Influence of Gender and Age on Science and Non-Science Students' Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness of University Lecturers

Babalola J. Ogunkola

School of Education, Faculty of Humanities and Education,
The University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus, Barbados.

Olakunle S. Akinsola

Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council
Abuja, Nigeria

Abstract

The study focused on university students' evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of their lecturers with a view to providing diagnostic feedback to lecturers about the effectiveness of their teaching. A descriptive survey research design was employed in carrying out the study. Moreover, a stratified random sampling technique was used to select fifty second year students from each of the Faculties of Science and Arts of Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria. A total of 100 students were eventually asked to evaluate the best lecturer among those teaching them during the semester by rating such lecturer using valid and reliable instrument named University Students' Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness Scale (USETES). The students rated the lecturers on a five-point scale of very poor, poor, moderate, good and very good. The instrument was made up of forty-six items that were divided into sections of students' interest, classroom organization, and fairness to students, preparation, giving of assignments, assessment/appearance and commitment. Percentages, frequency count and t-test were used to analyze the data. The study revealed that most of the students rated their lecturers above average with respect to sympathy, friendliness, good relationship with students, readiness to assist students, respect for the view of students, good interaction with students and good sense of judgment. However, most students rated the lecturers low on traits such as supervision of projects, regular class attendance and use of instructional materials. The study further found out that there were no significant influence of sex and age of the students on their evaluation of their lecturers' teaching effectiveness in some traits while significant influence of sex and age were recorded in other traits.

1. Background to the Problem

Teaching effectiveness has been the concern of many scholars in the past (Barr, 1984; Onocha, 1997 and Zakrajesk, 2002) and it is still an area that engages the attention of researchers today (Ogunniyi, 2004). This is expected because of the crucial role of teaching in any educational programme. Teaching effectiveness is multifaceted and therefore, there are different components of effective teaching (Boyle, 1997). Seldin (1999) provides a list of thirteen qualities that should be possessed by an effective teacher. According to him, an effective teacher should treat students with respect and care, provide the relevant information to be learned, use active, hands-on student techniques, vary instructional modes, and provide frequent feedback to students on their performances, offer real-world, practical examples, draw inferences from models and use analogies. He further says that an effective teacher should also be able to provide clear expectations for assignments, creates class environment which is comfortable for students, present himself or herself in a class as a 'real person' communicate in a way that is understandable to his or her students, use feedback from students and others to assess and improve his or her teaching and reflect on his or her own classroom performance in order to improve.

Consequently, student evaluation constitutes one measure of teaching effectiveness. For instances, student ratings are commonly collected at North America Universities and are widely endorsed by students, faculties and administrators (Centra, 1993). The purposes of these evaluations according to Marsh (1994) are variously intended to provide diagnostic feedback to faculty about the effectiveness of their teaching, a measure of teaching effectiveness to be used in administrative decision-making, information for students to use in the selection of courses by instructors, a measure of quality of the course to be used in course improvement and curriculum development and an outcome or a process description for research on teaching.

However, the use of student ratings as a measure of teaching effectiveness, in the opinion of Ogunniyi (2004)

has been centred on two viewpoints. Critics of its use have pointed to the inadequacy of students as a judge of teaching ability, emphasizing their lack of experience and difficulty of reporting judgments which are free from subjective biases. On the other hand, ratings have emphasized that effective learning results from interactions of students and teachers and that however biased the ratings may be, they are valuable sources of information concerning students' reaction to the behaviour of teachers.

Ogunniyi (2004) also noted that evidence has accumulated over the years concerning students' ability to rate teachers and that more institutions have turned to students' ratings for one purpose or another. After extensive research work on students' evaluation in various countries, Marsh (1994) concluded that students' ratings are reasonably well supported by research findings. Supporting the use of students' evaluations of their lecturers, McKeachie (1997) stated that well designed student evaluations are reliable and valid. Research by Cashin (1995) also suggested that faculty who receive higher training and feedback raised scores on students' ratings.

The literature reviewed so far implies that students' ratings are important both as a process – description measure and as an evaluation of the process. This dual role, played by students' ratings is also inherent in their use as diagnostic feedback, as an input for tenure promotion decision, information as well as for students' use in course selection.

Nonetheless, the fear that some personal variables of the students may affect the students' ratings has been the concern of researchers. Zakrajesk (2002) for instance reports that students' gender is unrelated to their evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Ogunniyi (2004) in a research effort stated that although there are a few factors of teaching effectiveness in which age of students had effect, he says that it is still safe to conclude that the age of students does not generally have effect on their evaluation of lecturers. Moreover, Marsh (1994) and Zakrajesk (2002) are of the view that the age of students does not affect their evaluation. This is not surprising because irrespective of their ages students have been found to identify lecturers that guide, focus, challenge and encourage students' learning (Carey, 2005). Although in successful classrooms, lecturers and students, according Bruer (2006), collaborate in the pursuit of ideas, and students quite often initiate new activities related to what they are taught, they still appreciate the role of their lecturers. Therefore, students see successful lecturers as skilled observers of students, as well as knowledgeable about what they teach, and how it is learned. Students, expect lecturers to match their actions to the particular needs of students, deciding when and how to guide, when to demand more rigorous grappling by the students, when to provide information, when to provide particular tools, and when to connect students with other sources (Carey, 2005).

The fact that students' evaluation of lecturers' teaching effectiveness has been found to be useful, reliable and valid and being employed in many developed countries but not yet embraced in a developing country like Nigeria underscores the need to shed light on what students' ratings will look like in a University in Nigeria. To this extent, the present study makes use of Olabisi Onabanjo University, as a case study to investigate students' evaluation of their lecturers' teaching effectiveness. The study further examined the influence of students' gender and age on their ratings. These are done with the view to providing feedback to the lecturers, purposely for improvement of instruction.

2. Research Questions

The following research questions guided the investigation:
1) What is the profile of science students' evaluation of their lecturers' teaching effectiveness?
2) What is the profile of non-science students' evaluation of their lecturers' teaching effectiveness?
3) Is there any significant influence of students' age on their evaluation of the lecturers' teaching effectiveness
4) Is there any significant influence of students' gender in their evaluation of their lecturers' teaching effectiveness?

3. Method

The study employed a descriptive survey research design as none of the variables under study was manipulated. Moreover, the target population of the study consists of lecturers and students in Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago Iwoye, Nigeria.

A total of 100 students from the university were used for this study. Fifty students were randomly drawn from one of the science-based faculties (Faculty of Science); one of the Arts based faculties (Faculty of Arts)

The instrument used for this study was one developed by Ogunniyi (2004) named University Students' Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness Scale (USETES). It has two sections. Section A contains the students' background characteristics such as gender and age. Section B contains the indicators of teaching effectiveness, which have been

divided into students' interest, classroom organization, fairness to students, preparation, creativity, assignments, assessment/appearance and commitment. Each student is expected to rate the lecturer as very poor, poor, moderate, good and very good.

Literature reveals some information on the psychometric properties of the instrument. Ogunniyi (2004) himself carried out the empirical validation. He administered the instrument to a sample of 100 students from the University of Ibadan. Using the data gathered, the Cronbach coefficient of alpha was computed to determine the internal consistency and a reliability coefficient of 0.7 was obtained. Despite the good report about USETES, the present researcher re-established a test – retest reliability coefficient of 0.92 on a smaple of 80 students (40 males, and 40 females) selected from the University of Benin. A Cronbach alpha value of 0.86 was also established for the instrument. This confers a high validity and high internal consistency on the instrument.

The 100 students selected from the two faculties were selected after they have had nine (9) weeks of lecture contacts in the semester. The students comprise 50 students (25 males, and 25 females) from Faculty of Science, representing Science-based faculty), and 50 students (23 males, 27 females) Faculty of Arts (representing Arts-based). The students who had been informed to feel free and be unbiased were told to think of a good lecturer among those teaching them during the semester and rate the lecturer on a 5 point scale of (i) very poor, (ii) poor, (iii) moderate, (iv) good and (v) very good. In case there was a situation where two or more lecturers were team-teaching particular course, students were told to rate the better or best out of the lecturers.

4. Data Analysis

The 100 USETES were collected and scored on faculty basis. The statistical tools used for analysis include frequency and t-test in order to appropriately provide answer to the research questions raised in the study.

5. Results

The results are presented below starting from the first research question.

5.1 Research Question 1: What is the profile of science students' evaluation of their lectures' teaching effectiveness in Olabisi Onabanjo University?

Table 1a: Profile of the Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Interest in Students in Olabisi Onabanjo University

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Sympathy	0	3 (6.0)	25(50.0)	15(30.0)	7(14.0)
2	Friendliness	0	3 (6.0)	21(42.0)	23(46.0)	3(6.0)
3	Good relationship	1 (1.9)	3 (6.0)	16(32.0)	18(36.0)	12(24.0)
4	Readiness to assist	0	8 (16.0)	5(10.0)	28(56.0)	9(18.0)
5	Respect for students' view	8 (15.4)	24 (48.0)	18(36.0)	0	0
6	Good Interaction	0	3 (6.0)	25(5.0)	15(30.0)	7(14.0)
7	Counseling of Students	0	3(6.0)	21(42.0)	23(46.0)	3(6.0)
8	Tolerance	1 (2.0)	3(6.0)	16(32.0)	18(36.0)	12(24.0)
9	Good sense of judgment	0	3(6.0)	25(50.0)	15(30.0)	7(14.)
10	Pleasant habits		3(6.0)	20(40.0)	17(34.0)	10(20.0)

It is obvious from the Table 1a that some of the students rated their lectures high in the area of sympathy friendliness, good relationship, readiness to assist and pleasant habits. On the other hand, the students rated the lecturers low in respect for students' views. However, the students were of the opinion that the lecturer is moderate in his interaction, counseling of students and good sense of judgment.

Table 1b: Profile of Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Level of Classroom Organization

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Effective delivery of lectures	0	0	11(22.0)	39(78.0)	0
2	Valid and adequate examination	0	14(28.0)	11(22.0)	25(50.0)	0

3	Use of relevant examples	0	0	11(22.0)	16(32.)	23(46.0)
4	Emphasis on important areas	0	0	11(22.0)	39(78.0)	0
5	Making students to discover their ideas	0	0	16(32.0)	34(68.0)	0
6	Possession of good handwriting	0	8(16.0)	19(38.0)	23(46.0)	0
7	Objectivity	0	2(4.0)	1(2.0)	17(34.0)	30(60.0)
8	Revision before Examination	0	10(20.0)	9(18.0)	24(48.0)	7(14.0)
9	Making use of conducive environment	0	12(24.0)	23(46.0)	15(30.0)	0
10	Audibility	0	7(14.0)	9(18.0)	29(58.0)	4(8.0)
11	Ability to discuss current development	0	0	6(12.0)	25(50.0)	19(38.0)

As revealed in Table 1b, majority of the students rated their lecturer's ability to effectively organize classrooms highly. About 78% claimed that their lecturer used relevant examples and that the lecturer is very objective in handling issues.

Table 1c: Profile of Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Fairness to Students.

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Refraining from bribery	0	0	12(24.0)	24(48.0)	14(28.0)
2	Dedication to work	0	0	7(14.0)	36(72.0)	6(12.0)
3	Refraining from sexual harassment	0	7(14.0)	1(2.0)	28(56.0)	14(28.0)
4	Originality	0	0	0	13(26.0)	37(74.0)
5	A parent substitute	0	4(8.0)	22(44.0)	22(44.0)	2(4.0)

In terms of fairness to students, as indicated in Table 1c, the students generally evaluated the performance of their lecturers as being either moderate or good or very good. It is only in the aspect of refraining from sexual harassment that 14% of the students rated their lecturers as being poor.

Table 1d: Profile of Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Level of Preparation for Teaching

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Punctuality	0	0	12(24.0)	25(50.0)	13(26.0)
2	Adequate Knowledge	0	0	7(14.0)	37(74.0)	6(12.0)
3	Adequate preparation before class	0	0	0	13(26.0)	37(74.0)
4	Unbiased attitude towards students	0	0	6(12.0)	25(50.0)	19(38.0)
5	Understanding of learners problems	0	0	1(2.0)	16(32.0)	33(66.0)
6	Efficiency	0	0	12(24.0)	25(50.0)	13(26.0)
7	Presentation of course content	0	0	11(22.0)	29(58.0)	10(20.0)

Regarding the level of preparation of the lectures for teaching, the students rated the lecturers as either moderate or good or very good. This implies that the lectures are always punctual, efficient, unbiased and they possess adequate knowledge of what they taught.

Table 1e: Profile of Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Levels of Creativity

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Taking Students' Level into consideration	0	0	23 (46..0)	27(54.0)	0
2	Using of instructional materials	0	6(12.0)	9(18.0)	15 (30.0)	20(40.0)

The general ratings of the students indicate that the lecturers are creative in the sense that they take the levels of students into consideration when teaching. Moreover, they aid their lessons with the use of instructional materials. Unfortunately, about 12% of the students rated their lecturers as being poor in their use of instructional materials.

Table 1f: Profile of Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Level of giving Assignments

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Giving home assignment	13(26.0)	25(50.0)	7(14.0)	5(10.0)	0

E-ISSN 2039-2117
ISSN 2039-9340

Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences
MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy

Vol 4 No 14
November 2013

| 2 | Giving group assignments | 13(26.0) | 27(54.0) | 10(20.0) | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Organizing excursion/field trips | 26(52.0) | 17(34.0) | 7(14.0) | 0 | 0 |

This table shows the ratings of the lecturers' ability to give assignments in terms of giving home assignments, giving group assignments and organizing excursion or field trips. The rating indicates that the performance of the lecturers is very low. In fact, 76% of the students rated lecturers low in giving home assignments. Excursions or field trips are not usually organized as rated by 86% of the students.

Table 1g: Profile of Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Use of Assignment and their Appearance

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Use of continuous assessment	0	3(6.0)	25(50.0)	15(30.0)	7(14.0)
2	Use of assignments	0	3(6.0)	25(50.0)	15(30.0)	7(14.0)
3	Smart dressing	0	0	17(34.0)	26(52.0)	7(14.0)
4	Neat dressing	0	3(6.0)	25(50.0)	15(30.0)	7(14.0)

The lecturers were generally rated as being moderate in the aspects of the use of continuous assessment and the use of scores of assignments given. However, the lecturers were highly rated in terms of appearance which involves traits such as smart and neat dressing.

Table 1h: Profile of Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Levels of Commitments to Work

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Supervision of projects	0	3(6.0)	25(50.0)	15(30.0)	7(14.0)
2	Attendance in class	0	10(20.0)	34(68.0)	4(8.0)	2(4.0)
3	Non- commercialization of lecture notes	3(6.0)	14(28.0)	24(48.0)	10(20.0)	2(4.0)
4	Provision of relevant references	2(4.0)	12(24.0)	24(28.0)	10(20.0)	2(4.0)

The students rated their lecturers high in the aspect of commitment, which includes supervision of projects, attendance in classes and others.

Table 2a - 2h revealed the profile of evaluation of the undergraduate students of their lecturers' teaching effectiveness in the Faculty of Arts of the University.

5.2 Research Question 2: What is the profile of Non-Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Teaching Effectiveness in Olabisi Onabanjo University?

Table 2a: Profile of Non-Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers Interest in them

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Sympathy	0	0	5(10.0)	21(42.0)	24(48.0)
2	Friendliness	0	0	8(16.0)	24(48.0)	18(36.0)
3	Good relationship with Students	-	0	0	18(36.0)	32(64.0)
4	Readiness to assist	0	6(12.0)	30(60.0)	14(28.0)	0
5	Respect for the view	-	10(20.0)	5(10.0)	13(26.0)	22(44.0)
6	Good interaction with students	0	0	11(22.0)	22(44.0)	17(34.0)
7	Counseling of students	0	0	6(12.0)	25(50.0)	19(38.0)
8	Tolerance for students	-	4(8.0)	0	21(42.0)	25(50.0)
9	Good sense of judgment	0	12(24.0)	38(76.0)	0	0
10	Pleasant habits	0	6(12.0)	39(78.0)	5(10.0)	0

Clearly shows that the students' rating of their lecturers on the aspect of interest in the students is mainly high with the exception of few students (12%) who rated the lecturers as being poor under readiness to assist the students.

About 20% of the students also rated the lecturers as being poor in their respect for the view of students.

Table 2b: Profile of the Evaluation of Non-Science Students on their Lecturers' Level of Classroom Organization

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Effective delivery of lectures	0	0	12(24.0)	33(66.0)	5(10.0)
2	Valid and adequate examination	3(6.0)	8(16.0)	13(26.0)	26(52.0)	0
3	Use of relevant examples	0	7(14.0)	38(76.0)	5(10.0)	0
4	Emphasis on important areas	0	0	16(32.0)	34(68.0)	0
5	Making students to discover their ideas	0	0	25(50.0)	25(50.0)	0
6	Possession of good handwriting	0	6(12.0)	3(6.0)	27(54.0)	14(28.0)
7	Objectivity	0	0	12(24.0)	38(76.0)	0
8	Revision before examination	0	11(22.0)	11(22.0)	28(56.0)	0
9	Making use of conducive environment	0	39(78.0)	9 (18.0)	2(4.0)	0
10	Audibility	0	0	8(16.0)	28(56.0)	14(28.0)
11	Ability to discuss current development	0	5(10.0)	6(12.0)	39(78.0)	0

The students generally rate the lecturers as begin good or very good as far as classroom organization is concerned. Although some of the students felt that the lecturers' performed moderately in classroom organization, a few (6%) of the students still rated their lecturers as being very poor in their relationship with students. A large proportion of the students (78%) rated the lecturers as poor in their sense of judgment. However, the lecturers were rated as very good in their interaction with students by of the students.

Table 2c: Profile of the Evaluation of Non-Science Students on their Lecturers' Level of Fairness to the Students

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Restraining from bribery	0	0	13(26.0)	37(74.0)	0
2	Dedicated to work	0	0	11(22.0)	22(44.0)	17(34.0)
3	Restraining from sexual harassment	0	9(18.0)	5 (10.0)	36(72.0)	0
4	Originality	0	0	3(6.0)	31(62.0)	16(32.0)
5	A Parent substitute	0	0	0	41(82.0)	9(18.0)

Table 2c reveals the level of fairness of the lecturers to the students. The lecturers were rated to be good in restraining from bribery by 74 % of the students while 94% of the students rated the lecturers as either good or very good as far as is concerned. 82% of the students evaluated the teachers as those that can stand as a substitute for their parents.

Table 2d: Profile of Non-Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Level of Preparation for Teaching

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Punctuality	0	0	42(84.0)	8(16.0)	0
2	Adequate knowledge	0	0	14(28.0)	23(46.0)	13(26.0)
3	Adequate preparation before class	0	0	6(12.0)	39(78.0)	5(10.0)
4	Unbiased attitude towards students	0	0	11(22.0)	29(58.0)	10(20.0)
5	Understanding of learners problems	0	15(30.0)	6(12.0)	29(58.0)	0
6	Efficiency	0	0	9(18.0)	27(54.0)	14(28.0)
7	Presentation of course content	0	0	12(24.0)	36(72.0)	2(4.0)

The non-science students generally rated their teachers high in the traits of adequate knowledge, adequate preparation before class, unbiased attitude towards students, understanding of learners' problems and presentation of course content. In spite of this high rating, some students (30%) rated the teachers as poor in their understanding of learner's problems.

Table 2e: Profile of Non-Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Level of Creativity

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Taking students' Level into consideration	0	0	11(22.0)	39(78.0)	0
2	Use of instructional materials	0	0	12(24.0)	22(44.0)	16(32.0)

78% of the students rated their lecturers as being good in taking the students' level into consideration during teaching. Moreover, 32% of the students rated the lecturers to be very good in their use of instructional materials, which is an indication of high level of creativity.

Table 2f: Profile of Non-Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Level of giving Assignment

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Giving home assignment	0	40(80.0)	9(18.0)	1(2.0)	0
2	Giving group assignments	0	33(66.0)	10(20.0)	7 (14.0)	0
3	Organizing excursion/field trips	11(22.0)	25(50.0)	14(28.0)	0	0

Generally, the lecturers were rated poor in giving both home and group assignments. 50% of the students also rated the lecturers as being poor in organizing excursion or field trips.

Table 2g: Profile of Non-Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Use of Assignment and Appearance

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Use of continuous assessment	0	0	15(30.0)	30(60.0)	5(10.0)
2	Use of assignments	0	0	42(84.0)	8(16.0)	0
3	Smart dressing	0	10(20.0)	16(32.0)	24(48.0)	0
4	Neat dressing	0	6(12.0)	16(32.0)	28(56.0)	0

The students rated the lectures as being moderate in their use of continuous assessment and making use of the little assignment they give to students rated the lecturers as either moderate (32%) or good (45%) in smart and neat dressing, although 20% of the students rated the lecturers as poor in smart dressing.

Table 2h: Profile of Non-Science Students' Evaluation of their Lecturers' Commitment

S/N	Items	Very Poor	Poor	Moderate	Good	Very Good
1	Supervision of projects and assignment	0	7(14.0)	33(66.0)	10(20.0)	0
2	Regular attendance at class	0	21(42.0)	25(50.0)	4(8.0)	0
3	Non-commercialization of lecture notes	0	14(28.0)	26(52.0)	10(20.0)	0
4	Provision of relevant references	11(22.0)	20(40.0)	19(38.0)	0	0

The general picture depicted by the rating of the students of their lecturers' commitment to work is that 66% of the non-science students considered their lecturers as being moderately committed to supervision of projects and assignments, while 25% of them were considered moderately committed to regular attendance at classes.

5.3 Research Question 3: Is there any Significant Influence of Students' Age on the Evaluation of Their Lecturers Teaching Effectiveness?

Table 3a: Influence of Science Students' Age on the Evaluation of their Lecturers' Teaching Effectiveness?

S/N	Variables	Age	N	X	SD	t	df	sig
1	Students' Interest	15-20 21-25	23 27	31.78 37.22	4.16 3.82	- 4.822	48	.000
2	Classroom organization	15-20 21-25	23 27	41.95 41.59	1.21 1.74	0.83	48	0.42 (NS)
3	Fairness to Students	15-20 21-25	23 27	19.91 21.92	1.53 7.8	-1.22	48	0.23 (NS)
4	Preparation	15-20 21-25	23 27	29.17 30.03	1.27 2.77	-1.38	48	0.18 (NS)
5	Creativity	15-20 21-25	23 27	8.04 7.07	1.43 1.38	2.43	48	0.02
6	Assignment	15-20	23	5.87	1.01	1.063	48	0.293

		21-25	27	5.44	1.67			(NS)
7	Assessment	15-20	23	10.91	2.17	-	48	0.002
		21-25	27	13.26	2.73	3.324		
8	Commitment	15-20	23	12.43	2.19	0.660	48	0.513
		21-25	27	12.04	2.06			(NS)

The table above shows that while science students' age has significant influence on students' ratings of their lecturers' teaching effectiveness in students' interest, assessment and creativity, it does not have significant influence on other aspects of lectures teaching effectiveness.

Table 3b: Influence of Non-Science Students' Age on the Evaluation of their Lecturers' Teaching Effectiveness

S/N	Variables	Age	N	X	SD	t	df	sig
1	Students' Interest	15-20	23	78.74	2.47	-0.11	48	0.91
		21-25	27	78.81	2.42			(NS)
2	Classroom organization	15-20	23	81.83	2.98	-3.47	48	0.001
		21-25	27	84.44	2.36			
3	Fairness to Students	15-20	23	39.0	1.76	-3.46	48	0.001
		21-25	27	40.6	1.42			
4	Preparation	15-20	23	55.1	0.97	4.21	48	0.000
		21-25	27	53.5	1.55			
5	Creativity	15-20	23	16.6	0.66	7.19	48	0.000
		21-25	27	15.22	0.70			
6	Assignment	15-20	23	19.17	0.94	2.31	48	0.03
		21-25	27	18.41	1.34			
7	Assessment	15-20	23	29.91	0.79	1.45	48	0.15
		21-25	27	29.48	1.22			(NS)
8	Commitment	15-20	23	26.52	0.95	-2.08	48	0.04
		21-25	27	27.04	0.81			

Table 3b reveals that non-science students' age has significant influence on students' ratings of their lecturers' teaching effectiveness in all the traits rated except on students' interest and assessment/ appearance.

5.4 Research Question 4: Is there any significant Influence of Students' Sex in the Evaluation of their Lecturers' Teaching Effectiveness.

Table 4a: Influence of Science Students' Sex on the Evaluation of their Lecturers' Teaching Effectiveness

S/N	Variables	Sex	N	X	SD	t	df	sig
1	Students' Interest	Male	25	36.24	4.77	2.34	48	0.023
		Female	25	33.20	4.39			
2	Classroom organization	Male	25	42.48	1.08	3.87	48	.000
		Female	25	41.00	1.56			
3	Fairness to Students	Male	25	19.56	0.51	-1.78	48	.082
		Female	25	22.44	8.09			(NS)
4	Preparation	Male	25	30.44	1.32	2.70	48	0.10
		Female	25	28.84	2.66			(NS)
5	Creativity	Male	25	8.80	0.41	12.65	48	0.00
		Female	25	6.24	0.82			
6	Assignment	Male	25	4.88	0.72	-4.49	48	0.000
		Female	25	6.40	1.52			
7	Assessment	Male	25	12.72	2.97	1.41	48	0.164
		Female	25	11.14	2.39			(NS)
8	Commitment	Male	25	11.88	1.75	-1.42	48	0.162
		Female	25	12.64	2.37			(NS)

The table above shows that science students' sex has significant influence on the ratings of the students in four traits: students' interest, assignment, classroom organization and creativity but not significant on the remaining traits.

Table 4b: Influence of Non-Science Students' Sex on the Evaluation of their Lecturers' Teaching Effectiveness

S/N	Variables	Sex	N	X	SD	t	df	sig
1	Students' Interest	Male	25	79.61	1.16	2.34	48	0.24 (NS)
		Female	25	78.04	2.96			
2	Classroom organization	Male	25	82.6	2.35	-1.41	48	0.16 (NS)
		Female	25	83.7	3.32			
3	Fairness to Students	Male	25	40.1	1.35	0.92	48	0.36 (NS)
		Female	25	39.6	2.04			
4	Preparation	Male	25	54.1	1.50	-0.82	48	0.48 (NS)
		Female	25	54.4	1.55			
5	Creativity	Male	25	15.8	1.04	-0.52	48	0.61 (NS)
		Female	25	15.9	0.92			
6	Assignment	Male	25	18.26	0.92	-2.86	48	0.01
		Female	25	19.19	1.30			
7	Assessment	Male	25	29.47	0.59	-1.25	48	0.22 (NS)
		Female	25	29.85	1.32			
8	Commitment	Male	25	26.74	0.54	-0.44	48	0.65 (NS)
		Female	25	26.85	1.13			

The table above clearly shows that the sex of non-science student does not significantly influence their ratings in all traits of teaching effectiveness measured here with the exception of assignment.

6. Discussion

The present research effort generated some important findings. Foremost is the fact that most science and non-science students rated their lecturers high on factors such as students' interest, organization, fairness, preparation, creativity and commitment. The implication of this is that students in Nigeria pay particular attention to the factors of teaching effectiveness. This finding is in consonance with the view of Zakrajesk (2002) who submits that there are some things that students can evaluate such as how well prepared instructors are, how effectively they explain concepts and also their responsiveness to student difficulties. Centra (1993) in agreement with the above, indentifies six factors that students can evaluate as good organization, effective communication, knowledge, positive attitude toward students, fairness in examination and grading and flexibility in approaches to teaching.

Secondly, the science and non-science students rated their teachers low in the trait of giving assignments as well as organizing excursion and field trips. This finding is an indication that students are not contented with the way lecturers handle out of class learning experiences. One reason why lecturers may not be making use of excursions, according to Ogunniyi (2004) is the fact that necessary facilities such as transport are not available.

Thirdly, the revelation that the science and non-science students' age has significant influence on their ratings of lecturers' teaching effectiveness, is an indication that maturity is expected to come to play in students' evaluation of lecturers'. This observation though is at variance with Marsh (1994) who reported that age does not affect students' ratings, should be noted in selecting the students that will evaluate lecturers.

Fourthly, the finding that students' sex has significant influence on students ratings of some traits while it revealed no significant influence on others is also an indication, that the matter of whether students' sex will influence their ratings or not should not be summarily concluded as was done by Zakrajesk (2002) that students' gender is unrelated to their evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

7. Conclusion

A major eye-opener of this study that Nigerian students as represented by students of Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria (whether science or non-science students) will not appreciate the work of any lecturer no matter how good he or she is if he or she is perceived not to have their interest at heart. Students expect to see lecturers pay attention to matters concerning their interest. They want the lecturer to be ready to assist them in their studies, they want the

lecturers to respect their views and they value the lecturers' counsel. Perhaps the reason why students depend on their lecturers so much is the dearth of resources for learning in Nigeria. The students also wish to be excited by excursion or field trips.

It is, therefore, recommended that universities in Nigeria should inculcate student' evaluation into the promotion criteria of lecturers. However, it should be a once in a while affair, but something that is regularly organized and the lecturers are fed back. The students, whose ratings will be used, should also be matured students. Furthermore, it should be ensured that male and female students' ratings are collected in evaluating a particular lecturer so as to annul the influence of sex, if any. Through students' evaluation of their lecturers' teaching effectiveness, a lot of improvement will be recorded in the standard of teaching and eventually raise the standard of education in Nigeria.

References

Barr, A.S. (1984). The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 16, 295-306.

Boyle, P. (1997). Australian National University Student Evaluation of Teaching (ANUSET). *A Guide for Academic Staff*, Melbourne, Malcolm Pettigrove and Claire Atkinson.

Bruer, J.T. (2006). *Schools for Thought: A Science of Learning in the Classroom.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 156-162.

Carey, S. (2005). *Conceptual change in Childhood.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 68-75.

Cashin, W.E. (1995). Student Rating of Teaching: The Research Revisited. IDEA Paper (32), *Centre for Faculty Evaluation and Development*, Kansas State University.

Centra, J.A. (1993). *Reflective Faculty Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Marsh, H. W. (1994). Students' Evaluation of University Teaching Research Findings, Methodological Issues and Directions for Future Research. *International Journal of Education Research*, 11(3), 252-390.

McKeachie, W.J. (1997) Student Ratings: The Validity of Use. American Psychologist, 52 1218-1225

Ogunniyi, M.A. (2004). Development Validation and Use of University Students' Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness Scale (USETES). *Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis* of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Onocha, C. O. (1997). Students Evaluation of Teaching: Methodological Issues. *A Paper Presented during I.C.E.E. Staff Seminar*, 10th October 1997.

Seldin, P. (1999). Changing Practices in Evaluating Teaching: A Practical Guide to Improved Faculty Performance and Promotion/Tenure. *Decision*, Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Zakrajesk,T. (2002). Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness. http://www.provost.cmich.edu/fcae/publications/evaluation%20teachingeffectiveness.doc