The Affection of Student Ratings of Instruction toward EFL Instructors

Yingling Chen[1]

[1] Center for General Education, Orieantal Institute of Technology, New Taipei City, Taiwan

Correspondence: Yingling Chen, Center for General Education, Oriental Instutte of Technology, New Taipei City, Taiwan. Tel: 886-909-301-288. E-mail: cil0226@mail.oit.edu.tw

Abstract

Student ratings of instruction can be a valuable indicator of teaching because the quality measurement of instruction identifies areas where improvement is needed. Student ratings of instruction are expected to evaluate and enhance the teaching strategies. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness has been officially implemented in Taiwanese higher education since 2005. Therefore, this research investigated Taiwanese EFL university instructors' perceptions toward student ratings of instruction and the impact of student ratings of instruction on EFL instructors' classroom teaching. The data of this quantitative study was collected by 21 questionnaires. 32 qualified participants were selected from ten universities in the northern part of Taiwan. The results indicate those EFL instructors' perceptions and experiences toward student ratings of instruction affects their approach to teaching, but EFL instructors do not prepare lessons based on the results of student ratings of instruction.

Keywords: student ratings of instruction, EFL, instruction

1. Introduction

The Ministry of Education (MOE) authorizes universities and colleges to determine whom to hire in the college system according to the Taiwanese College Regulation 21. Moreover, the MOE (2005) concluded that developing a system for teacher evaluation is necessary in each college and university. As a result, schools have more power in deciding the qualification of educators. Wolfer and Johnson (2003) emphasized that one must be clear about the purpose of a course evaluation feedback since it may determine the kind of data required. Moreover, teacher evaluation should include the key element for not only promotion, tenure, and reward, but also performance review and teaching improvement. In addition, student ratings of instruction become an essential element to evaluate teachers' success for ensuring the quality of teaching. Students' opinions are fundamental sources for forming the quality of instruction in higher education. Murray (2005) stated that more than 90% of U.S. colleges and universities pay attention to student evaluation of teachers in order to assess teaching. Besides, about 70% of college instructors recognize the need of student input for assessing their classroom instruction (Obenchain, Abernathy, & Wiest, 2001). Teacher decision making toward curriculum design and teacher expectancy of student achievement have a significant influence on the results of curricular and instructional decisions. However, most of the research focus on how to assist and improve students' learning through SRI, how to improve teaching effectiveness through SRI, issues of SRI, or student achievement toward SRI; few of them address how do instructors use the feedback from SRI or how do instructors improve teaching through the results of SRI (Beran, Violato, Kline, & Frideres, 2005). Accordingly, instructors' perceptions of student ratings become valuable in presenting a better insight for improving teacher performances because understanding how instructors are impacted by SRI is influential.

1.1 Literature

1.1.1 The Use of Student Ratings of Instruction

The implementations of SRI at colleges and universities have not only been employed for purposes of improving teaching effectiveness, but also have been used for personnel decisions such as tenure. SRI is widely practiced in colleges and universities across Canada and the United States (Greenwald, 2002) .In fact, student ratings is not a new topic in higher education. Researchers, Remmers and Brandenburg published their first research studies on student ratings at Purdue University in 1927. Also, Guthrie (1954) stated that students at the University of

Washington filled out the first student rating forms seventy-five years ago. Nevertheless, SRI is a pertinent topic for researchers to study because students still fill out the evaluation forms which produce vital information on teaching quality. Administrators take SRI into consideration to determine the effectiveness of instruction and personnel promotions as well. There were 68% of American colleges reported using student ratings in Sedin's 1983 survey. Meanwhile, there were 86 percent of American colleges reported using student rating surveys in colleges in 1993 (Sedin, 1993a). Seldin's (1993b) surveys reflected the growing number of use of student rating as an instrument for teaching evaluation in higher education.

1.1.2 Student Rating of Instruction in Higher Education in Taiwan

"During the 1990s, most education systems in the English-speaking world moved towards some notion of performance management" (West-Burnham, O'Neill, & Bradbury, 2001, p. 6). The widespread use of the performance management concept contributes to the education system, which focuses on specific measurement of classroom instruction delivery. The quality of teaching influences students not only academically, but also psychologically. With regard to the value of teacher evaluation, the Taiwanese Ministry of Education has mandated that colleges and universities monitor the quality of teaching because the quality of teachers and instructions impact students' academic achievement and the reputation of the school. Chang (2002) declared that approximately 76 percent of public universities and 85 percent of private universities have implemented SRI in Taiwan. As a result, teacher evaluation has become an instrument for examining instructors' classroom presentation. Liu (2011) stated that teachers' classroom presentation is equivalent to teacher appraisal and teacher performance. Furthermore, Liu (2011) found the following:

Since 28th December 1995, the 21st Regulation of the University Act stated that a college should formulate a teacher evaluation system that decides on teacher promotion, and continues or terminates employment based on college teachers' achievement in teaching, research and so forth. (p. 4) SRI has been wildly accepted by universities and colleges in Taiwan and has become a practical tool for enhancing teaching performance and developing an effective trigger to examine factors that relate to educational improvement.

SRI stimulates organizational level effects by providing information from evaluation practice such as diagnosing organizational problems. SRI raises environmental level effects such as hiring, retention, and dismissal which is highly public acts justified through the evaluation process (Cross, Dooris, & Weinstein, 2004).

1.2 State Hypotheses and Their Correspondence to Research Design

1.2.1 Null Hypotheses

The independent variable in this study was SRI. The dependent variables were northern Taiwanese EFL university instructors' perception and the influence of SRI on northern Taiwanese EFL university instructors. The null hypotheses was designed for testing the association between EFL instructors' perceptions and SRI, SRI and the classroom instruction, and the impact of SRI and the classroom instruction. A Chi-Square was used to test the associations of the null hypotheses. A Chi-square probability of .05 or less was used to reject the null hypotheses. The following hypotheses addressed the research question:

1.2.2 Research Questions

1). What are Taiwanese EFL university instructors' perceptions toward SRI?

H10: No association exists between EFL university instructors' perceptions and SRI

(at the .05 level of significance).

2). What impact does SRI have on EFL university instructors' classroom instructions?

H20: No association exists between the impact of SRI and classroom instruction

(at the .05 level of significance).

2. Method

2.1 Participant

All participating EFL instructors have master or doctoral degrees from the foreign universities or local Taiwanese universities. The subjects' ages were between thirty-five to seventy years old. Each participating experienced instructor has received at least three years of results from SRI.

2.2 Sampling Procedures

The researcher used random sampling strategy to gain participants from 10 universities in the northern part of Taiwan for the quantitative data. The key to random sampling is that each university in the population has an

equal probability of being selected in the sample (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). Using random sampling strategy helped the researcher prevent biases from being introduced in the sampling process by drawing names or numbers. 32 Taiwanese university EFL instructors and were conducted from ten universities in the Northern part of Taiwan.

2.3 Sample

The target participants for the quantitative phase were thirty-two Chinese speaking English instructors from 10 northern universities. All participating EFL instructors have master or doctoral degrees from the foreign universities or local Taiwanese universities. Each participating experienced instructor has received at least three years of results from SRI.

2.4 Measurment

The quantitative data was collected and identified through a demographic survey and EFL instructors' perception of SRI questionnaire. A questionnaire covering instructors' perceptions toward SRI and a demographic questionnaire were used to explain the result of the quantitative data.

2.5 Research Design

The researcher randomly selected ten northern universities, which offer the English or applied foreign language major by drawing from twenty-eight schools.

2.6 Data Analisis

The first step of data analysis was the analyzing of the quantitative data. The researcher assigned codes to all questionnaires so that the participants' information was ensured. Then, the information was transferred into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 21.0). Also, the researcher was correctly enter quantitative data into SPSS in order to run a Cronbach's alpha test to create internally consistent, reliable, and valid tests and questionnaires for enhancing the accuracy of the survey. Furthermore, a Chi-Square test was implemented for testing hypotheses using a non-parametric test. Cooper and Schindler (2006) stated that Non-parametric tests are used to test the significance of ordinal and nominal data. A Chi-Square was used to compare SRI to the dependent variables. The Chi-Square statistical analysis was used to determine if an association exists between SRI and EFL instructors' perceptions,

3. Results

In the Results section, summarize the collected data and the analysis performed on those data relevant to the The results were reported in two main parts: (1) background information of quantitative survey participants, (2) a Chi-Square test was used to compare SRI to response dependent variables.

3.1 Gender and Age

Table 1 showed the distribution of gender and age for participants who taught in the department of English and Applied Foreign Language in the universities. Among the 32 EFL university instructor participants, 57% (n= 19) of the participants were female and 43% (n=13) percent of the participants were male. In addition, 3% (n=1) of participants were between 25-29 years old, 29% of the participants (n=9) were between 30-39 years old, 37% of the participants (n=12) were between 40-49 years old, 25% of the participants (n=8) were between 50-59 years old, and 6% of the participants (n=2) were between 60-69 years old.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of gender and age

Gender	Frequency Overall	Percentage Overall
Female	19	57%
Male	13	43%
Total	32	100%
Age	Frequency Overall	Frequency Overall
25-19	1	3%
30-39	9	29%
40-49	12	37%

50-59	8	25%
60-69	2	6%
70+	0	0
Total	32	100%

Note. n=32.

3.2 Years of Teaching

Table 2 reported the distribution of years of teaching for the participants who taught in the department of English and applied foreign language in the universities under EFL settings. The years of teaching varied from participants to participants. The distribution of years were the following: 1 for 1-3 years of experience, 2 for 4-6 years of experience, 7 for 7-10 years of experience, 5 for 11-15 years of experience, 6 for 16-20 years of experience, 4 for 21-25 years of experience, 6 for 26-30 years of experience, and 1 for more than 30 years of teaching experience.

Table 2. Frequency distribution of years of teaching

Years of Teaching	Frequency Overall	Percentage Overall
Less than 1 year	0	0
1-3 years	1	3.1%
4-6 years	2	6.2%
7-10 years	7	21.9%
11-15 years	5	16%
16-20 years	6	19%
21-25 years	4	12%
26-30 years	6	19%
More than 30 years	1	3.1%
Total	32	100%

Note. n=32.

3.3 EFL Instructors' Highest Level of Education

Table 3 showed the distribution of EFL instructors' highest level of education among the 32 participants, 24 participants held doctoral degrees and 8 participants had master's degrees. Furthermore, 26 participants earned the highest level of formal education in a foreign country and 6 participants got the highest level of formal education in Taiwan.

Table 3. Frequency distribution of the educational background

Highest Degree	Frequency Overall	Percentage Overall
Master Degree	8	25%
Doctoral Degree	24	75%
Total	32	100%
Foreign Degree	26	81.25%
Domestic Degree	6	18.75
Total	32	100%

Note. n=32.

3.4 Employment Status

Table 4 showed the employment status among 32 participants. There were 12 (38%) permanent employment with on-going contracts without fixed end-points before the age of retirement, 10 (31%) were fixed term contracts for a period of more than one school year, and 10 (31%) were fixed term contract for a period of one school year or less. In the mean time, 12% of the participants (n=4) were part-time instructors and 88% of the participants (n=28) were full-time instructors.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for participants' employment status

Employment status (1)	Permanent employment	Fixed term contract of more than one school year	Fixed term contract of more than one school year or less	Total
Participants/Count	12	10	10	32
Percentage %	37.5%	31.25%	31.25%	100%
Employment status (2)	Part-time employment	Full-time employment	Total	
Participants/count	8	24	32	
Percentage%	25%	75%	100%	

Note. n=32.

3.5 Personal Development

Table 5 showed personal development status among 32 participants. There were 25% (n=7) of participants who had master's degree were pursuing a doctoral degrees that related to their professional field at present in Taiwan. There were 75% (n=25) of participants were holding their original degrees without pursuing further degrees.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for personal development status

Personal development status	Pursuing a doctoral degree at present	Holding the original degree	Total
Participants/Count	7 (in Education, TESL, Linguistics, and English fields)	25	32
Percentage %	22%	78%	100%

Note. n=32.

3.6 Internal Reliability

Six Likert-scale items (items 1-6) in the first section. The researcher assessed the internal reliability with a pilot test of item analysis to obtain the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was utilized to determine the reliability of 21 items in discovering Taiwanese EFL university instructors' perceptions toward student rating of instructions. The subscales were (1) EFL instructors' perceptions toward SRI (six items, Cronbach's Alpha .71); and the influence of SRI on EFL instructors' classroom instruction (fifteen items, Cronbach's alpha .74) (see Table 6). During data collection, participants were verified as part-time and full-time EFL university instructors. The survey packet was distributed at the office. After each participant had completed the survey questionnaires, the researcher reviewed the packet for completeness. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) defined validity as the degree to which data supports any inferences that a researcher uses based on the evidence he collects using a specific instrument. Content validity is defined as the level in which an instrument can be duplicated under the same condition with the same conditions and participants (Sproull, 2002).

Table 6. Reliability statistics of pilot SRI

Variables	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
EFL instructors' perceptions toward SRI	6	.71
The influence of SRI on EFL instructors' classroom instruction	15	.74

3.7 Rating of Instructions

A preliminary analysis was executed to determine Taiwanese EFL university instructors' perceptions toward student rating of instruction. Based on primary analysis in Table 7, item 1 reported that 25% of the participants strongly disagreed and 69% of the participants disagreed with the positive attitude toward SRI; 6% of the participants were neutral. In item 2, 59% of the participants disagreed with holding enthusiastic and confident perceptions about the results of SRI. Twenty-two percent of the participants were neutral; 16% of the participants agreed and 3% of the participants strongly agreed with having enthusiasm and confidence toward the result of SRI. In item 3, 41% of the participants disagreed that they spend more time preparing their classes according to SRI results. Fifty-three percent of the participants were neutral and 6% of the participants agreed that they spent more time preparing courses based on SRI results. Additionally, in item 4, 31% of the participants disagreed that being open to students' opinions would help receive more positive results of SRI. Forty-four percent of the participants were neutral; 22% of the participants agreed and 3% of the participants strongly agreed that being open to students' opinions would help receive more positive result of SRI. In item 5, 6% of the participants disagreed that they care about the quality of SRI. There were 41% of the participants were neutral. Fifty-three percent of the participants agreed and 16% of the participants strongly agreed that they cared about the quality of SRI. In item 6, 6% of the participants strongly disagreed and 47% of the participants disagreed that they were always satisfied with the results of SRI. Forty-one percent of the participants were neutral and 6% of the participants agreed that they were always satisfied with the result of SRI.

Table 7. Mean, standard deviation, and percentage of Taiwanese EFL university instructors' perceptions toward SRI

Item 1-6 Percentage	Strongly Disagree %	Disagree Agree %	Neutral %	Agree %	Strongly Agree %	M	SD
1. I have positive attitude toward SRI.	25	68.8	6.3	0	0	1.81	.535
2. I am enthusiastic and confident about the result of SRI.	0	59.4	21.9	15.6	3.1	2.68	.871
3. I spend more time preparing my class according to SRI results.	0	40.6	53.1	6.3	0	2.66	.602
4. I think if I am more open to students' opinions, the result will be more positive.	0	31.3	43.8	21.9	3.1	2.97	.822
5. I care about the quality of SRI	0	6.3	40.6	53.1	0	3.47	.621
6. I am always satisfied with the result of SRI	6.3	46.9	40.6	6.3	0	2.47	.718

Note. M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation.

3.8 Descriptive Analyses of the Influence of SRI on Taiwanese University EFL Instructors

According to the analysis in Table 8, item 7, 6% of the instructors strongly disagreed and 43.8% of the instructors disagreed that SRI was an effective instrument for improving English instructional delivery. There were 41% of the participants were neutral. There were 9% of the instructors agreed that SRI was an effective

instrument for improving English instructional delivery. In item 8, 16% of the participants strongly disagreed and the majority of the participants (56%) disagreed that SRI provides authentic information in developing effective English lessons. There were 28% of the instructors were neutral.

Furthermore, in item 9, 56% of the instructors strongly disagreed and 34% of the participants disagreed that they became more supportive in assisting students learning after receiving the result of EFL SRI. There were 9% of participants were neutral. In item 10, 13% of the instructors strongly disagreed and 41% of the instructors disagreed that the result of SRI provided positive encouragement for their classes. There were 31% of the participants were neutral. There were 6% of the participants agreed that the results of SRI provided positive encouragement for their classes. Moreover, item 11 was worded in reverse, 9% of the participants strongly disagreed and 50% of the participants disagreed that criticism from the SRI did not influence their English teaching performance. There were 25% of the instructors were neutral. There were 9% of the participants agreed that criticism from the SRI did not influence their English teaching performance.

In item 12, 6% of the participants strongly disagreed and 59% of the participants disagreed that EFL SRI was an efficient communicative bridge between their students and them. There were 25% of the participants were neutral. Only 9% of the participants agreed that EFL SRI is an efficient communicative bridge between their students and them. In item 13, 6% of the participants disagreed that students' feedback gave them ideas for teaching students with special needs. There were 56% of the participants were neutral and 37% of the participants agreed that students' feedback gave them ideas for teaching students with special needs.

In item 14, 34% of the participants disagreed that students' feedback improves their English classroom management. 37.5% of the participants were neutral. There were 28% of the participants agreed that students' feedback improved their English classroom management. Moreover, item 15 was worded in reverse, 3% of the participants strongly disagreed and 34% of the participants disagreed that they would not change their knowledge and understanding of English instructional practices after receiving the results of EFL SRI. There were 46% of the participants were neutral and 16% of the participants agreed that they would not change the knowledge and understanding of English instructional practices after receiving the result of EFL SRI.

In item 16, 13% of the participants strongly disagreed and the majority of the participants (63%) disagreed that students provided trustworthy information when evaluating the effectiveness of English classroom instruction. There were 22% of the participants were neutral. Only 3% of the participants agreed that students provided trustworthy information when evaluating the effectiveness of English classroom instruction. In item 17, 41% of the participants disagreed that students' academic achievements influenced the result of SRI. There were 31% of the participants were neutral. There were 25% of the participants agreed and 3% of the participants strongly agreed that students' academic achievements influenced the result of SRI.

In item 18, 28% of the instructors disagreed that if they improved the quality of their English teaching, they received higher ratings from students. There were 56% of the participants were neutral and 16% of the participants agreed that if they improved the quality of their English teaching, they received higher rating from students. In item 19, 13% of the instructors disagreed that if they received unpleasant rating scores in the past, they changed their English teaching strategies. There were 56% of the instructors were neutral. There were 25% of the instructors agreed and 6% of the instructors strongly agreed that they received unpleasant rating scores in the past, so they changed their English teaching strategies.

In item 20, 9% of the participants disagreed that after they changed their English teaching strategies, they received better scores of EFL SRI. There were 81% of the participants were neutral and 9% of the participants agreed that after changing their English teaching strategies, they received better scores of EFL SRI. In addition, item 21 was worded in reverse, 6% of the participants strongly disagreed and 25% of the participants disagreed that unpleasant scores of EFL SRI would not decrease their passion toward teaching. Thirteen percent (13%) of the participants were neutral. There were 25% of the participants agreed and 6% of the participants strongly agreed that unpleasant scores of EFL SRI would not decrease their passion toward teaching.

Table 8. Mean. standard deviation and percentage of the influence of SRI on Taiwanese university EFL instructors' classroom instruction

Item 7-21 Percentage	Strongly Disagree %	Disagree%	Neutral %	Agree %	Strongly Agree %	M	SD
7. EFL SRI is an effective instrument for improving English instructional delivery.	6.3	43.8	40.6	9.4	0	2.53	.761
8. Overall, EFL SRI provides me authentic information in developing effective English lessons.	15.6	56.3	28.1	0	0	2.13	.660
9. I become more supportive in assisting student learning after receiving the result of EFL SRI.	56.3	34.4	9.4	0	0	2.53	.671
10. The result of EFL SRI provides positive encouragement for my class.	12.5	40.6	31.3	15.6	0	2.50	.916
11. Criticism from the SRI does not influence my English teaching performance.	9.4	50.4	25.0	9.4	0	2.44	.840
12. EFL SRI is an efficient communicative bridge between my students and me.	6.3	59.4	25.0	9.4	0	2.38	.751
13. Students' feedback gives me ideas for teaching students with special needs.	0	6.3	56.3	37.5	0	3.31	.592
14. Students' feedback improves my English classroom management.	0	34.4	37.5	28.1	0	2.94	.801
15. I will not change the knowledge and understanding of English instructional practices after receiving the result of EFL SRI.	3.1	34.4	45.9	15.6	0	2.75	.762
16. Students provide trustworthy information when evaluating the effectiveness of English classroom instruction.	50	40.6	9.4	0	0	1.59	.665
17. Students' academic achievements influence the result of SRI.	0	28.1	56.3	15.6	3.1	2.91	.893
18. If I improve the quality of my English teaching, I will receive higher ratings from students.	0	28.1	46.3	21.9	3.1	2.88	.660
19. I received an unpleasant rating score in the past, so I changed my English teaching strategies.	0	12.5	56.3	25	6.3	3.00	.803
20. After I changed my English teaching strategies, I received better scores of EFL SRI.	0	63.4	50.3	3.4	9.4	3.47	.761
21. Unpleasant scores of EFL SRI will not decrease my passion toward teaching.	18.8	56.3	18.8	3.1	3.1	2.16	.884

Note. M=Mean; SD=Standard Deviation.

3.9 The Frequency of Distribution of Years of Teaching Experiences in Four Groups

Table 9 presented the frequency of distribution of years of teaching experiences in four groups. The researcher divided the participants into four different groups based on their years of teaching experiences. Group 1 represented participants who have been teaching English for 1-6 years (n=3). Group 2 indicated participants who have been teaching English for 7-15 years (n=12). Group 3 showed participants who have been teaching English for 16-25 years (n=10). Group 4 expressed participants who have been teaching English for more than 26 years (n=7).

Table 9. Frequency of distribution of years of teaching experiences in four groups

Groups 1-4	Frequency	Percentage %	Valid Percentage %	Cumulative Percent %
1 (1-6 years)	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
2 (7-15 years)	12	37.5	37.5	46.9
3 (16-25 years)	10	31.3	31.3	78.1
4 (26 year and more)	7	21.9	21.9	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Note. n=32.

3.10 The Means of the Influences of SRI on Taiwanese EFL University Instructors Based on Their Years of Teaching Experience

Four open-ended interview questions (Q1, Q3, Q7, and Q8) reflecting the first part of six quantitative survey questionnaires which were designed to investigate EFL instructors' perceptions toward SRI. The survey questionnaires were (1) in general, I have positive attitude toward SRI; (2) I am enthusiastic and confident about the result of SRI; (3) I spend more time preparing my class according to SRI result; (4) I think if I am more open to students' opinions, the results will be more positive; (5) I care about the quality of SRI; (6) I am always satisfied with the result of SRI. Based on the analysis of participants' interview transcripts, two themes, four subthemes and four issues emerged in order to answer the first research question. The findings to the first research question are structured in Table 10.

Table 10. Structure of the qualitative findings: Research Question 1

Research Question 1		
Themes	Subthemes	Issues
Theme 1: The university EFL Instructors' Perceptions of SRI Theme 2: The role of SRI	● Experiences of receiving the results of SRI ● Implementation of SRI in EFL classroom ● Opinions after receiving the result of EFL SRI ● Suggestions after receiving the result of EFL SRI	● Negative ● Objective ● The purpose of SRI ● The real situation of SRI in universities in Taiwan.

3.11 Quantitative Findings: Null Hypotheses 1

$H1_0$: No association exists between EFL university instructors' perceptions and SRI.

Table 11 reported that the researcher failed to reject the first null hypothesis which stated that there was not an association between EFL university instructors' perceptions and student rating of instructions based on a significance level of .149 in item 4 (EFL instructors become more open to SRI receive better ratings). The significance level of .804 in item 5 (EFL instructors care about the quality of SRI) accepted the first null hypothesis. Besides, the first null hypothesis, which stated that there was not an association between EFL university instructors' perceptions and student rating of instructions was rejected based on a significance level

of .000 in item 1 (EFL instructors have positive attitude toward SRI). The significance level of .000 in item 2 (EFL instructors are confident in the results of SRI) rejected the first null hypothesis. Also, the first null hypothesis was rejected based on the significance level of .003 in item 3 (EFL instructors prepare lessons based on the results of SRI). The significance level of .000 in item 6 (EFL instructors satisfy with the results of SRI) rejected the null hypothesis. As hypothesized, Cillessen and Lafontana (2002) stated that teachers' perceptions affect their behavior and classroom practices. The more teachers learn about their students, the more they are able to design effective experiences that elicit real learning. Borg (2006) noted that understanding teacher perception is central to the process of understanding teaching. Research also indicated that teachers who are willing to develop their teaching skills were open-minded in listening to feedback from their students (Chang, Wang, & Yong, 2003).

Table 11. The summary of chi-square testing for Null Hypothesis 1

Items 1-6	Sig	Null Hypothesis 1 Accept/Reject
1. SRI is an effective instrument for EFL instructors to improve instructional delivery.	.000	Reject
2. The results of SRI provide EFL instructors authentic information in developing lessons.	.000	Reject
3. EFL instructors become more supportive in students' learning after receiving the results of SRI.	.003	Reject
4. The results of SRI provide positive encouragement for EFL instructors.	.149	Accept
5. Criticism from SRI does not influence EFL instructors' teaching performance.	.804	Accept
6. SRI is an effective communicative bridge between EFL instructors and students.	.000	Reject

Note. A P-value of .05 or less was used to reject the null hypotheses.

3.12 Quantitative Findings: Null Hypothesis 2

$H2_0$: No association exists between the impact of SRI and classroom instruction.

Table 12 reported the summary of the Chi-Square test of second null hypothesis, which stated that there was no association between the impact of SRI and classroom instruction. The researcher failed to reject the second null hypothesis which stated that there was not an association between SRI and classroom instruction based on a significance level of .080 in item 10 (The results of SRI provide positive encouragement for EFL instructors) and a significance level of .102 in item 14 (SRI improves EFL instructors' classroom management). The second null hypothesis, which stated that there was not an association between SRI and classroom instruction was rejected based on a significance level of .002 in item 7 (EFL instructors have positive attitude toward SRI), a significance level of .016 in item 8, a significance level of .005 in item 9, a significance level of .004 in item 11, a significance level of .000 in item 12, a significance level of .002 in item 13 (SRI gives EFL instructors ideas for teaching students with special needs), a significance level of .002 in item 15(EFL instructors will not change the knowledge and understanding of instructional practices after receiving the results of SRI), a significance level of .001 in item 16 (The results of SRI provide trustworthy information for EFL instructors), a significance level of .021 in item 17 (Students' achievements influence the results of SRI), a significance level of .016 in item 18 (If I improve the quality of the English instruction, I will receive higher ratings from students), a significance level of .006 in item 19 (I received an unpleasant rating score in the past, so I changed my English teaching strategies), a significance level of .001 in item 20 (After I changed English teaching strategies, I received better results of SRI), and a significance level of .000 in item 21 (Unpleasant scores of SRI will not decrease my passion toward English teaching).

The current findings concurred with the hypothesis that an association existed between the influence of SRI and classroom instruction. Teacher evaluation provided information to faculty about teaching effectiveness (Biggs, 2003; Ramsdem, 2003; Yorke, 2003) and to students about how they can improve their learning and how well they are doing in the course (Carless et al., 2007; Gibbs 2006). Liu (2011) stated that teachers' classroom

presentation is equivalent to teacher appraisal and teacher performance. Furthermore, "since 28th December 1995, the 21st Regulation of the University Act states that a college should formulate a teacher evaluation system that decides on teacher promotion, and continues or terminates employment based on college teachers' achievement in teaching, research and so forth" (Liu, 2011, p. 4). "Universities started to formulate school regulations based on the University Act and began executing teacher education. According to the official documentation, 60% of the colleges stipulate that teachers have to pass the evaluation before receiving a promotion" (Liu, 2011, p. 4). EFL instructors' perceptions and experiences toward SRI will affect their approach to teaching. In other words, assessment attitudes and experiences by EFL students will also influence their way of learning.

Table 12. The results of chi-square testing for Null Hypothesis 2

Items 7-21	Sig	Null Hypothesis 2 Accept/Reject
7. SRI is an effective instrument for EFL instructors to improve instructional delivery.	.002	Reject
8. The results of SRI provide EFL instructors authentic information in developing lessons.	.016	Reject
9. EFL instructors become more supportive in students' learning after receiving the results of SRI.	.005	Reject
10. The results of SRI provide positive encouragement for EFL instructors.	.080	Accept
11. Criticism from SRI does not influence EFL instructors' teaching performance.	.004	Reject
12. SRI is an effective communicative bridge between EFL instructors and students.	.000	Reject
13. SRI gives instructors ideas for teaching students with special needs.	.002	Reject
14. SRI improves EFL instructors' classroom management.	.102	Accept
15. EFL instructors will not change the knowledge and understanding of instructional practices after receiving the results of SRI	.002	Reject
16. SRI provides trustworthy information for EFL instructors.	.001	Reject
17. Students' achievements influence the results of SRI.	.021	Reject
18. If I improve the quality of the English instruction, I will receive higher ratings from students.	.016	Reject
19. I received an unpleasant rating score in the past, so I changed my English teaching strategies.	.006	Reject
20. After I changed English teaching strategies, I received better results of SRI.	.001	Reject
21. Unpleasant scores of SRI will not decrease my passion toward English teaching.	.000	Reject

Note. A P-value of .05 or less was used to reject the null hypotheses.

4. Discussions

The results uncovered that EFL instructors' teaching attitudes and motivation were being diminished simply because teachers overwhelmingly expressed that SRI did not provide them useful feedback on their performance in the classroom. EFL instructors were not willing to take risk in assigning works, carrying out tests, or addressing needs in supporting student in learning. The results of SRI were hardly for EFL instructors used to make important decisions for improving the quality of instruction/education. In fact, SRI was considered an indicator of instructors' performance when it came time to dismiss them. The findings highlighted the northern Taiwanese EFL instructors' perceptions toward SRI and the influence of SRI on EFL instructors' classroom

instruction. Faculties were more likely to disagree on the effectiveness of SRI and pointed out the increasing issues of SRI. Broadly negative feedback accompanied by small numbers objective feedback may provide us with indicators about the different value perceptions and influences adopted by northern Taiwanese EFL university instructors. As the results of quantitative data showed 87% of the items from the second part of the influence of SRI on EFL university instructors had associations between SRI and classroom instruction. It was interesting to note that EFL instructors seemed to distrust the results of SRI. The possible explanations of the negative perceptions could indicate that EFL instructors were sensitive to the factors that the results of SRI were considered for tenure, promotion, and employment status which reflects Cross, Dooris and Weinstein's theory in 2004. SRI raises environmental level effects such as hiring, retention, and dismissal. They were highly public acts justified through the evaluation process. Students' perceptions of SRI may differ from the faculty members because students may not realize how the results of teacher evaluation may be used by administrators. As a result, students may not know the consequences of teaching. Administrators and educators need to understand factors that influence EFL instructors' classroom instruction so that they will be able to develop a reasonable environment in merit raises, promotion, and tenure decisions.

References

American Psychological Association. (1972). *Ethical standards of psychologists*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Anderson, C. A., Gentile, D. A., & Buckley, K. E. (2007). *Violent video game effects on children and adolescents: Theory, research and public policy*.

Beran, T., Violato, C., Kline, D., & Frideres, J. (2005). The utility of student ratings of instruction for students, faculty, and administrators: a consequential validity study. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *2*, 49-70.

Biggs, J. (2003). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.

Carless, D., Joughin, G., & Mok. M. M. C. (2007). Learning-oriented assessment: Principles and practice. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31, 395-398.

Chang, J. L, Wang, W. Z., & Yong, H. (2003). Measurement of Fracture Toughness of Plasma-Sprayed Al2O3 Coatings Using a Tapered Double Cantilever Beam Method. *Journal of the American Ceramic Society, 86*(8), 1437-1439. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1151-2916.2003.tb03491.x

Chang, T-S. (2002). *Student ratings of instruction*. Taipei, Taiwan: Yung Zhi.

Cillessen, A. H. N., & Lafontana, K.M. (2002). Children's perceptions of popular and unpopular peers: A multimethod assessment. *Developmental Psychology, 38*(5), 635-647. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.38.5.635

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Gibbs, G. (2006). How assessment frames student learning. In C. Bryan, & K. Clegg (Eds.), *Innovative Assessment in Higher Education* (pp. 23-36). London: Routledge.

Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. S. (2006). *Business research methods* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Constructs in student ratings of instructors. In H. I. Braun, D. N. Jackson, & D. E. Wiley (Eds.), *The role of constructs in psychological and educational measurement, 24*(3), 193-202, New York: Erlbaum.

Guthrie, E. R. (1954). *The evaluation of teaching: A progress report*. Seattle: University of Washington.

Liu, C-W. (2011). The implementation of teacher evaluation for professional development in primary education in Taiwan. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation.com, Boca Raton, Florida.

Ministry of Education (Taiwan) (MOE). (2005). Ministry of Education News: college law. Retrieved from October 31, 2016, from http://tece.heeact.edu.tw/main.php.

Murray, H. G. (2005). Student evaluation of teaching: has it made a difference? In the Annual meeting of the society for teaching and learning in higher education, June 2005 (pp.1-15). Charlottetown, Prince Edward

Island, Canada.

Obenchain, K. M., Abernathy, T. V., & Wiest, L. R. (2001). The reliability of students' ratings of faculty teaching effectiveness. *College Teaching, 49*(3), 100-104. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550109595859

Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Seldin, P. (1993a). How colleges evaluate professors: 1983 versus 1993. *AAHE Bulletin, 12*, 6-8

Seldin, P. (1993b). *The use and abuse of student ratings of professors*. Bolton, MA:Anker.

Sproull, J. (2002). Personal communication with authors, University of Edinburgh.

Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: a typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(1), 77-100. https://doi.org/10.1177/2345678906292430

West-Burnham, J., O'Neill, J., & Bradbury, I. (Eds.) (2001). *Performance management in schools: How to lead and manage staff for school improvement*. London, UK: Person Education.

Wolfer, T., & Johnson, M. (2003). Re-evaluating student evaluation of teaching: The Teaching Evaluation Form. *Journal of Social Work Education, 39*, 111-121.

Yorke, M. (2003). Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and enhancement of pedagogic practice. *Higher Education, 45*, 477-501. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023967026413