Unreliability in Student Evaluation of Teaching Questionnaires: Focus Groups as an Alternative Approach

Linda R. Martin  
*University of New Haven*

Robert Dennehy  
*Pace University*

Sandra Morgan  
*University of Hartford*

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj

Part of the Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons, and the Organizational Communication Commons

**Recommended Citation**  
Available at: https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj/vol10/iss1/8
Unreliability in Student Evaluation of Teaching Questionnaires: Focus Groups as an Alternative Approach

Linda R. Martin, Robert Dennehy, and Sandra Morgan

The conventional method used to measure teaching effectiveness is the student evaluation of teaching questionnaire (SET). Research on the validity and reliability of SETs is vast, though riddled with inconsistencies. The many “myths” of SETs are investigated and the incongruities are demonstrated. We hypothesize that the discrepancies in empirical studies come from misunderstanding and inappropriate actions by students. To address the complexity inherent in these problems, we suggest the use of focus groups as an alternative approach or complement to the standard SETs. A recommended format and guidelines for running classroom focus groups are provided. Institutional constraints and implementation concerns are addressed as well. This article lays the foundation for implementing a change in student assessment of teaching by proposing a method to compensate for bias in SETs, using focus groups as an evaluation tool, either as a stand-alone process or as a supplement to current methods. Organization Management Journal, 10: 66–74, 2013. doi: 10.1080/15416518.2013.781401
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The most commonly used method to evaluate teaching effectiveness in colleges in the United States and abroad is the student evaluation of teaching questionnaire (SET; Dommeyer, Blum, and Hanna, 2002; Glassisk, Huber & Maeroff, 1997). The review literature on the subject of student evaluation of teaching is vast and extensive (Wachtel, 1998), and comprehensive studies are available (Cohen, 1981; d’Apollonia & Abrami, 1997; Kulik, 2001). Virtually all aspects of SETs have been explored to determine the effectiveness of evaluations. Some of the aspects studied are the classroom environment, instructor and student characteristics, and students’ expectations. According to Cashin (1988), there are probably more studies of student evaluation of faculty than the combination of all other means of evaluating faculty.

This article evaluates the results of studies on SETs and demonstrates the inconsistencies that exist among studies. We demonstrate that the inconsistencies may be the result of misleading responses from students or ambiguous or misunderstood questions. A proposal is made to measure teaching effectiveness by the focus-group method, a method that leads to richer and more precise responses from students. Because focus groups represent a significant shift in measuring teaching effectiveness, the practical issues that may develop when using focus groups for evaluation are discussed. As an addendum, a step-by-step guide to constructing focus groups is also provided.

USES OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

There are many stakeholders in the SET process. One stakeholder is the student. Students are accustomed to completing the surveys and expect the opportunity to evaluate classroom teaching. The SET has become virtually part of the culture of the classroom in higher education today. However, students are very critical of the SET process (Sojka, Gupta, & Deeler-Schmelz, 2002). Student cooperation in the process is vital to its success, yet often it can be undermined (Abbot et al., 1990; Chonko, Tanner, & Davis, 2002; Svinicki, 2001). Students who do not understand the use of teaching evaluations or feel that the evaluation will be used for purposes that they do not appreciate will stop giving truthful input (Chen, Gupta, & Hoshower, 2004).

The primary research focus, however, for the multitudinous studies about student evaluations is the linkage between evaluations and appraisal. Because tenure, promotion, asset allocations, and peer opinion often depend on the results of student evaluations, faculty are concerned that evaluations accurately reflect teaching ability. However, a far more important
reason for administering and researching SETs is the opportunity they provide for improving teaching. Having a reliable and valid assessment of teaching effectiveness can lead to appropriate remedial actions in the classroom. As accreditation agencies (both disciplinary and regional groups) demand more accountability and assurance of learning in higher education, the use of SET as a data source and as a means of measuring outcomes will increase.

Despite the widespread use of SETs and their increasing importance, the interpretation of their data and their applicability for use in teaching improvement is highly questionable. As this article shows, SETs can be inaccurate and invalid and, in some cases, possibly fraudulent. It is unclear why these inconsistencies exist or why misinterpretations arise. It is our purpose to address these problems of inconsistencies while improving student involvement in the process. The investigation into SET’s inconsistencies leads to a proposal for an alternative to current practices.

VALIDITY OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS

A review of the literature indicates that while the research on student evaluations is extant and rigorous, the overall assessment of their validity is mixed (Chonko, Tanner, & Davis, 2002; Onwuegbuzie, Daniel, & Collins, 2009). Many articles present contradictory results, which may have led to confusion among faculty as to the reliability of SETs. For example, consider the questions of whether faculty can buy better evaluations by grading more leniently. Studies by Ellis et al. (2003), Greenwald and Gilmore (1997), Abrami and d’Apollonia (1998), and Marsh and Roche (2000) established that the correlation between grades and ratings was positive but probably in the area of 20%. In a large study of economics classes, McPherson, Jewell, and Kim (2009) found that a one-letter increase in expected grade caused evaluations to increase by 27%. When expected grades were below their expectations, students tended to punish instructors by lowering SET ratings (Griffin, 2004). However, one study established that there was a negative relationship between achievement and evaluation ratings (Yunker & Yunker, 2003), and two studies could find no relationship (Stimpert & Antonuccio, 2003; Wright & Palmer, 2006).

MYTHS ABOUT STUDENT EVALUATIONS

With such a mixture of results, it is understandable that faculty and administrators are confused about the use of SETs and may have erroneous ideas about the output created. To organize the major issues, we reproduce a set of “myths” first introduced by Theall and Franklin in 2001. Theall and Franklin presented each “myth” as a question and then summarized the evidence from research for each. We have added another “myth” and extended the research to the present date (Table 1).

Compounding the accuracy issues is the fact that while some survey instruments have been scientifically validated by psychometrics, in practice most student evaluation instruments are “home grown” and are a culmination of collaborative processes (Kolitch & Dean, 1999; Marsh, 1987). Coffey and Gibbs (2001) indicate that almost all SETs administered in the United Kingdom were developed by individual institutions for their own use. The scores on many SETs are calculated by software developed by faculty within the unit and may not produce the intended statistical results (Kozub, 2008).

Since the inconsistencies with SET results are uniform throughout different forms of questionnaires, it is unlikely that altering the current evaluation system by adjusting questions will produce better outcomes. Changing how the questionnaires are administered may also have drawbacks. For example, many institutions have converted the standard pencil-and-paper evaluations into online formats. This practice has not eliminated the observed inconsistencies but rather may have created new ones (Adams, 2012). Studies reviewed in Adams (2012) indicated mixed results in regard to bias. Of particular note, studies that compared the results from identical pencil-and-paper and online evaluations found no significant difference in the responses. Hence, while tweaking the current method might be more cost-effective than the labor-intensive focus-group interview, as the next section indicates, the inconsistent findings of the SETs are the consequences of the SET process itself. Therefore, a more radical change in the evaluation process is suggested.

REASONS FOR INCONSISTENT RESEARCH RESULTS

A number of factors may explain why the findings in empirical studies of SETs are inconsistent. First, researchers have shown that students have perceived misconceptions about the survey instrument. Students do not believe that evaluations are anonymous (Dommeyer, Baum, & Hanna, 2002). When faced with a request for feedback and a lack of clear understanding about how to give it, students may choose to say nothing at all or make very general statements that could not be criticized (Chonko, Tanner, & Davis, 2002). Abbott, Wulff, Nyquist, Ropp, and Hess (1990) found that “students’ willingness to participate in the evaluation process method is directly related to their satisfaction with the evaluation process.” Svinicki (2001) points out that students’ beliefs about the use of the results will impact their willingness to participate.

Second, students may intentionally or unintentionally distort responses. Robertson (2004) observed that students will attempt to answer a question even if the particular question does not apply to their class. Petersen, Maier, and Seligman (1993) found that if students felt their responses would be ignored, they were less motivated to make an effort to answer the questions accurately. When considered in the context of student evaluations, these errors may be particularly threatening due to students’ naive use of survey instrument, lack of expertise in either pedagogical methods or the subject of instruction, and use of anonymous evaluation forms (Haefele, 1993; Platt, 1993). Also, studies on locus of control of students showed that the internal/external orientation of the student may have a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth</th>
<th>Research results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Students are not qualified to rate the instructor.</td>
<td>The myth says no, but the empirical evidence says yes (Arreola, 1994; Theall &amp; Franklin, 1990a), with some exceptions (Trout, 1997).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ratings are based solely on popularity.</td>
<td>Popularity is not synonymous with lack of substance. There are no empirical studies that support the view that popular teachers are less effective. There have been studies on whether student evaluations measure “consumer satisfaction” rather than teaching effectiveness or learning (Williams &amp; Ceci, 1997). In two studies, instructor enthusiasm has been found to be important (Bosshardt &amp; Watts, 2001; Stimpert &amp; Antonuccio, 2003). Faculty with positive reputations receive higher evaluations (Griffen, 2001). Using factor analysis, Barth (2008) found that overall instructor rating was primarily determined by quality of instruction. However, an earlier study by Langbein (1994) found that evaluations were not always associated with other indicators of quality teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ratings are related to learning.</td>
<td>The results are mixed. In an early study of multisection courses with a common final exam but different instructors, the students who gave the highest ratings to their instructors were the ones who performed best on their exams (Cohen, 1981). In a study of accounting classes, Yunker and Yunker (2003) found that after adjusting for student quality (prior grades in accounting courses, grade point average, and ACT scores), there was a negative relationship between student evaluation and achievement. When comparisons are made to standardized tests, results show moderate correlation between grades and teaching evaluations (d’Apollonia &amp; Abrami, 1997).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Students cannot make accurate judgments while still in school.</td>
<td>There have been several studies comparing ratings in the next term, immediately after graduation, and several years later (Centra, 1979). All of these studies report the same result: Although students may realize later that a particular subject was more important than they thought, student opinion about teachers changes very little over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Student ratings are not reliable.</td>
<td>Whether reliability is measured within classes, across classes, or over time, student ratings are remarkably consistent (Marsh, 1987).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Ratings are affected by situational variables.</td>
<td>The overall effect of such variables as large sections and out-of-major courses is small (Marsh, 1987). Class length has an effect (Readon et al., 2008), while class size does not have a significant effect (Guder, Malliaris, &amp; Jalilvand, 2009). These moderating variables could account for the wide dispersion of overall results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Easy graders get better evaluations.</td>
<td>This most contentious of myths has been frequently studied. The correlation between grades and ratings was found to be positive in most studies, but probably in the area of 20% (Abrami &amp; d’Apollonia, 1998; Ellis et al., 2003; Greenwald &amp; Gilmore, 1997; Marsh &amp; Roche, 1998). A few studies found small negative effects (Yunker &amp; Yunker, 2003) or no effect (Stimpert &amp; Antonuccio, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Student evaluations are responsible for grade inflation.</td>
<td>Some studies have shown a positive relationship between grades and evaluation (Eiszler, 2002; Millea &amp; Grimes, 2002). However, other research indicates that grade inflation may have resulted from other factors, such as faculty development programs and increased student services and expectations (Boretz, 2004).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Based on Theall and Franklin (2001).*
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As concerns for assessment and accountability in higher education proliferate, the time is right for the use of focus groups to either replace or be an addition to the survey evaluation of teaching.

Furthermore, there are specific problem areas in SETs that focus groups can address. Researchers have identified that there is a disconnect between students’ perceptions and the way in which students respond to survey questions. Many students do not understand the questions in the survey and attempt to answer them from their own understanding (Robertson, 2004). Because of the interactive framework, the focus-group moderator has the opportunity to allow the discussion to evolve as students articulate their ideas. In a properly conducted focus group, participants can freely express their opinions in a comfortable and permissive environment.

Students do not understand who, if anyone, receives the results of the SET; thereby creating an apathetic approach to answering the questions. Having a moderator “listen” to their opinions gives them a sense of having an impact on their education. Additionally, because students believe that most faculty members do not take student evaluations seriously (Mukherji & Rustagi, 2008; Sojka, Gupta, & Deeter-Schmelz, 2002), by having the facilitator explain the purpose of the group to the students, students’ knowledge about why ratings are done will increase. Increasing students’ motivation to respond accurately will improve the quality of the evaluation data.

Because the focus-group process promotes self-disclosure among the participants and interaction with their peer group, active learning will take place (Brits & du Plessis, 2006). Students’ confidence in their ability to accurately assess a teacher will be augmented. Finally, focus groups will improve instruction by identifying actual factors that are affecting teaching and, consequently, constructive change can be made (Huxham et al., 2008).

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES, PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS, AND CONSTRAINTS FOR INSTITUTIONS

As we have seen in the focus-group literature (Krueger & Casey, 2000; Morgan, 1997), there are a number of issues related to running successful focus groups, whether for research/evaluation purposes or to collect marketing information. These all apply to our proposed model of using focus groups as an evaluation tool for business school teaching. Additionally, Parker and Tritter (2006) highlight some of the common problems that can be encountered when using focus groups to evaluate teaching. These issues include questions around the moderator (who is appropriate—not the actual course instructor, but perhaps faculty in the same discipline, an administrator, or other professional unconnected with the school, etc.?), training of the moderator and note taker (a separate person?), recording and creating transcripts of the focus groups (cost issues, permissions, confidentiality), timing (during the course or following it either immediately or later?), membership (all students, a random selection, or a representative sample?), questions to be included in the group sessions (similar or identical to SET questions and number of questions?), and analysis and presentation of the results (using themes, allowing administration to see all the data or not, computer analysis of content, or even who does the analysis?).

To expand on the issues identified in the literature, we propose a set of considerations that require discussion and resolution before implementing a focus-group evaluation approach. First, how expensive would it be to either duplicate the current evaluation system (i.e., use both SETs and focus groups), partially adopt the focus-group evaluation, or switch to focus-group evaluation completely? The institution would need to do a cost/benefit analysis for which the literature reviewed earlier in this article provides the basis. What outcomes are desired? How would “successful” results of focus-group evaluation be defined? Where would funding be available? Would it make sense (i.e., be less expensive) to start with a pilot program in a few classes, evaluate the results, learn from them, and then implement focus-group evaluation on a wider scale if warranted?

Faculty reactions to a prospective change of evaluation approach need to be taken into account. Can they help design the focus-group approach, thereby increasing their commitment and buy-in to the change (Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979)? What resistance might occur from faculty members who have prospered under the SET system with consistent high ratings? Also, some faculty may need training in running of a focus group.

Another area for discussion is the intended use of the data gathered from the focus groups. Will the faculty trust the data analysts to be fair and balanced (an issue because the data from focus groups are more subjective than the numbers from the SETs)? How will deans and department heads use the new type of data for both developmental and salary decision purposes? Will there need to be training for the administrators, possibly at additional cost?

Addressing the details of the focus-group process is critical in institutional planning. Student selection, moderator selection, and data analysis processes must be carefully designed to ensure fairness and lack of bias, as well as reliability and validity of the data gathered. Acting as a moderator might be appealing to faculty members as a potential research/publication opportunity. In this case, perhaps research funding could be obtained. Possibly the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB; in the case of business schools), New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), or other accrediting groups would be able to fund pilot efforts in the use of focus-group evaluation, as they are extremely interested in assurance of learning and measurable outcomes.

Another decision point is around triangulation of method. Should schools that decide to try focus-group evaluation also use another evaluation tool such as faculty self-evaluation, qualitative evaluations, SETs, observations, or peer review? How
is this decision to be made and who are the relevant decision makers?

In the focus-group process, both confidentiality and trust are critical for valid data to be collected. Students must believe their input will not be identified with them in the analysis and also trust the system so they do not fear repercussions from their contributions. Therefore, moderator training is essential.

Many institutions sell themselves, both in marketing materials and in mission statements, as “student-focused” and as providing “student-centered learning.” Using a focus-group evaluation method is the logical extension of evaluation for such a school, as it gives students a much stronger voice in their learning. Of course, an important challenge for all institutions is how to use evaluation data to help improve teaching. A review of current faculty development procedures and their results would be beneficial to any institution considering focus-group evaluation. Also, educating students about the proposed use of their data may gain more interest and cooperation in whatever evaluation system is used. Literature previously cited in the section on inconsistent research results reported that students often fail to recognize the value of evaluation, especially at the end of a term.

Undoubtedly, other questions remain in the reader’s mind and new concerns will emerge as institutions experiment with focus-group evaluation. As a starting point, in Appendix A, we provide a step-by-step guide to planning and running focus groups. The focus-group interview may be simple or more encompassing, depending on the institutional requirements. An example of a fairly basic focus group interview is given in Appendix B.

CONCLUSION

The current system of administering SETs is pervasive in colleges and universities. Have these organizations actually improved teaching through the SET method? The answer is probably “no.” Moreover, the Likert scale form of the SET does not lend itself to measuring or motivating course improvements. So how can a university improve teaching and also meet accreditation agencies’ requirements for the assurance of learning? The answer to these questions involves restructuring the process. The new process will involve students in a manner in which they will feel ownership. Focus groups can be formulated for every class, every term, or organized on a revolving schedule. The timing of the focus group can be at the end of a term or in the middle of a semester, or focus groups can be one part of a triangulation of research methods used to ascertain teaching effectiveness. But whichever way they are administered, better and more appropriate suggestions for improvement will be advanced. Furthermore, any changes to teaching evaluations that would increase their usefulness to faculty would benefit both faculty and universities.
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APPENDIX A: STEPS IN PLANNING AND CONDUCTING FOCUS GROUPS

This material is adapted from Christopher (2000).

Step 1: Define the Purpose and Outcomes of the Project

The first step is to define the purpose and final goals of the project. This step determines the direction of all further steps.

The purpose of the project is to gather evaluative data on the class from students enrolled in the class, and also to identify specific goals, such as changes in the course content and curriculum, instructor improvement, and administrative decisions such as tenure, termination, special salary adjustments, and annual salary increases.

At this step you would consider the gathering of other evaluative data.

Step 2: Identify Personnel

This step includes who will recruit the sample, generate the interviewer’s guide, moderate the focus groups, analyze the data, and write the report.

Step 3: Determine the Participants

Who will be able to give needed information?

The answer for this project is students who have completed the course. One factor to consider in determining participants for course evaluation is having focus-group participants represent the composition of the class in terms of age, year in school, grade in class, participation level, area of study, ethnicity, and gender.

Step 4: Write the Interviewer’s Guide

The interviewer’s (or moderator’s) guide provides the script and the list of questions to use for focus groups. The guide usually includes an opening statement of purpose, list of ground rules, an introduction exercise, and a list of questions/topic areas for discussion. Some typical questions would include:

1. First, let’s talk about things that worked well in the class.
2. Now let’s move on to things that did not go so well or could be improved.
3. What specific recommendations do you have to improve the course?
4. Moderator summarizes.
5. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Step 5: Set the Location, Date, and Times for the Sessions

Groups should be held in convenient locations and at times your potential participants will be able to attend. The length of the sessions should also be specified.

Step 6: Recruit the Participants

After your participants have been identified, a recruitment plan is developed and participants recruited. One should design a recruitment plan that will enable the maximum number of students to participate.

You might consider an initial e-mail solicitation that states the purpose of the focus group. Students should be informed that their responses will be anonymous. A follow-up telephone call is then suggested.

Step 7: Conduct the Focus Group

One consideration under this step is the number of groups to hold. The recommendation is to hold groups until theoretical saturation occurs. Saturation is the point at which previous participants have already provided the information given by new participants.

Step 8: Analyze and Interpret Data

It is assumed that you will make an audio recording of the focus group. Analysis can be tape-based, where notes are taken from listening to tapes, or transcription-based, where tapes are transcribed and analyses are based on transcriptions.

Step 9: Write the Report

The type of report depends on the intent of the study and who is the recipient of the results. For course evaluation, potential report readers may include other faculty teaching the same class, administrators making decisions on course content, administrators making personnel decisions, and staff in course development/teaching and learning offices.

APPENDIX B: ONE AUTHOR’S EXPERIENCE USING FOCUS GROUPS

As an administrator in a business college, I was tasked with collecting assessment information on program outcomes in order to continuously improve our curriculum. Two programs were identified for evaluation. One was an MBA program in
which the students would stay together throughout a prescribed course of study (cohort class). The second was the undergraduate business major.

**MBA cohort program:** (I conducted 10 interviews.)

To gather the information easily and efficiently with the cohort programs, I would attend the last scheduled class session of the program. In this way all members of the class were included in the interview. The classes were small, usually with 20 to 30 students in each class. The students were told that the group meeting was intended to elicit ideas to improve the program. The questions were simple: “What was the best part of the program?” and “What was the worst part of the program?” The best parts acknowledged were certain instructors and the cohort schedule. The worst parts identified also were certain instructors and generally some other situational variable, for example, food served, or textbooks not arriving on time. The follow-up question was, “What contributed to making the instructor good or bad?” Comments were recorded by hand by me, so that all responses were considered. Later the list, without the instructors’ names, was circulated with the department chairs to gain their suggested action for improvement.

**Undergraduate business majors:** (I conducted five interviews.)

For the undergraduate major, I invited (by mail) all graduating seniors to a session planned to coincide with a reading day. Generally, only about 30% of the seniors participated. The questions were the same as for the graduate program. Because the number of students participating was greater than 30 and the participants were more diverse, I had a person hand record the comments. One striking universal comment concerned behaviors by faculty members that was not apparent in the SET. For example, students claimed that many faculty members were missing classes, made inappropriate remarks, and had a lack of knowledge of the subject matter. The comments were summarized by the recorder, then circulated with the department chairs to obtain their suggestion for improvement.
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