· <u>c</u>	lion SEEQ surveys) provided clear support for the SEEQ factor structure on the basis of the total group and on	each factor) that could be represented by 4 higher order factors, prompting Marsh (1994a) to dub the authors as
<u> </u>		
		<b>A</b>
.* <b>*</b> .	~	
		»
·		
ι.		<u>.</u>
-		
, ,		
		<b>•</b> 11

- - -

-

\_

4





<u></u>	SETs. In two such studies, 16 background characteristics	learning, students' grades, and teaching effectiveness, so
¥		
ļ 		
•		
		, 1
<u>t</u>		
·		
-		
×		
*		
	-	
	dimensions but varied substantially depending on the	and related explanations of the expected-grade effect
2		
L		

## **Conclusions and Implications**

Cranton, P. A., & Hillgarten, W. (1981). The relationships between student ratings and instructor behavior: Implications for improving teaching. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 11, 73-81. d'Appliquée S. & Abrevi P. C. (1907). Nuclearing endeat ratings of

	Confusion about t	he validity and	the effectiveness of	teaching. Canadian Journ d'Apollonio S. & Abromi-	nal of Higher Education, 11, 73- P.C.(1997) Novigating student	-81. rotings of
12-		{				
1.						
	87 · · ·	(				
<b>X</b> . 1						
1 1						
•						
t						
L						
11						
8						
	<b>.</b>					
<u> </u>						
LE 1 1 100 100	<u> </u>					
^	<u> </u>					
e						
<u>-</u>	ę					, ,
	]. · · ·					
						L. L
<u>*</u>						
						e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
പ്പം -		-				

ing expected grades of individual students seem not to reflect grading leniency so that deductions based on Greenwald

Í

grading leniency would be negligible. For these reasons, we conclude that correcting for expected grades (instead of the intended torget, grading leniency) actually aliminates valid

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·