools could substantially lower the reliability and validity of the results and the expected effects. As reported by the subjects, the question sheets were separate from the answer cards and sometimes students did not receive a question sheet of their own. It was also reported that students were required to bring a special kind of pencil
for marking the answers, and some did not remember to bring one. These problems could be prevented if students were provided the proper pencil and were asked to check answers on the same sheet containing evaluation items.

Fourth, standardized procedures in administering the evaluation form need to be established and monitored, especially when the results are used for personnel decisions. Some subjects pointed out that proctors completed the forms for students. Some mentioned the evaluation form was sometimes administered during the break and the situation was disorderly. A few subjects reported that they were present during rating, while some reported they were not. Standardized procedures in administering the rating forms can reduce the above problems and, therefore, increase the reliability of the results.

Fifth, if faculty support is to be obtained and maintained, student evaluation for personnel decisions should not be used until faculty members are assured of its consistency and accuracy. The subjects' major objections to the administrative use of student evaluation lay in their distrust of the data collected. In order to convince those who are directly affected by this evaluation, proof of the accuracy of student evaluation data is desired.

Sixth, the study encourages the administration to remain alert to possible drawbacks of student evaluation. If student evaluation is to be used for personnel decisions, there would be some drawbacks. For example, as some subjects proposed, teachers may decrease the course workload or grade leniently in order to obtain higher ratings. In order to minimize these undesirable effects, colleges may want to look
at grade distribution, course syllabus, and other related material to supplement student evaluation.

Finally, overuse of student evaluation is to be avoided. If the evaluation is administered for every course, every semester, students may get bored and respond casually or not respond at all. This fact has been reported in the United States (Centra, 1981; Seldin, 1980). A similar effect of "evaluation fatigue" was reported by several subjects in the present study. It is suggested that the administration of student evaluation be limited to every year or two instead of every semester.

**Implications for Future Research**

This was the first study on the attitudes of Chinese faculty members and department chairpersons toward student evaluation of college instruction. Ideas generated from this exploratory study indicated some issues or areas where further investigation is desired.

It is advisable to conduct a similar study on the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons toward student evaluation at Tamkang University with a larger sample in order to compare the results with the present investigation. One might use the findings of this study regarding the relationship between attitudes and certain variables as the research hypotheses and test them for significance.

Studies on the attitudes of part-time faculty toward student evaluation at Tamkang University are suggested. Findings may be compared with those of full-time faculty. It is also recommended that the attitudes of upper administration at Tamkang be investigated.
Students' casual manner in completing the questionnaires turned out to be a problem with student evaluation. Studies on the perceptions of Tamkang students concerning the student course evaluation should be conducted in order to find out the grounds for such casualness so it can be prevented.

Studies are needed to determine the relationship between student ratings and course workload. Many faculty members contended that easy courses tended to get higher ratings than difficult courses. It would be important to test if this is true and take necessary measures subsequently.

**Final Conclusions**

In the Republic of China, Tamkang University is the only known institution practicing student evaluation of instruction. The present study was aimed to explore the attitudes of its faculty members and department chairpersons toward this system. It was found that subjects generally supported the idea of student evaluation. Their concerns lay with problems in the administering of the ratings, which could be overcome through an improved evaluation technique. This implies that student evaluation of college instruction is feasible in the Republic of China.
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INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTRODUCTION

Nature and purpose of the study

This is a study for an Ed. D. Dissertation at the University of Massachusetts, designed independently of the administration of Tamkang University. The purpose of the study is to find out the attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons at Tamkang University toward student evaluation of instruction.

Sampling procedure of the study

All the sample faculty members were selected randomly by using a table of random numbers according to the variables of academic field and rank. (All the sample department chairpersons were selected randomly by using a table of random numbers according to the variables of academic field.)

Confidentiality of the study

The personal data of all the interviewees will be kept confidential. This data will not be made accessible to persons other than the researcher. The responses of the interviewees reported in the dissertation will be referred to by subject's academic field and role without identifying any individual respondents.

CONTENT OF STUDENT EVALUATION

Student evaluation forms usually contain different categories of items, such as instructor's teaching skill, teacher-student rapport, and so on. I would like to know your opinion regarding the content of student evaluation. Here are eight cards. Each contains a category of items related to student evaluation. On the top is the title of the category, and there are several examples under it.

Category A: Knowledge of Subject

* Instructor knew his subject matter thoroughly
* Instructor kept current with development in his field
* Instructor published books or articles often
Category B: Organization, Structure, or Clarity
  *Material presented in an orderly manner
  *Instructor well prepared for each class
  *Class time well spent
  *Instructor gave lectures that were easy to outline

Category C: Teacher-Student Interaction or Rapport
  *Student felt free to ask questions or express opinions
  *Instructor was friendly toward student
  *Instructor actively helpful when students had difficulty
  *Instructor was accessible to students out of class

Category D: Teaching Skill, Communication, or Lecturing Ability
  *Instructor used examples or illustrations to clarify the material
  *Instructor spoke audibly and clearly
  *Instructor presented material clearly
  *Instructor summarized or emphasized major points in lectures or discussions

Category E: Workload, Course Difficulty
  *In relation to other courses, this workload was heavy
  *Reading assignment was very difficult
  *Course challenged me intellectually
  *I put a great deal of effort into this course

Category F: Grading, Examinations
  *Instructor told student how they would be evaluated
  *Examinations reflected the important aspects of the course
  *Instructor assigned grades fairly and impartially

Category G: Impact on Students, Student Self-Rated Accomplishments
  *I learned a great deal in this course
  *This course stimulated me to want to take more work in the same or a related area

Category H: Global, Overall Ratings
  *Instructor's effectiveness as a teacher was: (excellent to poor)
  *Overall value of the course was: (excellent to poor)

(The eight cards will be shown one by one. After showing one card, questions 1.1 to 1.4 will be asked.)

Please answer the following questions:

1.1 To what degree do you think students are capable of answering this category of questions? (If the answers is almost incapable, skip 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4)
1.2 To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?

1.3 (Department Chairpersons Only) 
As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?

1.4 To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in student evaluation forms?

1.5 Are there any other categories which we have not covered that you think are especially desirable to be included in the student evaluation form? Or undesirable? (What are they?)

**USAGE OF STUDENT EVALUATION**

We have been talking about your perspective on the content of student evaluation. Now I would like to ask you some questions concerning the utilization of the evaluation results.

2.1 How do you think student evaluation should be used?

2.2 Who do you think is eligible to utilize the results of student evaluation?

2.3 What do you think about the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement?

2.4 Has the evaluation information been used by the institution as a criterion for personnel decisions regarding promotion or reappointment?

2.5 What do you think about the use of student evaluation for personnel decisions?

2.6 What do you think about the use of student evaluation for student course selection?

2.7 Are there any usages of student evaluation which we have not covered that you think are especially desirable? Or undesirable? (What are they?)

**IMPACT OF STUDENT EVALUATION**

Let me ask you to think about the impact of student evaluation.
3.1 Were you aware of the results of student evaluation of your instruction from each class you taught?

3.2 What do you usually do after you are aware of the results of student evaluation of your instruction?

3.3 Is student evaluation helpful in improving your teaching performance?

3.4 [If yes] In what aspects?

3.5 [If no] What are the possible reasons?

3.6 (Department Chairpersons Only) How do you deal with the results of student evaluation of teachers in your department after you receive the report?

3.7 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on the teacher-student relationship? (Why do you think that?)

3.8 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on faculty morale? (Why do you think that?)

3.9 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on the quality of instruction of the whole university? (Why do you think that?)

3.10 Is there any impact of student evaluation at Tamkang University which we have not covered that you think is especially important? (What are they?)

SUPPORT/NON-SUPPORT OF STUDENT EVALUATION

I am going to present you certain viewpoints of other people regarding student evaluation. Please give your own opinions.

4.1 Some people think that student evaluation can provide opportunities for students to express their opinions regarding their own education. What do you think of this?

4.2 Some people think that student evaluation goes against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers. What do you think of this?

4.3 Some people think that student evaluation can stimulate less qualified professors to improve. What do you think of this?
4.4 Some people think that student evaluation provides universities control over faculty members. What do you think of this?

4.5 Some people think that student evaluation can provide democratic training for both professors and students. What do you think of this?

4.6 Some people think that students do not have the right to evaluate professors, regardless of the student's ability to do so. What do you think of this?

4.7 Are there any arguments which we have not covered that you think are important in supporting your viewpoint regarding student evaluation? (What are they?)
教師及系主任訪問表

說明

本研究的性質及目的

這次訪問是一項純粹的學術研究，目的在了解淡江大學教授及系主任對學生評量教學的態度。整個研究設計是在美國麻州大學論文委員會的指導之下完成，研究結果將成為我博士論文的主要內容。

本研究的取樣方法

所有被訪問的教授（系主任）是依據統計學上分層隨機取樣的方法由淡大日間部全體專任教師（系主任）中抽出來的。

本研究的機密性

所有接受訪問的教師及系主任的個人資料都將予以保密。除我本人以外，別人絕對無法取得。將來在撰寫博士論文時，所有訪問對象的意见都將以代號方式報導，絕不提及任何教授及系主任的個別身份。

學生評量教學的內容

調查學生對教學意見的表格通常包含幾種類型的題目，例如教師教學技巧、師生關係等等。我希望了解您對這類調查表內容方面的意見，這兒有八張卡片，每張卡片說明一種類型的題目，最上方是題目類型的名稱，其下是幾個例子。

甲類：學科知識

► 任課教師對這門課的知識了解十分透徹
► 任課教師了解這門課知識的最新發展動向
任課教師經常發表研究著作

甲類：教材組織
✧ 教材安排有條有理
✧ 任課教師每堂課均準備充分
✧ 課堂時間運用得當

丙類：師生關係
✧ 學生覺得能自由發問或表示意見
✧ 任課教師態度平易近人
✧ 學生有困難時任課教師會主動協助
✧ 課堂之外任課教師仍有時間指導學生

丁類：教學技巧
✧ 任課教師能適切運用範例教學
✧ 任課教師課講口語清晰
✧ 任課教師把教材解釋得很清楚
✧ 任課教師講課能提綱挈領

戊類：課負擔
✧ 與其他課比較，這門課負擔頗重
✧ 這門課指定的閱讀材料相當艱深
✧ 這門課對我具有挑戰性
✧ 我在這門課上花了很多工夫

己類：考試及成績評定
✧ 任課教師事前說明成績評定標準
試題能反映課程的重點
任課教師評定成績寬嚴適中，公正不偏

庚類：本門課對學生的影響
我從這門課中學到很多東西
這門課引起我的興趣，我想進一步選修這方面的課程

辛類：綜合性評鑑
綜合起來看，這門課老師的教學績效是（優、良、中、差、劣）
綜合起來看，這門課的價值是（優、良、中、差、劣）

請回答下列幾個問題：
1.1 您認為學生在回答這方面題目的能力如何？（如果答案是否定的，則省略1.2、1.3、1.4）
1.2 您認為學生這方面的意見對老師們的幫助如何？
1.3 站在系主任的立場，您認為學生這方面的意見對系裡的幫助如何？（本題僅適用於系主任）
1.4 您認為這方面題目適不適合列入學生意見調查表裡面？
1.5 除了刚才我們討論過的之外，您認為有沒有什麼其他類型題目適合列入學生意見調查裡面？有沒有什麼類型題目不適合列入學生意見調查表裡面？

學生評量教學的運用

2.1 您認為學生意見調查表的結果應該作什麼用途？
2.2 您認為什麼人有資格使用這種調查結果？
2.3 您對調查學生意見作為教師改進教學之用看法如何？
2.4 學校當局是否把學生意見調查結果作為升等續聘的參考？
2.5 [若是] 您對此事看法如何？
[若是] 如果學校這麼做，您認為如何？
2.6 學生評量教學的結果如果作為學生選課參考之用，您認為如何？
2.7 除了剛才我們所討論的之外，您認為學生評量教學有沒有什麼其他應該有的用途？或不應該有的用途？（是些什麼？）

學生評量教學的影響

3.1 最近三年內您是否每學期均收到班上學生意見調查的統計結果？
3.2 您在接到班上學生意見調查表的統計結果後通常怎樣處理？
3.3 您認為學生意見的結果能否幫助您改進教學？
3.4 [若能] 請問在哪方面有幫助？
3.5 [若不能] 請問可能原因為什麼？
3.6 您在接到學生對系上教師的評量結果後，通常怎樣處理？
[本題僅適用於系主任]
3.7 整體來說，您認為調查學生對教學的意見對師生關係影響如何？（為什麼您認為如此？）
3.8 整體來說，您認為調查學生對教學的意見對教師教學情緒的影響如何？
3.9 整體來說，您認為調查學生對教學的意見對全校教學水準的影響如何？
3.10 除了刚才我們所討論的之外，您認為北大實施學生評量教學有沒有什麼其他的影響？

支持或不支持學生評量教學的措施

4.1 有些人認為學生評量教學的措施能夠讓學生對切身的教育問題有表示意見的機會，您認為如何？

4.2 有些人認為學生評量教學的措施違反中國尊師重道的傳統，您認為如何？

4.3 有些人認為學生評量教學的措施能刺激比較差的老師改進教學，您認為如何？

4.4 有些人認為學生評量教學是學校用來控制老師的一種手段，您認為如何？

4.5 有些人認為學生評量教學的措施對老師及學生都是一種民主的訓練，您認為如何？

4.6 有些人認為學生根本沒有資格評量老師的教學，不論他們有沒有這方面的能力，您認為如

4.7 有沒有什麼其他的理由可以支持您對學生評量教學的看法？
QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the number of your choice after each statement. **ALL SURVEY INFORMATION WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.** You are requested not to sign your name. Thank you very much.

1. Sex
   1. Male
   2. Female

2. Age
   1. 50 and over
   2. 35 - 49
   3. Under 35

3. Academic Rank
   1. Professor
   2. Associate professor
   3. Instructor

4. College Affiliation
   1. College of Liberal Arts
   2. College of Business
   3. College of Management
   4. College of Sciences
   5. College of Engineering

5. Highest earned degree
   1. Doctorate
   2. Master's
   3. Bachelor's
   4. Other

6. Location of school from which you received your highest degree
   1. China (Taiwan or Mainland China)
   2. Other Asian country or district (e.g. Japan, Hong Kong)
   3. North American country (e.g. U.S.A., Canada)
   4. European country (e.g. United Kingdom, Germany)
   5. Other, please specify ____________________________

7. Years of teaching experience in the institutions of higher education
   1. 13 or more years
   2. 3-12 years
   3. Fewer than 3 years
8. Years of teaching experience at Tamkang University
   1. 9 or more years
   2. 3-12 years
   3. Fewer than 3 years

9. Did you chair your department in Spring 1983?
   1. Yes
   2. No

10. If no, had you been the department chairperson before?
    1. Yes
    2. No

11. Teaching load at Tamkang University in Spring 1983
    1. 11 or more hours per week
    2. 6-10 hours per week
    3. 1-5 hours per week

12. Teaching load at institutions other than Tamkang University in Spring 1983
    1. 4 or more hours per week
    2. 1-3 hours per week
    3. None

13. Number of books published in last three years
    1. 3 or more
    2. 1-2
    3. None

14. Number of articles published in last three years
    1. 3 or more
    2. 1-2
    3. None

15. If teaching has to be evaluated, who do you think is in the best position to evaluate a professor's teaching performance?
    1. Dean of academic affairs
    2. School dean
    3. Department chairperson
    4. Colleagues
    5. The professor him/herself
    6. Students
    7. Other, please specify

16. Please circle one to three most important factors in determining faculty promotion at Tamkang University.
    1. Research and publication
    2. Teaching performance
    3. Service to department and institution
    4. Length of service in rank
    5. Academic degree
6. Knowing right people
7. Personal attributes
8. Other (please specify) ________________________________

17. Have you heard of student evaluation of college instruction before it was implemented at Tamkang University?
   1. Yes, with some experience in completing such evaluation forms (participation in evaluation)
   2. Yes, without any experience in completing such evaluation forms (familiarity with, but no participation)
   3. No (unaware of evaluation)

18. How much do you know about the research findings on student evaluation of college instruction?
   1. Considerable
   2. Limited
   3. Almost none

19. Overall, what is your attitude toward the practice of student evaluation at Tamkang University?
   1. Strongly approve
   2. Approve
   3. Neither approve nor disapprove
   4. Disapprove
   5. Strongly disapprove
請在適合的答案號碼後打“√”，所有填答資料將予保密，並請不要署名，謝謝您的合作。
(1)姓
1. □男  2. □女
(2)年
1. □ 50 歲以上 2. □ 35 ～ 49 歲 3. □ 34 歲以下
(3)職
1. □ 教授  2. □ 副教授  3. □ 講師
(4)學院
1. □ 文學院  2. □ 商學院  3. □ 管理學院  4. □ 理學院  5. □ 工學院
(5)最高學歷
1. □ 博士  2. □ 碩士  3. □ 學士  4. □ 其他
(6)取得最高學歷的學校所在地
1. □ 中國（台灣或中國大陸）  2. □ 其他亞洲國家或地區（如日本、香港）
3. □ 北美洲國家（如美國、加拿大）  4. □ 欧洲國家（如英國、德國）
5. □ 其他（請說明）
(7)在大學院校的教學經驗
1. □ 13 年以上  2. □ 3 ～ 12 年 3. □ 3 年以下
(8)在淡江大學的教學經驗
1. □ 9 年以上  2. □ 3 ～ 8 年 3. □ 3 年以下
(9)七十一學年度第二學期是否在淡大擔任主任？
1. □ 是（第 10 題請不必作答）  2. □ 否（請填答第 10 題）
(10)若否，最近八內曾否在淡大擔任過主任？
1. □ 是  2. □ 否
(11)七十一學年度第二學期在淡大每週教學時數
1. □ 11 小時以上  2. □ 6 ～ 10 小時 3. □ 1 ～ 5 小時
(12)七十一學年度第二學期在淡大以外學校的每週教學時數
1. □ 4 小時以上  2. □ 1 ～ 3 小時 3. □ 無
(13)過去三內出版的書籍
1. □ 3 本以上  2. □ 1 ～ 2 本 3. □ 無
(14)過去三內發表的學術論文
1. □ 3 篇以上  2. □ 1 ～ 2 篇 3. □ 無
(15)如果教學必須加以評量，您認為誰最適合來評量大學教師教學的優劣？
1. □ 教務長 2. □ 學院院長 3. □ 係主任
4. □ 同系其他教師 5. □ 教師本人 6. □ 學生
7. □ 其他（請說明）
(16)請選擇一至三項您認為決定淡大教師升等的最重要因素
1. □ 研究及著作 2. □ 教學績效 3. □ 教學及或學校的服務 4. □ 年資
5. □ 學歷 6. □ 認識有關人士 7. □ 個人品質
8. □ 其他（請說明）
(17)在接觸淡大所作學生評量教學之前，您是否聽說過這種措施？
1. □ 聽說過，且曾填過這種調查表 2. □ 聽說過，但未曾填過這種調查表
3. □ 沒聽說過
(18)您對學生評量教學的有關研究知道多少？
1. □ 很多  2. □ 少許 3. □ 幾乎沒有
(19)整體來說，您對淡大實施學生評量教學的措施看法如何？
1. □ 極為贊成  2. □ 贊成  3. □ 無意見  4. □ 不贊成  5. □ 極不贊成
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF TAMKANG UNIVERSITY
March 8, 1983

President Celement C. P. Chang
Tamkang University
Taipei, Taiwan, R.O.C.

Dear President Chang:

I am presently a doctoral student at the University of Massachusetts majoring in higher education. I graduated from the Department of Education, National Taiwan Normal University, and came to the United States in 1980 for advanced studies. Enclosed is a copy of my curriculum vitae.

Many systems on American campuses are different from those in the institutions of higher education in Taiwan. What interests me most is the adoption of student evaluation for teaching improvement or personnel decisions. With the encouragement and guidance from my professors, I have studied the background and practice of student evaluation in the United States. I have also interviewed some Chinese faculty members and graduate students at the University of Massachusetts in order to gather their perspectives on this system.

A few alumni of your university mentioned that Tamkang had practiced student evaluation for a number of years. I admire your wisdom and courage in adopting innovations for instructional improvement, and my interest in this topic has increased. For my doctoral dissertation I would like to study the reactions of faculty and students to the practice of student evaluation at your university. If you approve, I will return to Taiwan at an appropriate time to conduct the investigation. It is hoped that the study may prove to be useful in the future development of student evaluation at Tamkang.

Sincerely yours,

Shun-Fen Chen
張校長

您好！

我是一個在美國主修高等教育的學生。原畢業於國內師範大學教育學系，民國五十九年秋季以教育部公費來美進修，目前在美國麻州大學攻讀教育學士學位，附個人英文履歷表一份。

美國大學有許多制度與國內大專院校不盡相同。我印象最深刻的是許多美國大學在期末調查學生對課程及教學的意見，作為教師改進教學或升等加薪的參考。在教授的鼓勵下指導之下，我曾多方蒐集資料，求了解此一措施在美國的發展背景與實施狀況，以及反應與爭論的契機。並曾藉暗訪方式研究麻州大學中國教授與留學生對此制度之觀感。因此勇於嘗試的我們已全面實施此项措施。我對您致力於貴校作實地的研究，也希望能以貴校的經驗為參考。同時對研究這個問題的契機的互動，作為教授 abroad 的反應。在博士論文的題材，您曾對我的支持，我將於適當的時候返國到貴校作客研究的結果對貴校略具參考價值，冒昧地寫信給您高請見諒，而此敬頌...

晚陳爵芬敬上三首

勸祺
Dear Prof. ________:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the interview. Your interview is scheduled at _________(time), ________(date) (day), at ________(place). It will take approximately one hour. If you cannot be present at that time, please let me know in order to rearrange the interview.

Student evaluation of instruction is quite common in American universities. However, it is rare in the institutions of higher education in this country. The practice of student evaluation at Tamkang University is unique and merits attention. Due to the cultural differences between Chinese and American society, there may be some distinctions between the practices of teaching evaluation in the two countries. Faculty members and department chairpersons are the people who are directly involved in teaching evaluations. Their opinions, therefore, would be of great value to the future development of teaching evaluation in this country. The title of my dissertation is "The attitudes of faculty members and department chairpersons toward student evaluation of instruction in a selected university in the Republic of China." Your points of view, collected through interviewing, will be invaluable data of this study.

This is purely academic research. The personal data of all the interviewees will be kept confidential. The responses of the interviewees reported in the dissertation will be classified according to academic field (liberal arts/business or sciences/engineering) and role (faculty member or department chairperson) without identifying any individual subjects. Protecting the rights of the subjects is a major concern of interview research, and is required by the University of Massachusetts for doctoral dissertations of this kind. You may have a copy of the results of the study if you desire it. If you have any further questions or concerns, please let me know. Thank you again for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely yours,

Shun-Fen Chen
INTERVIEW CODING FORM

Subject No.__________
Coder No.__________

CONTENT OF STUDENT EVALUATION

Category A: Knowledge of Subject

1.1.a To what degree do you think students are capable of answering questions related to this category?
   1. Quite capable  
   2. Somewhat capable  
   3. Almost incapable  
   8. Need not ask  
   9. Other (specify) _______

1.2.a To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?
   1. Quite useful  
   2. Somewhat useful  
   3. Almost useless  
   8. Need not ask  
   9. Other (specify) _______

1.3.a As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?
   1. Quite useful  
   2. Somewhat useful  
   3. Almost useless  
   6. Not applicable  
   8. Need not ask  
   9. Other (specify) _______

1.4.a To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in student evaluation forms?
   1. Quite appropriate  
   2. Appropriate  
   3. Inappropriate  
   8. Need not ask  
   9. Other (specify) _______
Category B: Course Structure

1.1.b To what degree do you think students are capable of answering questions related to this category?
1. Quite capable
2. Somewhat capable
3. Almost incapable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________

1.2.b To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________

1.3.b As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
6. Not applicable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________

1.4.b To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in student evaluation forms?
1. Quite appropriate
2. Appropriate
3. Inappropriate
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________

Category C: Teacher-student Rapport

1.1.c To what degree do you think students are capable of answering questions related to this category?
1. Quite capable
2. Somewhat capable
3. Almost incapable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________
1.2.c To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) ______________________________

1.3.c As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
6. Not applicable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) ______________________________

1.4.c To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in student evaluation forms?
1. Quite appropriate
2. Appropriate
3. Inappropriate
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) ______________________________

Category D: Teaching Skill

1.1.d To what degree do you think students are capable of answering questions related to this category?
1. Quite capable
2. Somewhat capable
3. Almost incapable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) ______________________________

1.2.d To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) ______________________________
1.3.d As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
6. Not applicable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________________________________________________________________

1.4.d To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in student evaluation forms?
1. Quite appropriate
2. Appropriate
3. Inappropriate
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________________________________________________________________

Category E: Workload

1.1.e To what degree do you think students are capable of answering questions related to this category?
1. Quite capable
2. Somewhat capable
3. Almost incapable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________________________________________________________________

1.2.e To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________________________________________________________________

1.3.e As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
6. Not applicable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) __________________________________________________________________
1.4.e To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in student evaluation forms?
1. Quite appropriate
2. Appropriate
3. Inappropriate
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) 

Category F: Grading and Examinations

1.1.f To what degree do you think students are capable of answering questions related to this category?
1. Quite capable
2. Somewhat capable
3. Almost incapable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) 

1.2.f To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) 

1.3.f As a department chairperson, to what degree to you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?
1. Quite useful
2. Somewhat useful
3. Almost useless
6. Not applicable
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) 

1.4.f To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in student evaluation forms?
1. Quite appropriate
2. Appropriate
3. Inappropriate
8. Need not ask
9. Other (specify) 

Category G: Impact on Students

1.1.g To what degree do you think students are capable of answering questions related to this category?
   1. Quite capable
   2. Somewhat capable
   3. Almost incapable
   8. Need not ask
   9. Other (specify) ________________

1.2.g To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?
   1. Quite useful
   2. Somewhat useful
   3. Almost useless
   8. Need not ask
   9. Other (specify) ________________

1.3.g As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?
   1. Quite useful
   2. Somewhat useful
   3. Almost useless
   6. Not applicable
   8. Need not ask
   9. Other (specify) ________________

1.4.g To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in student evaluation forms?
   1. Quite appropriate
   2. Appropriate
   3. Inappropriate
   8. Need not ask
   9. Other (specify) ________________

Category H: Global Ratings

1.1.h To what degree do you think students are capable of answering questions related to this category?
   1. Quite capable
   2. Somewhat capable
   3. Almost incapable
   8. Need not ask
   9. Other (specify) ________________
1.2.h To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?
   1. Quite useful
   2. Somewhat useful
   3. Almost useless
   8. Need not ask
   9. Other (specify) ____________________________

1.3.h As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?
   1. Quite useful
   2. Somewhat useful
   3. Almost useless
   6. Not applicable
   8. Need not ask
   9. Other (specify) ____________________________

1.4.h To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in student evaluation forms?
   1. Quite appropriate
   2. Appropriate
   3. Inappropriate
   8. Need not ask
   9. Other (specify) ____________________________

USAGE OF STUDENT EVALUATION

2.1 How do you think student evaluation should be used?
   (1) Mentioned M (2) Not Mentioned NM
   1. Improvement of the instructor's teaching
      (1) M
      (2) NM
   2. Improvement of the program
      (1) M
      (2) NM
   3. Improvement of the teaching-learning environment
      (1) M
      (2) NM
   4. Personnel decisions
      (1) M
      (2) NM
   9. Other (specify) ____________________________
2.2 Who do you think is eligible to utilize the results of student evaluation?

(1) Mentioned M        (2) Not Mentioned NM

1. President
   (1) M
   (2) NM

2. Vice president for academic affairs
   (1) M
   (2) NM

3. Dean of academic affairs
   (1) M
   (2) NM

4. School dean
   (1) M
   (2) NM

5. Department chairperson
   (1) M
   (2) NM

6. Faculty being evaluated
   (1) M
   (2) NM

7. Personnel committee
   (1) M
   (2) NM

9. Other (specify) ________________________________

2.3 What is your opinion about the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement?

1. Strongly approve
2. Approve
3. Neither approve nor disapprove
4. Disapprove
5. Strongly disapprove
9. Other (specify) ________________________________

2.4 Has the evaluation information been used by the institution as a criterion for personnel decisions regarding promotion or reappointment?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
2.5 What do you think about the use of student evaluation for personnel decisions?
1. Strongly approve
2. Approve
3. Neither approve nor disapprove
4. Disapprove
5. Strongly disapprove
9. Other (specify) ____________________________

2.6 What do you think about the use of student evaluation for student course selection?
1. Strongly approve
2. Approve
3. Neither approve nor disapprove
4. Disapprove
5. Strongly disapprove
9. Other (specify) ____________________________

IMPACT OF STUDENT EVALUATION

3.1 Were you aware of the results of student evaluation of your instruction from each class you taught?
1. Aware of the results of student evaluation from each class I taught
2. Aware of the results from some of the classes I taught
3. Not aware of the results at all

3.2 What do you usually do after you receive the results of student evaluation of your instruction?
1. Read them and take them seriously with action
2. Read them and take them seriously without action
3. Read them but don't take them seriously
4. Totally disregard them
6. Not applicable
9. Other (specify) ____________________________

3.3 Is student evaluation useful in directing your teaching performance?
1. Yes, quite useful
2. Yes, somewhat useful
3. No, almost useless
6. Not applicable
3.4 [If yes] In what aspects?
   (1) Mentioned M  (2) Not mentioned NM
   1. Organization of the course
      (1) M  (2) NM
   2. Teaching Skill
      (1) M  (2) NM
   3. Workload
      (1) M  (2) NM
   4. Rapport
      (1) M  (2) NM
   5. Grading and Examinations
      (1) M  (2) NM
   6. Not applicable
   9. Other (specify) ________________________________

3.5 [If no] What do you think are the possible reasons?
   (1) Mentioned M  (2) Not Mentioned NM
   1. Teaching can hardly be improved
      (1) M  (2) NM
   2. The evaluation questionnaire is not appropriate
      (1) M  (2) NM
   3. Students' judgment is not dependable
      (1) M  (2) NM
   4. The report of the evaluation results is hard to understand
      (1) M  (2) NM
   5. Do not know how to improve
      (1) M  (2) NM
   6. Not applicable
   9. Other (specify) ________________________________

3.6 How do you deal with the results of student evaluation of teachers in your department after you receive the report?
   1. Read them and take them seriously with action
   2. Read them and take them seriously without action
   3. Read them but don't take them seriously
   4. Totally disregard them
   6. Not applicable
   9. Other (specify) ________________________________
3.7 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on the teacher-student relationship?
1. Much better
2. Better
3. Little or no impact
4. Worse
5. Much worse
6. Do not know
7. Other (specify) ____________________________

3.8 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on faculty morale?
1. Much higher
2. Higher
3. Little or no impact
4. Lower
5. Much lower
6. Do not know
7. Other (specify) ____________________________

3.9 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on the quality of instruction of the whole university?
1. Much higher
2. Higher
3. Little or no impact
4. Lower
5. Much lower
6. Do not know
7. Other (specify) ____________________________

SUPPORT/NON-SUPPORT OF STUDENT EVALUATION

4.1 Some people think that student evaluation can provide opportunities for students to express their opinions regarding their own education. What do you think of this?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Do not know
7. Other (specify) ____________________________
4.2 Some people think that student evaluation goes against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers. What do you think of this?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
7. Do not know
9. Other (specify) 

4.3 Some people think that student evaluation can stimulate less qualified professors to improve. What do you think of this?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
7. Do not know
9. Other (specify) 

4.4 Some people think that student evaluation provides universities control over the faculty members. What do you think of this?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
7. Do not know
9. Other (specify) 

4.5 Some people think that student evaluation can provide democratic training for both professors and students. What do you think of this?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
7. Do not know
9. Other (specify) 

4.6 Some people think that students do not have the right to evaluate professors, regardless of the students' ability to do so. What do you think of this?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
7. Do not know
9. Other (specify) 

APPENDIX F

CODING SUGGESTIONS
CODING SUGGESTIONS

Questions 1.1

Quite Capable

Interviewees give positive answers without any reservations, such as:

- Students can judge.
- Students can understand.
- Students can answer.
- Students' ability is very good.
- There is no problem for students to answer.
- Students' answers are the most objective.
- These questions are directly related to students' own experiences.

Somewhat Capable

- Students probably can answer.
- Students' answers can reflect the fact more or less.
- Students have the ability to judge but . . .
- Students can answer but . . .
- Students can partially understand.
- Students can answer at least half but not all of the sample questions.
- The majority but not all of the students can answer.

Almost Capable

Interviewees give negative answers, such as:

- Students cannot judge.
- Students are very subjective.
- Students do not know at all.
- Students have no way to understand.
- It is very difficult for students to judge.
- Students' ability to answer is insufficient.
- Students are not clear about the answer.
- Students cannot answer most of the sample questions.
- Most of the students do not have the ability to answer.

Other

Interviewees give conditional answers, such as:

- Students can answer under a certain condition, while cannot answer under another condition.
Questions 1.2, 1.3

Quite Useful

Interviewees give positive answers without any reservations, such as:
- Students' opinions are very helpful.
- Of course students' opinions are useful.
- No doubt students' opinions can improve teachers' teaching.
- Students' opinions are a very good source of information.

Somewhat Useful

Interviewees give positive answers but show some uncertainty or reservations, such as:
- Students' opinions are probably helpful.
- Students' opinions are helpful but . . .
- Students' opinions are of limited help.
- At least half but not all of the sample questions are useful.
- Students' opinions are merely a source of information.

Almost Useless

Interviewees give negative answers, such as:
- Students' opinions can hardly change anything.
- Students' opinions are not helpful.
- Most of the sample questions are useless.

Other

Interviewees give conditional answers, such as:
- Students' opinions are helpful to a certain category of teachers, but not to another category.
- Students' opinions are helpful under a certain condition, but not under another condition.
Questions 1.3

Quite Appropriate

Interviewees give strong positive answers without any reservations, such as:

- These items are very good.
- These items are very appropriate.
- These items are very important.
- These items must be included.
- These items are appropriate and are a major part of the evaluation form.
- It is necessary to include these items.
- These items are worthwhile.
- These items are very needy.

Appropriate

Interviewees give positive answers with or without slight reservations, such as:

- These items are appropriate.
- These items can be included.
- It is all right to include these items.
- These items can either be included or not included.
- Most of the sample questions are appropriate.
- These items are needy.

Inappropriate

Interviewees give negative answers, such as:

- These items are not appropriate.
- It is unnecessary to ask these questions.
- Do not ask these questions.
- These items are worthless.
- Most of the sample questions are inappropriate.

Other

Interviewees give conditional or uncertain questions, such as:

- These items are appropriate under a certain condition, while inappropri¬
  ate under another condition.
- I need more consideration to decide.
Question 2.1

**Improvement of the Instructor's Teaching**
- used to improve the teaching skill of the instructor
- used by the department chairperson to help the instructor improve his/her teaching

**Improvement of the Program**
- used to aid the department in matching instructors with courses
- used to help the department decide which elective course should or should not be offered
- used to help the department schedule the time of the courses

**Improvement of the Teaching-Learning Environment**
- used as a channel of communication between teachers and students
- used to shorten the distance between teachers and students

**Personnel Decisions**
- used as a criterion for promotion or reappointment of the faculty members
Questions 2.3, 2.5, 2.6

**Strongly Approve**

Interviewees give strong positive answers without any reservations, such as:

- It is very good.
- Of course it helps.
- I strongly approve.

**Approve**

Interviewees give positive answers with or without slight reservations, such as:

- It can be accepted.
- It is all right.
- It cannot be weighted too heavily.

**Neither Approve nor Disapprove**

Interviewees give neutral answers, such as:

- No opinion.
- With or without it is okay.

**Disapprove**

Interviewees give negative answers, such as:

- It is not good.
- It is almost useless.
- There is little effect.
- It is unnecessary.
- I am doubtful of its effect.

**Strongly Disapprove**

Interviewees give strongly negative answers, such as:

- It is very inappropriate.
- I strongly disapprove.

**Other**

Interviewees give conditional answers, such as:

- It is appropriate under a certain condition, while inappropriate under another condition.
Question 3.4

Organization of the Course
- arrange the course differently
- prepare more for the class
- class time spent differently

Teaching Skill
- speak more slowly
- speak more clearly
- write more clearly on the blackboard
- use different methods to explain the material
- change the pace of the course

Workload
- change the level of difficulty of the course
- change the amount or content of the course material
- change the amount or content of the assignment
- change the academic expectation of the students

Rapport
- change classroom climate
- change attitudes toward students
- change the amount of time accessible to students

Grading and Examinations
- revise the grading policies
- change the content of examinations
Questions 3.7, 3.8, 3.9

**Much Higher (Much Better)**

Interviewees give positive answers, such as:
- raise (improve) considerably
- substantive positive impact
- become much higher (better)

**Higher (Better)**

Interviewees give positive answers, such as:
- has positive impact
- become higher (better)
- improved

**Little or No Impact**

Interviewees give neutral answers, such as:
- no impact
- very little impact
- no impact in most cases
- do not affect most people

**Lower (Worse)**

Interviewees give negative answers, such as:
- become lower (worse)
- has negative impact

**Much Lower (Much Worse)**

Interviewees give strong negative answers, such as:
- become much lower (worse)
- substantial negative impact

**Other**

Interviewees give conditional or uncertain answers, such as:
- become higher (better) under a certain condition, while become lower (worse) under another condition
- It is hard to say.
Questions 4.1 to 4.6

**Strongly Agree**

Interviewees give strong positive answers without any reservations, such as:

- Of course it is very good.
- Of course it is the case.
- Absolutely it is.
- It is very obvious.

**Agree**

Interviewees give positive answers with or without slight reservation, such as:

- I think so.
- It should be the case.
- It is true.
- It should have such function.
- It is effective.
- I approve.
- I agree.
- It is the fact.
- It is more or less correct.
- It is not incorrect.

**Neither Agree nor Disagree**

Interviewees give neutral answers, such as:

- No opinion.

**Disagree**

Interviewees give negative answers, such as:

- I disagree.
- I do not feel like that.
- It is not the case.
- It is not objective.
- It is not possible.
- I do not think so.
- It is not related to that.
Strongly Disagree

Interviewees give strong negative answers, such as:

- It is just the opposite.
- It is absolutely not the case.
- I strongly disagree.

Other

Interviewees give conditional or uncertain answers, such as:

- I agree under a certain condition, while disagree under another condition.
- It is hard to say.
APPENDIX G

A DISCUSSION OF THE INTERCODER RELIABILITY REPRESENTED BY TWO TYPES OF COEFFICIENTS
A DISCUSSION OF THE INTERCODER RELIABILITY REPRESENTED BY TWO TYPES OF COEFFICIENTS

Another type of intercoder reliability, Cohen's kappa \((k)\), was also calculated for each major question of the present study. Table 87 shows a contrast of the obtained \( \pi \)'s and kappa's. As can be seen in the table, results of the two sets of intercoder reliability are quite similar, while the values of \( \pi \)'s are less extreme than those of kappa's (except for the case of perfect agreement, in which the value of either \( \pi \) or kappa is 1.00).

The formulas used by these two types of coefficients are basically the same, in which the actual difference between obtained and chance agreement is divided by the maximum difference between obtained and chance agreement. The distinction lies in the calculation of the chance agreement. Scott assumes that the distribution of responses over the set of categories for individual coders is approximately equal to the distribution of the entire set of interviewees (Scott, 1955). However, Cohen contends that chance agreement should be based on the actual distribution of each pair of coders, and therefore, requires no assumption (Cohen, 1960; Frick & Semmel, 1978).

In the present study, the sample size chosen for comparing the agreement between two coders was ten. Extreme values of chance agreement were very likely to happen with such a small sample when Cohen's kappa was adopted. On the other hand, the obtained values of \( \pi \)'s avoided such extreme cases since the chance agreement calculation was based on the thirty-two interviews instead of ten. It
seemed that Scott's method was more appropriate for calculating the intercoder reliability when the sample size was small.

### TABLE 87
A CONTRAST OF PI'S AND KAPPA'S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Cohen's Kappa (k)</th>
<th>Scott's π (π)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 To what degree do you think students are capable of answering this type of question?</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 To what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to teachers?</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 As a department chairperson, to what degree do you think students' opinions of this type are useful to the department?</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 To what degree do you think it is appropriate to include this category of items in the student evaluation forms?</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 How do you think student evaluation should be used?</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Who do you think is eligible to utilize the results of student evaluation?</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 What is your opinion about the use of student evaluation for teaching improvement?</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Has the evaluation information been used by the institution as a criterion for personnel decisions regarding promotion or reappointment?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 What do you think about the use of student evaluation for personnel decisions?</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 What would you think about the use of student evaluation for course selection?</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Were you aware of the results of student evaluation of your instruction from each class you taught?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 What do you usually do after you are aware of the results of student evaluation of your instruction?</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Is student evaluation helpful in directing your teaching performance?</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 If yes, in what aspect?</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 If no, what are the possible reasons?</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 How do you deal with the results of student evaluation of teachers in your department after you receive the report?</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Cohen's Kappa (k)</td>
<td>Scott's Pi (π)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on the teacher-student relationship?</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation on faculty morale?</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 What do you think is the overall impact of student evaluation of the quality of the whole university?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Some people think that student evaluation can provide opportunities for students to express their opinions regarding their own education. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Some people think that student evaluations are against the Chinese tradition of respecting teachers. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Some people think that student evaluations can stimulate less qualified professors to improve themselves. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Some people think that student evaluation provides universities control over faculty members. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Some people think that student evaluation can provide democratic training for both professors and students. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Some people think that students do not have the right to evaluate professors, regardless of student's ability to do so. What do you think of this?</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CROSSTABULATION TABLES

In the following tables, "positive" overall attitude included "strongly approve" and "approve," while "non-positive" included "no opinion," "disapprove," and "strongly disapprove." Two subjects who did not answer the overall attitude item were excluded.

**TABLE 88**
OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>15 (68.2%)</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>7 (31.8%)</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22 (73.3%)</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 89**
OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>50 and Over</th>
<th>35-49</th>
<th>Under 35</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3 (50.0%)</td>
<td>11 (68.8%)</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>3 (50.0%)</td>
<td>5 (31.3%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100.0%)</td>
<td>16 (100.0%)</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 90

**OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY HIGHEST DEGREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7 (70.0%)</td>
<td>8 (66.7%)</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>19 (65.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>3 (30.0%)</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>10 (34.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10 (100.0%)</td>
<td>12 (100.0%)</td>
<td>5 (100.0%)</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>29 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** One subject did not answer the item of highest degree.

### TABLE 91

**OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY LOCALITY WHERE HIGHEST DEGREE RECEIVED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>N. American Area</th>
<th>Other Areas</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10 (76.9%)</td>
<td>4 (52.9%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>3 (23.1%)</td>
<td>8 (47.1%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13 (100.0%)</td>
<td>17 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 92
OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE
AT TAMKANG BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT
INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>13 or More Years</th>
<th>3-12 Years</th>
<th>Fewer Than 3 Years</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
<td>13 (65.0%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>7 (35.0%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (100.0%)</td>
<td>20 (100.0%)</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 93
OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE
AT TAMKANG BY TEACHING EXPERIENCE AT TAMKANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>9 or More Years</th>
<th>3-8 Years</th>
<th>Fewer Than 3 Years</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>9 (81.8%)</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>5 (55.6%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>4 (44.4%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (100.0%)</td>
<td>10 (100.0%)</td>
<td>9 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 94
OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>Department Chairperson</th>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6 (75.0%)</td>
<td>13 (59.1%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>9 (40.9%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>22 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 95
OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY TEACHING LOAD AT TAMKANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>11 or More Hours/Week</th>
<th>6-10 Hours/Week</th>
<th>1-5 Hours/Week</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>14 (73.7%)</td>
<td>1 (100.0%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>7 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>21 (100.0%)</td>
<td>1 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 96

OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY TEACHING LOAD OUTSIDE TAMKANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>4 or More Hours/Week</th>
<th>1-3 Hours/Week</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>6 (85.7%)</td>
<td>12 (60.0%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>8 (40.0%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 (100.0%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>20 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 97

OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY NUMBER OF BOOKS PUBLISHED IN THE PAST THREE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>3 or More</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4 (44.4%)</td>
<td>10 (71.4%)</td>
<td>17 (60.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>5 (55.6%)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
<td>11 (39.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 (100.0%)</td>
<td>9 (100.0%)</td>
<td>14 (100.0%)</td>
<td>28 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Two subjects did not answer the item of books published.
### TABLE 98

OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY NUMBER OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED IN THE PAST THREE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>3 or More</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10 (62.5%)</td>
<td>7 (70.0%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>18 (62.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>6 (37.5%)</td>
<td>3 (30.0%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
<td>11 (37.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16 (100.0%)</td>
<td>10 (100.0%)</td>
<td>3 (100.0%)</td>
<td>29 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: One subject did not answer the item of articles published.

### TABLE 99

OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE AT TAMKANG BY PAST EXPERIENCE WITH STUDENT EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>Participation in Evaluation</th>
<th>Familiarity With But No Participation</th>
<th>Unaware of Evaluation</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7 (77.8%)</td>
<td>7 (63.6%)</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>19 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (100.0%)</td>
<td>11 (100.0%)</td>
<td>10 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 100
OVERALL ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT EVALUATION PRACTICE
AT TAMKANG BY KNOWLEDGE ABOUT RESEARCH
ON STUDENT EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Attitude</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Almost None</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>9 (75.0%)</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
<td>18 (62.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-positive</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (25.0%)</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
<td>11 (37.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>12 (100.0%)</td>
<td>15 (100.0%)</td>
<td>29 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: One subject did not answer the item of knowledge about research on student evaluation.