

Student Attitudes towards Faculty Performance Assessment at the Jordanian Universities



Akif Lutfi Al-Khasawneh

Assistant Professor, Department of Financial & Administrative Sciences, AL-Huson University College, AL-Balqa' Applied University, Irbid, Jordan, P. O. Box 50, AL-Huson, 21510, Jordan

Email: akif_khasawneh@yahoo.com

Tel: +96275432309

Abstract: The purpose of the present study was to identify student's ability to evaluate performance of faculty members and their attitudes in evaluating faculty performance at the private and public universities in Jordan. Results revealed that:

- Student's ability to evaluate faculty performance was moderate (3.37).
- Personality traits of faculty were ranked top ($M=4.13$) by student attitudes in evaluation, whereas student-teacher interrelations was placed in the last rank ($M=2.78$) by student attitudes in evaluation.
- There were statistically significant differences ($\alpha=.05$) attributed to effect of gender for all study variables and the overall rating of attitudes, where differences were in favor of males. However, there were no statistically significant differences regarding *Laissez-faire* style, personality characteristics, and social relations.
- There were statistically significant differences ($\alpha=.05$) attributed to effect of gender on all study variables and the overall rating of attitudes, excluding openness/popularity, and tolerance/*Laissez-faire* where differences were in favor of public universities regarding personality qualities, and in favor of private universities on the other variables.

1 INTRODUCTION

Performance assessment is a major function of human resource management in business organizations. Through performance assessment, the organization can study, analyze, and measure both individual and organizational performances thereby identifying the feedback regarding performance levels. This feedback will help the organization to identify strengths that need to be enhanced and weaknesses that require remedy. On the other hand, performance assessment helps the organization make effective decisions and set up suitable strategies related to recruitment, training, rewarding, marketing, etc.

Assessment of performance not only ensures increased efficiency and effectiveness levels towards a better performance, it also measures the actual achievement by an individual or organization against benchmarks. The assessment outcomes that are produced on continual basis by an effective system will motivate organization and employees to exert greater efforts and improve their performance. An organization that seeks to improve organizational performance levels should concentrate on the human resource management strategies, pay greater attention to assessment, training, rewarding, and empowering the human resources, and recruitment of qualified personnel. The human resource management that is fair, honest and reliable will produce positive outcomes from the assessment process towards achieving the intended goals from the assessment in terms of minimizing negatives and maximizing strengths. The fairness of assessment is critical because it relates directly with employee rights, retention and promotion. On the contrary,

ineffective assessment would result in many problems such as disloyalty, low performance level, job conflicts, etc.

2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Many Jordanian universities adopt student-based assessment approach to assess performance of their faculties. The current study attempts to evaluate this practice and to find out whether such approach would influence impartiality fairness of the overall assessment process. Specifically, the problem addressed by the present study associates with the negative outcomes that professors would have when they find that their job advancement in terms of tenure, reward, esteem, or professional level are all contingent on student-based assessments.

3 STUDY QUESTIONS

1. What is the ability level of Jordanian university students to evaluate their faculty performance?
2. What attitudes dominate student's evaluations of their faculty performance?
3. Are there statistically significant differences in the attitudes held by students in evaluating their faculty performance that vary by gender?
4. Are there statistically significant differences in the attitudes held by students in evaluating their faculty performance that vary by proprietorship status?

4 STUDY OBJECTIVES

1. Identify extent to which students are capable to assess performance of their professors.
2. Identify attitudes of students in performance assessment of their professors
3. Identify whether there are statistically significant differences attributable to gender in student attitudes towards performance assessment of their professors.
4. Identify whether there are statistically significant differences attributable to university proprietorship in student attitudes towards performance assessment of their professors.

5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The major concern of the present study is to evaluate student's ability in assessing faculty performance at the Jordanian universities and to identify bases on which students build their assessments of teachers. This is a significant issue to consider because investigating this issue will benefit different parties including administrators, professors and the student. The outcomes from the current study will be valuable for universities that consider adoption assessment strategies, and will create for them various economic, social, psychological and organizational advantages.

6 HYPOTHESES

1. Low level of students' ability to evaluate their faculty performance.
2. There is low level of attitudes held by students to evaluate their faculty's performances.
3. There are no statistically significant differences attributed to gender in student attitudes towards performance assessment of their professors.
4. There are statistically significant differences attributed to university proprietorship in student attitudes towards performance assessment of their professors.

7 METHODS

7.1 Population & Participants

Population (N=1100) consisted of undergraduate Business Administration students attending the public and private in the northern region of Jordan. Participants were recruited from four universities: Irbid National University/Irbid Governorate (N=340), Jadara National University/Irbid Governorate (N=212), Ajloun National University/Ajloun Governorate (N=128), Jarash Private University/Jarash Governorate (N=420).

Participants (N=440) were randomly selected representing 40 per cent of the original population (N=1100). Questionnaires were sent to all participants, a total of (430) returned back, only (30) were excluded because are unusable for statistical analysis, and the remaining (400) questionnaires were usable for statistical analysis which is acceptable sample size in the statistical studies allow for generalize ability of results.

7.2 Data Collection:

For purpose of this study, data were collected using the questionnaire that was designed specifically for this purpose to fit with study questions, objects and variables. The questionnaire was validated by sending it to a number of judges and based on their opinions necessary adjustments were made accordingly in light of author's vision and study variables. To identify the internal consistency coefficient of respondent estimates, Chronbach alpha was used and alpha coefficient for students' ability to evaluate their faculty and their attitudes towards evaluation were (74%, and 84%) respectively which is higher than the standard percentage of (70%) and therefore is dependable to generalize results from the current study and its recommendations. The questionnaire consisted of three parts: Part one: measures participant demographics such as gender, university proprietorship. Part two: measures students' ability to evaluate their faculty performance. Six questions were equally assigned to measure students' evaluative ability in terms of self-confidence (items 1-6), seriousness (items 7-12) and honesty (items 13-18). Part Three: Attitudes Dominating Student Assessment of Faculty Performance Scale. Six attitudes were identified and measured through five items for each as follows: Items (1-5) measure student attitudes dominating assessment of faculty performance in terms of formality. Items (6-10) measure student attitudes dominating assessment of faculty performance in terms of openness/popularity. Items (11-15) measure student attitudes dominating assessment of faculty performance in terms of tolerance/ Laissez-faire. Items (16-20) measure student attitudes dominating assessment of faculty performance in terms of fair-mindedness. Items (21-25) measure student attitudes dominating assessment of faculty performance in terms of personality qualities of teacher. Items (26-30) measure student attitudes dominating assessment of faculty performance in terms of teach-student interrelationship.

7.3 Statistical Treatment

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to make the statistical treatments using frequencies, means and standard deviations, and T-test for paired comparisons.

8 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Longenecker & Pringle (1988: 661) defined performance assessment as "A technique of evaluating employees through simulation exercises interviews, psychological tests and group exercises to determine the degree to which they possess management potential". Durra & Sabagh (2008, 259) referred to performance assessment as the process of making judgments about employee performance and behavior at workplace. Recardo & Wade (2001) defined performance assessment as judging performance of others based on certain criteria. Nouri & Cortel (2011, 322) described performance assessment as managerial procedure aiming at evaluating individual outcomes using specific means to make judgment regarding the individual's contribution to carrying out the assigned tasks. Abdulnabi (2010, 189) defined performance evaluation as a procedure practiced within the technical managerial process to collect qualitative and quantitative data to identify the eventual performance level of employees for purpose benchmarking individual performances based on certain criteria. Leap & Crino, (1990: 317) referred to performance assessment as "Process of assessing quantitative and qualitative aspects of an employee's Job performance." Byar & Rue (2005, 251) described performance assessment as "Process of determining and

communicating to an employee how he or she is performing on the job and ideally, establishing a plan of improvement."

In summary, the earlier definitions of performance assessment as suggested by management theorists generally agree on the following characteristics of the performance assessment process:

1. Performance assessment is a process by which to identify the eventual level of employee's performance in the organization.
2. Performance assessment is not arbitrary; rather it is a process based on certain criteria
3. Performance assessment is periodical since individual's performance varies over time as a result of different factors.
4. The performance assessment process includes careful study, examination and analysis of employee performance using the simulation, interview, note-taking, etc.
5. Performance assessment involves making judgment that is positive or negative regarding employee performance or behavior.
6. Performance assessment is a procedure that targets exploring the quantitative and qualitative aspects of employee's job performance at the workplace.

Taking the earlier definitions in mind, this author would refer to performance assessment as "the methodologically-disciplined practice of a number of managerial and technical processes enabling to identify efficiency levels of the individuals assessed".

8.1 Objectives of the Performance Assessment Process

The assessment process has many objects, most importantly:

1. Providing guidance and insightful recommendations to human resource managers to rationalize their decisions regarding recruitment, retirement, rewarding, training, etc.
2. Identify how much an employee should be rewarded both materially and immaterially.
3. Enable self-assessment of employees through benchmarking among employees' performance so that for an employee to identify his job performance level, thereby self-development based on the feedback.
4. Identify the training needs in a simple way, and reveal the weaknesses in the organization to enable capacity building, improve skills and remedy of weaknesses in the employees.
5. Explore the performance levels of managerial units in the organization.
6. Identify what the organization expect from its employees
7. Documentation of data and information in the staff records to make use of them in the decisions-making or setting up strategies (Farmer, 2004).

8.2 Importance of the Performance Assessment

Performance assessment process produces many benefits for the individuals, groups and the organization as a whole. Most importantly such as the following:

1. Helps managers keep focused on the intended targets.
2. Assessment ensures fair treatment.
3. Supports a proper workplace with minimal errors and debts.
4. Motivates change, continuous improvement and development
5. Assessment supports goal-driven activities, policies and strategies.
6. Reflects a positive image about the organization to customers and other external actors by concentrating on performance.
7. Increase motivation and competition among employees towards better performance levels.
8. Reveals strengths and weaknesses in the organization, employees and systems

9. Enhances the supervisory and control practices.
10. Improves employee morale, especially qualified employees, and strengthens the relations with top managers (Attai & Al Fadel, 2006, 228; Byars & ue, 2005).

8.3 Problems related to performance assessment

There are many problems hindering performance assessment process, including the following:

1. Lack of clear-cut and well-defined assessment criteria equally apply to similar jobs and tasks.
2. Impartiality of some of the assessors for various cultural, political, social, or regional reasons.
3. Disparity of employee performance over time in that the performance of an employee would be assessed thoroughly in a month but not the remaining months.
4. The halo effect counteracts the assessment process when judging employee's performance is being influenced by certain quality whether positive or negative without adopting a wider perspective.
5. Assessment will be ineffective when undertaken based on psychological and physiological similarities between assessor and employee assessed which would result is biases and favoritism (Cherrington, 1995; Ivancevcch, 1992).

From the author's view, there are many other problems such as low adequacy of assessors compared with those who assess, for instance when teacher is assessed by students; conflicts arise between the superiors and subordinates or assessor and those assessed. Further, arbitrary assessment would produce inaccurate results that have negative effects on the various parties involved; and disagreement regarding the ideal based on personal judgment or temperamental reaction would influence the assessment result for example teacher evaluated by student based on test result.

9 LITERATURE REVIEW

Addahla (2006) entitled "Impact of performance management on employee satisfaction in Jordanian private sector organizations". The study involved a sample amounted 325 managers and employees at all levels working in 39 private organizations of all sizes. The study resulted the following:

1. The study concluded that to certain extents the workers financial needs are not covered.
2. Large number from private sector realizes and applies management performance requirements.
3. The selected sample evaluated their satisfaction in light of the organizations care for their welfare.

Peljhan & Tekavcic, (2008) entitled "The impact of management control systems–strategy interaction on performance management: A case study". The purpose of the study was to identify effect of interfered and varied control systems and strategies on organizational performance of private-sector firms. Results indicated that using a variety of evaluation and control methods contributed to increasing performance level of employees, behavior adjustment of employees, and improving outcomes. Furthermore, results demonstrated that formal control and assessment methods are more influential than informal control methods on employee performances.

Yang,et al (2011) entitled " The impact of computerized internal controls adaption on operating performance" sought to explore the impact of computerized internal controls on performance and concluded that the computerized control takes a significant part in revealing and reporting errors and identifying weaknesses while improve operating performance levels.

Sand & Hottmann (2012) entitled "The impact of performance measurement in a service factory" aimed at exploring the effect of management control on performance measurement and importance for the hotel service industry and found that continuing measurement of performance and management control processes have an effective impact on increasing the employee performance level and bettering their behavior.

10 EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Table (1) Frequencies and percentages by study variables

	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	M	184	41.7
	F	257	58.3
Proprietorship	Public	235	53.3
	Private	206	46.7
Total		441	100.0

10.1 Reliability Test

To test for reliability, Chronbach alpha internal consistency was computed on a pilot sample selected without the original sample. The following table shows coefficients computed which considered suitable for purpose of the present study.

Table (2) Chronbach alpha internal consistency

Areas	Internal Consistency
Student Ability to Evaluate faculty performance	.74
Attitudes dominating student assessment of faculty performance	
Formality	.78
Openness/Popularity.73	.73
Tolerance/ <i>Laissez Fair</i>	.75
Fair-mindedness	.77
Personality qualities of faculty	.74
Social interrelationships	.79
Overall Attitudes	.84

Question One: "What is the ability level of Jordanian university students to evaluate their faculty performance?"

To answer this question, means and standard deviations of students' ability to evaluate faculty performance at the Jordanian universities as demonstrated by the following table.

Table (3) Means and standard deviations of students' ability to evaluate faculty performance at the Jordanian universities in descending order by means

Rank	No.	Item	M	SD	Level
1	3	I am fully capable to understand the questionnaire questions and assess faculty accordingly	4.26	.79	High
2	13	I believe student's judgments on faculty are temperamental	4.04	1.01	High
3	9	I am careful to go through the questionnaire items thoroughly before responding	3.99	1.08	High
4	12	I would ask about any unclear or vague item	3.93	1.04	High
5	2	I am knowledgeable about performance criteria	3.91	.78	High
5	11	I am careful about completing the questionnaire seriously because outcomes will be applied in reality	3.91	1.02	High
7	1	I am confident about student's competency to evaluate faculties	3.80	.96	High

7	5	I believe that my evaluation of faculty is seriously considered by administrators	3.80	1.14	High
9	14	Student's evaluations bias their self-interest	3.69	1.23	High
10	15	I believe that student's evaluation of faculty depends on the test mark they scored	3.57	1.21	Moderate
11	17	I greatly confident that student's evaluations of faculty members are personally partial rather than impartial	3.38	1.16	Moderate
12	6	I feel hesitate to evaluate my faculties while on selected sample	3.34	1.21	Moderate
13	16	I trust student evaluations of faculties	3.06	1.17	Moderate
14	4	Mostly I need guidance to make evaluative questionnaire content and terms clearer	2.86	1.30	Moderate
15	18	I would evaluate my faculties at low if they assigned low score to me irrespective of their eventual performance level	2.43	1.36	Moderate
16	8	Time restrictions make me fill the questionnaire hastily	2.39	1.33	Moderate
17	10	I am concerned most with completing the questionnaire irrespective or understanding content	2.22	1.18	Low
1	7	I may ask a colleague complete the questionnaire instead if were busy	2.13	1.30	Low
		Students' ability to evaluate faculties	3.37	.35	Moderate

Table (3) shows that mean scores ranged between (2.134.26) with item (3) stating " I am fully capable to understand the questionnaire questions and assess faculty accordingly" was placed in the first rank (M=4.26), whereas item (7) " I may ask a colleague complete the questionnaire instead if were busy" was placed in the last rank (M=2.13), and the overall mean score of students; ability to evaluate faculty members was moderate (M=3.37).

Depending on these results, the hypothesis that students' ability to evaluate their faculty's performance was low is rejected.

Question two: "What attitudes dominate student's evaluation of their faculty performance?"

To answer this question, means and standard deviations of students' ability to evaluate faculty performance at the Jordanian universities as demonstrated by the following table.

Table (4) Means and Standard deviations of student attitudes in professor performance assessments in descending order by means

Rank	No.	Area	M	SD	Level
1	5	Personality qualities	4.13	.73	High
2	2	Openness/Popularity	3.80	.73	High
3	1	Formality	3.26	.73	Moderate
4	4	Fair-mindedness	3.18	.61	Moderate
5	3	Tolerance/ <i>Laissez Fair</i>	2.96	.93	Moderate
6	6	Social interrelationships	2.78	.95	Moderate

Table (4) shows that mean scores were within the range (2.78-4.13) with the attitudes to evaluate faculty's performance by students based on personality qualities of the faculties were placed first with the highest mean score (4.13) compared with the attitudes that were oriented with student-teacher interrelations that was ranked last with lowest mean score (2.78).

This result supports rejection of the hypothesis of "Low level of students' ability to evaluate their faculty performance".

Question three: "Are there statistically significant differences in the attitudes held by students in evaluating their faculty performance that vary by gender?"

To answer this question, means and standard deviations of students' ability and attitudes to evaluate faculty members at the Jordanian universities by gender. To demonstrate mean statistical differences, T-test was used and the following shows the related results.

Table (5) Means, standard deviations, and T-test results of gender effect on students' ability level and attitudes to evaluate faculty performance at the Jordanian universities

Item	Gender	Count	M	SD	T-Value	Freedom Degrees	Statistical α
Student's ability to evaluate faculty performance	M	184	3.41	.37	2.031	439	.043
	F	257	3.34	.34			
Attitudes dominating students' evaluations of faculty performance							
Formality	M	184	3.41	.68	3.706	439	.000
	F	257	3.16	.75			
Openness/Popularity	M	184	3.92	.72	3.071	439	.002
	F	257	3.71	.73			
Tolerance/Laissez Fair	M	184	3.03	.92	1.245	439	.214
	F	257	2.91	.94			
Fair-mindedness	M	184	3.28	.65	3.129	439	.002
	F	257	3.10	.56			
Faculty's personality qualities	M	184	4.15	.76	.555	439	.579
	F	257	4.11	.70			
Social interrelationships	M	184	2.87	1.04	1.879	439	.061
	F	257	2.70	.87			
Attitudinal Overall Degree	M	184	3.44	.46	3.824	439	.000
	F	257	3.28	.43			

Table (5) shows statistically significant differences at ($\alpha=.05$) attributed to gender effect on all study variables and the overall grade of attitudes. Differences were in favor of males, while there were no statistically significant differences in areas tolerance/ *Laissez Fair*, Personality Qualities, and social interrelations.

This result yields rejection of the hypothesis regarding the variables Formality, Openness/Popularity and Fair-mindedness; whereas the hypothesis was accepted with the following variables: Tolerance/Laissez Fair, Social interrelationships and Faculty's personality qualities

Question four: "Are there statistically significant differences in the attitudes held by students in evaluating their faculty performance that vary by proprietorship status?"

To answer this question, means and standard deviations of students' ability level and attitudes in evaluating faculty performance by university proprietorship were computed. To identify mean statistical differences, T-test was used and the following table shows related results.

Table (6) Means, standard deviations, and T-test results to identify effect of university proprietorship on students' ability level and attitudes to evaluate faculty performance

Item	Gender	Count	M	SD	T-Value	Freedom Degrees	Statistical α
------	--------	-------	---	----	---------	-----------------	----------------------

Student's ability to evaluate faculty performance	Public	235	3.31	.33	-3.757	439	.000
	Private	206	3.44	.37			
Attitudes dominating students' evaluations of faculty performance							
Formality	Public	235	3.10	.68	-5.048	439	.000
	Private	206	3.45	.75			
Openness/Popularity	Public	235	3.75	.74	-1.324	439	.186
	Private	206	3.85	.73	-1.325		
Tolerance/Laissez Fair	Public	235	2.90	.87	-1.383	439	.167
	Private	206	3.03	1.00	-1.370		
Fair-mindedness	Public	235	3.08	.52	-3.505	439	.001
	Private	206	3.28	.68	-3.446		
Faculty's personality qualities	Public	235	4.21	.67	2.540	439	.011
	Private	206	4.03	.78	2.516		
Social interrelationships	Public	235	2.57	.87	-4.869	439	.000
	Private	206	3.00	.98	-4.833		
Attitudinal Overall Degree	Public	235	3.27	.39	-4.017	439	.000
	Private	206	3.44	.49	-3.954		

Table (6) reveals statistically significant differences at ($\alpha=.05$) attributed to gender effect on all study variables and the overall degree of attitudes excluding for areas of openness/popularity, tolerance/*Laissez Fair*; differences were in favor of public universities within area "personality qualities", and in favor of private university for the other areas.

This result supports rejection of the hypothesis regarding the variables Formality, Fair-mindedness, Faculty's personality qualities, and Social interrelationships; whereas the hypothesis was accepted with the following variables: Openness/Popularity and; Tolerance/Laissez Fair.

11 RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of results from the present study, the following recommendations were suggested:

1. Human resource managers at the universities are called to keep track with evaluation outcomes on continual basis and to carefully consider such results from a scientific perspective before making any decision impacting the faculties so as to ensure fairness of the evaluation.
2. Human resource management departments at the universities are advised to organize alerting programs educating their students regarding criteria and basics of effective evaluation to ensure reliability and credibility of their evaluations.
3. Universities are called to enhance social interrelationships that are based on mutual trust and respect to ensure impartial evaluations by students.
4. Stronger social relations between the faculties, students, and the administrators should be established that are based on mutual respect, trust.
5. Faculty evaluation should be carried out based on articulated strategies with accurate and inclusive criteria.
6. Human resource management departments at the universities need to conduct their evaluations on continual basis in order to produce accurate and valid evaluation outcomes.
7. There should be a sort of cooperation between public and private universities on the evaluation methods and performance criteria that to be measured in order to narrow the gap in the evaluation process outcomes.

Appendix

Means and standard deviations of attitudes

No.	Item	M	SD
1	I evaluate positively a faculty who interacts with me within his free time only	3.03	1.26
2	I evaluate positively a faculty who defines limits in his/her relationship with students	3.79	1.09
3	I evaluate positively a faculty who allows time to talk about lecture issues	3.28	1.16
4	I evaluate positively a faculty who strictly complies with regulations	3.03	1.29
5	I evaluate positively a faculty who treats me formally	3.18	1.17
6	I evaluate positively a faculty who at any time or place freely	3.99	1.12
7	I evaluate positively a faculty who interacts with me openly without restrictions	3.79	1.23
8	I evaluate positively a faculty who allows me sit and talk him/her in a none-academic subject	3.61	1.23
9	I evaluate positively a faculty who popularly interacts with students	3.57	1.16
10	I evaluate positively a faculty who enjoys a sense of humor with students	4.03	.98
11	I evaluate positively a faculty who is less focused on student attendance/absence	2.97	1.31
12	I evaluate positively a faculty who directs fewer questions to students during lecture time	3.28	1.32
13	I evaluate positively a faculty who ignores the time I come into classroom	2.91	1.29
14	I evaluate positively a faculty who is less concerned with lecture start or end times	2.62	1.31
15	I evaluate positively a faculty who assigns no homework duties	3.02	1.33
16	I evaluate positively a faculty who gives me only the score I deserve	3.79	1.16
17	I evaluate positively a faculty who interacts with all students equally and indiscriminately	4.45	.93
18	I evaluate positively a faculty who accepts mediation to make my score up	2.46	1.33
19	I evaluate positively a faculty who gives me the mark I deserve irrespective of my conditions	2.54	1.29
20	I evaluate positively a faculty who gives me the mark I deserve irrespective of my performance	2.64	1.32
21	I evaluate positively a faculty who cares about dressing elegant	3.58	1.32
22	I evaluate positively a faculty who is eloquent and persuasive	4.23	.99
23	I evaluate positively a faculty who has a friendly smiling face	4.22	.95
24	I evaluate positively a faculty who is witty and deals gently with other	4.22	.94
25	I evaluate positively a faculty who is tolerant and open-hearted	4.39	.91
26	Due to family ties, my evaluation of faculty would bias positively	2.70	1.26
27	Due to tribal ties, my evaluation of faculty would bias positively	2.55	1.25
28	My evaluation of faculty would bias positively because of belonging to same party of association	2.39	1.25
29	My evaluation of faculty would bias positively because good interrelationship with him/her	3.30	1.28
30	My evaluation of faculty would bias positively based on colleague recommendations and suggestions	2.94	1.35
	Overall Attitudes Degree	3.35	.45

References

- Abdelnabi, Mohammad Amin. (2010). *Human Resource Management*. Zamzam Publishers and Distributors, Amman, Jordan
- Aldahleh, Faisal (2006). Impact of performance on employee satisfaction in Jordanian private sector organizations, *Amman Arab University of Graduate Studies*. Amman, Jordan.
- Attai, Yousef Hajeem; Al Fadel, Moayed Abed Al Hussein. (2006). *Human Resource Management: Integrated Strategic Approach*. Al Waraq Publishers & Distributors, Amman, Jordan.
- Byars, Lloyd, L. and Rue, Leslie, W. (2004). *Human resource management*, 7th.ed. , Mc Graw Hill, New York.
- Cherrington , David, j. (1995). *The management of human resources*, 4th.ed. Prentice Hall, New York.
- Dorra, Abdelbari; & Al Sabagh Zohair. (2008). *Human Resource Management in the 21st Century: System Approach*. Wael Publishing Housing, Amman.
- Farmer, Juliet (2004). How to get the most from Performance reviews, *PT, Magazine*, P.49, November, 2004.On-line, Available: www.findarticles.com.cited 3/8/2012.
- Ivancevich, John, M. (1992). *Human resource management foundations of personal*, 5th ed. IRWIN, Homewood, IL.
- Leap, Terry, L. and Crino , Michael, D.(1990). *Personnel human resources management*, Macmillan publishing company, New York.
- Longenecker , Justin and Pringle , Charles (1988). *Management*, 6th ed. Charles E. Merrill publishing company, Columbus, Ohio.
- Nori, Muneer & Cortel Fareed. (2011). *Human Resource Management*. Arab Assembly Publishers, Amman, Jordan
- Peljhan, Darja and Tekavcic, Metka (2008). The impact of management control systems-strategy interaction on performance management: a case study, *Organizacija*, Volume 41, Number 5, September-October, research Papers. DoI 10-2478/v10051-008-0019-1. [Http://organizacija.fov.uni-mb.si/index.php/organizacija/issue/view/25](http://organizacija.fov.uni-mb.si/index.php/organizacija/issue/view/25). cited on 1/10/21012.
- Sandt, Joachim and hottmann , christoph (2012). The impact of performance measurement in a service factory, *international university of applied sciences bad honnet bonn, Germany*. From internet http://www.iubh.de/files/de/fakulta/publikationen/PMA2012_full_papersSANDTHOFFMANN.pdf. Cited on 1/10/2012.
- Wade, David and Recardo , (2001). *Corporate performance management*, Woburn,MA,USA, Butterworth Heinemann.
- Yang, Ming-Hsien., Lin, Shiu-Wen and Koo, Lih-Tian (2011). The impact of computerized internal controls adaptation on operating performance, *African journal of business management*, Vol.5 (20) PP.

8204-8214, 16 September, DOI: 10.58971AJBM11,572. Available on line:
<http://www.academicjournals.org/ajbm>. Cited 1/16/2012.

Appendix

Questionnaire

Dear respondent,,

Compliment,,

This questionnaire is part of study entitled "Student Attitudes towards Faculty Performance Assessment at the Jordanian Universities". Please, read carefully the questions and respond based on your best opinion, noting that your responses will be dealt with in strict confidence and for scientific research purposes only.

Appreciating your best cooperation and interest

Researcher

Dr. Akif Lutfi Khasawneh

Al Balqaa Applied University-Al Husn University College

Part One

Demographic Characteristics

Put (×) in the suitable place

1. Gender O Male O Female
2. University Proprietorship O Public O Private

Part Two:

The following statements are measuring students' ability to evaluate performance of faculty members, please put (×) against the sentence that best describes your opinion

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Self-Confidence						
1	I am confident about student's competency to evaluate faculties					
2	I am knowledgeable about performance criteria					
3	I am fully capable to understand the questionnaire questions and assess faculty accordingly					
4	Mostly I need guidance to make evaluative questions content and terms clearer					
5	I believe that my evaluation of faculty is seriously correct					

	by administrators					
6	I feel hesitate to evaluate my faculties while on sample					
Seriousness						
7	I may ask a colleague complete the questionnaire in were busy					
8	Time restrictions make me fill the questionnaire hastily					
9	I am careful to go through the questionnaire items tho before responding					
10	I am concerned most with completing the questi irrespective or understanding content					
11	I am careful about completing the questionnaire se because outcomes will be applied in reality					
12	I would ask about any unclear or vague item					
Honesty						
13	I believe student's judgments on faculty are temperame					
14	Student's evaluations bias their self-interest					
15	I believe that student's evaluation of faculty depends test mark they scored					
16	I trust student evaluations of faculties					
17	I greatly confident that student's evaluations of members are personally partial rather than impartial					
18	I would evaluate my faculties at low if they assigned lo to me irrespective of their eventual performance level					

Part Three:

The following statements measure student attitudes towards evaluation of faculty performance, please put (X) against the statement that best describes your tendency

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Agree
Student's evaluation of faculty based on Formality Style						
1	I evaluate positively a faculty who interacts with me within his free time only					
2	I evaluate positively a faculty who defines limits in his/her relationship with students					
3	I evaluate positively a faculty who allows time to talk about lecture issues					
4	I evaluate positively a faculty who strictly complies with regulations					
5	I evaluate positively a faculty who treats me formally					
Student's evaluation of faculty based on Openness/Popularity Style						
6	I evaluate positively a faculty who at any time or place freely					
7	I evaluate positively a faculty who interacts with me openly without restrictions					
8	I evaluate positively a faculty who allows me sit and talk him/her in a none-academic subject					

9	I evaluate positively a faculty who popularly interacts with students					
10	I evaluate positively a faculty who enjoys a sense of humor with students					
Student's evaluation of faculty based on Tolerance/Laissez Fair Style						
11	I evaluate positively a faculty who is less focused on student attendance/absence					
12	I evaluate positively a faculty who directs fewer questions to students during lecture time					
13	I evaluate positively a faculty who ignores the time I come into classroom					
14	I evaluate positively a faculty who is less concerned with lecture start or end times					
15	I evaluate positively a faculty who assigns no homework duties					
Student's evaluation of faculty based on Fair-mindedness Style						
16	I evaluate positively a faculty who gives me only the score I deserve					
17	I evaluate positively a faculty who interacts with all students equally and indiscriminately					
18	I evaluate positively a faculty who accepts mediation to make my score up					
19	I evaluate positively a faculty who gives me the mark I deserve irrespective of my conditions					
20	I evaluate positively a faculty who gives me the mark I deserve irrespective of my performance					
Student's evaluation of faculty based on Faculty's personality qualities						
21	I evaluate positively a faculty who cares about dressing elegant					
22	I evaluate positively a faculty who is eloquent and persuasive					
23	I evaluate positively a faculty who has a friendly smiling face					
24	I evaluate positively a faculty who is witty and deals gently with other					
25	I evaluate positively a faculty who is tolerant and open-hearted					
Student's evaluation of faculty based on Social interrelationships						
26	Due to family ties, my evaluation of faculty would bias positively					
27	Due to tribal ties, my evaluation of faculty would bias positively					
28	My evaluation of faculty would bias positively because of belonging to same party of association					
29	My evaluation of faculty would bias positively because good interrelationship with him/her					
30	My evaluation of faculty would bias positively based on colleague recommendations and suggestions					
	Overall Attitudes Degree					