The Emergence Themes of Staff and Course Evaluation at UniMAP: A Grounded Theory Approach.

Hanif Suhairi Abu Bakar, Tengku Kastriafuddin Shah Tengku Yaakob, Zuraidi Ahmad Mokhdzar and Nor Azmi Hj Johari

School of Human Development and Techno-communication (iKOM), Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Perlis, Malaysia

hanif.suhairi@unimap.edu.my

Abstract. This paper concentrates on the emergence factors and themes that surfaced as result of paper and online course evaluation activities among students at Universiti Malaysia Perlis (UniMAP) that have never been reported prior to this. Before the online course and lecturer evaluation practices every semester, students need to fill out the form manually in order to evaluate the courses and lecturers, and this brings a lot of disadvantages and problems to the university. School of Human Development and Techno-communication (iKOM) has initiated the online course and evaluation approach, and is now being utilized by all schools at UniMAP. This research and innovation has also been awarded gold at the 11th Innovative and Creative Convention held at Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia (USIM) in 2015. The actual research attempted to assist the university to improve its way of handling and processing information that occurs every semester or biannually by focusing on factors that contribute to its predicament for staff and students at UniMAP. In addition, the research seeks to understand the antecedents, contexts, and prevailing conditions that influence it as well as the phenomenon, the coping strategies, and the consequences resulting from the coping strategies. Using a grounded theory methodology, in-depth interviews were conducted on students and staff from different schools at UniMAP. The data were analyzed using NVivo 10 by methodically coding and categorizing the data in open, axial, and selective coding to arrive at a model development. Working hypotheses were obtained based on informants’ individual comments and experiences that uniquely contribute to the body of knowledge on this new phenomenon at UniMAP. The involved elements derived from the model are the antecedents, the phenomenon itself, the coping strategies by informants, and the consequences resulting from these strategies. The significance of this study lies in its attempt to provide a working framework for reducing the dilemma when the time comes to execute staff and course evaluation that will eventually add up to time and money lost. This study is hoped to benefit all the parties: staff, students, the university, and other stakeholders to maximize the benefits of online evaluation practices. At a time when most assessments are done online around the world, this research is both timely and necessary.
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1. Introduction
The main intention of the current research was to construct a grounded theory of the online evaluation phenomenon on the basis of staff and students’ report about their own experience on previously manually executed course and lecturer assessment.

Second, it is expected that this study can offer a more profound descriptive account of the phenomenon. Nevertheless, the most fundamental ground to the researchers is to come out with a working hypothesis or process model of online evaluation. The researchers conducted the present study to examine the process by which online evaluation occurs and to propose a preliminary paradigm model (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) that can be tested in future research. The researchers preferred grounded theory methodology as it is preferably suited to construct a data-based theory that can be utilized as a foundation for future studies (Creswell, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Given the prevailing nature of online assessment, the researchers questioned how staff and students perceive it and whether their experiences are aligned with the existing views in the literature. The researchers believed that a grounded theory analysis would facilitate researchers to ascertain other characteristics of online course and staff evaluation that might justify its practice and make rooms for further improvements.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Validity and Reliability of Course and Lecturer Evaluations
Researchers commonly believe student evaluations (both online and paper evaluations) of instructors to be extremely trustworthy (Aleamoni, 1999; Centra, 1993; Hobson & Talbot, 2001) in contrast with evaluations done by colleagues or trained observers that have not been found to be reliable, hence not applicable (Centra, 1993).

Commonly, student assessments of lecturers have been established to be associated with ratings of instructor’s skills in course organization, relationship with students, and fair grading; variance in organizational skill elucidated most inconsistency in student evaluations (Jirovec, Chathapuram, & Rosegrant-Alvarez, 1998).

As soon as lecturers collect mid-semester feedback from students and have a truthful conversation about it with supervisor, it leads to higher evaluations at the end of the semester as well as higher final exam scores, providing facts that satisfactory evaluations can lead to better teaching (Overall & Herbert, 1979). Even though carry marks do have some consequences on how students rate instructors (Johnson & Valen, 2002), its effect is reasonably low (Gigliotti & Buchtel, 1990) and can be statistically attuned for (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997). Carry marks do not have as large of an effect as how much students feel they have learned (Bard, 1987), how much they felt stimulated by the class (Remedios & Lieberman, 2008), and whether the class was appropriately difficult (Centra, 2003). Differing to the “retaliation” theory, students who do poorly in a class are equally or less likely than those who do well to complete course evaluations (Liegle & McDonald, 2004).

2.2. Comparison of Online and Paper Evaluation
The main drawback of online course evaluation compared to paper evaluation is the low response time (Anderson, Cain, & Bird, 2005; Avery, Bryant, Mathios, Kang, & Bell, 2006). However, utilizing online media to remind students can drastically boost the response time (Norris & Conn, 2005). Noticeably, evaluation scores do not change via online evaluation in contrast to paper evaluations (Avery et. al, 2006; Donovan, Mader, & Shinsky, 2006). According to Anderson et al. (2005), Donovan et al. (2006), and Kasiar, Jennifer, Schroeder, and Holstad (2002), students place more and informative comments on online evaluations compared to the traditional paper evaluation. What is more, students and staff viewed online evaluation more optimistically in contrast to its predecessor (Anderson et al., 2005; Donovan et al., 2006).
Students’ comments on the online forms were more frequent and longer than the paper forms. They liked the online method better and believed that they might present more beneficial responses online (Anderson et al., 2005).

Ballantyne (2003) suggested that to increase the response rate, there needs to be approaches such as providing computer access, having school encouragement for the system, and allowing students see how their responses are being utilized for the better. For further improvement, the online evaluation needs to be planned so that students cannot rate the same course and lecturer more than once while the anonymity is still protected (Ballantyne, 2003). According to Ballantyne (2004), there are types of students that will likely respond more via online, namely male students, younger students, undergraduates, and full-time students. Students responding online were less likely to comment, but online comments were lengthier than paper comments (Ballantyne, 2004).

Regarding the expenditure, Bothell and Henderson (2003) compared the costs of an online evaluation system to paper evaluations and they found that it saved them $235,000 a year when Brigham Young University switched to online evaluations. The decreases come from a reduction in printing costs, personnel assistance for distribution and collection, processing, reporting, and fewer time taken away from lecturers in the classroom (Bothell & Henderson, 2003).

3. Method

3.1 Informants
Sixty academic and non-academic staff as well as students (n = 60) from various departments at UniMAP participated in this research. Data were collected over a period of three months right after final examinations in order to get fresh experiences from the informants. All informants were chosen by their first-hand encounter with the manual and online staff and course evaluation procedure in order to get more accurate information.

All the researchers also have the experience of real situation handling the two types of evaluations. The researchers also interviewed the Head of Academic Management Department whom at that particular moment has been given the green light by the university to purchase two new Optical Mark Recognition (OMR) machines.

3.2 Procedure
Data were gathered using grounded theory processes described in Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998). Creswell (1998) suggested that a standard grounded theory research will comprise 20–30 interviews that collectively saturate the categories that emerge during analysis.

Data accumulated in four phases that differ with regard to purpose and data collection strategies (Harry, Sturges, & Klingner, 2005) are summarised in Table 1.
Table 1. Four Phases in Data Collection

| Phase | Coding | Purpose                                                                 | Informants                  |
|-------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1     | Open   | Categorize codes within categories for advanced analysis                | 20 individuals and 5 in focus groups |
| 2     | Axial  | Specify codes in detail; relay codes to one another to create themes    | 5 individuals and 5 in focus groups |
| 3     | Selective | Create paradigm model and discuss themes in relation to model; establish plot that integrates paradigm model | 15 in focus groups |
| 4     | Selective | Test, certify, and explain paradigm model until saturated; recognize surfacing principles constant with paradigm model; perform member checks. | 10 in focus groups |

Data analysis of current study was completed by using NVivo 10 as to meet the terms of ‘trustworthiness’, ‘rigorousness’, or ‘quality’ of the data; therefore, it is important that these are carried out in a thorough and transparent manner (Crawford, Leybourne, & Arnott, 2000; Creswell, 1998; Kirk & Miller, 1986; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Seale, 1999). Thus, using software in the data analysis process has been thought by some to add rigor to qualitative research (Richards & Richards, 1994). Phase 1 data collection incorporated individual interviews and focus group interviews that allowed the researchers to generate a list of codes within five categories in the paradigm model, specifically antecedents, definitions of the phenomenon, context and conditions that affect the phenomenon, coping strategies, and consequences of the coping strategies taken. The main reason of open coding is to distinguish significant topics creditable of closer analysis and explanation (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In all, 25 staff and students were interviewed individually, and 35 in focus groups. The interviews at this stage were to implore preliminary thoughts and impressions about online evaluation in a setting in which informants could react to each other (Krueger, 1994). All interviews were based on both open-ended responses to the following questions:

1. How would you describe manual and online course and lecture’s evaluation?
2. What are the factors that influence you to use manual and then online evaluation?
3. Which would you prefer most; manual or online evaluation? Why?
4. What are some positive and negative aspects of manual and online evaluation?
5. How do you cope with the negative aspects of manual and online evaluation?

These questions are consistent with the major elements of the paradigm model described by Strauss and Corbin (1998). Table 2 shows 98 preliminary codes obtained from the interview sessions with each code representing a significant topic of discussion related to online and paper course, and staff evaluation.
### Table 2. Initial Categories and Codes in Phase 1

| Category                      | Code                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Antecedents**               | 1. Last-minute work.                                                                                                               |
|                               | 2. Do not care much.                                                                                                               |
|                               | 3. Not paying attention.                                                                                                           |
|                               | 4. Consider as less important.                                                                                                     |
|                               | 5. Assuming that lecturer(s) would not read their comments.                                                                         |
|                               | 6. Taking paper evaluation for granted.                                                                                            |
|                               | 7. Consider as less important.                                                                                                     |
|                               | 8. Assuming management will take for granted whether it is done or not.                                                            |
|                               | 9. Lecturers are afraid if the students will tell the truth.                                                                           |
|                               | 10. Lecturers are afraid if the students are not telling the truth.                                                                   |
|                               | 11. Had to do it because of instruction by immediate supervisor.                                                                     |
|                               | 12. Sense of duty.                                                                                                                   |
|                               | 13. Need to inform the staff’s bad performance.                                                                                    |
|                               | 14. Need to praise the staff’s excellent performance.                                                                               |
|                               | 15. Had to do it because of the carry marks.                                                                                         |
|                               | 16. Responsibility.                                                                                                                 |
|                               | 17. To further improve his or her own teaching techniques.                                                                           |
|                               | 18. To know his or her own weaknesses.                                                                                               |
|                               | 19. Had to do it because of instructions from the dean.                                                                               |
|                               | 20. Duty.                                                                                                                           |
| **Definitions**               | 21. To change the culture to support online student evaluation processes.                                                            |
|                               | 22. To identify the strengths and weaknesses of lecturers while performing their duties.                                             |
|                               | 23. To further improve the course’s content.                                                                                         |
|                               | 24. To further improve the lecturer’s style of delivery.                                                                             |
| **Contexts and Conditions**   | 25. The improvement of Internet facilities at UniMAP.                                                                                |
| that Influence the Antecedents| 26. Technology and Internet cannot be separated from students.                                                                         |
|                               | 27. Facebook and Google are free.                                                                                                   |
|                               | 28. Facebook and Google are common.                                                                                                |
|                               | 29. Can be completed anywhere and everywhere.                                                                                       |
|                               | 30. Can be completed anytime.                                                                                                      |
|                               | 31. Obligations to the university.                                                                                                  |
|                               | 32. To improve teaching and learning.                                                                                               |
|                               | 33. Being instructed to do so.                                                                                                      |
|                               | 34. Had to be done for staff evaluation by the head of department.                                                                    |
|                               | 35. Free application such as Facebook where students hang around often.                                                             |
| **Phenomenon**                | 36. Can easily remove the unpleasant students’ evaluation.                                                                           |
|                               | 37. Can easily instruct the students face-to-face.                                                                                   |
|                               | 38. Can easily explain to students face-to-face.                                                                                     |
|                               | 39. The improvement of staffs’ knowledge of Internet applications.                                                                   |
|                               | 40. The enhancement of students’ awareness of Internet applications.                                                                  |
|                               | 41. Free application such as Google Doc.                                                                                             |
|                               | 42. Responding to student concerns for privacy and anonymity.                                                                         |
|                               | 43. Immediate availability of data for analysis and reporting.                                                                       |
|                               | 44. More extensive qualitative responses to the open-ended questions.                                                                |
|                               | 45. Enforce uniformity for the evaluation of all courses.                                                                             |
|                               | 46. Providing faculty with the flexibility to add items specific to their courses.                                                   |
47. Having the opportunity to complete evaluations during free time.
48. The surveys cannot be misplaced.
49. There are no papers to be wasted.
50. Delivered OMR sheets arrive in an unscannable form because of damaged forms.
51. Incorrect printing.
52. Incorrect information being inputted.
53. Academic audit report is not completed.
54. Records are not updated.
55. OMR reporting is behind schedule.
56. Inaccurate data input.
57. OMR sheets are misplaced.
58. OMR sheets are not collected.
59. Delayed data collection.
60. Prolonged OMR processing time.
61. Copied OMR sheets are blurry.
62. The dissimilarities of items in OMR sheets are not compatible with some schools.
63. Staff insufficient.
64. Inappropriate for team-teaching subjects.
65. No minutes of meetings.
66. Numerous and tedious OMR processing procedures.
67. OMR machines are always out of order.
68. OMR machines are expensive.
69. The maintenance of OMR machines is expensive.
70. Distant OMR processing location.
71. Students fill out the forms for granted – yielding unreliable results.
72. Expensive OMR forms.
73. Had to queue in order use the OMR machines.
74. Schools gets a non-conformant status for failing to produce academic evaluation reports.
75. Qualitative data cannot be interpreted by OMR machines.
76. Results are often ambiguous and fail to provide action-oriented solutions.
77. Paper surveys are regularly delivered to the wrong place.
78. Paper surveys are not being delivered.
79. Summaries are often ambiguous and fail to provide action-oriented solutions.
80. Copied OMR forms cannot be read by the OMR machines.
81. Evaluations are the basis for highly stressful decisions rather than a tool for improving teaching and learning.
82. Paper surveys are regularly delivered to the wrong place.
83. Paper surveys are not being delivered.
84. Students know that their comments will not be read.
85. Hard to ensure that students will evaluate only once.
86. Hard to ensure sure that only students will evaluate, not staff themselves.
87. Hard to make sure that only students will evaluate, not staff.
88. Participation from students is not 100%.

Coping Strategies
89. Using copied OMR forms to save cost.
90. Lecturers fill out the OMR forms themselves.
91. Lecturers discard OMR forms that yield negative comments.
92. Carry on with copied OMR forms or sheets even though many were rejected by OMR machines.

Consequences
93. Improve quality of administrative work.
94. Improve quality of feedback or information.
95. Improve quality of teaching and learning.
96. Cut costs.
97. Less time-consuming.

Many staff and students for instance, mentioned characteristics of online technology such as social networking are facilitating factors to online evaluation. The researchers thus concluded that the focus group and individual interviews saturated the codes that were necessary to understand the occurrence of online evaluation after similar codes emerged during the interviews. Phase 2 that exercised axial coding encompassed of five individual interviews and five in a focus group, which aimed to elucidate codes in detail. Phase 2 clusters codes into themes and patterns related to online evaluation. Axial coding allowed the researchers to structure an advanced understanding of each of the five main components in the paradigm model (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

A structured interview was used in which each individual responded to three questions and follow-up probes. Question 1 was intended to familiarize individuals to a typical online evaluation situation. Questions 1 and 2 were based on the five questions presented in Phase 1 of data collection. Follow-up probe questions were added to focus in more detail on prominent categories mentioned during Phase 1.

(1) What are the positive and negative consequences of paper and online evolutions? Probes: quality of life and quality of academic.
(2) What do you do to cope with paper and online evaluation’s inadequacy? Probes: active, aggressive, avoidance, cognitive.
(3) What are the impacts of paper and online evaluations? Probes: emotional, behavior, social, physical, academic.

The researchers identified a range of preliminary themes on the foundation of five categories and codes as illustrated in Table 2. The researchers merged themes in accordance with the interviews. Phase 2 provides the researchers with the possibility to organize and label themes that could be tested in Phase 3. Therefore, macrothemes and themes identified in Phase 2 were viewed as provisional, subject to revision and removal in Phase 3.

Selective coding was intended for Phase 3. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), selective coding is the process of assessing the macrothemes and themes identified in Phase 2, linking the categories to one another, and developing a plot that integrates the paradigm model. Fifteen informants participated in three focus groups interviews to serve several purposes such as to duplicate crucial codes and themes that were identified in Phases 1 and 2 (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Second selective coding was used to delve into detail the connection among macrothemes within each category (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). A third objective was to request informants to discuss the five categories in the paradigm model related to each other; for example, informants discussed the relationship between antecedents and contextual conditions of the phenomenon in order to understand the process of online and paper evaluations (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

This information facilitated the researchers to construct a credible paradigm model that could be authenticated in Phase 4. The final objective was to create a storyline, which consists of a descriptive story about the central phenomenon of this research. This phase consists of two major outcomes. The first outcome distinguished the range of themes that were considered within macrothemes in each of
the five categories. Altogether as shown in Table 2, 98 themes were identified and were grouped into 5 macrothemes. The second outcome was a constructed preliminary paradigm model that has been validated in Phase 4 of data collection and illustrated in detail in the following section. The preliminary paradigm model consisted of the macrothemes and themes acknowledged so far.

Finally, Phase 4 was projected to validate and explain the paradigm model constructed in Phase 3. Ten informants in four focus groups were interviewed and asked to respond to a paradigm model based on the responses in Phase 3. The central idea was to perform member checks on the preliminary paradigm model. Informants were asked whether the themes and macrothemes were conceivable to them. A second purpose was to ask for comments and reactions concerning the reliability of the paradigm model.

Informants in Phase 4 were shown preliminary diagrams of the paradigm model and asked to comment on whether the model is sensible to them and in line with their own experience. A third purpose was to encourage the informants to refine or add to any of the categories, macrothemes, or themes in the paradigm model. According to Maxwell (1996), this last stage facilitated to guarantee that the final paradigm model was fully saturated, reliable, and credible.

4. Findings

4.1 Emerging Themes of Staff and Course Evaluation Phenomenon

The researchers proposed that the principal theme that emerged from the open coding investigative process which the in-depth interviews provided was that staff, especially the academic staff, desired to gain ‘a sense of fulfillment’ over their lives and they found that this concept could be easily achieved by their use of online media applications.

The fundamental categories that emerged from these interviews were (1) the antecedents of the phenomenon, (2) the contexts and conditions that influence the antecedents, (3) the central phenomenon, (4) the coping strategies, and (5) the consequences resulting from the coping strategies.

The identification of these five categories is the major element of the paradigm model of this particular study and should be beneficial to add to the existing literature and for the stakeholders to have a better understanding on the phenomenon.

All factors emerged evidently are interpretive in nature and entail advanced exploration; however, there was sound consistency among the informants in this research. After all, most informants
illustrated these factors impulsively and when asked truthfully to assess these factors in Phase 4 of this study using peer member checks, all informants (n = 10) strongly agreed with them.

4.2 Contexts and Conditions that Influence Antecedents
For this perspective, only staff are being interviewed as it is obligatory for them to meet the standards established by university. According to the informants (M = 65%, F = 35%), the obligations to the university is the main reason for academic and non-academic staff perform the paper and online evaluations every semester. However, for some (M = 34%, F = 66%), they made it clear that they did it as it was being instructed by their head of department and immediate supervisor. Nonetheless, there are lecturers (M = 25%, F = 75%) that have desire to be included in the exercise for they need to improve their performance in class.

The improvement of the Internet facilities is the key factor that encourages the staff to switch the old and obsolete technique to newer and improved networking methods. Additionally, in this day and age these Internet technologies are impossible to be separated from staff and students. With applications such as Facebook and Google, staff and students are able to communicate, store, collaborate, and manage information anywhere and anytime.

4.3 Antecedents
Findings in the current study showed that staff and students attributed staff and course evaluations to three types of antecedents. These include the academic staff’s behavior, non-academic staff’s behavior, and students’ behavior. Results show that laziness has been a major issue for all three types of informants as some informants (M = 70%, F = 30%) said that there are many things to achieve rather than concentrating on lecturer’s evaluation, which previously has no positive impact whatsoever. Many students and staff saw that paper evaluation is actually a waste of time and resources; they had to do it only because of their carry marks. Some students voiced that they assume lecturers would not read their comments at all. For the lecturers, many of the informants (M = 69%, F = 31%) expressed that they are afraid if the students write the truth about their bad performance or because of personal factors students will tell lies regarding their teaching approach. Thus, many informants consider it as less important things to do and they will do it just to abide the instruction from the university.

On the other hand, there are informants who are totally enthusiastic about the evaluation. For students, the informants (M = 36%, F = 64%) suggest that the practice is important and it is their responsibility to enlighten the academic staff’s performance whether it is an excellent or a poor ability during teaching and learning process. Being a lecturer, it is a good exercise to realize their weaknesses and thus can improve his or her teaching techniques.

4.4 Central Phenomenon
The researchers have become aware of the fundamental theme that surfaces from the interviews (during the open coding investigative process), namely staff and students achieve “a feeling of fulfillment” over their lives through the utilization of both paper and online evaluations. However, this feeling of fulfillment has produced advantages and disadvantages of the two approaches and this in turn will generate several coping strategies in order for them to regain yet another sense of satisfaction in their lives. Informants in the current study described a variety of disadvantaged aspects. However, apart from the drawback, the researchers found that there are benefits of both methods.

4.4.1 Advantages of Paper Evaluation
To academic staff, according to the informants (M = 90%, F = 10%), the most vital characteristic of paper evaluation is that they can easily remove the unpleasant students’ assessment by discarding the OMR sheets. Other criteria are that they (M = 55%, F = 45%) can easily instruct and explain and administer the process of evaluation face-to-face in order to minimize mistakes.
4.4.2 Advantages of Online Evaluation

Facebook and Google Apps indirectly have improved staff and students’ knowledge and awareness of Internet applications. These applications are at no cost and maintenance-free, plus they are ready to be used anywhere and anytime.

Many informants (M = 60%, F = 40%) admitted that online evaluation responds to student concerns for privacy and anonymity. Students can anonymously evaluate their lecturer with a peace of mind, that they can critique them if they are unhappy with the way their lecturer handles lectures, et cetera.

According to administrative staff, the availability of data for analysis and reporting is instantaneous in online evaluation. As soon as students input their responses, the system immediately analyzes and findings can be generated for viewing in an instant. In addition, more extensive qualitative responses to the open-ended questions can now be viewed and scrutinized with ease. Other than that, according to informants (M = 34%, F = 66%), online evaluation has enforced uniformity for the evaluation of all courses, that prior to this while exercising paper evaluation, there are difficulties when collecting and analyzing data for social science schools as the OMR sheets and analyzing machines are tuned toward engineering subjects.

Finally, the researchers found that online evaluation has provided faculties with the flexibility to add items specific to their courses to address the accreditation requirements. In other words, it provides the faculties with the total freedom to fine-tune all questions according to the course content and expertise of the lecturers.

4.4.3 Disadvantages of Paper Evaluation

There are numerous information regarding the drawback of paper evaluation from the informants (M = 80%, F = 20%) interviewed. All informants have raised the same concern and that data saturation has been detected at informant number seven during Phase 1 data collection. According to informants, since the original OMR sheets are expensive, many schools resorted to utilizing copied sheets and thus many of them cannot be analyzed by the OMR machines. Furthermore, because of this, many OMR sheets arrived in damaged state and cannot be scanned by the OMR machines. Additionally, OMR machines are always out of order plus the maintenance fees are expensive and the machines cost the university a fortune to replace them.

Another downside of paper evaluation is that qualitative data cannot be interpreted by OMR machines, albeit it is very crucial to be interpreted as all data are genuinely from the students themselves. Results and summaries of the analysis also are often ambiguous and fail to provide action-oriented solutions in view of the fact that many students fill out the forms for granted, yielding unreliable outcome. To make matters worse, the dissimilarities of items in the OMR sheets are not compatible with Social Science schools as they are arranged to meet the standards of Engineering-related subjects.

In terms of practical downsides, feedback from the informants (M = 60%, F = 40%) was that the completed OMR sheets were often misplaced or not collected at all. This frequently happened during the queuing process of data analysis. Informants also confirmed that after tedious analyzing process has been done, which in some cases took an exceptionally long time, some of the OMR sheets are regularly being delivered back to the wrong place or worse, not being delivered at all. This is due to staff that administer the overall process are insufficient in some schools that handle too many students. This leads to incomplete academic audit reports and schools are getting a non-conformant status for failing to produce academic evaluation reports.

Succinctly, informants (M = 75%, F = 25%) suggested that paper evaluations are the basis for extremely stressful decisions rather than an instrument for improving teaching and learning for the academicians.
4.4.4. Disadvantages of Online Evaluation
According to the informants (M = 66%, F = 34%), especially academic staff, it is very difficult to ensure that the students will evaluate only once and the accountability and reliability of the process is also very hard to measure as at the moment it can be certain that the staff themselves pretend to be students in order to try to evaluate with positive comments. The participation from students is of course not 100% and it is possible to generalize the population.

4.5 Coping Strategies
There are several coping strategies being enlightened by the informants (M = 52%, F = 48%) in order to deal with the weaknesses of staff and course evaluation, predominantly paper evaluation. Informants mentioned that they have done the following, for example by using copied OMR sheets to save cost and to meet the demand of high population of students. Some schools, according to the informants, will carry on with copied sheets even though many were rejected by the machines.

For some academic staff (M = 90%, F = 10%), in order to have good outcome for paper evaluation, they resorted by filling out the OMR sheets themselves or simply by discarding one that yields negative comments. For online evaluation, these lecturers will straightforwardly log in and disguise themselves as students and input very positive comments.

4.6 Consequences
By looking at the drawbacks of paper evaluation that are way too many compared to online evaluation, the university has decided to implement online evaluation for all schools beginning 2015. This accomplishment has improved the quality of administrative work significantly. There are no papers to be wasted and costs are reduced drastically. Every semester, the researchers’ school has managed to report the findings to all lecturers within a time frame given and this achievement has improved the quality of teaching and learning a great deal.

5. Conclusions
The majority of educators would coincide that course evaluations are vital not only for tenure and promotion but also to give the university feedback to improve teaching and give students an opportunity for constructive input into their own learning. If the findings of this research are correct, the blend of administrative convenience, lecturers’ desire for timely feedback, and course improvement through formative evaluation will cease the utilization of traditional paper evaluations and make online evaluations the method of preference.

Staff and course evaluations in any universities are likely to shape professional and career advancement, promotion, tenure, and of course the course content itself to be improved. Not many spheres in higher education become sources for more anxiety than staff and course evaluations, and few areas have been studied more for validity and reliability (Wachtel, 1998). From this current research and in line with many other studies, the researchers conclude that online staff and course evaluations bring the advantages of saving time, resources and many more over the traditional paper method of evaluation. As a consequence, academic staff may be required to utilize them in place of the more burdensome paper method.
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