

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION ON THEIR ASSESSMENT OF LECTURERS IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA

Inko-Tariah, Dorothy Chikaodi and Asuk, Unyejit Williams

Department Of Educational Psychology, Guidance And Counselling, Ignatius Ajuru University Of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

<https://doi.org/10.54922/IJEHSS.2023.05130>

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to examine the perspective of students on their appraisal of instructors within the three public universities located in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. The study conducted was an analytical descriptive survey, focusing on a population consisting of around 70,000 students. The sample size for this study was 550 individuals. Data collection was conducted using a self-structure questionnaire entitled "Students Perception on Lecturers Assessment Scale." The reliability of the instrument was assessed using the Cronbach Alpha technique, resulting in a computed value of 0.82. The data gathered in this study was subjected to statistical analysis. The mean and standard deviation were computed to address the research issues. Hypothesis 1 was tested using the independent t-test, while hypotheses 2 and 3 were tested using one-way ANOVA. The significance threshold for all statistical tests was set at 0.05. The findings indicated that students typically have a favourable impression of the appraisal of their teachers. Additionally, it was shown that there were no significant variations in students' impressions based on gender and school. However, the faculty of study did have a significant difference. It was recommended that more awareness be created on various disciplines of study to enhance students' perception towards the exercise as it can lead to the professional development of lecturers.

Keywords: Students' assessment of lecturers, professional development, assessment, and education.

1. INTRODUCTION

No nation can effectively solve its problems without a consciously improved educational system. Education is the major tool in raising the quality of life of a people as it creates a conducive environment for personal growth and hence national development. The developing countries of the world (like Nigeria) today are so tagged because they lack functional educational systems with which they can equip their citizens to solve their life problems and contribute meaningfully to solving global problems (Adesope, 2021). A country that constantly looks for solutions to its problems from outside is not even developing and this is an indication of a faulty educational system. Lapses in the system at the primary level can be corrected at the secondary level, and those at the secondary level can with struggles be corrected at the tertiary level, but when the tertiary level is also faulty, it becomes a huge problem reflected by the quality of life of the people.

In Nigeria, lamentations about the decayed state of the educational system abound (Adebumiti, 2022). Some authors have indicated, various factors that can be attributed to the sorry state of

education in Nigeria. The factors run across different stakeholders which include the teachers who having gone through the faulty system cannot give more than they received. Though a product of a deficient system, the teacher through certain ways can upgrade himself. The teacher can significantly improve the system through professional development and one of the ways he can do this is by getting feedback from students through students' evaluation of teachers (SET) (Inko-Tariah, 2013). This exercise makes teachers accountable to the stakeholders and when the result is used for decisions on promotions or hiring, can seal the fate of the teacher. In most African countries, this exercise is still resisted by teachers leading to some 'political' teachers that do not have any interest in the job but are cheating instead of teaching. A review of studies on this shows various viewpoints. Students' evaluation of teachers if properly done can help the teachers develop those areas where they are deficient. The students who sit and listen to the teacher for hours are in the best position to help identify areas that need improvement. Despite the contrasting viewpoints, most lecturers recognize the benefits of this exercise when carried out properly. SET is part of the school system in developed countries and its history dates as far back as in the 15th century as Barret et al. in Inko-Tariah (2013) noted.

This exercise in academic circles is believed to have started in Europe and has spread to other parts of the world as people recognized how much it can strengthen the system. Robinson (2023) stressed the importance of SET and how it can be improved, he linked the importance of teacher quality to improved student learning and believed that anything that improves teacher quality should be given priority.

Hejase et al, Adeyaro, Devis and Qujum, Sarzurkis and Farlazzo (2013, 2015, 2015,2018. & 2019) respectively all listed positive points on students' perception of this exercise. McDonald et al (2020) examined Students' Perception of Student Evaluation: Enabling Students' Voice and Meaningful Engagement. They worked with students from two tertiary institutions in New Zealand. Findings revealed that most of the students have a positive outlook on SET when carried out with the understanding that the benefits are for both the lecturers and students who realized they stand to benefit if the lecturers improve. If students are taught how to assess objectively, they can also assess their lecturers suppressing personal biases some critics have highlighted.

Sanchez et al (2020) examined the relationship between students' evaluation of their teachers and academic achievement in higher education. The study revealed a wide range of results based on the different samples studied, however, the overall result showed a moderately low relationship between student evaluation of lecturers and the academic performance of students which was statistically significant. In all, the advantages of SET are not to be neglected because of the perceived disadvantages. Every individual or organization needs unbiased constructive feedback to improve on whatever he is doing. Another study by Belrose (2021) on 'Students Evaluating Teachers: What Educators Need to Know' mentioned a study by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in 2009 on the "impact of students' evaluation in measuring educational success", the result revealed that feedback from students is to be of extreme importance to teachers' personal development as it improved teaching and learning of grade K-12 students. It created a rare opportunity for teachers to be students of their teaching.

From the ongoing, one would rightly point out that this is an exercise that can greatly improve teachers' instructional delivery, the issue of victimization by students can be managed by increasing the number of students evaluating a teacher, this will reduce subjectivity or bias in evaluating the teacher. Teachers can also be engaged in peer assessment to validate the points made by students.

Monzon et al 2022 cited a study by Spocra and Christeans in 2017 on "Is my opinion important in evaluating lecturers": Students' perception of students' evaluation of teachers' SET and their relationship to SET scores. The study was conducted on 967 undergraduates of Technological Indoamerican Echaderi, it was found that most students agreed to the relevance of the exercise and that it can improve teaching and learning, the researchers reported a significantly low positive relationship between the perception of students on SET and the scores they gave to the teachers on the exercise. Most of the students however felt the SET scores given were not used when decisions are taken on teachers.

However, Some researchers believe that students can misuse the privilege and score lecturers who insist on doing the right things and those who give a lot of assignments down. Researchers like Tonyenglish (2013) believed that SET is very necessary for the improvement of the educational system but pointed out pitfalls like students victimizing, bribing or even blackmailing lecturers. Lecturers on their part may become unnecessarily lenient so that students can score them high, but the advantages outweigh the shortcomings. The study conducted by Wong (2019) on the topic of "Should Students be Able to Grade Their Teachers" and implemented at Mak-Chinsan of Henrieth Secondary School, uncovered that students who have unfavourable opinions towards a teacher may provide poor evaluations, perhaps leading to instructors being less stringent in their approach towards students due to concerns of retaliation.

In a study by Flaherty (2020) "Even validated students' evaluations are unfair" it was reported that SETs are biased and unfair and should not be used for the hiring of teachers or promotion. If on formative ground, it was believed to be okay but not for summative or career decisions. UPSCBUDDI (2023) reported some arguments on SET especially from India and noted that some feel it will be demeaning to the teachers and that some mischievous teachers may go into deals with their students to do favours for each other. Upon all these, if SET is properly and objectively conducted, the feedback from students will impact positively students who are the primary audiences of the teacher. In another study by Viriri et al.(2021) on "Student's Evaluation of Teaching Challenges (Perceptions) of Students of Chinhoyi University of Technology in Zimbabwe, a sample of 67 students undertaking an E-Business course were studied. Data were collected with a semi-structured and unstructured questionnaire and findings revealed that the perception of students was not favourable as they felt the results were not used for improving teaching and learning, they feared victimization by lecturers if identified and were therefore reluctant in filling out the forms. It should be stressed that student's perception of SET will determine how effective it is in promoting teachers' professional development hence this study seeks the perception of students towards it.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions and hypotheses guided the study.

Research Questions

1. What is the mean response on the general perception of students on their assessment of lecturers?
2. To what extent does the perception of students differ based on moderator variables like gender, discipline and school

Hypotheses

1. Gender does not make a significant difference in the perception of students towards their evaluation of lecturers
2. The discipline of study does not make a significant difference in the perception of students towards their evaluation of lecturers
3. The school does not make a significant difference in the perception of students towards their evaluation of lecturers

2.METHODS

The study adopted an analytical descriptive survey design and involved 550 undergraduates from three public universities in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

A self-structured questionnaire was used for data collection. The instrument had 16 items in a Likert format with a reliability coefficient of 0.81. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while t-test and one-way ANOVA were used to analyze the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

3. RESULTS

Research Question One: What is the mean response on the general perception of students towards the assessment of lecturers?

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation on General Perception of Students Towards Assessment of Lecturers

S/No.	Items	Mean	SD	Remarks
1.	Students should be able to evaluate their lectures.	3.47	0.72	High Extent
2.	University students are old enough to give objective evaluations.	3.16	0.82	High Extent
3.	Student evaluation of their lectures will improve teaching and learning.	2.82	1.03	High Extent
4.	Lecturers will be more serious with their work if they know students will evaluate them.	3.58	0.69	High Extent
5.	Feedback from students will lead to the self-improvement of lecturers.	3.53	0.65	High Extent
6.	Students will not be objective in evaluating their lecturers.	2.43	1.08	Low Extent
7.	Unserious students will use this against lecturers who are uncompromising.	3.58	0.67	High Extent
8.	This evaluation should be used for the promotion of lecturers.	3.16	0.88	High Extent

9.	Students' evaluation of lecturers will bring about mutual respect between lecturers and students.	2.39	1.06	Low Extent
10.	Students are in a better place to evaluate their lecturers since they listen to them.	3.31	0.80	High Extent
11.	This will reduce sorting by lecturers.	3.16	0.93	High Extent
12.	Lecturers will not miss their classes if they know students will evaluate them.	3.38	0.77	High Extent
13.	Lecturers will victimize students who evaluate them negatively.	3.06	0.88	High Extent
14.	Students' evaluation of lecturers will make the lecturers try and cover the scheme for their courses.	3.37	0.74	High Extent
15.	This will reduce lecturers setting questions on things they did not teach.	3.42	0.76	High Extent
16.	This evaluation should be used for lecturers' self-improvement alone.	2.37	1.05	Low Extent
Grand Mean		3.14		

Source: Field Data, 2023

* Criterion Mean = 2.50

Table 1 presents the general perception of students towards the assessment of lecturers. Results in Table 1 showed that out of the 16 items bordering on students' general perception towards assessment of lecturers, the students agreed on 13 items (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15) to a high extent and disagreed on only 3 items (items 6, 9 and 16) with their mean scores (2.41, 2.38, 2.36) lower than the criterion mean (2.50). With the high grand mean (3.14) of the students for all the items, it was deduced that generally, students have a high perception towards the assessment of lecturers. This implies that students perceive they can objectively assess and provide feedback on lectures' effectiveness to a high extent.

Research Question Two: To what extent does students' perception of lecturers' assessments differ based on gender?

Table 2: Mean and Standard of Students' Perception of Lecturers Assessment Based on Gender

S/No	Items	Male (n = 220)			Female (n = 330)		
		\bar{X}	SD	Remarks	\bar{X}	SD	Remarks
1.	Students should be able to evaluate their lectures.	3.39	0.82	High Extent	3.52	0.65	High Extent
2.	University students are old enough to give objective evaluations.	3.24	0.76	High Extent	3.11	0.86	High Extent
3.	Student evaluation of their lectures will improve teaching and learning.	3.88	1.06	High Extent	2.77	1.01	High Extent
4.	Lecturers will be more serious with their work if they know students will evaluate them.	3.48	0.80	High Extent	3.65	0.60	High Extent

5.	Feedback from students will lead to the self-improvement of lecturers.	3.49 0.71	High Extent	3.56 0.60	High Extent
6.	Students will not be objective in evaluating their lecturers.	2.44 1.10	Low Extent	2.41 1.07	Low Extent
7.	Unserious students will use this against lecturers who are uncompromising.	3.55 0.64	High Extent	3.61 0.68	High Extent
8.	This evaluation should be used for the promotion of lecturers.	3.05 0.95	High Extent	3.23 0.83	High Extent
9.	Students' evaluation of lecturers will bring about mutual respect between lecturers and students.	2.41 1.10	Low Extent	2.38 1.04	Low Extent
10.	Students are in a better place to evaluate their lecturers since they listen to them.	3.35 0.82	High Extent	3.28 0.80	High Extent
11.	This will reduce sorting by lecturers.	3.20 0.96	High Extent	3.14 0.91	High Extent
12.	Lecturers will not miss their classes if they know students will evaluate them.	3.31 0.87	High Extent	3.43 0.69	High Extent
13.	Lecturers will victimize students who evaluate them negatively.	3.17 0.85	High Extent	2.99 0.88	High Extent
14.	Students' evaluation of lecturers will make the lecturers try and cover the scheme for their courses.	3.32 0.80	High Extent	3.41 0.71	High Extent
15.	This will reduce lecturers setting questions on things they did not teach.	3.45 0.70	High Extent	3.39 0.80	High Extent
16.	This evaluation should be used for lecturers' self-improvement alone.	2.38 1.09	Low Extent	2.36 1.03	Low Extent
	Grand Mean	3.19		3.14	

Source: Field Data, 2023

* Criterion Mean = 2.50

Table 2 reveals the mean difference in students' perception of lecturers' assessments based on gender. From the data in Table 2, it can be observed that the mean scores and standard deviation of both male and female students on the items are higher than the criterion mean of 2.50 except for 3 items (items 6, 9 and 16) that are lower than the criterion mean indicating that the students agreed to the items to a high extent. The grand mean of male students = 3.19 and female students = 3.14 for all the items which is higher than the criterion mean (2.50) set by the researcher.

Research Question Three: To what extent does students' perception of lecturers' assessments differ based on Faculty?

Table 3: Mean and Standard of Students' Perception of Lecturers Assessment Based on Faculty

S/N	Items	Education (n = 240)		Sciences (n = 163)		Humanities (n = 147)		Aggrte X̄	Remarks
		X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD		
1.	Students should be able to evaluate their lectures.	3.35	0.71	3.48	0.82	3.65	0.58	3.49 Extent	High
2.	University students are old enough to give objective evaluations.	3.09	0.81	3.21	0.78	3.23	0.88	3.18 Extent	High
3.	Student evaluation of their lectures will improve teaching and learning.	2.73	0.97	2.87	1.14	2.90	0.97	2.83 Extent	High
4.	Lecturers will be more serious with their work if they know students will evaluate them.	3.55	0.76	3.59	0.66	3.63	0.60	3.59 Extent	High
5.	Feedback from students will lead to the self-improvement of lecturers.	3.45	0.57	3.47	0.78	3.73	0.57	3.55 Extent	High
6.	Students will not be objective in evaluating their lecturers.	2.40	1.00	2.44	1.17	2.49	1.12	2.44 Extent	Low
7.	Unserious students will use this against lecturers who are uncompromising.	3.54	0.72	3.50	0.70	3.75	0.48	3.60 Extent	High
8.	This evaluation should be used for the promotion of lecturers.	3.13	0.84	2.90	1.14	3.43	0.72	3.15 Extent	High
9.	Students' evaluation of lecturers will bring about mutual respect between lecturers and students.	2.44	1.01	2.39	1.09	2.44	1.12	2.42 Extent	Low
10.	Students are in a better place to evaluate their lecturers since they listen to them.	3.03	0.91	3.11	1.00	3.46	0.82	3.20 Extent	High
11.	This will reduce sorting by lecturers.	3.33	0.75	3.45	0.77	3.41	0.80	3.40 Extent	High
12.	Lecturers will not miss their classes if they know students will evaluate them.	2.87	0.91	3.14	0.89	3.29	0.73	3.10 Extent	High
13.	Lecturers will victimize students who evaluate them negatively.	3.31	0.81	3.45	0.71	2.38	0.67	3.05 Extent	High
14.	Students' evaluation of lecturers will make the lecturers try and cover the scheme for their courses.	3.37	0.81	3.41	0.76	3.28	0.69	3.35 Extent	High
15.	This will reduce lecturers setting questions on things they did not teach.	3.21	0.83	3.69	0.53	3.45	0.77	3.45 Extent	High

16. This evaluation should be used for lecturers' self-improvement alone.	2.45	1.01	2.38	1.09	2.33	1.07	2.39	Low
Grand Mean	3.08		3.16		3.18		Extent	

Source: Field Data, 2023

* Criterion Mean = 2.50

Results in Table 3 show the extent of students' perception of lecturers' assessment differs based on faculty. From the results, it can be observed that except for items 6, 9 and 16 whose mean values are lower than the criterion mean (2.50), the mean values of students in Faculty of Education, Sciences and Humanities on items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 are all higher than mean criterion (2,50) with high aggregate mean. With the high grand mean value of 3.08 for the Faculty of Education, 3.16 for Sciences and 3.18 for Humanities, it was deduced that students' perception of lecturers' assessment does not differ based on Faculty to a high extent.

Research Question Four: To what extent does students' perception of lecturers' assessments differ based on School?

Table 4: Mean and Standard of Students' Perception of Lecturers Assessment Based on School

S/N	Items	Uniport (n = 275)		RSU (n = 183)		IAUE (n = 92)		Aggrte X̄	Remarks
		X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD		
1.	Students should be able to evaluate their lectures.	3.42	0.73	3.46	0.74	3.63	0.66	3.50	High Extent
2.	University students are old enough to give objective evaluations.	3.18	0.80	3.22	0.80	3.01	0.93	3.14	High Extent
3.	Student evaluation of their lecturers will improve teaching and learning.	2.89	0.99	2.95	1.07	2.83	0.94	2.89	High Extent
4.	Lecturers will be more serious with their work if they know students will evaluate them.	3.52	0.71	3.64	0.68	3.70	0.64	3.62	High Extent
5.	Feedback from students will lead to the self-improvement of lecturers.	3.50	0.66	3.57	0.67	3.53	0.56	3.53	High Extent
6.	Students will not be objective in evaluating their lecturers.	2.47	1.07	2.43	1.14	2.36	1.00	2.42	Low Extent
7.	Unserious students will use this against lecturers who are uncompromising.	3.56	0.70	3.62	0.63	3.59	0.61	3.59	High Extent
8.	This evaluation should be used for the promotion of lecturers.	3.06	0.89	3.37	0.88	3.00	0.88	3.14	High Extent
9.	Students' evaluation of lecturers will bring about mutual respect between lecturers and students.	2.36	1.07	2.42	1.06	2.45	1.00	2.41	Low Extent
10.	Students are in a better place to evaluate their lecturers since they listen to them.	3.29	0.69	3.36	0.94	3.20	0.82	3.28	High Extent
11.	This will reduce sorting by lecturers.	3.16	0.93	3.22	0.92	3.09	0.93	3.16	High Extent

12. Lecturers will not miss their classes if they know students will evaluate them.	2.42	0.6	0.9	0.6	High
13. Lecturers will victimize students who evaluate them negatively.	3.00	0.8	0.8	0.8	High
14. Students' evaluation of lecturers will make the lecturers try and cover the scheme for their courses.	3.39	0.7	0.7	0.8	High
15. This will reduce lecturers setting questions on things they did not teach.	3.40	0.8	0.7	0.7	High
16. This evaluation should be used for lecturers' self-improvement alone.	2.32	1.0	1.0	1.0	Low Extent
Grand Mean	3.06	3.17	3.14		

Source: Field Data, 2023

* Criterion Mean = 2.50

*Uniport=University of Port Harcourt; RSU=Rivers State University; IAUE=Ignatius Ajuru University of Education

Table 4 shows students' perceptions of lecturers' assessments based on the school. From the data in Table 4, it can be observed that all the respondents (students) irrespective of their university disagreed on 3 items (item 6 with mean of 2.47, 2.43 and 2.36 for Uniport, RSU and IAUE; item 9 with mean of 2.36, 2.42 and 2.45 for Uniport, RSU and IAUE, and item 16 with mean of 2.32, 2.39 and 2.46 for Uniport, RSU and IAUE) respectively which were remarked as low extent. However, the mean ratings of the students in the three Universities (Uniport, RSU and IAUE) on 13 items (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15) are higher than the criterion mean (2.50) and are remarked as high extent. With the high aggregate mean value of the respondents on each of the 13 items and the grand mean of 3.06, 3.17 and 3.14 for Uniport, RSU and IAUE, it was therefore, concluded that students' perception of lecturers' assessment is not based on the school.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference in students' perception of lecturers' assessments based on gender.

Table 5: Independent Sample T-test Analysis of Students' Perception of Lecturers Assessment Based on Gender

Gender	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.	α	Decision
Male	220	50.10	6.57					
				548	-0.351	0.726	0.05	H0 Not Rejected
Female	330	50.28	5.24					

Source: Field Data, 2023.

Results in Table 4.10 shows that at 0.05 level of significance and degree of freedom (df) of 548, t-value = -0.351 and P-value = 0.726. Since P-value (0.726) > 0.05, the null hypothesis that "there is no significant difference in students' perception of lecturers' assessment based on gender" is therefore not rejected.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference in students’ perception of lecturers’ assessment based on faculty.

Table 6a: One-Way ANOVA of Difference in Students’ Perception of Lecturers Assessment Based on Faculty

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision
Between Groups	824.382	2	412.191	12.755	.000	Sig.
Within Groups	17677.152	547	32.317			
Total	18501.535	549				

* N = 550; df = (2, 547); P = 0.000 < 0.05

Table 6a presents the summary of the One-Way Analysis of Variance of difference in students’ perception of lecturers’ assessment based on faculty. Results in Table 6a shows that at 0.05 level of significance and degrees of freedom (df) = (2, 547), F-ratio = 12.755 and P-value = 0.000. Since P-value (0.000) < 0.05, the F-ratio of 12.755 is statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance ($F_{(2, 547)} = 12.755, P < 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in students’ perception of lecturers’ assessment based on faculty” was rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference in students’ perception of lecturers’ assessments based on faculty. However, the observed significant difference in the means of the groups is clearly shown in Table 6b below.

Table 6b: Summary of Bonferroni Post Hoc Tests of Multiple Comparisons of Group Mean Differences in Students’ Perception of Lecturers’ Assessment Based on Faculty

(I) Faculty	(J) Faculty	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Education	Sciences	-1.29402	.57699	.076	-2.6796	.0915
	Humanities	-3.00221*	.59539	.000	-4.4320	-1.5725
Sciences	Education	1.29402	.57699	.076	-.0915	2.6796
	Humanities	-1.70819*	.64661	.025	-3.2609	-.1555
Humanities	Education	3.00221*	.59539	.000	1.5725	4.4320
	Sciences	1.70819*	.64661	.025	.1555	3.2609

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 6b presents the Bonferroni Post Hoc Tests of Multiple Comparisons showing the mean difference in students' perception of lecturers' assessment based on faculty. Data in Table 6b showed that the significant difference as observed in Table 6a above in students' perception of lecturers' assessment based on faculty occurred between the mean ratings of students in Faculties of Education and Humanities with the mean difference = -3.00221* and Sciences and Humanities with the mean difference = 1.70819* as indicated in Table 6b. This implies that disparity exists in the perception of lecturers' assessment between students in Faculties of Education and Humanities and between those in Sciences and Humanities.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference in students' perception of lecturers' assessments based on School.

Table 7: One-Way ANOVA of Difference on Students' Perception of Lecturers Assessment Based on School

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision
Between Groups	94.759	2	47.379	1.408	.246	Not Sig.
Within Groups	18406.776	547	33.650			
Total	18501.535	549				

* N = 550; df = (2, 547); P = 0.246 > 0.05

From the results in Table 7 on One-Way Analysis of Variance of mean difference in students' perception of lecturers' assessment based on school, it can be observed that at 0.05 level of significance and degrees of freedom (df) = (2, 547), F-ratio = 1.408 and P-value = 0.246. Since P-value = 0.246 > 0.05, the F-ratio (1.408) is not statistically significant ($F_{(2, 547)} = 1.408$, $P > 0.05$). Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in students' perception of lecturers' assessment based on the school was not rejected. This implies that students' perception of lecturers' assessments is not significantly determined by the school or University.

4. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Tables 1,2,3 and 4 showed the results of the four research questions on the general perception of students towards the assessment of lecturers and if the perception differed based on gender, discipline and school. Results show that generally, the students agreed on 13 out of 16 items, with a grand mean of 3.14, it was deduced that students have a high perception towards SET. This agrees with the findings of Hejace et al (2013), Forlazz, (2019), McDonald (2020) and others who found students to have a positive perception towards SET, However, Viriri et al.'s result in a study in 2021 disagreed with this. This could be because students realize the importance of a lecturer's professional development in the teaching and learning business.

The result of the t-test shows a t-value of -0.351. The result in Table five on the difference in perception based on gender showed calculated means of 50.10 for males and 50.28 for females leading to a mean difference of 0.18. with a p-value of 0.73 implying there is no significant difference based on gender. This result is in concordance with Devis and Quyyum (2017) who found no significant difference in the perception based on gender. This is probably because at the university level, students are exposed to the same experiences and therefore reason alike.

On the discipline of study, the result of the research question showed a grand mean of 3.08, 3.16 and 3.18 for Education, Science and Humanities respectively, indicating very Little mean difference however the one-way ANOVA result on significant difference gave a p-value of .000 indicating a significant difference on student's perception. When the Bonferroni post hoc test of multiple comparisons was done, the results showed significant differences existed in students' perception of the faculties of Education and Humanities, also between those in sciences and humanities. This result disagrees with the findings of Devis and Quyyun (2017) which showed no significant difference in students' perception of their assessment of lecturers based on discipline. The reason for the present result could be due to the different teaching methods adopted by lecturers in Humanities and Education being different from those in science.

On the difference in perception based on school, means of 3.06, 3.17 and 3.14 for Uniport, RSU and IAUE do not show many mean differences. The result of the one-way ANOVA done to see if there are significant differences in perception based on the different schools shows an F value of 1.408 and a P-value of 0.246. This result can also be compared to that of Devis and Quyyun (2017) who found no difference in the perception of students irrespective of their locations or what they are studying. The result could be because these students have all reached the stage of post-conventional morality and cannot be easily influenced by others.

In conclusion, students generally have a positive perception of their assessment of lecturers. This exercise when properly done creates mutual respect between students and lecturers and promotes lecturer professional growth thereby improving the educational system.

5. RECOMMENDATION

1. Students should be made to understand the importance of this exercise so that they look beyond their likes and dislikes and give an objective assessment.
2. Lecturers should also be made to understand that the students are in the best position to give them feedback which can enhance the personal growth of the lecturer.
3. The items used for assessment should be valid to measure what they purport to measure and avoid items that are assessing the personal opinion of the students.

REFERENCES

1. Adebumiti, A. (2022 01 Oct). Nigeria at 62: Educational system in need of a total overhaul. *The Guardian*. <https://guardian.ngs.future.nigeria>.
2. Belrose. O. (2021). Students evaluating teachers. What educators should know? <https://famerica.org-opinion>.
3. Devis, S.& Qayyum, N. (2017). Major factors affecting students' perception towards faculty evaluation of teaching (SET). *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*. 8(5), 149-167.
4. Ferlazzo, L. (2019). Response: The value of Having students evaluate Teachers. *Education Week*.
5. Flaherty, C. (2020). 'Even' valid' students' evaluations are unfair. *Inside Higher Education*. insidehighered.com/news/2020/02/27/study
6. Hajesa, A.J; Al-kaakour; R, Halawi, L, & Hajesa, H.J.(2013) Students' perception of students' evaluation of the teaching process. *Research gate*.

7. Inko-Tariah, D.C. (2013). The attitude of lecturers towards students' evaluation of their teaching effectiveness in Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*.4(15), 21-26
8. McDonald, J; Moskal, A. & Stuart, T. (2020). Students' perception of students' evaluation: enabling students voice and meaningful engagement. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*.45(8), 67-74.
9. Monzon, N.S; Suarez, V.G & Parches, D.G.C (2022) Is my opinion important in evaluating lecturers? Students' perception of evaluation of teaching (SET) and their relationship to SET Scores. *International Journal on Theory and Practice*.
10. Sanchez, T,Glar-corbi, R; Castejion, J; Jack, V & Jaime, L (2020). *Educational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/ijpsy.2020.60233>.
11. Sarzunski, T. (2018). Should students evaluate their teachers? <https://mystudentvoice.com> >stud
12. Tonyenglish. (2013). Students' opinion of their teachers. *Tonyenglish*. [vn/en/view/students' opinion of their teachers. html](http://vn/en/view/students%27%20opinion%20of%20their%20teachers.html).
13. UPSCBUDDI.(2019.06.22). should students be allowed to grade their teachers' essays?
14. Viriri, P,Chutama, M& Viriri, L. (2021). Students' evaluation of teaching: challenges &perception of students at Chinhoyi University of Technology in Zambia. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*. 9(2).
15. Wongs, G. (2019). Talking points: Should students be able to grade their teachers? *Discover*