European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available online at: www.oapub.org/edu

DOI: 10.46827/ejes.v11i8.5450 Volume 11 | Issue 8 | 2024

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION IN A GHANAIAN COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Francis Justice Kwesi Agbofa[i]
Department of Education,
Seventh-day Adventist College of Education,
Asokore-Koforidua,
Ghana

Abstract:
The study conducts an evaluation of tutors and instruction at the Seventh-Day College of Education at Asokore, Koforidua. The study employed an electronic version of Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) questionnaire to evaluate tutors and instruction at the college. A quantitative approach with a cross-sectional survey design was employed, where 317 respondent students who had spent at least one whole academic year were sampled by a multi-stage sampling approach, which blended quota and convenience sampling. The data was analysed with SPSS 23, where means and standard deviations of questionnaire items were used to establish how students evaluate tutors. It was revealed that students have a good appreciation of their learning but are indifferent in terms of appreciation of tutors' enthusiasm for teaching. Student respondents agree that tutors have a good appreciation for group interaction during class but are also indifferent in agreement with tutors' rapport with students. The study further revealed that students are neutral in terms of agreement with the overall expression of good presentation of academic content and use of alternative approaches and theories, as well as with the value and fairness of examinations and graded materials. Positive and statistically significant correlations were established among all the sub-scales of the SEEQ scale. A statistically significant correlation was also established between the years students have spent at the college and their overall evaluation of educational quality. The study recommends that management of the College and University of Education, Winneba should provide avenues for tutors' continuous professional development to enhance their teaching skills and strategies.

Keywords: instruction, student evaluation of teaching, college of education, college tutor, Ghana

[i] Correspondence email: agbofafrancis@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) are realizing that higher education could be regarded as a business and a service industry, which focuses more on meeting or even exceeding the needs of their students, who are, in essence, their customers. HEIs are awakened to the demands that the delivery of their services should be given more attention. What makes a good teacher? As a response to the question, what is known about teachers and teaching at HEIs significantly impacts ratings. What are good teachers known for, as well circumcenter all discussions on teacher assessment or evaluation.

At face value, one would evaluate teachers by their ability to effect personal change and development in their students. Others would value teachers by their effectiveness in facilitating good academic work. Another avenue for valuing teachers is by asking their students to rate them. The procedure is termed as student evaluation of teachers (SET). Asking students to rate their teachers has been the most widely used among all strategies. According to Murray (1997), forms of SET in current use assess teacher and course characteristics such as clarity of explanation, enthusiasm for subject matter, encouragement of student participation, breadth of coverage, and quality of feedback, which are assumed to be (1) observable by students; (2) under the control of the instructor; and (3) correlated with student learning.

Beginning in the late 1960s and early 1970s, colleges and universities in the United States and Canada began to use formal student ratings of teaching as (1) feedback to instructors, and (2) input for administrative decisions on faculty salary, retention, tenure and promotion (Murray, 1997). Reliance on SET as the predominant measure of university teachers' performance is not confined to the USA but is a worldwide phenomenon (Newton, 1988; Seldin, 1989; Stratton, 1990). Miller (1988) reiterates that this practice has become more common in other parts of the world, such as Australia, Britain, Nigeria, Thailand, Switzerland, Belgium, Hong Kong, Israel and New Zealand. SET has become a widely used instrument in higher education. DeShields *et al.* (2005) aver that the popularity of SET results from the case that higher education institutions are focusing on identifying and satisfying the needs and expectations of their students. Justifying the position of DeShields *et al.* (2005), Elliott and Healy (2001) viewed student satisfaction as a short-term attitude resulting from an evaluation of a student's educational experience.

Pratt (1997) and Murray (1997) identified that student evaluation of teaching is an important, yet, one of the most controversial developments in higher education. According to Johnson (2003), controversy regarding the validity of student evaluations of teaching grows, with evidence for and against their use as a measure of instructor teaching performance. Extant literature identifies class size (Hanna, Hoyt & Aubrecht, 1983a), course content (Cashin, 1990; Hanna *et al.*, 1983b), gender of the instructor (Anderson & Miller, 1997; Martin, 1984), and grading leniency (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997) as factors that influence student assessments of instructor performance. Some HEIs have experimented with other methods for evaluating teachers' performance, such as instructor self-evaluation, review of course materials and teaching portfolios compiled by instructors, and in-class observation by faculty peers. Nevertheless, Wolfer and

Johnson (2003) view student evaluation remains the most widely used method for evaluating teaching. Students remain the most common source of data and standardized measures: thus, student evaluation is the most common method for soliciting such data (Wolfer & Johnson, 2003). Wolfer and Johnson (2003) bear that schools have tried various methods for obtaining student evaluations, ranging from semi-structured, qualitative measures to standardized and exclusively quantitative measures.

In Ghana, students' rating of teachers' instruction is widely used in colleges and universities. Ghanaian studies in the literature, however, do not focus directly on evaluating teachers: Quansah (2022) examined the item and rater variabilities in students' evaluation of teaching and course exercise, Osei-Assibey *et al.* (2020) evaluated the use of assessment for learning strategy by basic school teachers in Ghana, and Quansah *et al.* (2024) reviewed studies conducted to examine the validity of student evaluation of teaching. All relevant studies do not necessarily focus on teacher evaluation but on the validity of methods used for evaluation. The current study attends to the dearth of knowledge on the performance of tutors at teacher education colleges in Ghana. Teacher evaluation studies are used to evaluate the teaching of individual teachers. This study novelly focuses on the evaluation of the composite of tutors of a whole college. The study, in essence, evaluates instruction at the Seventh-Day Adventist College of Education by establishing the average ratings established for tutors at the College.

2. Methodology

The study employed a quantitative approach where only quantitative data was collected and analysed with statistical approaches. A cross-sectional survey design was used for the study as the study considered a section of the population which was sampled, and the responses were generalized for the whole population.

The population of the study constitute all students enrolled at the Seventh-Day College of Education, Askore-Koforidua. The targeted population was students who had spent at least one year in their programme of study. As such, first-year students were not of interest to the study. Students who have spent at least one year were considered because one academic year is enough to witness the cycle of what a typical academic year is like at the College. Based on this, the second-year, third-year and fourth-year cohorts of students were exclusively the population of interest to the study.

A sample size of 317 was established using the table for sample size determination, according to Krejcie and Morgan (1970). According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a sample size of 317 is appropriate for a population of about 1800. The total population of students for the groups of interest, in essence, second-year, third- and fourth-year cohorts of students, was estimated at 1815 students, according to the College's secretariat.

Considering a strategy for sampling where the goal is to create a representative sampling, Neuman (2014) proposes nonprobability sampling as an easier and less demanding approach. For this, a multistage sampling procedure was adopted where convenience and quota sampling were employed. Quota sampling was used based on the three cohorts of students considered to determine what proportion of the groups in the

targeted population should be featured in the sample. This quota is expressive of the weight of experience in terms of years different cohorts have of educational service delivery in the college. Given the total number of complete academic years that all the groups making the targeted population have exhausted at the college is six years (i.e. the fourth-year cohort has exhausted three complete academic years; the third-year cohort has exhausted two years; and the second-year cohort has exhausted one year, summing up to six years), a quota of 3/6 (50 percent) of the sample was sourced from the fourth-year cohort; 2/6 (i.e. 1/3) was sourced from the third-year cohort; and 1/6 from the second-year cohort. After establishing the quota, convenience sampling was used to sample the respondents from groups. According to Neumann (2014), in convenience sampling, the primary criteria for selecting cases are that they are easy to reach, convenient, or readily available. This is exactly the case with the targeted students when school is in session. As well, every one of the students considered could respond to the questionnaire the study administered to give the data the study sought.

The instrument used for the study consists of three sections. The first section collects data on the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. The second section sought to collect data to analyse student's expectations of educational service delivery. The third sought data on students' perception of the reality of educational service delivery. For the second and third sections, the study considered the use of the Students' Evaluation of Educational Quality Scale developed by Marsh in 1982. The Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ) (Marsh, 1982) is one of the best-developed and most widely used student feedback questionnaires in the literature (Vernadakis *et al.*, 2012). The SEEQ is not based on student learning research but on psychometric analysis. A consequence of this is that while the constructs underlying the SEEQ are less well supported by learning theory, the psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire are developed to a high degree. This study employed a modified version of the SEEQ where the items in the scale were considered in context. The modification is reflected in the questionnaire where respondents were asked to respond to the items for what their expectations were before enrolling in school, and what the reality is, based on their experience at the Seventh-Day Adventist College of Education. A 5-point Likert scale was used to assess students' ranking of each item on the scale, where strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, neutral = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. The SEEQ has an exceptionally high level of reliability which is justified by scales observing Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.88 to 0.97. It also has a reasonable level of validity since the scale's scores correlate significantly with a wide range of measures of learning outcome such as student marks on standardized examinations, students' feelings of mastery of course content, students' plan to apply skills learnt in courses, and students' plan to pursue the subject for further studies (Marsh, 1997).

The questionnaire was hosted as a digital questionnaire on Microsoft Forms. The link to the questionnaire was shared along with the description of the study to the social media platforms of the student population of interest, and students were persuaded to respond to the questionnaire while not cajoling or enticing them with gains of whatever forms to respond. As a quality control procedure, the index numbers of students, which

are unique to each student, were requested, and this was used as a basis for eliminating double entries by a single respondent. The number of respondents determined by the quota was observed for the earliest of responses and on getting up to the desired number of responses for a group, the researcher stopped receiving new data.

The data for the study was analysed with SPSS version 23. Quantitative data analyses employing statistics were considered. In this, descriptive analysis using frequencies and means with standard deviation, and inferential statistics using preason product moment correlation and linear regression were used.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

The study analysed the socio-demographic characteristics of respondent students to inform readers' appreciation of the whole data and its source. The gender, age, academic performance, and the academic level of respondent students constitute the socio-demographic variables assessed. As shown in Table 1, the sample was dominated by male students, who constituted 56.5% of the total sample of 317 students.

Table 1: Gender composition of student respondents

Gender	N	Percentage (%)
Male	179	56.5%
Female	138	43.5%

Source: Field data (2024).

The ages of the respondents revealed that students are aged between 19 and 33 years old. A mean age of 23.9 years with a standard deviation of 2.4 was established, which signifies that the majority of the respondent students were younger than the maximum age found. In terms of academic performance, the CGPA of respondents were used as the index for measuring academic performance. The study established an average CGPA of 3.42 with a standard deviation of 0.46. As shown in Table 2, the minimum and maximum CGPA were 1.00 and 4.00, respectively. The findings for the socio-demographic characteristics so far presuppose that students generally are younger and are in good academic standing.

Table 2: Age and academic performance of student respondents

Variable	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D.
How old are you?	19.00	33.00	23.9495	2.40726
What is your CGPA	1.00	4.00	3.4217	0.46356

Source: Field data (2024).

3.2 Student evaluation of learning

Learning is a complex concept which, according to Illeris (2009), has dimensions. In its broad sense, Illeris (2007, p. 3) defines learning as any process by which living organisms exhibit permanent behaviour change which is not solely dependent on biological

maturation. For the complexity of the concept of learning, Jarvis (1897, p. 32) defined learning as 'the transformation of experience into knowledge, skills and attitudes', but after several metamorphoses, Jarvis redefined learning as the combination of processes throughout a lifetime whereby the whole person – body (genetic, physical and biological) and mind (knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, emotions, beliefs and senses) – experiences social situations, the perceived content of which is then transformed cognitively, emotively or practically (or through any combination) and integrated into the person's biography resulting in a continually changing (or more experienced) person. According to the SEEQ, the sub-scale for student evaluation of learning borders on how students perceive their learning experiences as intellectually stimulating and challenging. The items in Table 3 make up the learning sub-scale. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.829 was established for the sub-scale, which suggests a good internal consistency between the 4 items in the sub-scale. The study identified that students generally are neutral about the position that the courses they read at the college are intellectually challenging and stimulating. A mean of 2.89 and a standard deviation of 1.23 supports the case. Despite they are neutral on how stimulating their courses are, the study revealed that student respondents generally agree (M = 3.7, SD = 1.28) with the case that they have learnt something which they consider valuable. Respondent students established that they agree (M = 3.42) with the case that their interest in education has increased as a consequence of the programmes they are reading at the College. The results, as presented in Table 3, identify that students generally admit that they have learnt and understood the subject materials in their programmes. A mean of 3.59 and a standard deviation of 1.15 established that students understand the subject materials in their programmes of study. For the composite of items in the learning sub-scale, the study found a mean of 3.4 and a standard deviation of 0.99, which presupposes that generally, respondent students neither perceive their learning experiences as intellectually stimulating and challenging nor not.

The results from student evaluation of learning highlight an interesting disconnect between students' perceptions of intellectual challenge and the value they find in their education. While the mean score for intellectual challenge suggests a somewhat neutral stance, the higher scores for value and understanding indicate that students still see their education as worthwhile and beneficial. This finding aligns with research on student motivation. Self-determination theory (SDT) by Deci & Ryan (2000) proposes that intrinsic motivation, driven by the desire for knowledge and understanding, plays a crucial role in student engagement and learning. Even if courses are not inherently stimulating, students may value the knowledge gained for future careers, personal growth, or simply the satisfaction of learning something new (Astin, 1993).

Several reasons may account for explaining the disconnect. The focus of courses on practical application may play. As college courses and programmes are intended to train students to be educators, courses are practically oriented but not necessarily challenging or stimulating intellectually. Thus, teacher education programmes are focused on the practical application of knowledge. This aligns with research on "utilitarian value," where students see education as a means to an end, such as job security

(Vansteenkiste *et al.*, 2004). McTighe and Wiggins (2013) offered that if assessments do not require deep thinking or critical analysis, students might perceive the content as easy to grasp but not intellectually stimulating. A mismatch in learning style is as well likely to bring about the results. Felder and Silverman (1988) reiterate that teaching styles that do not cater for individual learning styles could lead to students understanding the material without feeling challenged or stimulated. Tutors of the College should endeavour to foster an intellectually stimulating and challenging learning environment while maintaining the intended relevance of course content and student understanding. By understanding this disconnect, educators can identify areas for improvement. Finding ways to bridge the gap between intellectual challenge and perceived value might lead to more engaging and ultimately, more rewarding educational experiences for students.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of learning sub-scale

Item	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D.
I found the course intellectually challenging and stimulating	1.00	5.00	2.89	1.23
I have learned something which I consider valuable	1.00	5.00	3.70	1.28
My interest in education has increased as a consequence of this programme	1.00	5.00	3.42	1.21
I have learned and understood the subject materials in this programme	1.00	5.00	3.59	1.15
Learning	1.00	5.00	3.40	0.99

Source: Field data (2024).

3.3 Student evaluation of tutor enthusiasm, energy, humour and ability to hold interest

The study sought to investigate student evaluation of tutor enthusiasm towards their practice as teachers. According to the SEEQ, a seven-item sub-scale establishes tutor-displayed enthusiasm, energy, humour and ability to hold student interest during a class session or a lesson. Rated on a scale of 1 to 5 for strong disagreement to strong agreement, a mid-point of 3 supposes a neutral position. A 0.941 Cronbach's alpha, which presupposes a good internal consistency within the sub-scale, was observed for the seven-item sub-scale. As has been presented in Table 4, the first item of the enthusiasm sub-scale asked student respondents to respond with their level of agreement to the statement that tutors are enthusiastic about teaching their courses. The study identified a mean agreement of 3.02 (SD = 1.13), which suggests that students are generally neutral in terms of agreement with the statement. The second item considered the expression that tutors are dynamic and energetic in conducting their courses. A mean agreement of 3.12 (SD = 1.23) reveals that students are indifferent in terms of agreement or disagreement when it comes to how dynamic and energetic tutors are in conducting their courses. Observing a mean score of 3.25 with a standard deviation of 1.14, the study has established that students in the Seventh-Day Adventist College of Education in Asokore Koforidua are generally neutral in agreement with the position that their tutors enhance presentations with humour. This general neutrality in agreement is also reflected in the expression of the fact that students are also neutral with the statement that the style of

presentation adopted by tutors holds their interests in class. A mean score of 3.03 with a standard deviation of 1.24 represents the case. Going forward, student respondents also indicated a generally indifferent agreement (Mean = 3.19; SD = 1.2) with the position that course materials are well prepared and carefully explained. Student respondents are also generally neutral (Mean = 3.24; SD = 1.17) with the statement that the proposed objectives of lessons agree with what is taught and that students tend to follow the lessons. The last item also found a mean score of 3.23 with a standard deviation of 1.26, expressing neutral expression to the fact that tutors at the college give lectures that facilitate note-taking. For the composite of the sub-scale, the study has revealed that students neither agree nor disagree with the fact that tutors are enthused as teachers.

The study's findings regarding student perceptions of tutor enthusiasm paint a picture of neutrality. Across all aspects of enthusiasm, including excitement about teaching, dynamism, and use of humour, student responses averaged around a mean of 3, indicating neither strong agreement nor disagreement. This neutrality warrants further exploration. While concerning, this does not necessarily imply apathy. Tutors might be competent but lack charisma, leading to neutral evaluations (Shulman, 1986). Fraser (1998) views enthusiasm goes beyond where tutors focus on clarity of explanations of course content.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of enthusiasm subscale

Item	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D.
Tutors are enthusiastic about teaching their courses	1.00	5.00	3.02	1.13
Tutors are dynamic and energetic in conducting their courses	1.00	5.00	3.21	1.23
Tutors enhance presentations with the use of humour	1.00	5.00	3.25	1.14
The tutors' style of presentation holds my interest during class	1.00	5.00	3.03	1.24
Course materials are well prepared and carefully explained	1.00	5.00	3.19	1.20
Proposed objectives agree with what is taught, so you know where courses are going	1.00	5.00	3.24	1.17
Tutors give lectures that facilitate taking notes	1.00	5.00	3.23	1.26
Enthusiasm	1.00	5.00	3.17	1.03

Source: Field data (2024).

3.4 Student evaluation of tutor encouraging students to discuss, participate, share ideas and ask questions

According to Howard and Henney (1998), Peterson (2001), and Petress (2006), many academics consider class participation as evidence of active learning or engagement that benefits learning, critical thinking, writing, appreciation of cultural differences, time management and interpersonal, listening and speaking skills. The group interaction sub-scale is defined according to the SEEQ as where students are encouraged by tutors to discuss, participate, share ideas and ask questions in class. The subscale is made of 4 items, as presented in Table 5. A reliability co-efficient of 0.96 established as Cronbach's alpha was found for the sub-scale. The study revealed that student respondents generally

agree (M = 3.77; SD = 1.14) with the position that tutors encourage students to discuss, participate, share ideas and ask questions in class. In discussing the individual items that make up the scale, the item revealed that students agree (M = 3.82; SD = 1.19) with the fact that tutors encourage students to participate in group interactions. Observing a mean of 3.75 with a standard deviation of 1.18, the study found that tutors do invite students to share their ideas and knowledge. Again, it has been established that tutors encourage students to ask questions and are given meaningful answers, with a mean of 3.78. The last item in the scale sought to establish whether or not tutors encourage students to express their own ideas and or question tutors. The study found a mean score of 3.74 with a standard deviation of 1.24, which presupposes that student respondents generally agree that students are encouraged to question tutors as well as express their ideas.

This study's findings regarding student perceptions of tutor encouragement for discussion, participation, and questioning are positive. The findings indicate that students generally agree that tutors promote an active learning environment. Observed scores suggest that tutors actively encourage student participation, sharing ideas, asking questions, and expressing their viewpoints. This aligns with research on active learning strategies, which show increased student engagement and knowledge retention compared to traditional lecture-based methods (Prince, 2004). When tutors encourage discussion and questioning, classrooms become more student-centered, fostering critical thinking, collaboration, and deeper understanding (Astin, 1993). This fosters essential skills for future careers and personal growth. Despite the scale capturing overall encouragement, further investigation could explore specific strategies tutors use to promote participation.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of group interaction sub-scale

Item	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D.
Students are encouraged to participate in group interactions	1.00	5.00	3.82	1.19
Students are invited to share their ideas and knowledge	1.00	5.00	3.75	1.18
Students are encouraged to ask questions and are given meaningful answers	1.00	5.00	3.78	1.21
Students are encouraged to express their own ideas and/ or question tutors	1.00	5.00	3.74	1.24
Group interaction	1.00	5.00	3.77	1.14

Source: Field data (2024).

3.5 Student evaluation of tutor rapport

Individual rapport, according to the SEEQ, defines how tutors are accessible, friendly, and interested in students' issues. The sub-scale observed a reliability co-efficient of 0.92 for the 4 items which presupposes a good internal consistency in the items making up the sub-scale. As has been presented in Table 6, the composite of the scale items observed a mean rating of 3.33 with a standard deviation of 1.1, which indicates that students are generally indifferent when it comes to their agreement with the statement that tutors demonstrate a good sense of rapport with students. The overall neutral score on rapport

suggests a disconnect. Individually, the first item, which has it that tutors are friendly towards students, found a mean score of 3.34 with a standard deviation of 1.21. This suggests that student respondents agree that tutors are friendly towards students. This is a positive first-step in building a good rapport between students and tutors. Friendliness alone is, however, not enough. Rapport involves trust, mutual respect, and a sense of connection. On observing a mean score of 3.46 and a standard deviation of 1.24, the study established that tutors make students feel welcome to seek help/advice in or outside of the classroom. A mean score of 3.23 (SD = 1.23) was established for the case that tutors have a genuine interest in individual students. The mean found connotes that students neither agree nor disagree with the case. When it comes to the position of how accessible tutors are to students, the study also established that students neither agree nor disagree with the expression that tutors are adequately accessible to students during office hours or after classes. A mean of 3.2 and a standard deviation of 1.2 supports the case.

Table 6: Descriptive statistics of tutor rapport sub-scale

Item	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D.
Tutors are friendly towards students	1.00	5.00	3.43	1.21
Tutors make students feel welcome in seeking help/ advice in or outside of class	1.00	5.00	3.46	1.24
Tutors have a genuine interest in individual students	1.00	5.00	3.23	1.23
Tutors are adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class	1.00	5.00	3.20	1.20
Individual rapport	1.00	5.00	3.33	1.10

Source: Field data (2024).

3.6 Student evaluation of breadth

Termed as breadth, the SEEQ defines the concept as the presentation of the broad background, concepts and alternative approaches/theories. In essence, the data collected here focuses on how tutors go about with instruction at the Seventh-Day College of Education. The items in Table 7 make up the sub-scale, where a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 was established. The study revealed that students neither agree nor disagree (M = 3.18; SD = 0.97) with the overall expression of good presentation of academic content and use of alternative approaches and theories. By a mean of 3.01 (SD = 1.05), the study established that students demonstrate a neutral position in agreement with the statement that tutors contrast the implications of various theories. Also expressing neutral agreement, the study found a mean of 3.21 (SD = 1.14) for the case that tutors present the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class. Despite interpreting as neutral agreement, tutors present points of view other than their own when it is appropriate as a variable observed the highest mean score (M = 3.35; SD = 1.1) among all the sub-scale items. The last item in the scale considers the adequacy of discussions of current developments in various fields of study by tutors in class. The study found a mean of 3.16 with a standard deviation of 1.16 to connote that student respondents neither agree nor disagree with the case.

The study's findings regarding student perceptions of how tutors present academic content are concerning. A neutral score suggests room for improvement in tutors' pedagogy. Effective teaching involves engaging students with various approaches (Gagne, 1985). Exposing students to different perspectives is crucial for critical thinking and deeper understanding. The study's findings highlight the need for tutors to present academic content more comprehensively. Incorporating diverse perspectives, historical context, real-world applications, and a variety of teaching methods, tutors can create a more engaging and intellectually stimulating learning environment for students at the Seventh-Day Adventist College of Education in Asokore Koforidua.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics of the breadth sub-scale

Item	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D.
Tutors contrast the implications of various theories	1.00	5.00	3.01	1.05
Tutors present the background or origin of ideas/concepts developed in class	1.00	5.00	3.21	1.14
Tutors present points of view other than their own when appropriate	1.00	5.00	3.35	1.10
Tutors adequately discuss current developments in the field	1.00	5.00	3.16	1.16
Breadth	1.00	5.00	3.18	0.97

Source: Field data (2024).

3.7 Student evaluation of assessment

Assessment is at the heart of formal higher education. As identified by Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000, pp. 1–28), 'assessment is a core component of effective learning'. The authors indicated that the teaching and learning processes need to be assessment-centered to provide learners with opportunities to demonstrate their developing abilities and receive support to enhance their learning. The SEEQ distinguished examination and assignment, but for this paper, assessment combined examination and assignment. According to the SEEQ, examination defines the students' perceptions of the value and fairness of examinations and graded materials, while assignments consider the value of assignments in adding appreciation or understanding of course content. Examination in the context of the Seventh-Day Adventist College of Education is summative, emphasizing assessment to validate student learning. Assignments are intended to support student learning, which, in essence, is considered formative. Wiliam and Black (1996) contend that formative assessment and summative assessment are not separate or fixed processes, justifying the decision to merge examination and assignment into assessment. Internal consistency was observed among the items in the assessment sub-scale, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89 for the 5 items making up the scale. As shown in Table 8, the study revealed that students hold a neutral position (Mean = 3.05; SD = 1.04) with the value and fairness of examinations and graded materials, as well as their consideration of the value of assignments in adding their appreciation or understanding of courses. The study established that students generally are of the viewpoint that feedback on examinations and graded materials is neither valuable nor otherwise (M =

2.73; SD = 1.28). Students also do not agree or disagree (M = 2.68; SD = 1.27) with the expression that the methods used for evaluating students' work are fair and appropriate. The study further revealed that students are impersonal in terms of agreement with the expression that examinations or graded materials test course content as emphasized by tutors. This finding may be attributed to the nature of examination at the College. Test items used to assess student learning at the College are not teacher-made. Examinations and graded materials are developed and supervised by the Institute of Teacher Education and Continuous Professional Development at the University of Education, Winneba. As such, what the tutors may intend to test students on may not necessarily feature in various tests. Despite tutors playing a role in test item development, the practice has always been collating test items developed by tutors of respective courses from all colleges affiliated with the University of Education, Winneba, and a sample of items is drawn from the pool and used to test learning. Students are also indifferent (M = 3.38; SD = 1.25) in the case that required readings or texts are valuable. Observing the odd case of expressing general student agreement, a mean score of 3.49 (SD = 1.26) was established for the fact that students view readings, homework, and assignments as contributing to appreciation and understanding of subjects. The neutral score established for the value of reading suggests that some students might not find assigned readings relevant or engaging. Tutors should, therefore, ensure administering effective reading assignments to enhance understanding and stimulate the intellectual curiosity of students, according to Vacca *et al*. (1996). The higher mean score for appreciating and understanding subjects through assignments is a positive sign. This suggests that students recognize the connection between assigned work and learning objectives, even if they do not find all readings inherently valuable. Overall, on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 refers to the least agreement and 5 refers to the highest agreement with quality academic service delivery, a mean rating of tutors and academic service delivery at the college was established at M = 3.32; SD = 0.93.

Table 8: Descriptive statistics of the assessment sub-scale

Item	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D.
Feedback on examinations/graded materials is valuable	1.00	5.00	2.73	1.28
Methods of evaluating students' work are fair and appropriate	1.00	5.00	2.68	1.27
Examinations/graded materials test courses' content as emphasized by tutors	1.00	5.00	2.98	1.14
Required readings/texts are valuable	1.00	5.00	3.38	1.25
Readings, homework, etc., contribute to appreciation and understanding of the subject	1.00	5.00	3.49	1.26
Assessment	1.00	5.00	3.05	1.04

Source: Field data (2024).

3.8 Correlations between SEEQ sub-scales

According to Table 9, the study revealed a statistically significant correlation among all the SEEQ sub-scales. As shown, a strong and positive correlation (r = 0.745; p-value =

0.00) was found between tutor enthusiasm and student learning. This suggests that the more tutors are enthusiastic, the more student learning is positively affected. This aligns with findings from Patrick *et al.* (2000). Enthusiastic tutors create a more engaging classroom, fostering deeper learning and motivation in students. Tutor enthusiasm also positively affects students' group interaction (r = 0.787; p-value = 0.00) as well as tutors' rapport (r = 0.829; p-value = 0.00). This is a direct association which is expressive of any individual's social life. This is to express that as tutors become enthusiastic, they tend to establish a good individual rapport with students, which also positively affects how students participate in class. Logically, students will participate less in classes with tutors who are cold and aloof, unlike where tutors are warm and welcoming. As such, a positive and strong correlation (r = 0.763; p-value = 0.00) exists between students' group interaction and the tutor's rapport. Student learning is also positively correlated with tutor individual rapport (r = 0.728; p-value = 0.00) and student group interaction (r = 0.858; p-value = 0.00). Going forward, the study identifies that breadth (r = 0.745; p-value = 0.00) and student appreciation of assessment (r = 0.698; p-value = 0.00) positively correlate with student learning. Breadth and assessment are also positively correlated (r = 0.738; p-value = 0.00). This suggests that as the scores for students' appreciation for the teaching style adopted by tutors increases, their appreciation of the value of assessment forms (i.e. examinations and assignments) also increases, which collectively, as well as individually, positively affects student learning. The style adopted by tutors to present lessons to students correlates positively with tutor enthusiasm (r = 0.787; p-value = 0.00), tutor individual rapport (r = 0.743; p-value = 0.00), as well as positively influences students' participation in class (r = 0.768; p-value = 0.00). Having established these, the study further revealed that tutor enthusiasm (r = 0.706; p-value = 0.00), individual rapport (r = 0.717; p-value = 0.00), and students' group interaction (r = 0.674; p-value = 0.00) all positively correlate with students' appreciation of the value and fairness of examinations at the Seventh-Day Adventist College of Education.

Impliedly, the correlations hold that tutor enthusiasm fosters individual rapport, which in turn, promotes student participation. This suggests a positive cycle: enthusiastic tutors build rapport, leading to a more welcoming environment where students feel comfortable to participate. The findings further suggest that enthusiastic tutors create a more positive and interactive classroom environment, leading to stronger student-tutor relationships and increased participation. The strong correlations existing between student learning and both group interaction and individual rapport reinforce the importance of creating a collaborative learning environment where students can discuss, share ideas, and learn from each other. The positive correlations between student learning and both breadth of content and appreciation of assessment also suggest that students value assessments that are perceived as fair and relevant to their learning. Again, the way tutors organize and deliver their lessons plays a crucial role in creating an engaging and effective learning environment. It is recommended that tutors adopt more engaging teaching methods and create a positive and supportive classroom environment which will foster student learning.

Table 9: Correlation matrix for SEEQ sub-scales

Sub-Scale		Learning	Enthusiasm	Group Interaction	Individual Rapport	Breadth
Enthusiasm	Pearson Correlation	0.745	--			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00				
Group Interaction	Pearson Correlation	0.858	0.787	--		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	0.00			
Individual Rapport	Pearson Correlation	0.728	0.829	0.763	--	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Breadth	Pearson Correlation	0.745	0.787	0.768	0.743	--
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Assessment	Pearson Correlation	0.698	0.706	0.717	0.674	0.738
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: Field data (2024).

3.9 Relationship between students' academic performance and progress, and their evaluation of teaching at the Seventh-Day Adventist College of Education

In establishing how relevant demographic characteristics of students relate to their evaluation of teaching at the college, the study analysed the relationship with their academic performance and progress, emphasizing students' grade point average and their level in the college. The study revealed that there is no statistically significant correlation ($r = 0.1$; p-value = 0.075) between student CGPA and their evaluation of teaching. While some authorities argue that a multidimensional approach to evaluating teaching effectiveness, including the sub-scale factors considered in this study, is valid and reliable (Burdsal and Harrison 2008), assumptions of SET are increasingly being challenged (Hornstein 2017; Esarey and Valdes 2020; Heffernan and Bosetti 2020). Conforming with the finding established for the relationship between academic performance and SET, a meta-analysis by Uttl, White and Gonzalez (2017) concluded that SET ratings are unrelated to student learning and that students do not learn more from teachers with higher SET ratings. Heffernan (2022) concurs that overall response rates are typically low for tutors who are perceived to be rigid in enforcing basic school rules, particularly those about examinations. Students tend to complete evaluations at a time of heightened anxiety, usually during times when final assessments are due or have been marked, and often in anticipation of doing poorly (Heffernan, 2022), justifying the established no significant correlation between academic performance and SET.

However, the number of years students have spent at the College significantly correlates (p-value = 0.001) with their evaluations of teaching. Despite statistical significance, the correlation is weak ($r = 0.185$). A statistically significant correlation means we can reject the null hypothesis that there's no relationship between the number of academic years student have spent and their evaluation of teaching at the College. In this case, there is a scientifically justifiable reason to reject this null hypothesis. However, the weak correlation coefficient suggests that the effect size is small. Even though there is a positive association, the number of years only explains a small amount of the variations in teaching evaluation. Students who stay in college longer might be inherently more positive towards the institution, potentially leading to higher evaluations over time, regardless of teaching quality. Again, as students' progress through their college years,

their priorities and expectations for teaching might change. Freshmen might prioritize clear explanations, while seniors might value more challenging or specialized instruction. Years spent experiencing a phenomenon influence one's appreciation of the case. A relevant case is established by Osei-Assibey *et al.* (2020): teachers with at least four years of experience in teaching demonstrated greater skills concerning the use of a variety of feedback from students as a basis for deciding on groupings, instructional strategies and resources than their counterparts with less than four years of teaching experience ($t(98) = 17$, $p = .00 < .05$).

Table 10: Relationship between sociodemographic variables and SET

Demographic variable		**SET**
CGPA	Pearson Correlation	0.100
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.075
Student academic level	Pearson Correlation	0.185
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001

Source: Field data (2024).

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The study sought to present a student evaluation of tutors at the Seventh-Day Adventist College of Education at Asokore in Koforidua. The study's objective was achieved without observing any challenges. It was revealed that students are generally neutral in their evaluation of tutors and instruction at the College. Based on the findings, the study recommends that despite students' neutral stance on the intellectual challenge of courses, efforts should be made to make courses more intellectually stimulating. Tutors should incorporate more critical thinking exercises, real-world applications, and problem-solving tasks into their lessons. Increasing tutor enthusiasm and engagement will also help. Tutors need to employ a variety of teaching methods to keep students engaged. Interactive lectures, group discussions, and multimedia presentations are good methods to consider. Tutors should aim to present academic content more comprehensively, including background information, alternative approaches/theories, and current developments in various fields of study. This can be achieved through diverse teaching methods and the incorporation of real-world examples. Tutors should promote active learning and participation by encouraging students to participate in classroom discussions, sharing of ideas, and questioning. Active participation could be ensured through group activities, case studies, debates, and presentations, which will promote deeper understanding and critical thinking. Building positive rapport and supportive relationships is also recommended at the College. Tutors should strive to build strong and positive rapport with students by being accessible, friendly, and interested in students' issues. Creating a welcoming environment where students feel comfortable seeking help and advice can enhance the overall learning experience. Again, tutors and entities responsible for all forms of assessment should ensure that assessments are perceived as valuable and fair by students. Providing constructive and early feedback on examinations and assignments would help students improve their understanding and

appreciation of the content of courses. The management of the College and the University of Education, Winneba should provide avenues for tutors' continuous professional development to enhance their teaching skills and strategies. Workshops, seminars, and peer observations can provide valuable insights and improve teaching effectiveness. As it has been established that it is important for tutors to consider student feedback and adjust their teaching methods accordingly, regular evaluations and discussions with students can help identify areas for improvement and enhance the overall teaching and learning experience. Also, other forms of teacher evaluation, such as peer observation by other tutors, are encouraged where feedback could be correlated with student ratings of tutors to have a better appreciation of tutor evaluation.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

About the Author(s)

Francis Justice Kwesi Agbofa had attended University of Cape Coast in the Central Region of Ghana for his undergraduate and postgraduate programs. He holds a Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) in Arts, a Master of Education (M.Ed.) in Educational Administration, a Master of Education (M.Ed.) in Teacher Education, a Master of Philosophy (MPhil) in Educational Administration, a Doctor of Education (EdD) in Educational Administration, and a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Management. Francis Justice Kwesi Agbofa is affiliated with the Education Department at the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) College of Education, Asokore-Koforidua in the Eastern Region of Ghana, where he teaches educational courses. He is currently pursuing a second Doctor of Philosophy program in Educational Leadership at University of Education, Winneba, Ghana. He is currently appointed as Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Officer. He has contributed to the body of knowledge on Teacher Education, publishing research articles in peer-reviewed journals.

References

Andersen, K., & Miller, E. D. (1997). Gender and student evaluations of teaching. *PS: Political science & politics*, *30*(2), 216-219. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ps-political-science-and-politics/article/gender-and-student-evaluations-of-teaching/490655A1753FD14C181DEBFA0269018F

Astin, A. W. (1993). Diversity and multiculturalism on the campus: How are students affected? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *25*(2), 44-49. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1993.9940617

Astin, A. W. (1993). Principles of good practice for assessing student learning. In *Leadership Abstracts* (Vol. 6, No. 4, p. n4).

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn* (Vol. 11). Washington, DC: National academy press.

Burdsal, C. A., & Harrison, P. D. (2008). Further evidence supporting the validity of both a multidimensional profile and an overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *33*(5), 567-576. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701699049

Chen, Y., & Hoshower, L. B. (2003). Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness: An assessment of student perception and motivation. *Assessment & evaluation in higher education*, *28*(1), 71-88. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301683

DeShields Jr, O. W., Kara, A., & Kaynak, E. (2005). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. *International journal of educational management*, *19*(2), 128-139. Retrieved from https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/09513540510582426/full/html

Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. *Journal of marketing for higher education*, *10*(4), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v10n04_01

Esarey, J., & Valdes, N. (2020). Unbiased, reliable, and valid student evaluations can still be unfair. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *45*(8), 1106-1120. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1724875

Felder, R. M., & Silverman, L. K. (1988). Learning and teaching styles in engineering education. Engineel.zng Education, 78(7), 674-68 1. Preceded by a preface in 2002: http://www.ncsu.edu/felderpublic/PapersILS-1988.pdf

Fraser, B. J. (1998). Classroom environment instruments: Development, validity and applications. *Learning environments research*, *1*, 7-34.

Gagné, F. (1985). Giftedness and talent: Reexamining a reexamination of the definitions. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *29*(3), 103-112.

Greenwald, A. G., & Gillmore, G. M. (1997). Grading leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings. *American psychologist*, *52*(11), 1209. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003-066X.52.11.1209

Hanna, G. S., Aubrecht, J. D., & Hoyt, D. P. (1983b). Discriminant and convergent validity of high school student ratings of instruction. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *43*(3), 873-878. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316448304300327

Hanna, G. S., Hoyt, D. P., & Aubrecht, J. D. (1983a). Identifying and adjusting for biases in student evaluations of instruction: Implications for validity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *43*(4), 1175-1185. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/001316448304300428

Heffernan, T. (2022). Sexism, racism, prejudice, and bias: A literature review and synthesis of research surrounding student evaluations of courses and teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(1), 144-154. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1888075

Heffernan, T. A., & Bosetti, L. (2020). The emotional labour and toll of managerial academia on higher education leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *52*(4), 357-372. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2020.1725741

Hornstein, H. A. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating faculty performance. *Cogent Education*, *4*(1), 1304016. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1304016

Howard, J. R. & Henney, A. (1998). Student participation and instructor gender in the mixed-age college classroom. *The Journal of Higher Education, 69*(4), 384-405. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1998.11775141

Illeris, K. (2009). Transfer of learning in the learning society: How can the barriers between different learning spaces be surmounted, and how can the gap between learning inside and outside schools be bridged? *International journal of lifelong education, 28*(2), 137-148. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370902756986

Illeris, K. (2018). A comprehensive understanding of human learning. In *Contemporary theories of learning* (pp. 1-14). Routledge. Retrieved from https://www.routledge.com/Contemporary-Theories-of-Learning-Learning-Theorists--In-Their-Own-Words/Illeris/p/book/9781138550490

Jarvis, P. (2012). *Learning to be a person in society*. Routledge. Retrieved from https://www.routledge.com/Learning-to-be-a-Person-in-Society/Jarvis/p/book/9780415419031

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *30*(3), 607-610. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308

Lakeman, R., Coutts, R., Hutchinson, M., Lee, M., Massey, D., Nasrawi, D., & Fielden, J. (2022). Appearance, insults, allegations, blame and threats: an analysis of anonymous non-constructive student evaluation of teaching in Australia. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(8), 1245-1258. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2012643

Lawrence Neuman, W. (2014). Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Pearson. Retrieved from https://letrunghieutvu.yolasite.com/resources/w-lawrence-neuman-social-research-methods_-qualitative-and-quantitative-approaches-pearson-education-limited-2013.pdf

Marsh, H. W. (1982). SEEQ: A Reliable, Valid, and Useful Instrument for Collecting Students' evaluations of University Teaching. *British journal of educational psychology*, *52*(1), 77-95. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1982.tb02505.x

Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., Chung, C. M., & Siu, T. L. (1997). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Chinese version of the Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality Instrument. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *89*(3), 568. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-0663.89.3.568

Martin, E. (1984). Power and authority in the classroom: Sexist stereotypes in teaching evaluations. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *9*(3), 482-492. Retrieved

from https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/494073?journalCode=signs

McTighe, J., & Wiggins, G. (2013). *Essential questions: Opening doors to student understanding*. ASCD. Retrieved from https://www.ascd.org/books/essential-questions?variant=109004

Miller, A. H. (1988). Student assessment of teaching in higher education. *Higher Education*, *17*(1), 3-15. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3446996

Murray, H. G. (1997). Does evaluation of teaching lead to improvement of teaching? *The International Journal for Academic Development*, *2*(1), 8-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144970020102

Newton, J. D. (1988). Using student evaluation of teaching in administrative control: the validity problem. *Journal of Accounting Education*, *6*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/0748-5751(88)90033-4

Osei-Asibey, E., Kusi P., Nimoh, V., & Bosson-Amedenu, S. (2020). Evaluation of Assessment Strategies Used by Basic School Teachers in Ghana: The Case of Assessment for Learning. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, *33*(4), 58-66. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.9734/jesbs/2020/v33i430218

Patrick, B. C., Hisley, J., & Kempler, T. (2000). "What's everybody so excited about?": The effects of teacher enthusiasm on student intrinsic motivation and vitality. *The Journal of experimental education*, *68*(3), 217-236. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/00220970009600093

Peterson, R. M. (2001). Course participation: An active learning approach employing student documentation. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *23*(3), 187-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475301233004

Petress, K. (2006). An operational definition of class participation. *College Student Journal, 40*(4), 821-823. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2006-23101-012

Pratt, D. D. (1997). Reconceptualizing the evaluation of teaching in higher education. *Higher education*, *34*(1), 23-44. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1003046127941

Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of engineering education*, *93*(3), 223-231. Retrieved from https://www.engr.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/drive/1smSpn4AiHSh8z7a0MHDBwhb_JhcoLQmI/2004-Prince_AL.pdf

Quansah, F. (2022). Item and rater variabilities in students' evaluation of teaching in a university in Ghana: application of many-facet Rasch model. *Heliyon*, *8*(12). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12548

Quansah, F., Cobbinah, A., Asamoah-Gyimah, K., & Hagan, J. E. Jr. (2024). Validity of student evaluation of teaching in higher education: a systematic review. *Front. Educ. 9*:1329734. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1329734

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary educational psychology*, *25*(1), 54-67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Seldin, P. (1989). How Colleges Evaluate Professors. 1988 vs. 1983. *AAHE Bulletin*, *41*(7), 3-7. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED305872

Shevlin, M., Banyard, P., Davies, M., & Griffiths, M. (2000). The validity of student evaluation of teaching in higher education: love me, love my lectures?. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *25*(4), 397-405. https://doi.org/10.1080/713611436

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational researcher*, *15*(2), 4-14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004

Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Gonzalez, D. W. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *54*, 22-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007

Vacca, R. & Vacca, J. (1996). *Content area reading*. 5th Ed. New York: Harper Collins. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264869786_Content_Area_Reading_Literacy_and_Learning_Across_the_Curriculum

Vansteenkiste, M., Simons, J., Lens, W., Sheldon, K. M., & Deci, E. L. (2004). Motivating learning, performance, and persistence: the synergistic effects of intrinsic goal contents and autonomy-supportive contexts. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *87*(2), 246. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.246

Vernadakıs, N., Gıannousı, M., Tsitskari, E., Antonıou, P., & Kıoumourtzoglou, S. (2012). A comparison of student satisfaction between traditional and blended technology course offerings in physical education. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *13*(1), 137-147. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ976936

Wiliam, D., & Black, P. (1996). Meanings and consequences: A basis for distinguishing formative and summative functions of assessment? *British educational research journal*, *22*(5), 537-548. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/1501668

Wolfer, T. A., & Johnson, M. M. (2003). Re-evaluating student evaluation of teaching: The teaching evaluation form. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *39*(1), 111-121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2003.10779122