INSIGHTS

IN INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

The Journal of the Braun Foundation

Reprint of Volume 1

Power, money and teaching quality: attitudes of part-time lecturers on an international study programme (US to UK) toward student evaluation of their teaching.

Dominic Janes

Does, and how does the pressure of the market have an impact on the teaching staff of international education programmes? Is the imperative to retain fee-paying stu-dents in conflict with academic quality, particularly in situations in which academic staff are working in a part time or temporary capacity? This paper represents a piece of action research which I have carried out to gain insight into such issues. A key part of my work is the management of part-time teaching staff on US to UK study abroad programmes which bring university students to study in London for a semester. Many of the lecturers work for a variety of organisations in addition to Foundation for International Education, London (FIE) where I am employed. There are, on aver-age, about fifteenth lecturers working in any one semester. They are paid only for the hours they teach and have no security of tenure beyond the contract for a particular course. FIE receives all of its funding from student fees, which are sent via partner universities in the USA. Teaching quality assurance is my responsibility and I am expected to report back to my line manager at FIE and to the US universities who are sending the students.

I am interested in thinking about whether there are ‘best practices’ for the support and staff development of such ‘adjunct professors’ (US terminology for part-time lecturers). They are currently evaluated by a student course questionnaire given out in the last class of the term and by a class-visit in the first semester, and every four years thereafter. The aims of this action research are to inform and so enable the improvement of teacher evaluation procedures at FIE, to review the strategy of FIE to teacher evaluation, to understand the attitudes of teachers, managers and admin-istrators towards FIE’s evaluation strategy and to investigate ways in which the FIE evaluation strategy can be more supportive of good teaching practices.

FIE operates academic systems which are modelled on those common in US higher education in which it is automatic for credit-awarding courses to be evaluated by those studying them. Such written evaluations began in USA in the 1920s, but really rose to prominence there in the 1960s in the context of demands for student empow-erment and participation:

Partly student demands represent the desire to be treated as equal negotiators pursuing rational ends, but partly they embody a much less explicit desire for involvement and participation in a community of equals inspired by higher ideals. (Hatch, quoted in Page, 1974: 3).

The literature on part-time teachers in higher education, let alone on those working on international education programmes, is far from extensive. The reason for this is strongly suggested by the title of the edited collection Cogs in the Classroom Factory (Herman and Schmid, 2004): in most universities part-time teaching has either been seen as an aspect of PhD training or has been seen as a 'mopping up' activity where full-timers cannot cover teaching commitments. The part-time teacher's voice, therefore, been rarely heard. The literature that exists is mainly derived from the in-stitutional viewpoint, such as Elizabeth Walker, Effective Management of Part-Time Teachers (2000). There is, therefore, a gap in the literature in relation to attitudinal studies of teachers towards strategies that are already in place on an international higher education programme.

Student evaluation of part-time teachers in the UK is currently framed as an element of the overall framework of institutional 'teaching quality assurance'. Extensive policy documents are available from all US and UK universities in terms of overall academic procedures, and British national Standards are maintained by the Qual-ity Assurance Agency. However, neither FIE, nor Birkbeck FCE, nor even the Open University (OU) (which have largest cohort of part-time teachers in UK Higher Education) have specific policy documents on evaluation of those staff by students and managers (personal communications with Dean Pateman, Senior Faculty Administrator, Faculty of Continuing Education, Birkbeck, 20/3/06 and with (Open University Centre for Research in Education and Educational Technology, 6/04/06).

Birkbeck uses similar teacher evaluation methods to FIE. These are communicated in the Lecturers' Handbook. There is a student questionnaire:
As part of our quality assurance procedures, we ask students to complete .in End of Class Questionnaire, at the end of the module, which gives them .in opportunity to feed back on all aspects of the learning experience. You may, if you wish, use a similar format or questions in an evaluation for your own use part-way through the module, but it is the Standard End of Class Questionnaire which should be returned to the Faculty (Birkbeck, 2005: 25-6).

And there are Teaching Quality Assessment (TQA) Class Visits'. The main purpose of these it stated to be 'collecting evidence of the teaching qual-ity offered by the Faculty, [but] they may also be used for other functions such as providing advice and guidance on teaching methods, learning support, and curriculum matters (Birkbeck, 2005: 24). These Visits happen every four years or when there is a new course offering. It is interesting that collection of informa-tion is giving priority here in comparison with teaching development, suggesting an emphasis on assurance rather than enhancement.

The Open University has a quality assurance mechanism which is based on the dis-cussion of a tutor's marking by a mentor. There is also a class visit in the first year Although, as I have mentioned, there is also no policy document discussing this evaluation strategy the OU is keen to stress the idea of the 'reflexive teacher'. This is most clearly explained in the Supporting Open Learners Reader. This states that the OU advocates teacher employment of Kolb's model of a virtuous circle of practice, Observation, reflection and improvement, saying that 'our professional experience is the product of interaction between our own subject and teaching knowledge and the response of a particular student and student group' (Kolb discussed in Open University, 2002: 132). The Reader adds that 'being interested in your own learning is an excellent foundation for facilitating your students' learning (Open University, 2002: 135).

The general literature on quality in higher education is enormous and I cannot begin to summarise it here. But there is a basic division between the notions of assur-ance (making sure what should happen is happening) and enhancement (making im-provements). Both are regarded by many of their advocates as a key element in the modernisation of education. One article, taking the long perspective (!) on classroom teaching, argues that no longer are figures like Thomas Arnold of Rugby School 'iso-lated figures' since the 'stultifying effects of teaching as you have been taught are not longer with us' (Matheson and Matheson, 2004: 172)

However, there is a counter discourse amongst a minority of educationalists that suggests that quality assurance is rooted in managerialism, the aim of which is not so much the improvement, as the commodification of higher education (Morley, 2003). International education in the UK is widely undertaken as a money-making activity because there are no caps on fees (unlike the Situation in relation to UK

and EU undergraduates). It has been commented that ‘the maxim grow-ing the external affairs of universities [in Britain] has been marketing’ (Walker, 2001: 38). A paper on the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) has argued that globalisation of education empowers capital at the ex-pense of national regulators (governments) and the providers of the services faculty (Scherrer, 2005). FIE is potentially Very vulnerable to such developments since it is entirely dependent on student fees. Personal reflections have also been developed by US study abroad professionals into the issue of consumerism in study abroad and the buying and consumption of pre-packaged ‘edutainment’ experiences (Bolen, 2001. Compare with the ideas in Naidoo and Jamieson, 2005).

Writers taking post-modern approaches have argued that we should look at inter-national education, not simply in terms of learning, but also of consumer behaviour in the context of the construction of the self through travel and purchased experi-ence. In such a world it may be right to question where visions of quality come from: perhaps from notions of comfort, contentment and happiness which are far removed from an empirical assessment of pedagogical competence. This does a disservice, not merely to the teacher, but also to their students, since the more we support a simple, traditional, external, rational definition of quality, the less we honour the definitions of quality by those affected by the policy and program (Stake, 2001: 4).

At their most extreme opinions are deeply opposed and entrenched. On the one side Wilshire has written of the moral collapse of US universities, many of which now offer A- or A as an average grade to their students, as the result of a mechanism by which the university has become a system of expensive mass production of me-diocrity (Wilshire, 1990: 225). On the other hand, advocates of the sovereignty of the market assert that response to market pressures for ‘success’ mean that evalua-tion must serve student customer desire or British universities ‘will go the way of other failed UK industries’ (Ackers, 1997). I therefore propose to examine the atti-tudes of teachers at FIE to investigate whether they think that the current evaluation mechanisms in place act to help or to fetter them in their professional pursuit of their understanding of high quality teaching. This is intended as a first step toward a process of policy examination and change within FIE so as to ensure that teaching enhancement can occur in an environment of commercial pressures.

Research methodology

My core method was the use of attitudinal qualitative research question-naires. I chose this method because I wanted to capture the attitudes of my colleagues at a level subtlety which I felt would have been difficult to ascertain with a quantitative survey. Above all I did not want to constrain respondents by limiting them to a series of defined categories of response. One weakness of the approach I chose was that the resulting data is less easy to summarise since it cannot be conveniently tabulated. Moreover, I cannot produce any indications of Statistical relevance beyond the basic return rate.

I seriously considered carrying out either focus groups or one to one interviews| These would have had the advantage of enabling me to drill down deeper into the attitudes of the participants. However, I decided not to take this approach because of ethical and confidentiality issues. The people I am soliciting for information are my colleagues and, if they are teachers, are under my evaluation and management I was, therefore, very concerned that anonymity should be fully maintained, and did not see an easy way to do achieve this in the case of interviews, other than by employing someone else to do them (which would not be appropriate in a sole authored study such as this).

Above all, my purpose in carrying out this research was to develop a piece of action research which would aid the development of my professional practice by enhancing teaching and learning. Lewin coined the phrase ‘action research’ in 19461 (Matheson and Matheson, 2004: 174) and it is, today, often associated with giving voice, leading the oppressed and enabling the facilitation of change (Parker, 2005). Even if this may seem a somewhat patronising approach, it was clear to me that j there had never been a formal occasion during which FIE teachers and staff had been invited to consider teacher evaluation procedures. In that context it is possible to understand the teacher as being comparatively disempowered. Moreover, by 1 gaining responses from admin-istrators as well as teachers, I would be seeking to promote a plurality of voices (Cal-houn, 1993). If the results suggest that change is needed then I am keen to present the resulting report as evidence for its necessity. This is all intended as a spur to my per-sonal self-reflection and I hope that I am ready to answer Stringer’s call to ‘look, think and act!’ (Stringer, 1999: 18, 43-44 and 160 and Smith, 1996/2001: unpaginated). Avis has argued that possibly subversive systems analysis research is not going to flourish in a heavily positivist, managerial, what works’ system (Avis, 2001). Therefore, robust research methods are essential to ensure that the results are taken seriously at FIE.

My method was to give out qualitative questionnaires. These were of two types, one of which was aimed at those teaching in Spring semester 2006, and the other at those who manage part-time teachers (including myself) or who interpret or use the evaluation data so produced. There were fifteen people in the first category and four people in the second. The questionnaires were to be returned anonymously, and they could be posted back if participants did not wish to send them by email attachment. Participants were informed that participation was entirely optional, and that their comments would not be used in any evaluation of their performance. They were encouraged not to talk about their specific subjects, unless necessary, so as to avoid the danger of thereby giving away their identity.

Critical discussion of findings

The questionnaires produced results which showed some strong patterns across the teaching staff. The return rate for these was satisfactory at 9 out of 15. Some rather different attitudes emerged from the administrators' responses, but these, at a response rate of 2 out of 4 represent a small sample from which it is hard to extract an overall pattern. It was encouraging to see that six of the teachers stated that they looked at the student evaluation form as an element in evaluating their own teaching. This suggests that the form is of some use and is being employed by the teachers and not just by the administrators. In addition, teachers mentioned observing students in class and the quality of their work as key indicators. Two teachers mentioned keeping students' interest as a key indicator. One developed this theme by commenting that 'this can be problematic for me as I have found students in their late teen and early twenties... do not appear to be interested'. Yet the teacher comments that he or she still gets good evaluations: 'I find myself amazed that I have reached students who I thought were bored stiff during class'. This might imply that Observation of students in class presents different impressions from those found on evaluation forms, so prompting thoughts about which is more accurate.

Everyone agreed that teachers should be evaluated. The strongest expression of this came from one of the administrators who stated that evaluation is a 'requirement of all work performance whether in the class on the assembly line. It gauges qual-ity, productivity and effectiveness. The real task is the methodology used to under-stand the results.' This suggests a strongly positivist and managerialist approach to the assessment of Performance, and yet one that still recognises the challenges in interpreting the resulting data. The other administrator picked up on the same

ambiguity by commenting that ‘for too long teaching in HE was subject to no significant assessment’ yet the results can be ‘seen as leading to popularity contests’. It is also interesting to compare such managerial views with the worker interpretation of teachers in the capitalist system as Cogs in the Classroom Factory (Herman and Schmidt, 2003). It is possible to advance a class-based analysis of teachers not as independent Professionals, but as workers whose labour is exploited within a system of production.

The teachers’ concerns were less to do with interpretative methods than with the mechanics of implementation and its purposes. There was particular concern about the psychological and emotional aspects of class Visits. One lecturer stated that ‘I find being evaluated excruciatingly uncomfortable and embarrassing’ whilst another was concerned that frequent inspection ‘may affect the attitude of the students’. Another was concerned that although ‘constructive criticism is always welcome by teachers that are happy to move out of their comfort zone and continuously improve’, neverthe-less the danger was of the development of ‘negative criticism to which we are prone in ‘our culture’. It was felt that a visit was better when done by a colleague ‘who you know and respect’, rather than ‘someone who is more officious with a clipboard and check-list’. The most negative response was that class visiting ‘represents another aspect of the surveillance culture albeit in a minor way’. One respondent advocated peer review, rather than a visit by a manager. All this suggests a lively awareness of the issue of power relations in the context of classroom evaluation work.

On the other hand another teacher commented that they had been guilty of ‘moaning’ about ‘over-zealous monitoring in the past’, yet as long as class interventions were kept to a minimum, and aims made explicit only those really sensitive about their ability should object. And another tutor wrote that it was important for FIE lo know how well they are doing in ‘customer satisfaction’ as well as ‘how well classes fit into the overall curriculum’. A similar breakdown of responses occurred to the questions ‘Why do you think you are evaluated at FIE? What difference does it make to you? Is it important to you?’ Most people thought that the main purpose was the upholding of academic quality. One put is succinctly, that the purpose was to ‘see if I am up to it!’ However, a couple of respondents accepted the importance of student satisfaction saying that ‘equally it is essential to meet the expectation of students’ and that ‘we are paid to teach courses for FIE not for ourselves’, Overall, academic quality was widely perceived as an important driver of evaluation, but market issues were important to a minority of the teachers.

There is not currently a standard course visit comments form and none of the teachers suggested that this would be a good idea which does not in itself imply that one should not be created. However, there was extensive commentary on the student course evaluation form. I did here ask a leading question: whether more qualitative data would be useful? My concern was that the form was primarily numerical. Such data is easily used to make managerial comparisons between faculty but it is much less useful in providing feedback useful for making teaching quality enhancements. I was influenced by the reading of Storti on American workplace culture who commented that 'the achievement ethos leads to the belief that whatever cannot be quantified, cannot be truly valued' (Storti, 2004: 75). A more Machiavellian reading of this would be that to quantify is also to distort data since if not very carefully carried out it can involve simplification into neat and preordained categories. This reading is supported by one teacher response that 'I would not welcome a ratings system, in which teachers are evaluated solely by the "scores" from the audience"'. It should be added that such systems are used in a number U.S. universities, and senior staff may be denied promotion on the basis of student perception of teaching under performance. Numerical data on Student evaluation of teachers is not infrequently published and informs student course choice. There was widespread support for more qualitative data (mentioned by six out of nine teachers) one commenting that 'qualitative feedback is essential in any marketing feedback'. Another tutor stated that they created their own qualitative course evaluation. It is clear that there is a widespread feeling that this form could be improved. There were several suggestions of additional questions. One of the most interesting came from one of the managers who said that 'I would like to see questions that ask students to evaluate their contribution, commitment, effort and so on. This would draw their attention to their responsibility for their own learning'. This raises the important issues that students are asked to evaluate a process in which they share responsibility for success. It also implies that one of the results of student evaluation form-filling is attitudinal development by the students them-selves. In other words, the result of the exercise is not simply restricted to potential for change on the part of the teacher.

Perhaps the most dramatic results from the surveys come from the answers to the question, do you think that students are potentially biased in their evaluation of you (i.e. do they evaluate on any criteria, do you feel, other than academic quality - for example, do they like you, what grades are they awarded, how much work do they

have to do, what time of day is the class set at). Does this means that the results are unfair?' One teacher said that 'most students tend to be fair', but eight teachers and both managers said that they would show bias.
One teacher commented that all evaluations are "unfair". Grades, classroom chemistry, imagine[d] slights genuine differences of opinion all play their parts'. Two mentioned grade expectations: students can sometimes get biased, especially if they were expecting their results' and 'I don't know if I would call it bias, but, yes, of course some students might be more generous with their evaluations if the grades are more generous'. The danger here is of course, that academic Standards may be devalued in the face of potential student displeasure. It is such issues that led Leading figures at the Council for International Educational Exchange to argue for formative rather than summative assessment of students since 'better overall study abroad results can be obtained by giving students the freedom to experiment, move outside the traditional academic box, and take risks. This can best be achieved by relieving them from concern about what might happen to their academic records as the result of studying abroad' (Trooboff, Cressey and Monty, 2004: 215)1 However, the abandonment of summative marking can hardly be a sustainable long-term policy in higher education. Above all, there is the danger that students will simply not complete work if it will not count towards a final grade contributing to their degree.

A key point appears to be cultural approaches to teaching and learning. One tu-tor commented that 'much is contingent on their previous experience back in the States'. As Ryan has commented, 'cultural backgrounds and experience... shape what we value as knowledge and learning' (Ryan, 2000: 16). Cultural issues are not always easy to spot. One administrator commented that 'faculty personality play» a large part' in determining student perceptions. This raises the interesting issue of whether personality should play a part in recruitment strategies. However, there is more to it than that. A Hong Kong study examined the issue of teachers' personalities and 'teaching effectiveness' (Chan, 2000, compare with Roskams, 1998), The conclu-sion was that extrovert teachers were more positively received than| introverts, but that beyond that certain aspects of personality were seen as positive or negative in particular cultures. The maintenance of 'face' and 'harmony' were valued by Hong Kong students because of their own cultural background. The FIE evaluation proc-ess currently does not assume anything other than cultural homogeny amongst the US students and therefore may be missing important individual, ethnic and cultural differences in attitudes and learning styles. This may have happened because US

and UK cultures are perceived to be similar. After all they do show up in this way on Hofstede's intercultural rankings: both are very individualist, fairly male-dominated societies with a high 'envy quotient' directed toward the rich and powerful (Hofstede, 2004: 10 and table 1). Yet it is a major ele-ment in the justification of Coming to the UK from the US to study in this county that students will thereby learn from cultural differences. Evaluation procedures may, therefore, need some rethinking in the light of notions of inter-cultural context.

Perhaps the most unsettling responses to these questions focus on the affective ele-ments of teaching and learning. One tutor commented that responses can 'reflect the individual gripes of students', whilst another stated that 'I think that most of the students will evaluate the course based on whether or not they have been enter-tained.' The danger here is that personal likes and pleasures are driving out objective assessment of self-learning. This is particularly problematic in that the professional literature emphasises the emotional challenges and difficulties of studying abroad - as in Sweitzer and King's description of 'bracing for the bumps' as a phase in taking an international internship course (2004: 116. Compare Garavan and Murphy, 2001: 282). As one teacher summed it up, 'there are many influences on a student's evalu-ation, including personal liking, the mood they are in that day, even where they are in the culture shock cycle'. In other words acculturation stresses may cause temporary unhappiness, meaning that very different results would be obtained depending on the date of the evaluation (Shiraev and Levy, 2004 330). Or, as one of the administra-tors said, 'don't give them [the forms] out at exam time'!

So, comments one teacher, student evaluation 'should be taken for what it is: an im-pressionistic measure of the general mood and reaction of the students'. It is interest-ing how far that has taken us from the idea of the student evaluation as an objective assessment in which views emerge from an impartial and 'culturally untainted place' (Morley, 2003: 137). It is very clear that student wants are extremely important. A study of an international classroom in Australia discovered the student desire for 'practical relevance' and 'added value', in the sense of an interest in precisely how each class helped them to get a higher mark (Pearson and Chatterjee, 2000). This is not quite the same thing as how each class enabled them to think, challenge, or develop in any ways outside the stated assessment criteria. This is a problem in that study abroad is widely understood as a holistic process of learning that transcends classroom prac-tice through wider personal development as a form of lifelong learning (Steinberg, 2002: 223).

Morley has constructed a strongly critical model of student teaching evaluation practises as emerging from a redistribution of power in the academy. The result is the production of student passivity and a blame cul-ture, involving students engaging with a product, not a process' that they judge good or bad regardless of their own commitment (Morley, 2003: 141). She argues that 'in this sense, the democracy of the consumer, or knowledge capitalism, appears to have been more successful than earlier notions of student empowerment' (Morley, 2003: 143). His reasoning is that the students are not thereby empowered to learn, but are pacified by having everything made easier for them. The beneficiaries are the managers, who preside over disempowered tutors and numbed students. Edward Said said that in being intellectual 'the whole point is to be embarrassing, contrary, even unpleasant' (Said, 1994: 9). The system which Morley constructs and deconstructs is a capitalist ritual of consumption which does anything but challenge the assumptions of its paying clients (the students).

It should be emphasised, however, the lecturers at FIE did not express concern about being brow-beaten by FIE or its students. I had read of an Australian professional development programme offered to international lecturers which raised their morale, and made them feel more included in the organisation, even if they were not sure that the students were learning more as a result (Dixon and Scoll, 2004). There are increasing demands for continuing professional development for all staff involved in international education, on the administrative as well as the teaching side (Dunstan, 2003: 2). I was, therefore, keen to ascertain the attitude of the teachers toward such an innovative system of enhanced institutional support There was, however, only lukewarm endorsement for a move towards establishing a programme of professional development. All of the lecturers felt very or fairly happy with the support they received from FIE. A hint of the reasons behind this thinking comes from the comment that 'why we choose to be part-time... part of it may be that we feel we are able to deal with professional development without too much monitoring, and certainly without lots of extra paperwork!' They might prefer pleasing the consumer to satisfying a complex bureaucracy. Moreover, only those who want to teach fee-paying US students will opt to teach for FIE. These may well be teachers who are more Willing to work in the context of market pressures, or are even eager for the challenge, if only because they are slightly better paid than they would be in the UK public sector.

Reflections on the research process

There is a major debate taking place in US higher education on the contrasting virtues or evils of institutional or market Validation mechanisms. The same debate can be seen taking place in the 1950's Soviet Union as imagined by Alexander Solzhenitsyn in his novel Cancer Ward.

"One way or the other, Ludochka, the doctor should depend on the impression ha| makes on his patients, he should be dependent on his popularity." To which the other responds "have you any idea what the pace of work is like at medical institution nowadays? It was different in your day. Just think how many patients there are for every doctor."

With the right kind of primary system," Oreshenkov countered, "there'd be fewer cases altogether, and no neglected ones. The primary doctor should have no more patients than his memory and personal knowledge can cover" (Solzhenitsyn, 2003: 256-7)

FIE operates in the private, not for profit sector of higher education. Its fee levels mean that students are given a high degree of attention and its teachers are, to some extent, judged by their popularity. However, as with private medicine there is the prob-lem that many people cannot afford this level of Service. And, moreover, there is the important difference that, unlike patients under treatment by doctors, students have the responsibility for learning with the assistance of their lecturers. The purpose of action research is not simply to find out information, but to make a difference in the workplace. As has been commented, it is 'exploratory in nature and involves seeking to better understand the participants, their learning and their context before formulat-ing a judgement as to whether improvement is even desirable or possible' (Matheson and Matheson, 2004: 184). There are certain economic factors which limit the degree to which the likes and dislikes of part-time teachers can influence educational policy. The overall background in the UK is not encouraging. In Further Education 15% of teachers were part-time in the mid 1980s, but 63% in 1996/7. The average pay was £16 per hour (Walker, 2000): 37-40, figs. 2, 5, and 7). A survey of the Learning and Skills sector found that part-timers made up 66% of teaching staff and that their average pay in 2002-3 was £18 per hour with no pay for preparation and that many part-time teachers expressed 'anger and frustration' (Hillier and Jameson, 2004: 1) Meanwhile, in higher education the Association for University Teachers has produced materials

campaigning for a better deal for part-time lecturers. Based on a calcula-tion of three hours preparation to one hour of contact time, and dividing the salaries of full-time lecturers at 37.5 hours per week x 44 weeks per year, the AUT calculated that at the base of the lecturer A pay spine the per hour equiva-lent was £36.74 and at the top of the Senior Lectureship, pay spine £82.18 (AUT, 2005: 12 and table F1). Part-time teaching staff at the Open University, Birkbeck and FIE are clearly being paid at the low end, if we accept such figures as these, compared to full-time university lecturers, even if their pay is distinctly higher than their further educa-tion colleagues. The same is the case in the USA and is made worse by a lack of un-ionisation (Morits, 1996 and Gappa and Leslie, 1993: 80). This is also the case in study abroad in London. The lack of security of employment tenure is a powerful incentive for faculty to toe the institutional Line. Whether this results in higher teaching quality or not would provide the basis for a very interesting, if ambitioned follow-up study.

Whilst I can have no influence on market forces, to return to my key objectives of this study I may well ask what constructive enhancements in teacher evaluation might be made in the context of current market pressures. A key issue appears to be the dis-semination of the results of this research to relevant stakeholders (teachers, admin-istrators, students) so as to continue discussion on education al a complex process which cannot be easily summed up by simple evaluation methods. The hope would be to begin to develop a stakeholder consensus in which teachers, students and manag-ers work together rather than push against each other in oppositional power blocks (Malory, 2001: 24). As been argued, the ‘greater involvement of stakeholders in decid-ing the scope and procedures of evaluations is more likely to be enlightening, empow-ering and conducive to effective change (Aczel, undated). Evaluation forms need to be developed through consultation with faculty so as to become of maximum use in the enhancement of their own teaching practice, whilst still providing a full and fair oppor-tunity for students to make their views clear. In the future, it may be possible to refine and extend the scope of this research so as to investigate the influence of ethnic, cul-tural, age and gender diversity on student and teacher perceptions of teaching quality.

Aczel, James, ‘Some issues in evaluation’, kn.open.ac.uk/workspace.cfm?wpid=1068, accessed 26/04/2006.
Ackers, Jim, ‘Evaluating UK courses: the perspective of the overseas Student’, in David McNamara and Robert Harris, eds., Overseas Students in Higher Education: Issues in Teaching and Learning (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 187-200.
Association of University Teachers, Part-Time not Part-Person: Getting the Best Deal for Pmli Time Staff. Information and Strategy Pack (London: AUT, 1995).
Avis, James, ‘Educational research: the teacher researcher and social justice’, Education an§ Social Justice 3 (2001), pp. 34-42.
Benson, Alexis, Michelle Hinn and Ciaire Lloyd, eds., Visions of Quality: How Evaluators Define Understand and Represent Program Quality, Advances in Program Evaluation 7 (Amsterdam IAI, 2001).
Birkbeck College, Sessional Lecturers’ Handbook 2005-6 (London: Birkbeck, 2005).
Bolen,, M.,Consumerism and U.S. study abroad’, Journal of Studies in International Education 5 (2001) pp. 182-200.
Calhoun, Emily, ‘Action research: three approaches’, Educational Leadership 51 (1993), pp. 62-65. Chan, B., An empirical study of the relationship between tutor’s personality and teaching effectiveness: implications for management of tutors in distance education’, in Proceedings of the Offshore 2000 Conference Education and Training in an E-Learning World Boom or Doom? (Canberra: Centre for the Enhancement of Learning, 2000), pp. 47-62.
Dixon, Kathryn and Shellyann Scott, ‘Professional development programs for international lecturers: perspectives and experiences related to teaching and learning’, 18th IDP Australian International Education Conference, 5th-8th October 2004,
www.cdesign.com.au/proceedings_aiec2004/papers%20(pdf)/wed%20%20Dixon%20&%20Scott.pdf, f» • ml 17.4.06
Dunstan, Paula, ‘Towards best practice in international education: staff training and development’, IDP Australian International Education Conference, 21-24 October 2003, www.idp.com/17aiecpapers/program/ wednesday/maninted4/DunstanWed1635_p.pdf, accessed 17.04.06
Gappa, Judith M. and David W. Leslie, The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 19931.
Garavan, Thomas N. and Ciaire Murphy, ‘The co-operative education process and organisational socialisation: a qualitative study of Student perceptions of its effectiveness’, Education + Training 43 (2001), PP. 281-302.
Herman, Deborah M. and Julie M. Schmid, eds., Cogs in the Classroom Factory: the Changing Identity Academic Labor (Westport: Praeger, 2003).
Hillier, Yvonne and Jill Jameson, A Rieh Contract? Or, the Ragged-Trousered Philanthropy of KfIme Staff in the Learning and Skills Sector (London: Learning and Skills Development Agency 2004).
Hofstede, Geert, ‘Business cultures’, in. ed. Fred E. Jant, Intercultural Communication: a Reader (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2004), pp. 8-12.
Malory, Linda, ‘Representing the truth about program quality or the truth about representing program quality’, in Benson, Hinn and Lloyd (2001), pp. 19-27.
Matheson. Catherine and David Matheson, ‘Research in professional practice’, in ed. A. Coles, in Post-Compulsory Education: Policy, Practise and Values (London: David Fulton, UM!’.!, |)p, 172-189.
Morits, Edward J., ‘Evaluation of the course and the adjunct’, in Virginia Biano-Mathis and Neal Chalfsky, eds., The Adjunct Faculty Handbook (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1996), pp. 186-206. Morley, Louise, Quality and Power in Higher Education (Maidenhead: Open University Pr 2003).
Naidoo, R., and I. Jamieson, ‘Knowledge in the marketplace: the global commodification of teaching and learning in higher education’, in eds., P. Ninnes and M. Hellsten, Internationalist Higher Education: Critical Explorations of Pedagogy and Policy (Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong, 2005), pp. 37-51.
Open University, Supporting Open Learners: Reader, 3rd ed. (Milton Keynes: Open Universlty 2002).
Page, Colin, Student Evaluation of Teaching: the American Experience (London: Society Higher Education Research, 1974).
Parker, Ian, Qualitative Psychology: Introducing Radical Research (Milton Keynes: Op| University Press, 2005).