· <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>		
		A
.* * .	~	
		»
·		
μ.		<u>.</u>
-		
, ,		
		• 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

۲, 4 Confusion about the validity and the effectiveness of SFTs will continue as long as the various distinct compo-

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'Apollonia, S., & Abrami, P. C. (1997). Navigating student ratings of a.

Ξ ^μ	
<u>,</u>	
• • •	
* •	
<u> </u>	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	,
· •	
۶	ł
r <u></u>	
• 2	
<u>}</u>	
	—
<u>i</u>	

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

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

i de la constante de	
1	
	I
	4
, y a	-
<u>.</u>	
t∙ ≱	
-	
•	
	~ · · · · ·
د	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<u> </u>	