



Factors Affecting Students Perception towards Teaching Faculty Evaluation at University of Malakand

Zahid Khan¹, Jawad Hussain², Arshad Ali³, Sidra Ali⁴

Abstract

In the present study we identify the factors affecting students' perception towards teaching faculty evaluation in University of Malakand. Stratified random sampling is used to identify the students. Academics faculties are considered as strata. Sample is selected by equal allocation method from each stratum. Information from the selected students is collected by a structure questionnaire. The necessary characteristics are presented by table. In order to find the significant factors affecting faculty evaluation logistic regression model is used. The result shows that good relation of students with faculty members, teaching method, and qualification of faculty members are significantly associated with faculty evaluation. Faculty should try to make good relationship with students and should focus on their teaching method. University administration should hire faculty having higher qualification.

Keywords: Faculty Evaluation, teaching method, qualification of faculty members, good relation, logistic regression model

1. Introduction

Teaching faculty assessment gives valuable information about the faculty member's achievement in the form of teaching (Seif, 2004). Through assessment the growth in instructive system can be measured. The assessment systems in institutes lead to high quality teaching (Akbari, 2014). Many countries utilized the student's evaluation of teaching tool (SET) as a resource of supporting and refining teaching eminence (Hammonds, 2017). The SET is new word utilized usually with many preceding terms such as Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) and student's evaluation of teaching effectiveness etc. SET is broadly utilized in the assessment of faculty and their teaching effectiveness (Spooren and Christiaens, 2017; Spooren et al., 2017).

The SET can be summed up in three groups: features of the students themselves and their partialities in awareness and outlooks; features of the course itself together with environmental aspects and features of the teacher (Worthington, 2002).

An evaluation preforma is offered to students that enquire and score their insights of teachers and courses frequently on a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Spooren, 2013). Many researchers identified the factors affecting student's thinking to SET. According to a study, personality of the teacher is a biasing factor in evaluation of teachers (Mohammed & Pandhiani, 2017). Another important factor is gender, male faculty member gets more SET score than female, regardless of the fact that male instructor's areas low competent instructors as their female counterpart (Anne, 2017). Class size also a significant factor for faculty evaluation score. Higher size of class gives low score vice versa (Annan et al., 2013). According to a research done in 2011, top graduate educational institutes did the assessment system by means of the student and administrator grading methodology by both students and administrators (Kamali et al., 2014). Other factors responsible for evaluation are; age, sex, qualification, medium of teaching. Similarly, class size and students' grades were found to be major factors related to course and students in the tool (Haris et al., 2022).

Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC) under Higher Education Commission (HEC) directs the universities to evaluate the faculty members by students at the end of each semester. On the basis of evaluation, marks are given to faculty members. The students evaluated the faculty members positively or negatively. Thus a study is mandatory to evaluate the student's perception about the evaluation, that is, on the basis of which factors they give higher marks or low marks to faculty member in faculty evaluation proforma. In the present study we assess the factors responsible for the better evaluation of the faculty members. Another word, we are identifying those factors which make faculty member best in eye of students.

2. Material and Methods

The population of this study is the students of University of Malakand. From the population, students are selected by stratified random sampling method. For this purpose the population is divided into strata and then from each stratum equal samples are selected. Academic faculties are consider as strata, and from each faculties sample are selected by simple random sampling method. The University of Malakand has nine faculties; sciences, arts and humanities, social

¹ Lecturer, Department of Statistics, University of Malakand, Chakdara, Dir (Lower), Pakistan

² Associate Professor, Department of Commerce & Management Sciences, University of Malakand, Chakdara, Dir (Lower), Pakistan

³ M.Phil Scholar, Department of Statistics, University of Malakand, Chakdara, Dir (Lower), Pakistan

⁴ BS Student, Department of Statistics, University of Malakand, Chakdara, Dir (Lower), Pakistan

Sciences, law, biological sciences, information technology, engineering, education, management sciences. From each faculty 10 students are identified by stratified random sampling equal allocation method. A structured questionnaire is formatted and distributed among the selected respondents. All the students fill the questionnaires and returned.

2.1. Ordinal Logistic Regression

Standard logistic model is used when the dependent variable is categorical. The generalized form of standard logistic model is ordinal logistic model which used when dependent variable have three or more category and every category has important order (Liu and Koirala, 2013). For instance, grade of students in examination, A grade represent higher marks, B grade represent higher marks but lower than A grade, similarly, C grade is lower than A and B grade. In this situation, as with many latent variables, there may be an underlying continuous variable but the metric, that is, the distance between adjacent levels, is unknown (Tarling, 2008). The common model which is used for such ordinal data is called proportion odd model or cumulative logit model, because it estimates cumulative odd of exactly or below a specific level of dependent variable, that is, PO model characterizes the ordinal response in k categories in term of k-1 cumulative categories comparisons, specifically, k-1 cumulative logits of the ordinal responses (David and Mitchel, 1994). More specifically, in case of four level of ordinal outcome i.e 0, 1,2,3 three logit will be modeled, one for each of the cut points; 0 vs. 1, 2, 3; 0, 1 vs. 2, 3; and 0, 1, 2 vs. 3 (Hosmer and Lemeshow, 2000).

To illustrate the ordinal logistic model (proportional odds model), suppose the dependent variable Y has t ordered categories. The t categories can be represented as t – 1 binary comparison. The cumulative odd of the ith category as

$$odd(Y \leq j) = \frac{p(Y \leq i)}{p(Y > i)} = \frac{p_1 + p_2 + p_3 \dots \dots p_j}{p_{i+1} + p_{i+2} + p_{i+3} \dots \dots p_t}$$

The proportional odd model for the single predictor variable is then

$$\log \left(\frac{p(Y \leq i)}{p(Y > i)} \right) = \alpha_i - \beta x,$$

So that

$$p(Y \leq i) = \frac{e^{\alpha_i - \beta x}}{1 + e^{\alpha_i - \beta x}} \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \dots \dots t - 1$$

3. Result and Discussion

Total of 90 undergraduate students are selected from the population consisting 63 (70%) male and 27(30%) female (Table 1). Further, Students are selected randomly, therefore, from various semester questionnaire filled and returned. Table 1 shows that Out of 90 students, 10(11%) are from 1st semester, 20(22%) from 2nd semester, 51(57%) from 3rd semester, 6(7%) from 5th semester, and 3(3%) from 6th semester are selected.

Table 1: Gender of Students and Semester in Which They Are Enrolled

Gender	Number	Percentage
Male	63	70
Female	27	30
Semester		
1 st	10	11
2 nd	20	22
3 rd	51	57
5 th	6	7
6 th	3	3

In questionnaire several questions regarding evaluation of faculty members are given but all are not found statistically significant. Three factors found significantly related to faculty evaluation which are; relation of students with teachers, teaching method of faculty members, and qualification of faculty members. Table 2 shows that students who are strongly disagree with relation base evaluation of teachers are 6(7%), disagree are 6(7%), not satisfied 11(12%), agree

39(43%), and strongly agree 28(31%). Concerning teaching method of faculty members, students who mark strongly agree are 8(33%), disagree 2(13%), not satisfied 17(19%), agree 30 (33%), strongly disagree 23(25%). Focusing on qualification of faculty members, 5(6%) students are found strongly disagree, 17(19%) are disagree, 26(29%) are not satisfied, 27(30%) are disagree, and 15(16%) are strongly disagree. Students who strongly disagree from faculty performance are 3(3%), 5(6%) found disagree, 10(11%) found not satisfied, 38(42%) found disagree, 34(38%) found strongly disagree.

Table 2: Satisfaction Levels of Students and Associated Factors

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Satisfied	Agree	Strongly agree
Relation with teachers	6(7%)	6(7%)	11(12%)	39(43%)	28(31%)
Teaching method	8(33%)	2(13%)	17(19%)	30(33%)	23(25%)
Qualification of faculty members	5(6%)	17(19%)	26(29%)	27(30%)	15(16%)
Satisfaction level of Students	3(3%)	5(6%)	10(11%)	38(42%)	34 (38%)

The significant factors associated with evaluation of teachers are assessed by logistic regression model. The reason behind using of this model is the ordinal dependent variable. The result of logistic regression model is presented in Table 3 which shows that relation with faculty member is significantly related ($p < 0.05$) to dependent variable (satisfaction level of students). Further, its coefficient is positive showing positive relationship between them. Thus, as the level of relationship between students and faculty members increases, the satisfaction level of students increases and vice versa.

Teaching method of faculty members significantly associated ($p < 0.05$) with students' satisfaction level. The positive coefficient of teaching method is showing positive relationship with satisfaction level. Thus, as the student's satisfaction level from teaching method increases the students are more satisfied from the faculty members and vice versa.

Another factor which is significantly related to the dependent variable is qualification of faculty members. The students more satisfied from PhD faculty members because they have more knowledge and command on subject. The coefficient of this factor is also positive which show the higher the qualification of faculty members the higher the satisfaction level of students regarding student's satisfaction level.

Table 3: Results of Logistic Regression Model with Satisfaction from Faculty, Dependent Variable, and Relation with Faculty Members, Teaching Method, Qualification as Independent Variables

	Coefficient	P value
Const(1)	0.587428	0.701
Const(2)	1.81209	0.232
Const(3)	2.32433	0.132
Const(4)	3.68699	0.025
Relation with Faculty members	0.664129	0.047
Teaching method	0.714468	0.033
Qualification	0.744426	0.044

4. Conclusion

The present study is assessing the factors associated with faculty evaluation in University of Malakand. Sample of undergraduate student who are population of this study are selected by stratified random sampling method. Finding

shows that teaching method, relation of students and faculty members and qualification of faculty members are significantly associated with positive evaluation of faculty members.

The faculty members should establish good relationship with students, and should improve teaching method that students positively evaluate the faculty members. Administrations should ensure high qualified faculty members for their positive evaluation by students which leads to higher rank of institution.

References

- Akbari, M., Moeintaghavi, A., Ghanbari, H., Bageri, M., & Otoufi, A. A. (2014). A Comparison of the Students' and Teachers' Viewpoints about the Characteristics of a Good Teacher in Dentistry. *Journal of Mashhad Dental School*, 38(4), 281-290.
- David, K., & Mitchel, K. (1994). Logistic regression: A self-learning text.
- Hammonds, F., Mariano, G. J., Ammons, G., & Chambers, S. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching: improving teaching quality in higher education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 21(1), 26-33.
- Haris, S., Jamil, B., Haris, M., Deeba, F., Khan, M. J., & Khan, I. Z. (2022). Factors Affecting Students Perception towards Faculty Evaluation of Teaching at Nowshera Medical College, Pakistan. *The Professional Medical Journal*, 29(02), 258-264.
- Hosmer, D. W., & Lemeshow, S. (2000). Applied Logistic Regression. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.
- Liu, X., & Koirala, H. (2013). Fitting Proportional Odds Models to Educational Data with Complex Sampling Designs in Ordinal Logistic Regression. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*. 12(1), 235-248.
- Seif, A. (2007). Educational measurement, assessment and evaluation. *Tehran: AGAH*, 60-132
- Spooren, P., & Christiaens, W. (2017). I liked your course because I believe in (the power of) student evaluations of teaching (SET). Students' perceptions of a teaching evaluation process and their relationships with SET scores. *Studies in educational evaluation*, 54, 43-49.
- Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598-642.
- Spooren, P., Vandermoere, F., Vanderstraeten, R., & Pepermans, K. (2017). Exploring high impact scholarship in research on student's evaluation of teaching (SET). *Educational Research Review*, 22, 129-141.
- Tarling, R. (2008). Statistical modelling for social researchers: Principles and practice. Routledge.
- Worthington, A. C. (2002). The impact of student perceptions and characteristics on teaching evaluations: a case study in finance education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(1), 49-64.