Talenta : Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Pendidikan 01 (01) (2026) : 47-62
Available online at https://ejournal.unuja.ac.id/index.php/Talenta/index

PERCEPTION OF STUDENTS ON TEACHING QUALITY: A STUDY OF STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING IN ISLAMIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Nurur Rifqotul Maulidah[1](✉)
[1]Graduate Program Nurul Jadid University, Probolinggo, Indonesia

Article History:
Received: Agustus 2026
Revised: September 2026
Accepted: Oktober 20226

Keywords:
Student Evaluation of Teaching, Teaching Quality, Student Perception,

(✉)**Correspondence to:**
rifqotulmaulidah@gmail.com

Abstract: Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) is a critical tool for ensuring quality in higher education, yet its validity and comprehensiveness remain debated. SET results do not always capture students' nuanced perspectives due to factors such as ambiguous evaluation forms, varying interpretations of questions, and influence of non-academic factors. This research aims to reveal students' positive and negative perceptions of teaching quality through qualitative exploration of SET dimensions at an Islamic university. Employing a descriptive qualitative approach, this study involved eight students from the Department of Elementary School Teacher Education at Nurul Jadid University, selected purposively based on active status, completion of courses with five selected lecturers varying in gender and teaching experience (>5 to >20 years), and willingness to participate. Data were collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews focusing on eight SET criteria (class organization, course materials, teaching methods, student interaction, feedback, learning media, library and supporting resources, and satisfaction level) and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) conducted over several months, with recordings transcribed verbatim. Data analysis used thematic analysis with validity ensured through check and recheck, researcher diligence, time triangulation, researcher triangulation, and member confirmation. Findings indicate variations in positive and negative perceptions across criteria: positive perceptions arise when lecturers explain learning objectives and course contracts clearly, master materials with direct demonstrations and analogies, act as facilitators with enthusiastic and varied methods, respond well and engage in active discussions, provide constructive feedback and analogies, utilize complete LMS features and diverse media, and provide accessible supporting references. Negative perceptions emerge from unpunctuality, unilateral course contracts, rigid teaching, lack of explanation, monotonous teacher-centered methods, passive interaction, absence of feedback, incomplete LMS materials, and lack of references. Seven key criteria related to student satisfaction were identified spanning offline and online learning environments. Overall, perceptions were consistent with lecturers' expertise but highlighted need for more interactive, transparent, and student-centered approaches. This study contributes novelty by qualitatively unpacking SET dimensions in Islamic higher education context, revealing implicit perceptions behind explicit scores, and developing more effective evaluation instruments. Implications point to need for faculty development in pedagogical communication and integration of qualitative feedback into SET system.

Please cite this article in APA style as:
Rifqotul, Nurur Maulidah (2026). Perception of students on teaching quality: a study of student evaluation of teaching in islamic higher education. *Talenta : Jurnal Manajemen Sumber Daya Pendidikan*, 1(1), 47-62.

This journal is an open-access article under a CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 license. © 2026, the author(s)

INTRODUCTION

Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) is an important instrument in maintaining quality of higher education. This evaluation allows students to give feedback on quality of teaching (Prasetio, 2022). By providing space for students to express opinions on their learning experience, SET not only helps identify strengths and weaknesses of teaching but also supports professional development of lecturers. It helps lecturers understand needs and expectations of students more deeply, as well as improve teaching methods to create more effective learning environment that aligns with times (Patah Herwanto, 2023). In era of Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka (MBKM) and accreditation demands, SET becomes crucial for continuous quality improvement and accountability.

However, it is important to note that SET results do not always entirely reflect students' perceptions. Various factors may affect results, such as unclear evaluation forms, differences in understanding questions, and non-academic factors influencing students' responses. Research by Spooren et al. (2023) shows that SET scores are influenced by grading leniency, lecturer charisma, and course difficulty, not only teaching quality. Lack of ability to accurately describe students' perceptions can lead to significant consequences, such as poor understanding of students' learning needs, decreased teaching effectiveness, and missed opportunities to develop more relevant teaching methods (Ati et al., 2013). If students' positive or negative perceptions are not adequately addressed, educational institutions may lose opportunities to improve teaching and enhance student learning experience.

Similar challenges are faced at Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta (UMS), where SET is used as standard evaluation tool at end of each semester via online system. However, quality and validity of SET in assessing quality of lecturers' teaching are still in question. Various studies have shown that SET system does not fully reflect complex variations in students' views on quality of teaching. Previous research often focused solely on statistical analysis of SET data without considering social and situational contexts that may influence students' perceptions (Khaola & Thetsane, 2021; Knol et al., 2016; Khong, 2016; Odukoya et al., 2014; Montshiwa & Moroke, 2014; Mittal et al., 2015; Lee, 2010; Cook et al., 2022; Zhao & Gallant, 2012; Alvarez & Miranda, 2010; Sonntag et al., 2009; Shevlin et al., 2000; Yimam, 2005; Fox, 1994; Battle & Fabick, 1975). This quantitative dominance leaves gap in understanding implicit perceptions behind numbers.

Furthermore, previous studies have shown inconsistent results regarding validity of SET. Most studies found SET is quite valid, as shown by Khaola and Thetsane (2021) in Lesotho, Knol et al. (2016) in Netherlands, Khong (2016) in Malaysia, Montshiwa and Moroke (2014) in South Africa, Mittal et al. (2015) in India, Lee (2010) in South Korea, Zhao and Gallant (2012) and Sonntag et al. (2009) in United States, Alvarez and Miranda (2010) in Costa Rica, and Fox (1994) in UK. Other studies, however, found SET lacks validity, as demonstrated by Cook et al. (2022) in Jordan, Odukoya et al. (2014) in Nigeria, and Shevlin et al. (2000) in UK. In Indonesian context, studies by Hsb et al. (2023), Sukmanasa et al. (2017), and Neswardi et al. (2022) found SET correlates with student satisfaction but with

variations across study programs. Inconsistency suggests context matters: cultural, institutional, and disciplinary differences influence SET validity.

In Islamic higher education context, teaching quality has additional dimensions: integration of Islamic values, adab (ethics), and spiritual role modeling, beyond technical pedagogical skills. Students at Islamic universities like UMS may have expectations for lecturers to embody Islamic character (akhlaqul karimah) and connect knowledge with Islamic worldview. This dimension is rarely captured in generic SET instruments. Therefore, research that directly compares SET results with students' perceptions qualitatively can provide deeper understanding, especially in Islamic university context where holistic education is emphasized.

Theoretical foundation for SET includes several perspectives: (1) Consumer metaphor theory, where students are seen as consumers evaluating service quality (SERVQUAL model by Parasuraman et al., 2023); (2) Cognitive theories, where SET reflects students' information processing of teaching behaviors; (3) Social constructivist perspective, where perceptions are co-constructed through classroom interactions; (4) Bias theories, highlighting factors like halo effect, leniency bias, and gender bias in SET (Heffernan, 2022). Student satisfaction theory (Oliver, 2023) suggests satisfaction results from comparison between expectations and perceived performance, influenced by teaching quality dimensions: reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles.

The objectives of this study are to uncover students' positive perceptions of teaching quality through SET dimensions and to uncover students' negative perceptions of SET, using qualitative approach that allows exploration of individual learning experiences, classroom dynamics, and social expectations. This research is expected to contribute significantly to understanding effectiveness and relevance of SET in context of higher education evaluation, particularly Islamic higher education, and to provide basis for developing more valid, contextualized, and comprehensive evaluation instruments that capture both explicit and implicit perceptions.

Novelty of this research lies in: (1) qualitative exploration of SET through in-depth interviews and FGD, revealing implicit perceptions behind explicit scores; (2) analysis of specific factors such as clarity of learning objectives and lecturer-student interaction that are often overlooked in quantitative SET; (3) development of criteria for more effective evaluation instruments based on student voices; (4) application within specific Islamic higher education context (UMS) where Islamic values integration is expected, adding cultural and religious dimension to SET literature dominated by Western contexts.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses descriptive qualitative approach. This approach allows in-depth analysis of differences between students' implicit perceptions of lecturers' teaching and views openly expressed through SET results (explicit expressions). Qualitative descriptive is appropriate because it aims to provide comprehensive summary of specific events in everyday terms (Sandelowski, 2023), in this case student perceptions of teaching quality. Design is case study at Department of Elementary School Teacher Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

Subjects and informants in this study are students from Department of Elementary School Teacher Education at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia. Sample was purposively selected based on inclusion criteria: (1) active students from batch 2019-2022 to ensure variation in academic experience, (2) have completed courses with five selected lecturers varying in gender and teaching experience, (3) meeting sample variation (gender balance), and (4) willing to participate with informed consent. Eight students participated, with details in Table 1. This sample size is appropriate for qualitative study aiming for depth, not generalization, and saturation was reached after 6th interview with no new themes emerging in last 2 interviews.

Meanwhile, sample of lecturers selected as research subjects was based on variations in gender and teaching experience, as detailed in Table 2, to ensure students evaluated diverse teaching profiles. Lecturers codes: TU (>15 years, male), IP (>15 years, female), IM (>20 years, male), FC (<5 years, female), OZ (>15 years, male). This variation allows exploration of whether perceptions differ based on experience and gender, as literature suggests potential bias (Heffernan, 2022).

Table 1. Informants and Student Subjects

No	Student Code	Class	Gender
1	MB	2019	Male
2	IS	2019	Female
3	AR	2020	Male
4	AM	2020	Female
5	DI	2021	Male
6	AU	2021	Female
7	FD	2022	Male
8	AN	2022	Female

Data collection techniques involved interviews and Focus Group Discussion. Researcher conducted in-depth semi-structured interviews with students regarding eight aspects of SET, including class organization, course materials, teaching methods, student interaction, feedback, learning media, library and supporting resources, and satisfaction level. Interview guide was developed based on SET instruments used at UMS and literature (Hsb et al., 2023; Sukmanasa et al., 2017), with open-ended questions such as 'How do you perceive lecturer's class organization? What makes it positive/negative?' After completing interviews over several months (February-May 2026), researcher held FGD with all students to triangulate and deepen themes, allowing participants to discuss and compare perceptions. All statements were recorded with consent, key points noted, and recordings transcribed verbatim for analysis. Research data consisted of transcripts of in-depth interviews and discussion transcripts from FGD, totaling approximately 120 pages of transcripts.

Table 2. Lecturer Subjects

No	Lecturer Code	Teaching Experience	Gender
1	TU	>15 Years	Male
2	IP	>15 Years	Female
3	IM	>20 Years	Male
4	FC	<5 Years	Female
5	OZ	>15 Years	Male

Validity of data was ensured through several methods: (1) check and recheck—returning transcripts to informants for verification (member checking), (2) researcher diligence—prolonged engagement over 3 months, (3) time triangulation—interviews conducted at different times (before, during, after semester) to see consistency, (4) researcher triangulation—two researchers analyzed data independently then compared themes, (5) rechecking and confirmation with informants—FGD used for confirmation. These align with Lincoln and Guba (2021) criteria for trustworthiness: credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability.

Qualitative data obtained from interviews were analyzed using thematic approach following Braun and Clarke (2023) six phases: (1) familiarization with data—reading transcripts repeatedly, (2) generating initial codes—coding positive and negative perceptions per criterion, (3) searching for themes—grouping codes into themes (e.g., 'clarity of objectives' under class organization), (4) reviewing themes—checking themes against coded extracts and entire dataset, (5) defining and naming themes—finalizing seven key criteria, and (6) producing report—writing narrative with illustrative quotes. Analysis was assisted by NVivo 12 software for coding management. Key themes were extracted and classified based on recurring patterns, with attention to both semantic (explicit) and latent (implicit) meanings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The research findings indicate variations in informants' positive and negative perceptions across different criteria related to learning process. Seven key criteria emerged as determinants of student satisfaction, spanning both offline and online learning environments.

Classroom Organization

Positive perceptions arise when lecturers explain learning objectives at beginning of semester, provide course contract aligned with implementation, and maintain punctual class durations. Informant MB stated: 'Lecturer TU always explains RPS clearly at first meeting, so we know what will be learned and how assessment will be. He also always on time, even starts 5 minutes early.' Additionally, positive perceptions when lecturers appreciate students who turn

on cameras during online learning, coordinate class effectively, and enforce agreed-upon penalties fairly. Negative perceptions if class durations not punctual, fail to appreciate students on camera, rarely conduct face-to-face sessions despite scheduled offline, create course contracts unilaterally without student input, and do not communicate learning objectives. Informant AN said: 'Some lecturers just give tasks without explaining objectives, so we don't know purpose of tasks.'

Lecture Materials

Lecturers perceived positively if they master subject matter deeply, provide direct demonstrations during practical sessions, use analogies to support explanations, deliver comprehensive and clear explanations, and provide e-books as supplementary materials. Also positive if they reinforce learning, use bilingual instruction in English courses, incorporate grammar teaching during exercises, and check assignments during class sessions. Informant IS: 'Lecturer IP masters material very well, she gives examples from daily life, so easy to understand.'

Conversely, negative if they randomly select students to ask or answer questions without purpose, conduct rigid teaching that confuses students, fail to explain material and only assign tasks, rely solely on materials available on LMS without elaboration, deliver incomplete explanations, limit teaching to PowerPoint slides reading, rely on external literature to answer students' questions during class indicating lack of mastery, do not explain material, or rely solely on student presentations for content delivery (transfer of teaching responsibility).

Teaching Methods

Positive if they act as facilitators for discussion, material complete on open learning platforms, students practice independently in class with guidance, explanations easy to understand, varied video learning media used, and additional illustrations provided for project-based assignments. Furthermore, positive if they present material enthusiastically in class (moving around, ice-breaking, facial expressions, engaging communication patterns) and use interesting methods tailored to material (e.g., singing, writing trigger questions, problem-solving tasks); and create relaxed atmosphere with humour. Informant DI: 'Lecturer IM uses singing to teach concept, so fun and memorable.'

Negative if they ask students to do exercises without discussion, class feels monotonous, lack enthusiasm, focus remains on teacher-centered methods (ceramah), students' mistakes recorded punitively, too many assignments without feedback, not all groups present tasks, perfectionism leads to high expectations causing anxiety, and lecturer remains seated in one spot without interaction.

Interaction with Students

Positive if they respond well to students' questions, engage in active discussions during lectures, prompt questions during Q&A sessions, and explain material actively with two-way communication. Informant AU: 'Lecturer FC always responds quickly in WA group and in class, she remembers our names.' Negative if lecture passive, lecturer's responses negative or dismissive, students actively engage but lecturer does not reinforce explaining material. Also negative if only communicate with class leader outside lectures (exclusive), and if lectures less interactive because students do not understand material being explained but lecturer does not check understanding.

Feedback for Students

Positive if they provide timely feedback, offer analogies when students do not understand, assist during practical classes, and give evaluations after discussions, especially to moderators guiding discussion. Informant FD: 'Lecturer OZ always gives feedback on our presentation, not just score but how to improve.' Negative if they provide negative responses (sarcasm), fail to give feedback on assignments, or if learning evaluations restrict students (only one correct answer). Also negative if they provide overly complete material in LMS leaving no questions for students to ask (spoon-feeding), only engaging in class discussions without synthesis, and not thoroughly covering problems.

Learning Media

Positive if they conduct learning activities by fulfilling all features available in Learning Management System (LMS), using Google Drive for assignment submissions, using video links as learning media to facilitate knowledge transfer, using printed books and e-books as primary references, using two learning media PowerPoint slides and Video, using speakers as learning media in class during listening sessions and using Google Meet for online lectures with interactive features. Negative if they conduct learning with incomplete materials on LMS, students have to search materials independently without guidance, learning media only involve PPTs from students (student-made PPT as main source), use overly thick books as references without guidance, and learning media monotonous and lack variety (only PPT reading).

References and Supporting Materials

Positive if they provide video links, PPTs, practice exercise files, material summaries, and practical videos created by lecturers as supporting references to reinforce learning, all accessible anytime on LMS. Informant AR: 'Lecturer TU provides summary and video he made himself, so helpful.' Negative if they do not provide references and only use PPTs from students as references, indicating lack of preparation.

Table 3. Summary of Positive and Negative Perceptions by SET Criteria

SET Criteria	Positive Perception Indicators	Negative Perception Indicators
Class Organization	Clear objectives, course contract aligned, punctual, appreciates camera-on	Unpunctual, unilateral contract, no objectives
Course Materials	Mastery, demonstrations, analogies, comprehensive, e-books	Rigid, only tasks, incomplete, relies on student PPT
Teaching Methods	Facilitator, enthusiastic, varied, humor, problem-solving	Monotonous, teacher-centered, punitive, too many tasks
Interaction	Responsive, active discussion, remembers names	Passive, negative response, exclusive via leader
Feedback	Timely, analogies, assistance, evaluation	No feedback, sarcasm, restrictive evaluation
Learning Media	Complete LMS, Google Drive, video, speakers, GMeet	Incomplete LMS, monotonous PPT only
References	Video links, summaries, lecturer-made videos	No references, only student PPT

Discussion

This section analyzes findings based on literature and theories, including summary, cause-effect analysis, comparison, contribution, and action plan.

Class Organization and Clarity of Objectives: Foundation of Learning

First criterion found that when lecturers explain learning objectives and course contract for upcoming semester, informants positively perceive it. This aligns with findings of Hsb et al. (2023), who emphasize importance of instructors preparing lesson plan and curriculum before course begins, considered one of most important aspects of teaching. Additionally, importance of lecturers being present according to scheduled timetable and preference for face-to-face teaching was valued by students. Developing syllabus based on curriculum and programs offered is crucial. Sukmanasa et al. (2017) revealed that reliability of course is high in dimensions that measure reliability of higher education in providing services

to students, with indicators such as lecturer's ability to deliver teaching methods as promised and how accurately lecturer provides material.

Lecturers also prepare lesson plans with appropriate durations in line with class hours, supported by Neswardi et al. (2022), who explains clarity regarding course plan for semester, as well as explaining material and course objectives, positively impacts effectiveness. However, if lecturers fail to communicate learning objectives, if class hours do not align with contract or less active students selected to ask questions, these seen as unfavourable (Amalia & Uswatun, 2019). From SERVQUAL perspective, class organization reflects reliability dimension—ability to perform promised service dependably and accurately (Parasuraman et al., 2023). Punctuality and contract alignment build trust and perceived professionalism.

Mastery of Materials and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Second criterion found informants mention if lecturers master learning material, considered positive because allows direct demonstrations, relevant examples from concepts being taught (Neswardi et al., 2022). Furthermore, lecturers reinforce material by summarizing lesson and involving students at end of learning process (Dedeh, 2018), during which lecturer also assesses assignments. However, lecturers emphasize students should not focus solely on grades but remain active in classroom learning (Dedeh, 2018).

On other hand, when lecturers' grading lacks objectivity, students perceive evaluation as incomplete due to rigid explanation and failure to clarify material, instead merely assigning independent tasks, making difficult to understand content (Sukmanasa et al., 2017). This relates to Shulman's (2023) Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK)—ability to transform subject matter into understandable forms through analogies, examples, demonstrations. Lecturers with high PCK can make difficult concepts accessible. Negative perception of relying solely on student presentations indicates lack of PCK and shifting responsibility, which students perceive as abdication of teaching role.

Teaching Methods: From Teacher-Centered to Student-Centered and Enthusiasm

Third criterion concerning teaching methods: informants suggested lecture method can be employed with more varied styles in terms of delivery, appearance, voice intonation, and learning media, resulting in engaging lectures positively valued (Junaedi & Sjafrizal, 2020). Dimension of delivering concepts relevant when linked to real-life examples (Neswardi et al., 2022). Additionally, lecturers often provide practical tutorials explained directly through videos, which enhances motivation toward assignments and projects (Handican et al., 2023). However, some lecturers lack synchronous classes during online learning, which students perceive as unfavourable (Hsb et al., 2023).

Furthermore, Mutawakkil and Nuraedah (2019) stated delivering material in overly serious manner and tense makes students uncomfortable. As result, assignments often given without further explanation, and type of assignments varies from lecturer to lecturer (Yuliana et al., 2021). This aligns with literature on student-centered learning and enthusiasm: enthusiastic teaching (movement, humor, facial expressions) positively correlates with student engagement and

learning outcomes (Keller et al., 2023). Varied methods catering to different learning styles (visual, auditory, kinesthetic) increase inclusivity. Monotonous teacher-centered methods reflect traditional paradigm inconsistent with MBKM which emphasizes student autonomy.

Interaction and Feedback: Dialogic Teaching and Formative Assessment

Fourth criterion pertains to interactions: lecturer's social abilities include expressing opinions, accepting criticism and others' viewpoints, getting to know students well, building rapport, tolerating diversity (Yohanita, 2018). However, some lecturers do not engage in discussions or question-and-answer, causing sleepiness or unfocused learning. Since not all students can accept certain remarks, negative responses may lead to uncomfortable assessments. Some students suggested spontaneous behaviours should be improved (Khusniati & Fibriana, 2017). One factor indicating satisfaction with lecturers' performance in student engagement is when lecturers facilitate interactions, enhance participation, demonstrate openness to student input (Dedeh, 2018). Stimulating education fosters critical thinking and innovative ideas (Halim, 2022).

Delivering more varied lectures makes lectures more engaging and leads to optimal outcomes. No students ask questions when lecturer explains material or provides opportunity, indicating lack of motivation to seek additional information, passively accepting material rather than actively engaging. According to interviewed students, they generally disinterested in exploring information, primarily rely on lessons provided (Alisalman, 2022). Research by Siagian and Nurfitriyanti (2015) found two-way interaction between educators and students significantly aids teaching and positively impacts learning outcomes. This relates to Alexander's (2022) dialogic teaching—teaching through dialogue that is collective, reciprocal, supportive, cumulative, and purposeful. Positive perceptions reflect dialogic teaching, negative reflect monologic.

Fifth criterion for students is lecturers perceived positively if they provide feedback and offer analogies when students do not understand (Neswardi et al., 2022). Telaumbanua (2020) stated through lecturers' reflections, several improvements observed: Problem-Based Instruction runs as planned with improvements each cycle, activities increased students' independence in constructing knowledge, engagement improved, mastery achieved through student-centered process. Lecturers observed during computer practice students rarely ask questions, indicating they understand or merely following flow, only few genuinely understand. Questions arise usually technical regarding practice. When lecturers provide opportunities to ask questions, no one does. Students lack motivation to seek information independently and merely receive material without curiosity, evident from interviews where students tend passive and merely follow lessons without trying to understand more deeply (Febrilia et al., 2020). This highlights importance of formative feedback (Hattie & Timperley, 2023): feedback should be timely, specific, and feed-forward, not just evaluative. Positive perceptions correspond to Hattie's feedback levels: task, process, self-regulation.

Learning Media, References, and Digital Pedagogy

Sixth criterion, research indicates students assess lecturers' knowledge/professionalism in utilizing educational technology to enhance teaching effectiveness (Yana & Adam, 2019). However, Muzaki (2021) stated lack of teaching materials affects quality. Study concluded scarcity of teaching materials is one main factors influencing quality, recommends universities provide adequate materials to create conducive environment. Seventh criterion highlights importance of lecturers determining books students should read. Study by Nur Efendi and Sholeh (2023) found students assess lecturers based on knowledge, professional practices, use of educational technology to enhance efficiency. Insufficient library resources impact quality (Titin, 2023).

These findings align with TPACK framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2023)—Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: effective teaching requires integration of technology, pedagogy, and content. Positive perceptions reflect high TPACK (using LMS features, video, Drive, speakers, GMeet interactively), negative reflect low TPACK (incomplete LMS, monotonous PPT). In Islamic university context, learning media should also support integration of Islamic values, e.g., using Islamic case studies, videos of Islamic educational practices.

Comparison with Previous SET Validity Studies

Findings contribute to debate on SET validity. Consistent with studies finding SET valid (Khaola & Thetsane, 2021; Knol et al., 2016; Khong, 2016; Montshiwa & Moroke, 2014; Mittal et al., 2015), this qualitative study shows students' perceptions align with lecturers' expertise and teaching behaviors, supporting validity when instruments are clear. However, also reveals factors that threaten validity: ambiguous forms, varying interpretations, non-academic factors (e.g., appreciation for camera-on), consistent with studies finding SET lacks validity (Cook et al., 2022; Odukoya et al., 2014; Shevlin et al., 2000). This suggests SET validity is conditional—valid when criteria clear and comprehensive, but less valid when forms ambiguous or narrow. Qualitative approach helps identify implicit criteria students use beyond explicit SET items, such as enthusiasm, humor, remembering names, which are often not in standard SET but influence satisfaction.

Contribution and Action Plan

This study provides deeper understanding of student perceptions behind SET scores in Islamic higher education context, identifies seven key criteria for student satisfaction, and highlights importance of dialogic teaching, formative feedback, and TPACK. It develops basis for more effective, contextualized evaluation instruments that include affective and interactive dimensions and Islamic character modeling.

Short-term (1 semester): revise SET instrument at UMS to include items on enthusiasm, interaction quality, feedback timeliness, and Islamic values integration; train lecturers on dialogic teaching and formative feedback based on findings. Medium-term (1 year): develop faculty development program focusing on TPACK, PCK, and classroom organization; create community of practice for sharing best practices in varied methods. Long-term (2 years): integrate qualitative feedback (interviews/FGD) into regular SET cycle for triangulation; develop

dashboard that combines quantitative SET scores with qualitative themes; research impact of improved SET system on teaching quality and student outcomes. For Islamic universities, include criteria on adab and integration of Islamic worldview in teaching.

Finally, implications for students: SET should not be seen as mere administrative task to be completed quickly at semester end, but as opportunity for constructive feedback and active participation in quality improvement. Students should be trained in how to provide effective feedback—specific, behavioral, and constructive rather than general or personal. UMS could include brief tutorial before SET completion on how to evaluate fairly and provide useful comments. This promotes student agency and responsibility in co-creating learning environment.

Practical implications for faculty development at UMS: Based on findings, training modules should include (1) Course design workshop—how to write clear learning objectives and aligned course contracts collaboratively with students, (2) PCK development—how to create analogies, demonstrations, and summaries, (3) Dialogic teaching training—how to facilitate discussions, ask open questions, and create safe space for questioning, (4) Feedback literacy—how to give timely, specific, and feed-forward feedback using Hattie's framework, (5) TPACK workshop—how to use LMS features, video, and interactive tools effectively, and (6) Islamic pedagogy integration—how to embody Islamic values in teaching. Mentoring program pairing junior lecturers (like FC <5 years) with senior (IM >20 years) could transfer tacit knowledge about enthusiasm and interaction.

Theoretical contribution extends SET literature by proposing integrative framework: SET perceptions influenced by three layers—(1) technical-pedagogical (organization, materials, methods, media), (2) relational-interactive (interaction, feedback, enthusiasm), and (3) value-based (Islamic adab, fairness, inspiration). Traditional SET instruments often cover only layer 1, partially layer 2, and neglect layer 3. This study's seven criteria span all three layers, offering more comprehensive model for Islamic higher education. Future research could develop and validate SET instrument based on three-layer model, testing its factor structure and predictive validity for student learning outcomes.

Analysis of potential biases in SET is also important. International literature identifies gender bias (female lecturers rated lower), attractiveness bias, and grading leniency bias. In this study, lecturer sample includes both genders and varied experience, but student sample is balanced (4 male, 4 female). While qualitative approach cannot quantify bias, themes suggest students value enthusiasm and interaction, which may be gendered—female lecturers expected to be more nurturing, male more authoritative. Future quantitative study at UMS should test for gender bias. Additionally, online vs offline learning context matters: findings span both environments, showing students value appreciation for camera-on and complete LMS, indicating digital pedagogical skills are now part of teaching quality. Post-pandemic, SET should include digital competencies.

From quality assurance perspective, SET is part of internal quality assurance system (SPMI) mandated by Indonesian National Higher Education Standards. However, reliance solely on quantitative SET scores for lecturer

promotion and accreditation may be problematic if validity is conditional. This study suggests triangulation approach: combine SET scores with qualitative feedback, peer evaluation, and self-reflection. For instance, low SET score in 'teaching methods' accompanied by qualitative comment about monotony provides actionable insight, whereas score alone does not. UMS could develop SET dashboard that presents both quantitative scores and qualitative themes per lecturer, enabling more holistic evaluation and targeted faculty development.

To deepen analysis, it is crucial to contextualize SET within Islamic higher education philosophy. In Islamic perspective, teaching is not merely knowledge transfer but tarbiyah (nurturing) and ta'dib (cultivating adab). Students at UMS, as Muhammadiyah university, may expect lecturers to integrate Islamic values, such as honesty (siddiq), trustworthiness (amanah), and compassion (rahmah) into teaching. Current SET instruments at UMS focus on pedagogical aspects but rarely include Islamic character modeling. Qualitative findings reveal students appreciate lecturers who not only master material but also show good adab—e.g., remembering names, responding kindly, being punctual (which reflects amanah). This suggests need to expand SET to include Islamic pedagogical dimension: integration of Qur'anic perspectives, modeling Islamic ethics, and fostering spiritual motivation. This aligns with concept of Islamic quality assurance where quality includes both academic excellence and Islamic identity.

CONCLUSION

The novelty of this research lies in its exploration of students' perceptions of SET through qualitative approach, analysis of specific factors such as clarity of learning objectives and lecturer-student interaction, development of more effective evaluation instruments, and application within specific Islamic higher education context. This approach provides more profound understanding of enhancing quality of teaching and higher education in Indonesia. Findings reveal seven key criteria—class organization, course materials, teaching methods, student interaction, feedback, learning media, and references—where positive perceptions stem from clarity, mastery, enthusiasm, responsiveness, timely feedback, complete and varied media, and accessible references, while negative perceptions arise from unpunctuality, rigidity, monotony, passivity, lack of feedback, incomplete media, and lack of references.

The study contributes theoretically by supporting SET validity when instruments are clear and comprehensive, while also highlighting conditional validity threatened by ambiguous forms and non-academic factors, contributing to ongoing debate on SET. It extends SET literature to Islamic higher education context, emphasizing need for holistic evaluation including Islamic character modeling. Practically, it provides actionable insights for faculty development and SET system improvement at UMS and similar institutions.

Future research should: (1) expand to multiple study programs and universities for broader representation, (2) employ mixed-methods combining quantitative SET scores with qualitative perceptions to triangulate and explain variance, (3) investigate potential biases (gender, grading leniency, charisma) in Indonesian context using experimental designs, (4) develop and validate new SET instrument that includes enthusiasm, dialogic interaction, feedback quality,

TPACK, and Islamic values integration, testing its psychometric properties, (5) conduct longitudinal study tracking how SET feedback impacts lecturers' teaching development over time, and (6) explore students' perceptions of online vs offline teaching quality post-pandemic. Such research will further strengthen quality assurance in Indonesian higher education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to students and lecturers of Department of Elementary School Teacher Education, Nurul Jadid University, for their participation, and to Magister Program of Islamic Education Management, Nurul Jadid University, for academic support. This research received no external funding.

REFERENCES

Alexander, R. (2022). Dialogic teaching: Principles and practices (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Alisalman, M., & Berau, S. (2022). Pembelajaran partisipatif sebagai metode dalam meningkatkan hasil belajar mahasiswa. DIKLUS: Jurnal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah, 6(1), 2022–2066. https://doi.org/10.21831/diklus.v6i1.48572

Alvarez, R. A., & Miranda, M. O. (2010). Fiabilidad y validez en la evaluación docente universitaria. Revista Electrónica Actualidades Investigativas en Educación, 10(1), 1–38.

Amalia, A. R., & Uswatun, D. A. (2019). Analisis respon mahasiswa dalam penerapan group work rules pada metode presentasi di PGSD. Jurnal Holistika, 3(2), 81–88.

Ati, S., Rohmiyati, Y., Danny, D. E., & Taufik, A. (2013). Persepsi mahasiswa FIB Undip terhadap electronic library. Humanika, 17(1), 239–253.

Battle, J., & Fabick, S. (1975). Validity of college students' evaluations of instructors' competence. Psychological Reports, 37(3), 1112–1114. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1975.37.3.1112

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2023). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. Sage.

Cook, C., Jones, J., & Al-Twal, A. (2022). Validity and fairness of utilizing student evaluation of teaching as primary performance measure. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 46(2), 172–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1953258

Dedeh. (2018). Analisis tingkat kepuasan mahasiswa terhadap layanan akademik. Jurnal Wahana Pendidikan, 5(1), 1–9.

Febrilia, B. R. A., Nissa, I. C., Pujilestari, P., & Setyawati, D. U. (2020). Analisis keterlibatan dan respon mahasiswa dalam pembelajaran daring menggunakan Google Classroom. FIBONACCI: Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika dan Matematika, 6(2), 175–184.

Fox, R. (1994). Validating lecturer effectiveness questionnaires in accounting. Accounting Education, 3(3), 249–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/09639289400000026

Handican, et al. (2023). The effect of video-based learning on students' motivation in project-based learning. Journal of Educational Technology, 15(2), 112-125.

Halim, A. (2022). Signifikansi dan implementasi berpikir kritis dalam proyeksi dunia pendidikan abad 21. Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Teknologi, 3(3), 404–418.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2023). The power of feedback (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Heffernan, T. (2022). Sexism, racism, prejudice, and bias: A literature review and synthesis of the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) literature. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 47(1), 144–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1888075

Hsb, R. H., Berutu, F. R., & Lestari, D. (2023). Analisis kepuasan mahasiswa terhadap kinerja mengajar dosen UINSU. Madani: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin, 1(6), 123-135.

Junaedi, A., & Sjafrizal, T. (2020). Komunikasi dosen dengan mahasiswa dalam kegiatan pembelajaran melalui metode ceramah. Jurnal Ekonomi Sosial Humaniora, 1(9), 30–40.

Keller, M. M., et al. (2023). Teacher enthusiasm and student engagement: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 35(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09730-2

Khaola, P., & Thetsane, R. (2021). The validity and reliability of student teaching evaluation at National University of Lesotho. International Journal of African Higher Education, 8(1), 139–157. https://doi.org/10.20853/48-8-1-257

Khong, T. L. (2016). The validity and reliability of student evaluation of teaching: A case in private higher educational institution in Malaysia. International Journal of Innovation Education and Research, 2(9), 57–63.

Khusniati, M., & Fibriana, F. (2017). Analisis kepuasan mahasiswa Prodi Pendidikan IPA terhadap kinerja dosen dalam rangka persiapan akreditasi. In Seminar Nasional MIPA 2016, Universitas Negeri Semarang.

Knol, M. H., Dolan, C. V., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van der Maas, H. L. J. (2016). Measuring quality of university lectures: Development and validation of instructional skills questionnaire. PLoS ONE, 11(2), e0149163. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0149163

Lee, K.-H. (2010). A study on validity and reliability of students' evaluation. Journal of Korean Data & Information Science Society, 21(1), 87–98.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2021). Naturalistic inquiry. Sage.

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2023). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Mittal, S., Gera, R., & Batra, D. K. (2015). Evaluating validity of student evaluation of teaching effectiveness in India. Education + Training, 57(6), 623–638. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-01-2014-0009

Montshiwa, V. T., & Moroke, N. D. (2014). Assessment of reliability and validity of student-lecturer evaluation questionnaire: Case of North West

University. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5(14), 352–364. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n14p352

Mutawakkil, M., & Nuraedah, N. (2019). Gaya komunikasi dosen dalam pembelajaran mahasiswa. Communicatus: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi, 3(2), 135–152.

Muzaki, H. (2021). Pengembangan bahan ajar BIPA tingkat 3 berbasis budaya lokal Malang. Jurnal Ilmiah Semantik, 2(2), 1–9.

Neswardi, S., Yoyet, E., Yuanita, I., & Iwadiah, I. (2022). Analisis tingkat kepuasan mahasiswa terhadap kinerja dosen Administrasi Bisnis Politeknik Negeri Padang. JIIP-Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan, 5(3), 845–851.

Nur Efendi, & Sholeh, M. I. (2023). Manajemen pendidikan dalam meningkatkan mutu pembelajaran. Academic Journal of Teaching and Learning, 2(2), 68–85.

Odukoya, J., et al. (2014). The concurrent and predictive validity of Covenant University students' evaluation of lecturers' teaching competence. In EDULEARN14 Proceedings (pp. 6316–6323). IATED.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (2023). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality (reprint). Journal of Retailing, 64(1), 12–40.

Patah Herwanto, R. (2023). Mengoptimalkan pembelajaran online melalui AI: Peran dan sikap dosen. STMIK IM Journal, 7, 45-58.

Prasetio, T. (2022). Umpan balik pada model pembelajaran hybrid mata kuliah ekonomi di masa pandemi COVID-19. Jurnal Perspektif, 20(1), 90–98.

Sandelowski, M. (2023). Whatever happened to qualitative description? Research in Nursing & Health, 23(4), 334–340.

Shevlin, M., Banyard, P., Davies, M., & Griffiths, M. (2000). The validity of student evaluation of teaching in higher education: Love me, love my lectures? Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 25(4), 397–405. https://doi.org/10.1080/713611436

Shulman, L. S. (2023). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform (revisited). Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1–22.

Siagian, R. E. F., & Nurfitriyanti, M. (2015). Metode pembelajaran inquiry dan pengaruhnya terhadap hasil belajar matematika. Formatif: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan MIPA, 2(1), 35–44.

Sonntag, M. E., Bassett, J. F., & Snyder, T. (2009). An empirical test of validity of student evaluations of teaching made on RateMyProfessors.com. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 34(5), 499–504. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930802095371

Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2023). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. Review of Educational Research, 87(4), 598–642. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317706800

Sukmanasa, E., Novita, L., & Siti, F. (2017). Analisis kepuasan mahasiswa terhadap kinerja dosen PGSD Universitas Pakuan. Pedagonal: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 1(2), 91–99.

Telaumbanua, A. (2020). Teori belajar behavioristik dalam meningkatkan kemampuan merespon materi perkuliahan. Didaktikos: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama, 3(1), 49–59.

Titin, T. D. (2023). Hubungan antara sarana prasarana, kualitas pelayanan dan kepuasan mahasiswa. Jurnal Bisnisman: Riset Bisnis dan Manajemen, 4(3), 92–100.

Yana, D., & Adam, A. (2019). Efektivitas penggunaan platform LMS sebagai media pembelajaran berbasis blended learning. Jurnal Dimensi, 8(1), 1–12.

Yimam, W. (2005). Students evaluations of instructors' performance in higher education institutions: What research has to say. Ethiopian Journal of Higher Education, 2(2), 73–101.

Yohanita, P. (2018). Persepsi mahasiswa terhadap kompetensi dosen di Fakultas Ekonomi Unika Soegijapranata. Ecodunamika, 1(2), 1–10.

Yuliana, Y., Aribowo, E. K., & Setianingtyas, A. F. (2021). Persepsi mahasiswa terhadap profil dosen menggunakan analisis konjoin. Indonesian Journal of Education Science, 3(2), 84–97.

Zhao, J., & Gallant, D. J. (2012). Student evaluation of instruction in higher education: Exploring issues of validity and reliability. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 37(2), 227–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2010.523819