UNIVERSIDAD DE ESPECIALIDADES ESPÍRITU SANTO

FACULTAD DE ESTUDIOS INTERNACIONALES

CROSS ANALYSIS OF PROFESSOR – STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND THE LEVEL OF SINCERITY: A STATISTICAL APPROACH

TRABAJO DE TITULACIÓN QUE SE PRESENTA COMO REQUISITO PREVIO A OPTAR EL GRADO DE INGENIERO EN CIENCIAS EMPRESARIALES

NOMBRE DEL ESTUDIANTE:
STALIN DAVID TORO SARMIENTO

NOMBRE DEL TUTOR:
BILLY ROBERTO ANDRADE GARCÍA

SAMBORONDÓN, DICIEMBRE, 2018

Cross Analysis of Professor – Student Evaluations and the Level of Sincerity: a Statistical Approach

Stalin Toro Sarmiento, Universidad Espíritu Santo – Ecuador, storo@uees.edu.ec, Facultad de Estudios Internacionales – Edificio P, Universidad Espíritu Santo, Km. 2.5 Vía Puntilla Samborondón.

Abstract

In this article, the topic of Teacher Hetero-evaluation is addressed. The objective is to analyze whether the relationship of Teacher Hetero-evaluation is congruent with values and sincerity of students. This academic research is Descriptive and has been done through a Quantitative Approach. The following instruments are used: Hetero-evaluation, Student's grades, Number of Students, Number of Fails, Fail Rate, Time Period and Subjects, as well as a Values Test. A statistical approach was performed, which includes hypothesis testing, correlations, significant differences and dependency tests. Some of the results show that teacher Hetero-evaluations increase as Students grades increase as well. Moreover there is statistical evidence that explains how number of students failing a course affects negatively Teacher Evaluation Score. Results from Study of Values Test indicate that students register low scores of Religious Value and with a high degree of Economic Value. This evidence may be harmful for the development of transcendental values such as sincerity and honesty. Therefore Hetero-evaluation could be distorted due to fragility of students' personality.

Keywords: *Hetero-evaluation, quality education, sincerity, cross analysis, statistical analysis, personality, values.*

CROSS ANALYSIS OF PROFESSOR – STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND THE LEVEL OF SINCERITY: A STATISTICAL APPROACH

Introduction

Quality education is vital for societies. When individuals are exposed to quality education, they are able to improve and master their attributes and abilities so they can achieve their potential as human beings and professional citizens, capable to make a difference. The Ecuadorian Higher Education System affirms that the quality of higher education is constituted in a principle that consists in the constant and systematic search for excellence, relevance, optimal production, transmission of knowledge and development of thought through self-criticism, external criticism and permanent improvement. (Presidencia de la República, 2010).

In accordance with the source, it is believed that quality includes a deep and careful analysis of the different structures that constitute the Higher Education System, such as universities, faculties, careers, teachers, students, methodologies, evaluations, controls. (Cevallos, 2016). It is worthy to mention the words for education importance by Nobel Peace Prize winner, Malala Yousafzai (2013): "One child, one teacher, one pen and one book can change the world". Therefore it is important to point out that teachers are one of the fundamental pillars in Higher Education System, and that's why Government organizations such as CEAACES evaluates the qualities of the teaching staff, as well as the working conditions, and their respective contracts in which they specify their activities, which must contribute to the development of substantive activities of teaching, research and connection with society.

One of the tools applied to track teacher performance within the universities and polytechnic institutes is Integral Evaluation that is stipulated in

Article 64 of the "Reglamento de Carrera y Escalafón del Profesor e Investigador". At UEES and other institutions of the Higher Education, the Teacher Hetero-evaluation is applied to all academic staff which is one of the three components of the Integral Evaluation.

But Teacher Hetero-evaluation has had a controversial approach from the teacher's point of view. This evaluation has led to positive and negative consequences. Professor Andrade B., Statistics Teacher at UEES, affirms that when results and comments are good the dean takes advantage of these comments to motivate the teacher; when comments are bad, the dean has a meeting with the teacher to investigate what occurred, and gives guidelines to improve his/her performance; and when comments denote resentment, they are not taken into consideration.

At the same time it, is believed that these results can also be altered by other factors such as distorted values from students, degree of affectivity and breadth of knowledge. This is why the following question arises: Are college students sufficiently sincere to provide useful and reliable comments for the improvement of teacher's performance? Millman (1981) cited in Fernández, Mateo, & Muñiz (1996) believes that this is not the only relevant system of evaluation**;** however it is the one that currently enjoys a greater number of guarantees concerning the reliability and validity of the information collected. (Marsh, 1987)

It is significant to provide a tool to the directors of the institution, in order to carry out the respective adjustments (if necessary) in the context of the questions raised in the Hetero-evaluation. Directors of higher institutions will be

free to make decisions that improve the performance of teachers, and consequently obtaining better teaching techniques. Additionally, this research article serves to be replicated in different teachers of different faculties at UEES.

The general objective of this academic research is to analyze whether the relationship of Teacher Hetero-evaluation is congruent with values and sincerity of students. Thus, the following specific objectives have been established:

- To explore and find significant difference in the student's grades in different periods and subjects.
- To explore and find a significant difference in a Teacher Hetero-evaluations provided by students in different periods and subjects.
- To analyze the relationship between teacher-student and student-teacher evaluation.
- To analyze values test results per men and women students.

Literature Review

Quality Education

The Organic Law of Higher Education contemplates the Ecuadorian Higher Education as a strategic area where its main aims are oriented to the search for truth, the affirmation of identity, the cultural development and the mastery of scientific and technological knowledge, essential aspects derived from teaching, research and the connection with the community. These are priorities for the economic, social and cultural development of the country. Furthermore, Ecuadorian higher education must be relevant, and meet the terms of quality in order to help identifying and solving the problems of society, which means it has

to act with responsibility and assurance in the creation, development and transmission of knowledge in all fields. (Consejo Nacional de Evaluación y Acreditación de la Educación Superior del Ecuador, 2003)

Quality plays an important role, which implies that all the actors linked to higher education must act responsibly in the generation and consolidation of a self-regulating attitude, seeking that this does not become an individual project, but a permanent, participatory process for everyone, which can also be turned into a common practice. (Consejo Nacional de Evaluación y Acreditación de la Educación Superior del Ecuador, 2003)

But how is it possible to get a quality system? What does it really require? Nagoba and Mantri (2015) believe that: "the success of any education system depends on the quality of teachers, which, in turn, depends on the effective teaching / learning process." Quality teachers are characterized by numerous skills. It is evident they have to manage a broad understanding of a specific subject and be able to transmit the content to the level of student knowledge. They also must assure effective learning while maintaining control of the class, one of the most arduous tasks for a teacher.

Pushkar (2015) argues that even teacher's personality influences the quality of learning. A teacher must be friendly, sympathetic, self-assured, warm, approachable, cheerful, dedicated and motivated. As it is mentioned before, qualities of an excellent teacher are countless, but it is clear that teachers play a crucial role in quality education. They are responsible for forming professional citizens, capable of shaping their futures, and the future and destiny of a nation.



Figure 1. Teacher Quality and Impact

Source: Role of Teachers in Quality Enhancement in Higher Education

For this reason, the bodies in charge of the follow-up of higher education in Ecuador have established regulations to control teacher's performance. However, Torres (2011) points out, in one of her articles called "The model of teacher preparation that has not worked", that Higher Education Programs in Ecuador doesn't pay attention to real conditions off teaching, and instead it should focus on motivations, interests, concerns, knowledge, time and resources available for teaching. This can assure quality teachers. It's necessary to apply methodologies so that they start learning from themselves, to build on themselves.

The expert on education, Paulo Freire (1970), in one of his books affirms: "Leaders who do not act dialogically, but insist on imposing their decisions, do not organize the people--they manipulate them. They do not liberate, nor are they liberated: they oppress." Unquestionably, the Ecuadorian Government has established impositions in the Education System which has led to witness improvements such as the incentive for teachers to obtain a fourth level degree and keep improving their teaching techniques, but also there have been controversies in the admission to obtain education in a desired career. So new

questions arises: Is the Ecuadorian Education System really working in aims to acquire Quality Education? Are all type of regulations established being effective to offer a better teaching-learning process?

Educational Laws and Regulations

The Article 155 of The Organic Law of Higher Education (LOES, by its initials in Spanish), in regards to the evaluation of academic performance, mentions that:

"Higher Education Professors will be evaluated periodically in their academic performance. “The Reglamento de Carrera y Escalafón del Profesor e Investigador” of the Higher Education System will establish the evaluation criteria and the forms of student participation in the evaluation mentioned previously” (Presidencia de la República, 2010)

In effect, higher-level institutions are required to apply an Integral Evaluation to all academic staff. This is stipulated in Article 64 of the “Reglamento de Carrera y Escalafón del Profesor e Investigador”. It mentions as follows:

“The integral evaluation of performance will be applied to all the academic staff of higher education institutions, public and private, with the exception of the honorary academic staff. The integral evaluation of performance covers the teaching activities, research and administration or academic management” (Consejo de Educación Superior, 2014)

In addition, Article 355 of the Ecuadorian Constitution is taken into consideration, which states that:

"…Universities and polytechnic schools are recognized with the right to autonomy, exercised and understood in a solidary and responsible manner. This autonomy guarantees the exercise of academic freedom and the right to search for truth, without restrictions; government and self-management, in line with the principles of alternation, transparency and political rights; and the production of science, technology, culture and art." (Asamblea Constituyente, 2008)

Hetero-evaluation

With this in mind, one of the tools for evaluating teacher's performance is Teacher Hetero-evaluation, which is one of the three elements that are part of the Integral Evaluation for academic staff. Soleto and Vanga (2015) defined Hetero-evaluation as an external evaluation, which is materialized when each person, in correspondence with their results pattern, evaluates another. Similarly, according to Article 67 of the "Reglamento de Carrera y Escalafón del Profesor e Investigador", Hetero-evaluation is described as: "the evaluation made by students on the learning process taught by the academic staff" (Consejo de Educación Superior, 2014). But why is this type of evaluation so important to perform it?

Fernández, Mateo, & Muñiz (1996) state that Teacher Hetero-evaluation is useful to obtain both strengths and weaknesses in teachers' practices, thus they can understand what they need to polish to offer an improved teaching practice. Additionally, Gündüz and Fokoué argue that main goal of Hetero-evaluations is the extraction of knowledge; patterns and information, with the finality of providing useful feedback to help teachers apply better teaching techniques and

give students a richer and more effective learning experience (Gündüz & Fokoué, 2015)

In this research article, Teacher Hetero-evaluation is considered as an evaluation or "survey" that measures the degree of satisfaction of the students on the teacher's performance, work and performance. Since college students are the main actors of this evaluation, it is important that they do it with objectivity. According to Mr. Andrade's experience, this evaluation is altered by different factors, such as the lack of sincerity, resentment or affinity of the students with the teacher. Noriega, Bueno, Medina and Calderon (2018) explain that students usually evaluate teachers positively, placing him/her often in a group of overvalued or highly evaluated, so they strongly believe students have to evaluate fairly towards teachers.

With the purpose of fulfilling the aforementioned regulations, UEES has developed the following evaluation model which is proposed by Chickering & Gamson (1999), and covers good practices in higher education. This model evaluates behaviors and actions that allow associating them with teachers' excellent performance.

This hetero-evaluation includes 7 areas related to higher education, and also takes into account UEEScribe, a methodology that promotes a writing culture and learning excellence. The academic components and evaluation areas are specified as follows:

1) **About contact with students:** Teachers are seen as a motivational force. When teachers interact with students, they feel encouraged to keep

working hard and think carefully about their decisions and achievements. Number of questions: 2, Assessment of the area: 8%

2) **Cooperation in the learning process (between students)**: Team work helps to improve communication skills and problem solving. It motivates students to participate and get involved in multiple tasks. Number of questions: 2, Assessment of the area: 8%.
3) **Active learning:** It's about how students are encouraged to use different methods of "learning by doing". Students take on their responsibility to make it part of their daily life thorough experiences. Number of questions: 2, Assessment of the area: 16%
4) **Providing adequate feedback:** Students learns to evaluate their and others' performance and improve it, to self-monitor and move towards professional autonomy. (Multiprofessional Faculty Development). Number of questions: 3, Assessment of the area: 20%.
5) **Time dedicated to learning (task):** It refers to non-contact activities, so students take advantage of time to improve their learning outside classrooms. Number of questions: 2, Assessment of the area: 20%.
6) **Communication of high expectations:** If the expectations of the teaching-learning process are high and achievable, students will be able to improve their learning. When teachers expect more from students, it implies a better academic performance which requires a clear communication of what is expected during the course. Number of questions: 2, Assessment of the area: 10%

7) **Respect for different talents and ways of learning:** Every individual has his/her own way of learning. That's why it is important take advantage of different experiences and knowledge of every person. Students and teachers can take advantage of those differences, so that they can improve the learning process in a better way. Number of questions: 2, Valuation of the area 10%.
8) **UEES Methodology (UEEScribe):** UEEScribe is a strategy aimed to promote a culture of writing and academic excellence. Number of questions: 3, Value of the area 16%.

Valuation of the areas: The total number of questions is 18 and each one has four possible answers listed below:

Table 1

Hetero-evaluation weighing

Answers	**Weighing**
Always	1.00
Most of the Time	0.75
Least Part of the Time	0.25
Never	0.10

Teacher Hetero-evaluation is calculated as follows: the total per area obtained by the teacher is multiplied by the weight assigned to each area. This is an example of how a final score would look like if the teacher obtained the maximum scores in all the areas (UEES , 2014):

Table 2

Hetero-evaluation weighing by area

Area	Maximum Score	Weighing
1	2	0.08
2	2	0.08
3	2	0.16
4	3	0.20
5	2	0.12
6	2	0.10
7	2	0.10
8	3	0.16
	18	1

On a scale of 100, the teacher's grade would be calculated as follows:

$$X: Teacher's assessment\ over\ 100$$

$$C_1: Qualification\ obtained\ from\ the\ teacher\ in\ the\ hererovaluation\ on\ 1$$

$$C_2: Maximum\ rating\ that\ the\ teacher\ could\ have\ that\ is\ 1$$

$$X: \frac{C_1}{C_2} x\ 100$$

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values

This model proposed by Gordon W. Allport, Philip E. Vernon and Gardner Lindzey, is a psychological tool used to measure six types of values: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious. This method is constituted in the philosophy of educator Eduard Spranger (1882–1963) who proposed six types of personalities oriented to beliefs, ways of thinking and life patterns. (Saavedra). Each of these type of ideal personality is oriented towards a basic value: 1) Theoretical: truth; 2) Economic: usefulness; 3) Aesthetic: harmony and beauty; 4) Social: love for people; 5) Political: power and leadership; 6) Religious: unity or moral excellence. (Young, 1942)

Allport (1961) argues that personal philosophy of life related to values is a core feature of personality implying direction of motivation, future goals, and current choices. It is important to add that Allport selected numerous words that would define a person, and then he classified them into three levels: cardinal, central and secondary traits. He mentions that central traits are the building blocks of our personality. These are the basic elements that make up most of our behavior. (Allport, 1930) Clear examples are **honesty** and **kindness**.

Methodology

This academic article has been developed through a descriptive research since it collects quantifiable information which is used to perform a statistical analysis and to describe the characteristics of the population being studied. Based on the objectives of this research, a correlational research is carried out to measure how strong is the relationship between a dependent variable (Teacher Hetero-evaluation) with more than two independent variables. In this case, the independent variables to be analyzed are: Subjects, Grade Average, Period Time, Year, Number of fails and Fail Rate. Additionally, it is important to mention that the current article follows a quantitative approach since this article contains statistical, mathematical and numerical analysis of pre-existing data provided by Mr. Andrade and the Dean of the School of International Studies. This approach measures all impacts with quantities.

The database, which is seen in Appendix A, is made up of the records of Mr. Andrade's students' grades from Winter 2015 to Spring 2017 periods, these are classified by subjects. It also contains total scores of Teacher Hetero-

evaluation classified by subjects during the same period mentioned above. Students' grades were given by Professor Andrade, who has been in charge of collecting this information for the time mentioned previously. On the other hand, the hetero-evaluations scores are given by Dean Office of the School of International Studies. This data reflects the total average of the evaluation prescribed by the students towards Professor Andrade in each subject taught and during the specified period. The final scores of each evaluation is in terms of quantitative information.

Then a Study of Values Test, found in Appendix B, was performed to measure the different traits of six basic values that define the personality of students. This model was proposed by Gordon W. Allport, Philip E. Vernon and Gardner Lindzey. A convenience sampling was applied to carry out this test. That is, due to the convenient accessibility and proximity to the subjects; 36 students from two Mr Andrade's courses (Statistics II and Application in Quantitative Methods) took the test.

Population and Sample

For Cross Analysis Tests, this article used a population equal to all the subjects of Mr. Andrade and Sample = 41 records corresponding to the subjects taught from Winter 2015 to Spring I 2017. For Study of Values Test, the population used is equal to all the students in Mr. Andrade's classes, and a sample = 36 students corresponding to two different Mr. Andrade's subjects. The results of each individual are shown in Appendix C. The variables to be tested are described in table 3.

Table 3

Description of Variables

Variable	***Description***	***Units***	***Scale***
Hetero-evaluation	It consists of a person evaluating what another has done. In other words it's the assessment made by one person over another, in which questions are shown to measure their work, attitude, performance, among other characteristics. (Casanova, 1998) In this research article it is an evaluation performed by students towards teachers.	0 – 40	Scale
Subject	At UEES it is referred to the courses offered in the curriculum of every university career. Also it is defined as a department of knowledge or learning.(Merriam Webster Dictionary). In this academic research the subjects taken into consideration are: Calculus I, Calculus II, Project I, Projects II, Application in Quantitative Methods, Statistics I, Statistics II and Linear Algebra	---	Nominal
Grade Average	It's a number that represent the global academic grade of a course.	0 – 100	Scale
Number of fails	It's a number that represent the quantity of the students didn't pass the course.	students	Scale
Fail Rate	It's the percentage of students that didn't pass a course in a specific period.	%	Scale
Period	It refers to the period of time in which a specific subject was taught. The School of International Studies at UEES manage the following schedule of periods: • Winter: January – March • Spring I: March – April • Spring II: April – June • Summer: July – August • Fall I: August – October • Fall II: October – December	---	Nominal
Year	It's a period of 12 months, starting from January 1st and ending on the 31st December.	---	Ordinal

Statistical analysis to perform

It will be carried out descriptive statistics: hypothesis testing for two or more means, correlations, significant differences and dependency tests. It is expected that there are significant differences between the variables analyzed: Teacher - student - teacher evaluation. Likewise, a Values Test will be used to explore the degree students' sincerity when making the Teacher Hetero-evaluation.

Analysis of Results

Part 1: Final grades per subject, per time period and per year

Subject distribution

This research article have taken into account 41 Mr. Andrade courses which are distributed into 8 subjects taught from Winter 2015 to Spring I 2017. Next, Figure 2 shows the subjects distribution, where it can be seen that most of the subjects had similar proportions but Projects I with a few 4.9% of classes.



Figure 2. Subjects distribution from Winter 2015 to Spring I 2017.

Grades Average per subject

Descriptives

Grade Average

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	7	86,6343	2,77728	1,04971	84,0657	89,2028	82,76	91,56
CALCULUS I	4	72,0400	3,31935	1,65967	66,7582	77,3218	67,84	75,55
CALCULUS II	5	76,1720	6,68693	2,99048	67,8691	84,4749	64,95	80,78
EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS	2	89,8000	5,58614	3,95000	39,6105	139,9895	85,85	93,75
EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	4	86,4375	3,89658	1,94829	80,2372	92,6378	83,36	91,69
LINEAR ALGEBRA	6	78,4233	3,79343	1,54866	74,4424	82,4043	71,40	81,95
STATISTICS I	6	77,9483	5,28553	2,15781	72,4015	83,4952	69,53	83,67
STATISTICS II	7	81,7443	3,88123	1,46697	78,1547	85,3338	75,33	88,45
Total	41	80,7622	6,45615	1,00828	78,7244	82,8000	64,95	93,75

Figure 3. Descriptive Statistics of Grade Average between Subjects

Figure above shows that course with the highest Grade Average Mean (89.80) is Evaluation & Development of Projects, and the course with the lowest Grade Average Mean (72.04) is Calculus I. As it is shown in Figure 4, Tests of Normality for Grade Average by K-S test result (p-value=0.055) and Shapiro–Wilk test result (p-value=0.562), they both show that at 0.05 significance level the variable grade average is assumed to be normally distributed.

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Grade Average	,136	41	,055	,977	41	,562

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Figure 4. Test of Normality for Grade Average Variable

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Grade Average

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,929	7	33	,497

Figure 5. Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Grade Average

According to Levene's test p-value = 0.497 there is statistical evidence to assume homogeneous variances. Next the test of equality of means will be

performed to find if there is significant difference in the mean of Grades Averages between Subjects.

$$H_0: \mu_{Calculus\ I} = \mu_{Calculus\ II} = \mu_{Linear\ Algebra} = \mu_{Statistics\ I} = \mu_{Statistics\ II}$$

$$= \mu_{Projects\ I} = \mu_{Projects\ II} = \mu_{Aplication\ in\ Quantitative\ Methods}$$

$$H_1: At\ least\ one\ mean\ evaluation\ level\ is\ different.$$

According ANOVA test p-value < 0.001, the null hypothesis is rejected and therefore a significant difference does exist in the mean grades average between subjects. Then Tukey HSD Analysis is proceed since there are statistically differences between the groups as a whole.

ANOVA

Grade Average

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1030,307	7	147,187	7,625	,000
Within Groups	636,967	33	19,302		
Total	1667,274	40			

Figure 6. ANOVA Test for Grade Average between Subjects

Table 4

Multiple Comparisons for Grade Average between Subjects

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable:	Grade Average				
(I) SUBJECT			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tukey	APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	CALCULUS I	14,59429*	2,75371	,000
		CALCULUS II	10,46229*	2,57252	,006
		EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS	-3,16571	3,52256	,984
		EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	,19679	2,75371	1,000
		LINEAR ALGEBRA	8,21095*	2,44427	,037
		STATISTICS I	8,68595*	2,44427	,023
		STATISTICS II	4,89000	2,34837	,446
	CALCULUS I	CALCULUS II	-4,13200	2,94719	,850
		EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS	-17,76000*	3,80480	,001
		EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	-14,39750*	3,10661	,001
		LINEAR ALGEBRA	-6,38333	2,83593	,350
		STATISTICS I	-5,90833	2,83593	,446
		STATISTICS II	-9,70429*	2,75371	,025
	CALCULUS II	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS	-13,62800*	3,67579	,016
		EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	-10,26550*	2,94719	,027
		LINEAR ALGEBRA	-2,25133	2,66034	,989
		STATISTICS I	-1,77633	2,66034	,997
		STATISTICS II	-5,57229	2,57252	,397
	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	3,36250	3,80480	,986
		LINEAR ALGEBRA	11,37667	3,58720	,058
		STATISTICS I	11,85167*	3,58720	,042
		STATISTICS II	8,05571	3,52256	,330
	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	LINEAR ALGEBRA	8,01417	2,83593	,123
		STATISTICS I	8,48917	2,83593	,086
		STATISTICS II	4,69321	2,75371	,685
	LINEAR ALGEBRA	STATISTICS I	,47500	2,53653	1,000
		STATISTICS II	-3,32095	2,44427	,869
	STATISTICS I	STATISTICS II	-3,79595	2,44427	,773

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4 shows which groups differ from each other. It can be observed that there is statistically significant difference in the Grade Average between the students who took Application in Quantitative Methods and Calculus I (p=0.000) and Calculus II (p-value=0.006). However there are no differences between the groups that took Calculus I and Calculus II (p-value =0.850). Also, it is clear to appreciate that there is a significant difference in the Grade Average between the groups that took Calculus II and Evaluation & Development of Projects (p-value =0.16), and Evaluation & Development of Projects II (p-value =0.27). Nonetheless there is no significant difference between the groups that took Projects I and Projects II (p=0.986), as well as between the Linear Algebra and Statistics II subject (p-value =0.869).

Grades Average per period

Figure 7 shows that the Periods with the highest Means Grade Average are Spring I (82.7156) and Spring II (82.2780), on the other hand the period with the lowest Grade Average Mean is Summer (78.42).

Descriptives

Grade Average

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
FALL I	6	78,5050	8,47914	3,46160	69,6067	87,4033	64,95	85,85
FALL II	6	80,2767	6,27200	2,56053	73,6946	86,8587	73,58	91,56
SPRING I	9	82,7156	3,16123	1,05374	80,2856	85,1455	77,08	87,45
SPRING II	5	82,2780	9,67850	4,32835	70,2606	94,2954	69,53	93,75
SUMMER	6	78,4200	5,36826	2,19158	72,7864	84,0536	67,84	82,76
WINTER	9	81,3567	7,05748	2,35249	75,9318	86,7815	71,19	91,69
Total	41	80,7622	6,45615	1,00828	78,7244	82,8000	64,95	93,75

Figure 7. Descriptive Statistics of Grade Average between Periods

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Grade Average

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2,263	5	35	,070

Figure 8. Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Grade Average between Periods

ANOVA

Grade Average

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	113,909	5	22,782	,513	,764
Within Groups	1553,365	35	44,382		
Total	1667,274	40			

Figure 9. ANOVA Test for Grade Average between Periods

According Levene's test p-value = 0.070, there is statistical evidence to assumed homogeneous variances. Next the test of equality of means will be performed to find if there is significant difference in the mean of Grades Averages between Periods.

$$H_0: \mu_{Fall\ I} = \mu_{Fall\ II} = \mu_{Spring\ I} = \mu_{Spring\ II} = \mu_{Summer} = \mu_{Winter}$$

$$H_1: At\ least\ one\ mean\ evaluation\ level\ is\ different.$$

Additionally, ANOVA p-value = 0.764 indicates that there is no significant difference in the mean grades average between the periods in which they were taught.

Grades Average per year



Figure 10. Means Plot for Grade Average between years

ANOVA

Grade Average

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	62,699	2	31,349	,742	,483
Within Groups	1604,575	38	42,226		
Total	1667,274	40			

Figure 11. ANOVA Test for Grade Average between years

Figure 10 shows that year with the highest Grade Average Mean is 2017 (83.5667), which means that students have shown a better performance through time. It also shows that the year with lowest Mean Grade Average is 2016. According to ANOVA test p-value=0.483, the null hypothesis of no difference between the means fails to reject, therefore a significant difference doesn't exist in the mean grades average between years. It can be predicted that for the existence of a significant difference the range of years has must be broader.

Part 2: Teacher Hetero-Evaluation per Subject and per time period

Teacher Evaluation per Subject

Descriptives

Teacher evaluation

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	7	37,2057	1,77931	,67251	35,5601	38,8513	33,58	38,96
CALCULUS I	4	33,8900	3,13070	1,56535	28,9084	38,8716	30,99	38,14
CALCULUS II	5	33,9440	2,77335	1,24028	30,5004	37,3876	29,37	35,95
EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS	2	37,7200	1,42836	1,01000	24,8867	50,5533	36,71	38,73
EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	4	38,4250	1,67478	,83739	35,7600	41,0900	36,86	40,00
LINEAR ALGEBRA	6	35,9467	2,74325	1,11993	33,0678	38,8255	32,20	40,00
STATISTICS I	6	34,8717	2,64321	1,07908	32,0978	37,6455	32,15	39,44
STATISTICS II	7	36,1900	2,76839	1,04635	33,6297	38,7503	31,26	39,24
Total	41	35,9293	2,71306	,42371	35,0729	36,7856	29,37	40,00

Figure 12. Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Evaluation between Subjects



Figure 13. Means Plot for Teacher Evaluation between Subjects

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Teacher evaluation	,072	41	,200*	,965	41	,234

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Figure 14. Tests of Normality for Teacher Evaluation

Figure 12, Descriptive Statistics, shows that Evaluation & Development of Projects II has the highest score of Teacher Evaluation (38.42), on the other hand Calculus I and Calculus II register the lowest scores. Figure 13 exposes the aforementioned. Aditionally Tests of Normality for Teacher Evaluation (Figure 14) by K-S test result Test (p-value=0.200) and Shapiro–Wilk test (p-value=0.234), they both indicate the variable teacher evaluation is not statically significantly different from a normal distribution, so Teacher Hetero-evaluation is assumed to be normally distributed. Based on ANOVA test p-value= 0.092, there are no significant differences in the mean teacher evaluation between subjects.

ANOVA

Teacher evaluation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	86,263	7	12,323	1,954	,092
Within Groups	208,164	33	6,308		
Total	294,427	40			

Figure 15. ANOVA test for Teacher evaluation between Subjects

Teacher-evaluation per period

Descriptives

Teacher evaluation

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
FALL I	6	36,2217	2,91985	1,19202	33,1575	39,2859	31,26	40,00
FALL II	6	34,8033	2,40032	,97993	32,2843	37,3223	32,15	38,14
SPRING I	9	37,2167	2,20831	,73610	35,5192	38,9141	33,26	40,00
SPRING II	5	36,3360	2,87938	1,28770	32,7608	39,9112	32,45	38,96
SUMMER	6	34,6283	4,16361	1,69979	30,2589	38,9978	29,37	39,44
WINTER	9	35,8389	1,93798	,64599	34,3492	37,3286	32,21	39,09
Total	41	35,9293	2,71306	,42371	35,0729	36,7856	29,37	40,00

Figure 16. Descriptive Statistics of Teacher evaluation between periods

ANOVA

Teacher evaluation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	34,091	5	6,818	,917	,482
Within Groups	260,336	35	7,438		
Total	294,427	40			

Figure 17. ANOVA test for Teacher evaluation between periods

Based on Figure 16, Descriptive Statistics, teacher evaluation obtained better scores during Spring I (37.22), Spring II (36.34) and Fall I (36.22), meanwhile scores in Fall II (34.80) and Summer (34.63) are the lowest. Means Plot Figure 18 exposes the aforementioned and also it indicates that Winter has a relative positive score (35.84). According to ANOVA test (Figure 17) p-value = 0.482, there are no significant differences in the mean teacher evaluation between bimester periods.



Figure 18. Means Plot of Teacher evaluation between periods

Teacher Evaluation per year

Descriptives

Teacher evaluation

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
2015	16	35,3400	2,72186	,68047	33,8896	36,7904	30,99	39,44
2016	19	36,1647	3,02472	,69392	34,7069	37,6226	29,37	40,00
2017	6	36,7550	1,25842	,51375	35,4344	38,0756	35,55	38,57
Total	41	35,9293	2,71306	,42371	35,0729	36,7856	29,37	40,00

Figure 19. Descriptive Statistics of Teacher evaluation between years

ANOVA

Teacher evaluation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10,700	2	5,350	,717	,495
Within Groups	283,727	38	7,466		
Total	294,427	40			

Figure 20. ANOVA test for Teacher evaluation between years

Figure 19 shows that teacher evaluation has had a general improvement, where in 2015 had a mean of 35.34 and in 2017, 36.76, meaning that students have grade his teacher in a better perspective way, taking into consideration that instructor must fulfill the important points presented in the hetero-evaluation survey. However according to ANOVA test (Figure 20) p-value: 0.495, there are no significant differences in the teacher evaluation mean between years.

Fail Rate per Subject

Descriptives

Fail Rate

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	7	,0000	,00000	,00000	,0000	,0000	,00	,00
CALCULUS I	4	,2019	,14126	,07063	-,0229	,4267	,09	,41
CALCULUS II	5	,2276	,16714	,07475	,0201	,4351	,08	,50
EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS	2	,0000	,00000	,00000	,0000	,0000	,00	,00
EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	4	,0000	,00000	,00000	,0000	,0000	,00	,00
LINEAR ALGEBRA	6	,0931	,11186	,04566	-,0243	,2104	,00	,27
STATISTICS I	6	,1582	,15832	,06463	-,0079	,3244	,00	,41
STATISTICS II	7	,1007	,12303	,04650	-,0131	,2145	,00	,33
Total	41	,1014	,13452	,02101	,0590	,1439	,00	,50

Figure 21. Descriptive Statistics of Fail Rate between Subjects

Figure 21 shows that course with the highest Fail Rate Mean is Calculus II (0.23), on the other hand Application in Quantitative Methods (0.00), Evaluation & Development of Projects I (0.00) and Evaluation & Development of Projects II represent the lowest Fail Rate Mean. According to Normality Tests for Fail Rate Variable, the data isn't t normally distributed. It can be illustrated in Figure 22 by both significance values returned by the K-S test result (p-value=0.000) and Shapiro–Wilk test result (p-value=0.000).

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Fail Rate	,287	41	,000	,775	41	,000

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Figure 22. Tests of Normality for Fail Rate

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Fail Rate

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
3,584	7	33	,006

Figure 23. Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Fail Rate

According to Levene's test p-value = 0.006, indicates homogeneous variances are not assumed. Following the test of equality of means will be performed to find if there is significant difference in the Fail Rate Mean between Subjects.

$$H_0: \mu_{Calculus\ I} = \mu_{Calculus\ II} = \mu_{Linear\ Algebra} = \mu_{Statistics\ I} = \mu_{Statistics\ II}$$

$$= \mu_{Projects\ I} = \mu_{Projects\ II} = \mu_{Aplication\ in\ Quantitative\ Methods}$$

$$H_1: At\ least\ one\ mean\ evaluation\ level\ is\ different.$$

According ANOVA test p-value = 0.019, the null hypothesis of no difference is rejected, therefore a significant difference does exist in the mean fail rate between subjects. Then Tukey HSD Analysis is proceed since there are statistically differences between the groups as a whole

ANOVA

Fail Rate

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	,274	7	,039	2,864	,019
Within Groups	,450	33	,014		
Total	,724	40			

Figure 24. ANOVA Test for Fail Rate between Subjects

Table 5

Multiple Comparisons for Fail Rate between Subjects

	(I) SUBJECT	(J) SUBJECT	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tukey HSD	APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	CALCULUS I	-,20192	,07322	,141
		CALCULUS II	-,22761*	,06840	,040
		EVALUATION & DEV. OF PROJECTS	0,00000	,09366	1,000
		EVALUATION & DEV.OF PROJECTS II	0,00000	,07322	1,000
		LINEAR ALGEBRA	-,09306	,06499	,836
		STATISTICS I	-,15822	,06499	,259
		STATISTICS II	-,10068	,06244	,740
	CALCULUS I	CALCULUS II	-,02568	,07836	1,000
		EVALUATION & DEV.OF PROJECTS	,20192	,10116	,500
		EVALUATION & DEV.OF PROJECTS II	,20192	,08260	,254
		LINEAR ALGEBRA	,10887	,07540	,830
		STATISTICS I	,04370	,07540	,999
		STATISTICS II	,10124	,07322	,858
	CALCULUS II	EVALUATION & DEV.OF PROJECTS	,22761	,09773	,309
		EVALUATION & DEV.OF PROJECTS II	,22761	,07836	,104
		LINEAR ALGEBRA	,13455	,07073	,559
		STATISTICS I	,06938	,07073	,974
		STATISTICS II	,12693	,06840	,589
	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS	EVALUATION & DEV.OF PROJECTS II	0,00000	,10116	1,000
		LINEAR ALGEBRA	-,09306	,09538	,975
		STATISTICS I	-,15822	,09538	,712
		STATISTICS II	-,10068	,09366	,958
	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	LINEAR ALGEBRA	-,09306	,07540	,916
		STATISTICS I	-,15822	,07540	,437
		STATISTICS II	-,10068	,07322	,862
	LINEAR ALGEBRA	STATISTICS I	-,06517	,06744	,976
		STATISTICS II	-,00762	,06499	1,000
	STATISTICS I	STATISTICS II	,05754	,06499	,985

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 5 shows that there is only one group which differs from another. It can be observed that there is statistically significant difference in the Fail Rate

Mean between the students who fail in Application in Quantitative Methods and Calculus II (p-value=0.040). Based on the rest of the information, it can be verified that there are not significant differences between the subjects shown on the table.

Part 3. Cross Analysis Grades Average Vs Teacher Hetero-evaluation

Correlations

		Teacher evaluation	Fail Rate	Grade Average	# Students	# Fail	# Pass
Teacher evaluation	Pearson Correlation	1	-,495**	,462**	-,204	-,492**	-,014
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,001	,002	,202	,001	,932
	N	41	41	41	41	41	41
Fail Rate	Pearson Correlation		1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)						
	N		41				
Grade Average	Pearson Correlation		-,811**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000				
	N		41	41			
# Students	Pearson Correlation		,157	-,023	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,326	,884			
	N		41	41	41		
# Fail	Pearson Correlation		,904**	-,749**	,378*	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,015		
	N		41	41	41	41	
# Pass	Pearson Correlation		-,209	,289	,922**	-,011	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,190	,067	,000	,945	
	N		41	41	41	41	41

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Figure 25. Correlations between variables.

According to Figure 25, the variables Fail Rate, Grade Average and Number of Fails are highly correlated between them, for that reason a multiple linear regression Model cannot be performed. Therefore a simple regression analysis is preceded between Teacher evaluation and the three variables mentioned before, in order to explain individual changes over the dependent variable: teacher evaluation, as it is shown with the slope.



Figure 26. Scatter Plot of Teacher evaluation between variables

Teacher evaluation – Fail rate: The p-value=0.001 for correlation significant test gives evidence to conclude there is a significant correlation (r = -0.495), negative and moderate, between teacher evaluation and fail rate of students, meaning that greater the number of students who fail the courses, the less of the final score of teacher evaluation.

Teacher evaluation – Grade average: The p-value=0.002 for correlation significant test gives enough evidence to prove there is a significant correlation (r=0.462), positive and moderate, between teacher evaluation and grade average, meaning the greater the grade average of students in different subjects, greater the final score of teacher evaluation.

Teacher evaluation – Number of students: The p-value= 0.202 for correlation significant test gives no evidence for significant correlation between teacher evaluation and number of students. As it is shown on the figure, the correlation of teacher evaluation between the numbers of students reflects a negative and weak tendency, which means it's meaningless.

Table 6

Simple Linear Regression Analysis

SIMPLE LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

Model	R	R-square	Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error		
(Constant)	0,462	0,213	20,255	4,835	4,189	,000
Grade Average			,194	,060	3,252	**,002**
(Constant)	0,495	0,245	36,942	,469	78,772	,000
Fail Rate			-9,988	2,806	-3,560	**,001**
(Constant)	0,492	0,242	36,727	,437	84,092	,000
# Fail			-,564	,160	-3,527	**,001**

a. Dependent Variable: Teacher evaluation

Regression analysis for number of fails: According to Table 6, where Beta Coefficient for number of fails is -0.564, this means that for each student who fails the course, the teacher evaluation score will be reduced by almost half a point. Additionally, this variable as predictor explains 24% of teacher evaluation.

Regression analysis for fail rate: For every percentage point increase in the fail rate, the teacher evaluation score will be reduced by 10 points. The significance value for fail rate (0.001) indicates that this model is significant. It is also important to add that this variable explains 25% of teacher evaluation.

Regression analysis for grade average: Based on table 6, the Beta Coefficient for grade average is 0.194, meaning that for every point increase in the course grade average; the teacher evaluation will be increased in 0.2 points. Moreover grade average explains 21% of teacher evaluation.

As shown above, it is important to highlight that an increase in the grade average of the course would increase the Teacher Hetero-evaluation score, instead

an increase on the number of students who fail a course or on the fail rate would decrease the Teacher Hetero-evaluation score.

Part 4: Results of Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values



Figure 27. Results of Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values Test

Figure 27 shows that, on the religious value, the mean score for boys and girls were 36.69 and 31.96 respectively. Both are classified under a low score. On the contrary, the mean score for boys on the economic value was 50.74; for the girls 47.2. Both scores for economic value are considered high. The mean score for boys on the theoretical value was 43.13; for girls 36.77. On the aesthetic value, the mean score for boys and girls were 35.30 and 40.85 respectively. Additionally, the mean score for boys on the social value was 36.78; for the girls 41.31. On the political value, the mean score for boys and girls were 42.09 and 37.15 respectively. The scores of economic, aesthetic, social and political values, in both sexes fall under an average range. A high economic value in both sexes explains that individuals are characterized by dimensions of practical returns, efficiency, production, capitalism and maximizing gains. (Klassen, Pomeroy, & Hartman, 2009) A low religious value (also called regulatory value) in boys and girl,

describe that these individuals aren't driven to establish order, routine and structure (Klassen, Pomeroy, & Hartman, 2009)

Conclusions

It was shown that Calculus I is the subject with the lowest grade average; according to Mr. Andrade's experience, it is due to the degree of difficulty presented by the subject as it involves a lot of mathematical analysis. The relationship of the students' grades and the grades of the Hetero-evaluation is directly proportional, which means the higher the students' grades the higher the score of Hetero-evaluation. Another important aspect to mention is that for each student who fails the course, the teacher evaluation score will be reduced by almost half a point.

Some interesting results from descriptive analysis is that in Spring I, students tend to grade better their teacher, not to mention that students have a better performance in the same subject with a Mean Grade Average of 82.72. Additionally, Evaluation & Development of Projects II is the subject with the highest Mean Teacher Evaluation (38.42), meaning that students tend to grade better their teacher in that subject. By contrast, students tend to grad worst their teacher in Calculus I. This may affirm the suspicion that students show their resentment through hetero-evaluation since they have low grades in a specific subject, in this case Calculus I follows this trend.

Even though significant differences weren't found between Teacher Hetero-evaluation and other academic variables, this evaluation could be altered by the great empathy of the students with Mr. Andrade, their feelings towards the

teacher and above all by the lack of sincerity. Results on the Values Test deduces men and women have a low mean score on the religious value, and a high mean score on the economic value. This may explain that their morality has a nuance of fragility which cannot allow the development of transcendental values such as honesty, an essential dimension to have a healthier human coexistence. After taking into account these results, it is evident that students aren't sincere enough when evaluating a teacher; some of them think they don't do it with objectivity, and instead, sometimes they think they provide useless information.

One of the limitations this academic research faced was the limited number of samples. Therefore for future researches it is recommended to increase the number of samples in regards of Students grades and Hetero-evaluation scores so that results are more accurate. The same recommendation is for the number of individuals in taking the Values Test. It is hoped that this study will be replicated with other teachers of different faculties at UEES.

To conclude it, Hetero-evaluation and other type of evaluations, in which students and teachers are involved, should be modified in a way the instrument focuses on evaluating the development of personality. It should not be an evaluation of control, but a useful tool to develop values, leading to a better effective teaching-learning process. Likewise, it is more important to emphasize in the process, not in the results. Additionally, Hetero-evaluation should not be mandatory; instead students must be offered to take it in a voluntary manner. When it is imposed, it creates distortion on honesty and sincerity of individuals. Future research is encouraged to continue to find significant variables may have a greater impact on the superficiality of Hetero-evaluation.

References

Allport, G. (1930). Obtenido de https://webspace.ship.edu/cgboer/allportesp.html

Asamble Constituyente. (2008). *Constitución de la República del Ecuador.* Obtenido de https://www.oas.org/juridico/mla/sp/ecu/sp_ecu-int-text-const.pdf

Casanova, M. A. (1998). La evaluacion educativa: escuela basica. En M. A. Casanova, *La evaluacion educativa: escuela basica* (pág. 99). Madrid : La Muralla. Obtenido de http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=S1517-97022018000100461&script=sci_arttext&tlng=en#B8

Cevallos, C. E. (2016). CALIDAD DE LA EDUCACIÓN E ÍNDICES DE GESTIÓN EN RELACIÓN CON EL PRESUPUESTO DE. *Revista Científica de la Universidad de Cienfuegos*, 211.

Consejo de Educación Superior. (2014). *Reglamento de Carrera y Escalafón del Profesor.* Lexis. Obtenido de http://www.epn.edu.ec/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/3REGLAMENTOCARRERA1.pdf

Consejo Nacional de Evaluación y Acreditación de la Educación Superior del Ecuador. (2003). *La calidad en la Universidad Ecuatoriana.* Quito: UNESCO/IESALC. Obtenido de https://es.slideshare.net/liliancoello24/la-calidad-en-la-universidad-ecuatoriana-1

Fernández, J., Mateo, M. A., & Muñiz, J. (1996). Valoración por parte del profesorado de la evaluación docente realizada por los alumnos. *Psicothema, 8*(1), 167-172.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* . New York : The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc. .

Gündüz, N., & Fokoué, E. (09 de January de 2015). *Journal of Applied Statistics.* Recuperado el 13 de April de 2018, de Pattern Discovery in Students' Evaluations of Professors A Statistical Data Mining Approach: https://arxiv.org/pdf/1501.02263.pdf

Klassen, P. T., Pomeroy, L., & Hartman, R. S. (2009). *assessments 24x7*. Obtenido de https://www.assessments24x7.com/reports/ValuesManual.pdf

Marsh, H. W. (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational*(11), 253-288.

Merriam Webster Dictionary . (s.f.). *Merriam Webster* . Obtenido de https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/subject

Multiprofessional Faculty Development . (s.f.). *The Multiprofessional Faculty Development Unit*. Obtenido de https://faculty.londondeanery.ac.uk/e-learning/effective-feedback/why-is-feedback-important

Nagoba, B. S., & Mantri, S. B. (2015). Role of Teachers in Quality Enhancement in Higher Education. *Journal of Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences University, 4*(1), 177-182. Obtenido de https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282928863_Role_of_Teachers_in_Quality_Enhancement_in_Higher_Education

Noriega, J. Á., Bueno Castro, G., Medina Figueroa, F. L., & Calderón González, N. G. (2018). Modelo de autoevaluación y heteroevaluación de la práctica docente en Escuelas Normales. *Educação e Pesquisa, 44*, 1-19. Obtenido de https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s1678-4634201844170360

Presidencia de la República. (2010). *Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior*. Quito: Lexis. Obtenido de http://www.ces.gob.ec/index.php?option=com_phocadownload&view=category&id=11:ley-organica-de-educacion-superior&Itemid=137

Pushkar, P. (2015). Role of Teacher In Higher Education. *International Journal of Education and Information Studies*, *5*(1), 25-30.

Saavedra, M. E. (s.f.). *Scribd* . Obtenido de https://es.scribd.com/doc/71983173/VALORES-SEGUN-SPRANGER

Sotelo, A. F., & Vanga Arévalo, M. G. (2015). Proceso de autoevaluación, coevaluación y heteroevaluación para caracterizar el comportamiento estudiantil y mejorar su desempeño. *Revista San Gregorio, 1*(9), 6-15. Obtenido de http://revista.sangregorio.edu.ec/index.php/REVISTASANGREGORIO/article/view/52

The Guardian . (12 de July de 2013). *The Guardian* . Obtenido de https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/jul/12/malala-yousafzai-united-nations-education-speech-text

Torres, R. M. (2011). *Otra Education Blogspot* . Obtenido de https://otra-educacion.blogspot.com/2011/02/el-modelo-de-preparacion-docente-que-no.html

UEES . (2014, September 4). Retrieved from https://es.slideshare.net/uees_ec/instructivos-y-formularios-de-evaluaciones-a-docentes

Young, A. W. (1942). A study of the dominance of six basic motives in personality as set forth by Eduard Spranger in his book, "Types of Men". *ETD Collection for AUC Robert W. Woodruff Library.*(404). Obtenido de http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/dissertations/?utm_source=digitalcommons.auctr.edu%2Fdissertations%2F404&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages

Annexes

Appendix A

Data of Hetero-evaluation and Students' grades

YEAR	PERIOD	SUBJECT	GRADE AVERAGE	#STUDENTS	GRADE STD EVA	#FAILS	#PASS	FAIL RATE	HETERO-EVALUATION
2015	WINTER	CALCULUS II	80,13	8	11,22	2	6	25%	35,75
2015	WINTER	STATISTICS I	81,24	17	10,21	3	14	18%	34,52
2015	WINTER	STATISTICS II	88,45	11	6,17	0	11	0%	39,09
2015	SPRING I	STATISTICS II	82	15	17,55	2	13	13%	35,22
2015	SPRING I	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	83,36	11	5,42	0	11	0%	37,1
2015	SPRING II	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS	93,75	20	2,97	0	20	0%	38,73
2015	SPRING II	APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	85	29	6,13	0	29	0%	37,32
2015	SUMMER I	CALCULUS I	67,84	22	20,30	9	13	41%	30,99
2015	SUMMER I	STATISTICS I	79	6	6,10	0	6	0%	39,44
2015	SUMMER I	APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	82,76	19	7,44	0	19	0%	33,58
2015	FALL I	LINEAR ALGEBRA	71,4	15	19,65	4	11	27%	36,08
2015	FALL I	CALCULUS II	64,95	20	15,63	10	10	50%	35,39
2015	FALL I	STATISTICS II	80,21	24	13,88	4	20	17%	31,26
2015	FALL II	STATISTICS I	80,5	18	9,71	2	16	11%	32,15
2015	FALL II	LINEAR ALGEBRA	80,38	4	3,57	0	4	0%	32,2
2015	FALL II	APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	91,56	9	4,65	0	9	0%	36,62
2016	WINTER	CALCULUS I	71,19	13	18	2	11	15%	32,21
2016	WIINTER	STATISTICS I	73,75	4	15,11	1	3	25%	34,99
2016	WINTER	APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE RESERCH METHODS	87,09	17	6,35	0	17	0%	37,5
2016	SPRING I	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	87,1	10	8,46	0	10	0%	39,74
2016	SPRING I	LINEAR ALGEBRA	77,08	6	18,41	1	5	17%	40
2016	SPRING I	CALCULUS II	80,78	9	7,39	1	8	11%	33,26
2016	SPRING I	STATISTICS II	83,08	12	7,98	0	12	0%	37,59
2016	SPRING II	CALCULUS I	75,55	11	10,44	1	10	9%	34,22
2016	SPRING II	STATISTICS I	69,53	17	10,19	7	10	41%	32,45
2016	SPRING II	APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	87,56	20	8,3	0	20	0%	38,96
2016	SUMMER	LINEAR ALGEBRA	79,42	6	9,35	0	6	0%	35,15
2016	SUMMER	CALCULUS II	80	10	7,63	2	8	20%	29,37
2016	SUMMER	STATISTICS II	81,5	3	9,26	0	3	0%	39,24
2016	FALL I	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS I	85,85	10	8,5	0	10	0%	36,71

CROSS ANALYSIS OF PROFESSOR – STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND THE LEVEL OF SINCERITY: A STATISTICAL APPROACH

2016	FALL I	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	83,6	5	7,03	0	5	0%	40
2016	FALL I	APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	85,02	22	6,77	0	22	0%	37,89
2016	FALL II	LINEAR ALGEBRA	80,31	8	13,34	1	7	13%	34,33
2016	FALL II	CALCULUS I	73,58	13	13,23	2	11	15%	38,14
2016	FALL II	STATISTICS II	75,33	6	16,6	2	4	33%	35,38
2017	WINTER	EVALUATION & DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS II	91,69	8	4,38	0	8	0%	36,86
2017	WINTER	CALCULUS II	75	13	7	1	12	8%	35,95
2017	WINTER	STATISTICS I	83,67	15	7,98	0	15	0%	35,68
2017	SPRING I	LINEAR ALGEBRA	81,95	10	8,12	0	10	0%	37,92
2017	SPRING I	STATISTICS II	81,64	14	10,14	1	13	7%	35,55
2017	SPRING I	APPLICATION IN QUANTITATIVE METHODS	87,45	11	4,66	0	11	0%	38,57

Appendix B

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values





PARTE I

INSTRUCCIONES: A continuación se presentan varias afirmaciones o preguntas con dos respuestas alternativas. Indique sus preferencias personales anotando los números apropiados dentro de las casillas a la derecha de cada pregunta. Algunas de las alternativas le pueden parecer igualmente atractivas o desagradables. Sin embargo, escoja siempre una de ellas aunque sólo le parezca relativamente más aceptable que la otra. En cada pregunta, usted tiene 3 puntos que puede distribuir en cualquiera de las siguientes combinaciones:

- Si está de acuerdo con la alternativa (a) y en desacuerdo con la (b), escriba 3 en la primera casilla y 0 en la segunda, así:
- Si está de acuerdo con la (b) y en desacuerdo con la (a), escriba:
- Si tiene una ligera preferencia por la (a) en lugar de la (b), anote:
- Si tiene una leve preferencia por la (b) en lugar de la (a), escriba:

No escriba ninguna combinación de números que no sea alguna de estas cuatro. No hay límite de tiempo, pero no se demore demasiado en cualquier pregunta o afirmación. No deje sin responder ninguna de las preguntas, a menos que realmente le sea imposible tomar una decisión.

PASE A LA SIGUIENTE PÁGINA.

CROSS ANALYSIS OF PROFESSOR – STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND THE LEVEL OF SINCERITY: A STATISTICAL APPROACH





CROSS ANALYSIS OF PROFESSOR – STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND THE LEVEL OF SINCERITY: A STATISTICAL APPROACH

17. La meta de las Iglesias en la actualidad debería ser: (a) hacer surgir las tendencias altruistas y caritativas; (b) alentar la devoción espiritual y un sentido de comunión con el Altísimo.

18. Si tuviera que pasar cierto tiempo en una sala de espera y sólo hubiera dos tipos de revistas a elegir, ¿preferiría (a) "Era Científica"; (b) "Arte y Decoración"?

19. ¿Preferiría escuchar una serie de conferencias sobre: (a) la comparación de méritos de los sistemas de gobierno de España y nuestro país; (b) la comparación del desarrollo de las grandes creencias religiosas?

20. ¿Cuál de las siguientes funciones de la educación formal le parece la más importante? (a) la preparación que da para logros prácticos y recompensas económicas; (b) la preparación que brinda para una participación en actividades comunitarias y auxilio de personas menos afortunadas.

21. ¿Está más interesado en leer narraciones sobre la vida y obra de hombres como: (a) Alejandro el Grande, Julio César y Carlomagno; (b) Aristóteles, Sócrates y Kant?

22. ¿Los avances industriales y científicos modernos son señal de un mayor grado de civilización que los logrados por cualquier sociedad de tiempos anteriores, por ejemplo, los griegos? (a) sí; (b) no.

23. Si trabajara en una organización industrial (y suponiendo que los salarios fueran iguales), ¿usted preferiría: (a) ser consejero de los empleados; (b) tener un puesto administrativo?



24. Si tuviera que elegir entre la lectura de dos libros, ¿sería más probable que usted seleccionara: (a) "Historia de la religión en nuestro país"; (b) Historia del desarrollo industrial en nuestro país"?

25. La sociedad moderna se beneficiaría más de: (a) una mayor preocupación por los derechos y bienestar de los ciudadanos; (b) un mayor conocimiento de las leyes fundamentales de la conducta humana.

26. Suponga que está en posición de ayudar a elevar la calidad de vida o moldear la opinión pública, ¿preferiría influir en: (a) la calidad de vida; (b) la opinión pública?

27. ¿Preferiría escuchar una serie de conferencias populares sobre: (a) el progreso de los trabajos de servicio social en la ciudad donde usted reside; (b) pintores contemporáneos?

28. Toda la evidencia que se ha acumulado de manera imparcial, muestra que el universo ha evolucionado hasta su estado actual de acuerdo con leyes naturales, de modo que no hay necesidad para suponer que detrás de ello existe una causa primera, propósito cósmico o divinidad. (a) estoy de acuerdo con esta afirmación; (b) estoy en desacuerdo.

29. En un periódico dominical, ¿es más probable que usted lea: (a) las secciones sobre compra y venta de casas y el informe de la Bolsa de Valores; (b) la sección sobre galerías y exhibiciones de arte?

30. ¿Qué considera más importante en el desarrollo de la educación de sus hijos: (a) la religión; (b) la educación física?



CROSS ANALYSIS OF PROFESSOR – STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND THE LEVEL OF SINCERITY: A STATISTICAL APPROACH

PARTE II

INSTRUCCIONES: A cada una de las siguientes situaciones o preguntas le siguen cuatro actitudes o respuestas posibles. Clasifique estas respuestas en el orden de su preferencia personal anotando en la casilla apropiada a la derecha, una puntuación de 4, 3, 2 o 1. A la afirmación que más prefiera asígnele un 4, a la que le parezca más atractiva en segundo lugar asígnele un 3, y así sucesivamente.

Ejemplo: Si aquí hubiera una pregunta y las siguientes afirmaciones fueran alternativas para clasificarlas en orden de preferencia, usted colocaría un:

– 4 en la casilla, si esta afirmación le pareciera la más atractiva;

– 3 en la casilla, si esta afirmación le despertara interés en segundo lugar;

– 2 en la casilla, si esta afirmación le atrajera en tercer lugar;

– 1 en la casilla, si esta afirmación es la que representa su menor interés o preferencia.



Es posible que se le ocurran respuestas que desde su punto de vista serían preferibles a aquellas que se le presentan; sin embargo, es necesario que seleccione entre tales alternativas y clasifique las cuatro en el orden de su preferencia, aunque a veces le sea difícil tomar una decisión. Si le es realmente imposible expresar su preferencia, puede omitir la pregunta. Asegúrese de asignar sólo **un 4, un 3**, etc., para cada pregunta.

PASE A LA SIGUIENTE PÁGINA.

1. ¿Considera usted que un buen gobierno debería tener por meta principal: (**Recuerde asignar un 4 a su primera preferencia, 3 a la segunda,** etc.)
   a. brindar mayor ayuda para los pobres, enfermos y ancianos;
   b. el desarrollo de la industria y el comercio;
   c. la introducción de principios éticos elevados en sus políticas y diplomacia;
   d. el establecimiento del país en una posición de prestigio y respeto en relación con otras naciones?

2. En su opinión, un hombre de negocios que trabaja toda la semana, pasaría mejor el domingo:
   a. elevando su nivel cultural con la lectura de libros serios;
   b. tratando de ganar en el golf o las carreras;
   c. asistiendo a un concierto sinfónico;
   d. concurriendo a escuchar un sermón en verdad trascendente.

3. Si pudiera influir en los programas educativos de las escuelas públicas de la ciudad donde vive, usted intentaría:
   a. promover el estudio y la participación en las bellas artes;
   b. estimular el estudio de los problemas sociales;
   c. proporcionar más instalaciones y aparatos para los laboratorios;
   d. aumentar el valor práctico de los cursos que se imparten.

4. En amigos de su propio sexo, prefiere usted a uno que:
   a. sea eficiente, trabajador y de mentalidad práctica;
   b. se interese de manera seria en pensar acerca de sus actitudes ante la vida;
   c. posea cualidades de liderazgo y capacidad de organización;
   d. muestre sensibilidad artística y emocional.

5. Si viviera en un pueblo pequeño y tuviera un ingreso mayor a lo que requieren sus necesidades, ¿preferiría
   a. aplicar este dinero de manera productiva para ayudar al progreso comercial e industrial;
   b. ayudar al desarrollo de las actividades de grupos religiosos locales;
   c. cederlo para el desarrollo de la investigación científica en su comunidad;
   d. donarlo a una sociedad de fomento para el bienestar familiar?

6. Cuando usted va al teatro, por lo general gusta más de:
   a. obras que tratan sobre la vida de grandes hombres;
   b. ballet o espectáculos similares;
   c. obras que tienen por tema el sufrimiento y el amor humanos;
   d. obras polémicas que se proponen demostrar algún punto de vista.



CROSS ANALYSIS OF PROFESSOR – STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND THE LEVEL OF SINCERITY: A STATISTICAL APPROACH



7. Suponiendo que usted estuviera capacitado para ello, y que el salario para las siguientes ocupaciones fuera el mismo, ¿preferiría ser:
   a. matemático(a);
   b. gerente de ventas;
   c. religioso(a);
   d. político(a).

8. Si tuviera suficiente dinero y tiempo, ¿preferiría
   a. formar una colección de esculturas y pinturas originales;
   b. establecer un centro para el cuidado y capacitación para personas con retraso mental;
   c. aspirar al Senado o a un puesto en el gabinete;
   d. establecer un negocio o empresa financiera de su propiedad?

9. En una plática vespertina con amigos íntimos de su propio sexo, usted se muestra más interesado cuando se habla sobre:
   a. el significado de la vida;
   b. los avances en la ciencia;
   c. literatura;
   d. socialismo y mejoramiento social.

10. ¿Cuál de las siguientes actividades preferiría realizar durante parte de sus siguientes vacaciones (si su capacidad y otras condiciones lo permitieran)?:
   a. escribir y publicar un ensayo o artículo original sobre biología;
   b. permanecer en algún sitio apartado del país donde pueda apreciar los bellos paisajes;
   c. inscribirse en un torneo local de tenis u otro deporte;
   d. adquirir experiencia en algún nuevo rubro de los negocios.

11. Las grandes hazañas y exploraciones de descubrimiento, como las de Colón, Magallanes, Byrd y Marco Polo, le parecen significativas porque:
   a. representan las conquistas del hombre sobre las fuerzas de la naturaleza;
   b. aumentan nuestro conocimiento sobre geografía, meteorología, oceanografía, etc.;
   c. son lazos de unión entre los intereses y sentimientos de todas las naciones.
   d. cada una de ellas contribuye un poco a la comprensión última del universo.

TOTAL

R S T X Y Z

9

12. Debería uno guiar su propia conducta de conformidad con, o brindar su mayor lealtad hacia:
   a. la propia creencia religiosa;
   b. los ideales de belleza que uno tenga;
   c. la propia organización laboral y nuestros compañeros de trabajo;
   d. los ideales de caridad que tengamos.

13. ¿Hasta qué punto admira usted a las siguientes personas famosas?:
   a. La fundadora de la Cruz Roja, Florence Nightingale;
   b. Napoleón;
   c. Henry Ford;
   d. Galileo.

14. Al elegir esposa, usted preferiría una mujer que: (Si usted es **mujer** responda a la pregunta **14A**)
   a. pueda lograr el prestigio social y se gane la admiración de los demás;
   b. guste de ayudar a las personas;
   c. sea fundamentalmente espiritual en sus actitudes hacia la vida;
   d. tenga dotes artísticas.

14A. (*Para* **mujeres**) Preferiría un esposo que:
   a. sea exitoso en su profesión y se gane la admiración de los demás;
   b. guste de ayudar a las personas;
   c. sea fundamentalmente espiritual en sus actitudes hacia la vida;
   d. tenga dotes artísticas.

15. Al ver el cuadro de Leonardo da Vinci, "La Última Cena", usted tiende a considerarlo como:
   a. una expresión de las más altas aspiraciones y sentimientos espirituales;
   b. uno de los cuadros más valiosos e irremplazables que se hayan pintado jamás;
   c. un testimonio de la versatilidad de Leonardo y de su lugar en la historia;
   d. la quintaesencia de la armonía y la composición.

FIN DE LA PRUEBA

TOTAL

R S T X Y Z

10

CROSS ANALYSIS OF PROFESSOR – STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND THE LEVEL OF SINCERITY: A STATISTICAL APPROACH

HOJA DE PUNTUACIONES
Estudio de Valores

INSTRUCCIONES:

1. Primero asegúrese de que se hayan respondido todas las preguntas.
   Nota: Si le ha sido imposible responder a todas las preguntas, puede dar puntuaciones iguales a las contestaciones alternativas de cada pregunta omitida de la siguiente manera:
   Parte I. 1½ puntos para cada alternativa. La suma de las puntuaciones para (a) y (b) siempre debe ser igual a 3.
   Parte II. 2½ puntos para cada alternativa. La suma de las puntuaciones para las cuatro alternativas bajo cada pregunta debe ser siempre igual a 10.
2. Sume las puntuaciones de las columnas en cada página y anote el total en las casillas al final de la misma.
3. Transcriba los totales de cada una de las páginas precedentes a las columnas que se encuentran en el cuadro 1. Para cada página anote el total de cada columna (R, S, T, etc.) en el espacio que tenga la misma letra. **Observe que el orden en que se insertan las letras en las columnas del cuadro 1 es diferente en cada página.**

CUADRO 1.

Totales en cada página	Teórico	Económico	Estético	Social	Político	Religioso	La suma de las puntuaciones para cada hilera debe ser igual a la cifra que se proporciona en esta columna
Parte I Página 2	(R)	(S)	(T)	(X)	(Y)	(Z)	24
Página 3	(Z)	(Y)	(X)	(T)	(S)	(R)	24
Página 4	(X)	(R)	(Z)	(S)	(T)	(Y)	21
Página 5	(S)	(X)	(Y)	(R)	(Z)	(T)	21
Parte II Página 8	(Y)	(T)	(S)	(Z)	(R)	(X)	60
Página 9	(T)	(Z)	(R)	(Y)	(X)	(S)	50
Página 10	(R)	(S)	(T)	(X)	(Y)	(Z)	40
Total							240
Cifras de corrección							
Total final							240

4. Sume los totales de las seis columnas. Sume o reste las cifras de corrección según se indica en el cuadro.
5. Verifique sus cómputos asegurándose de que la puntuación total de las seis columnas sea igual a 240. (Si lo desea, utilice los márgenes para sus sumas.)
6. Señale las puntuaciones marcándolas con puntos en las líneas verticales del cuadro 2. Una con líneas rectas los seis puntos para obtener el perfil gráfico de sus valores.

* En la edición de 1951, estas cifras fueron: **Teórico +3, Social –3.**

CUADRO 2. PERFIL DE VALORES

Nombre _____ FECHA _____
Apellidos Nombre(s) SEXO (M o F) _____

PERFIL DE VALORES



Perfil masculino promedio_____Perfil femenino promedio_____

INTERPRETACIÓN

Es mejor interpretar el perfil comparando las puntuaciones obtenidas con los siguientes rangos. (Las normas detalladas para estudiantes universitarios y para ciertas ocupaciones se podrán encontrar en el Manual del **Estudio de Valores**.)

Varones

Puntuaciones altas y bajas. La puntuación en alguno de los valores se puede considerar alta o baja si queda fuera de los siguientes límites. Estas puntuaciones superan el rango de 50% de todas las puntuaciones **masculinas** en ese valor.

Teórico	**39-49**	**Social**	**32-42**
Económico	**37-48**	**Político**	**38-47**
Estético	**29-42**	**Religioso**	**32-44**

Puntuaciones muy altas y muy bajas. La puntuación en alguno de los valores se puede considerar sumamente distintiva si es mayor o menor a los siguientes límites. Estas puntuaciones quedan fuera del rango de 82% de todas las puntuaciones **masculinas** para ese valor.

Teórico	**34-54**	**Social**	**28-47**
Económico	**32-53**	**Político**	**34-52**
Estético	**24-47**	**Religioso**	**26-51**

Mujeres

Puntuaciones altas y bajas. La puntuación en alguno de los valores se puede considerar alta o baja si queda fuera de los siguientes límites. Estas puntuaciones superan el rango de 50% de todas las puntuaciones **femeninas** en ese valor.

Teórico	**31-41**	**Social**	**37-47**
Económico	**33-43**	**Político**	**34-42**
Estético	**37-48**	**Religioso**	**37-50**

Puntuaciones muy altas y muy bajas: La puntuación en alguno de los valores se puede considerar sumamente distintiva si es superior o inferior a los siguientes límites. Tales puntuaciones se colocan fuera del rango de 82% de todas las puntuaciones **femeninas** para ese valor.

Teórico	**26-45**	**Social**	**33-51**
Económico	**28-48**	**Político**	**29-46**
Estético	**31-54**	**Religioso**	**31-56**

Appendix C

Study of Values Test Results

INDIVIDUAL	SEX	THEORETICAL	ECONOMIC	AESTHETIC	SOCIAL	POLITICAL	RELIGIOUS	TOTAL
1	M	37	44	41	42	39	37	240
2	M	37	55	38	37	31	42	240
3	F	38	54	38	43	39	28	240
4	M	46	42	39	45	37	31	240
5	F	34	45	45	50	28	38	240
6	F	37	48	43	37	41	34	240
7	M	38	55	33	42	52	20	240
8	M	48	52	46	24	44	26	240
9	M	31	56	31	38	54	30	240
10	F	48	45	33	46	32	36	240
11	F	41	47	38	39	47	28	240
12	F	34	42	52	42	34	36	240
13	F	49	40	38	49	25	39	240
14	M	47	46	30	39	37	41	240
15	M	48	53	29	32	46	32	240
16	M	52	59	24	30	50	25	240
17	M	53	59	36	35	39	18	240
18	M	42	48	28	41	50	31	240
19	F	32	48	42	41	37	40	240
20	F	33	58	35	40	46	28	240
21	F	25	40	36	45	41	53	240
22	M	38	56	33	35	46	32	240
23	M	32	44	47	33	42	42	240
24	M	50	50	43	34	41	22	240
25	M	33	49	44	31	38	45	240
26	F	33	53	39	39	42	34	240
27	F	37	49	44	35	30	45	240
28	M	44	53	31	41	42	29	240
29	M	45	50	38	26	46	35	240
30	M	45	47	25	45	38	40	240
31	M	49	42	39	38	42	30	240
32	M	44	47	29	50	36	34	240
33	M	47	51	32	40	43	27	240
34	F	37	45	48	31	41	38	240
35	M	39	51	45	38	33	34	240
36	M	47	58	31	30	42	32	240