

Western Kentucky University
TopSCHOLAR®

Masters Theses & Specialist Projects

Graduate School

7-16-2008

An Examination of Sources of Instructional Feedback and the Connection with Self Determination Theory and Job Satisfaction

Paige M. Birkholz

Western Kentucky University, birkhpm@wku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Cognitive Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Birkholz, Paige M., "An Examination of Sources of Instructional Feedback and the Connection with Self Determination Theory and Job Satisfaction" (2008). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 3.
<http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/3>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact connie.foster@wku.edu.

AN EXAMINATION OF SOURCES OF INSTRUCTIONAL FEEDBACK AND THE
CONNECTION WITH SELF DETERMINATION THEORY AND JOB
SATISFACTION

A Specialist Project
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Specialist of Education

By
Paige M. Birkholz

August 2008

AN EXAMINATION OF SOURCES OF INSTRUCTIONAL FEEDBACK AND THE
CONNECTION WITH SELF DETERMINATION THEORY AND JOB
SATISFACTION

Date Recommended: July 16, 2008

Steven Winger
Director of Thesis

Pitt Derryberry.

Carl Myers,

Dean, Graduate Studies and Research Date

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank Dr. Steven Wininger for providing me with guidance throughout the long process of writing this thesis. I appreciate all of your hard work and patience! To Dr. Pitt Derryberry, thank you for serving on my thesis committee. You have provided me numerous helpful suggestions and ideas to help better my thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. Carl Myers for not only serving on my thesis committee but for the unending support and guidance throughout the last three years in the School Psychology program. Thank you for having confidence in me and pushing me to do my best! Lastly, I would like to thank my family and friends for all of their support and patience they have given to me throughout graduate school.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iii
Abstract	iv
Literature Review	3
Self Determination Theory	5
Cognitive Evaluation Theory	6
Self Determination Theory's Three Basic Needs	8
Competence Valuation	10
Sources of Feedback for College Teachers	11
Institutional Student Ratings	12
Consultation with Faculty	13
Soliciting Feedback from Students	13
Self-Assessment	14
Self-Observation	15
Peer/Administrator Observation	16
Team Teaching	16
Purpose of Current Study.....	17
Method	20
Results	24
Discussion	41
References	48
Appendices	54

List of Tables

Table 1: Representation of instructors 21

Table 2: Most and least helpful sources; usefulness of sources 24

Table 3: Utilization and desire for more information on sources 25

Table 4: Examples of how information gained from institutional student ratings is used to improve teaching..... 26

Table 5: Examples of how consultation with other faculty members is used to improve teaching..... 28

Table 6: Examples of how non-university student feedback is used to improve teaching..... 29

Table 7: Examples of how self-assessment is used to improve teaching..... 30

Table 8: Examples of how self-observation is used to improve teaching..... 32

Table 9: Examples of how information gained from peer/administrator observation is used to improve teaching..... 33

Table 10: Examples of how team teaching is used to improve teaching..... 34

Table 11: Suggestions for changes to SITE evaluations..... 36

Table 12: Correlations for study measures..... 40

AN EXAMINATION OF SOURCES OF INSTRUCTIONAL FEEDBACK AND THE
CONNECTION WITH SELF DETERMINATION THEORY AND JOB
SATISFACTION

Paige M. Birkholz

August 2008

Pages 71

Directed by: Dr. Steven Wininger, Dr. Carl Myers, and Dr. Pitt Derryberry

Department of Psychology

Western Kentucky University

This study looked to gain information and detail on seven sources of instructional feedback. Instructor's utilization and perceived value of those sources were examined, along with fulfillment of psychological needs and present job satisfaction. Instructors from Western Kentucky University (WKU; $N = 126$) were solicited as participants. An online survey included five different measures. The first, a Sources of Feedback Questionnaire, was created to examine various sources of instructional feedback utilized by participants (institutional student ratings, consultation with faculty, soliciting feedback from students, self-assessment, self-observation, peer/administrator observation, and team teaching). The second measure, adapted from the Basic Needs Satisfaction questionnaire (Deci et al., 2001), was based on the proposal that with the satisfaction of basic needs instructors will show greater job satisfaction. The third questionnaire was a measure of present job satisfaction (Larkin, 1990; Oshagbemi, 1995; Oshagbemi, 1999). The fourth measure was a measure of Competence Valuation (Elliot et al., 2000). The final measure was a basic questionnaire created to obtain demographic information for each participant

Of the seven sources of feedback studied, self-assessment (i.e., reflection) was found to be the most utilized source, whereas self-observation (i.e., videotaping) was

found to be the least utilized. The most helpful source of feedback to improve an instructor's effectiveness was soliciting feedback from students; institutional student ratings were found to be the least helpful. Soliciting feedback from students was also found to be the most useful source of feedback for improving teaching. Job satisfaction was significantly correlated with the three basic psychological needs as well as two other items from the basic needs questionnaire (enjoyment and effort). Job satisfaction of participants was also significantly correlated with competence valuation and the utilization of institutional student ratings. In terms of fulfillment of the basic psychological needs and utilization of the feedback sources, relatedness was the only need that was found to be significantly correlated with utilization of feedback.

Literature Review

Teacher job satisfaction contributes not only to teachers' motivation and improvement but also to students' learning and development (Perie, Baker, & Whitener, 1997). Teachers' job satisfaction, which is linked to teachers' work performance, includes teachers' involvement, commitment, and motivation related to the job (Sargent & Hannum, 2005). It is often found that when employees are satisfied with their job they are more likely to remain in their job positions. The same holds true for teachers; the more satisfied teachers are with their jobs and teaching experiences, the more likely they are to remain in their schools and continue working in their teaching positions, thus, decreasing attrition rates.

While there has been a great deal of research conducted on teacher job satisfaction and attrition at the K-12 level, little attention has been paid to teacher attrition at the college level. As Dee (2004) notes, "available research provides few insights for administrators who seek to improve faculty retention rates" (p. 604). McBride, Munday, and Tunnell (1992) state high rates of faculty turnover at a university can be costly to the reputation of the institute and to the quality of instruction provided. Institutional effectiveness is often diminished when faculty is not available, courses cannot be offered or projects cannot be completed due to faculty turnover (Dee, 2004). As with any occupation there are numerous factors which contribute to employee turnover. Multiple researchers have identified a wide range of stressors that contribute to faculty inclination to leave including lack of autonomy, limited support for innovation, and a diminished sense of collegiality (Barnes, Agago, & Combs, 1998; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Manger & Eikeland, 1990; Smart, 1990).

In a study conducted by Dee (2004), faculty turnover intent in an urban community college was examined. Faculty intent was referred to as the degree of likelihood that an employee would terminate employment in a work organization, whereas intent-to-stay was referred to as the extent to which an employee planned to continue membership with a current employer. The findings indicated that faculty turnover intent was, in general, low to moderate and respondents reported high levels of autonomy and communication openness. Faculty who perceived high levels of communication openness and high levels of autonomy tended to report lower levels of turnover intent.

While there is little research at the college level examining teacher attrition, there is an ample amount of research examining teacher turnover at the K-12 level. One branch of research at the K-12 level focuses on the rather high attrition rates of new teachers. Similar to the college level attrition at the K-12 level is costly for not only the schools but also for the students who are connected with those teachers choosing to leave their position. Newmann and Wehlage (1995) found that successful schools (in terms of teacher retention) created “opportunities for teachers to collaborate and help one another achieve the purpose; and teachers in these schools took collective, not just individual, responsibility for student learning” (p. 3). Louis, Kruse, and Marks (as cited in Kardos & Johnson, 2007) found that teachers’ individual academic talents and skills can be reinforced by a professional community within the institution that promotes school improvement. Kardos and Johnson (2007) described how new teachers, who were considered novices, were given assistance, encouraged to seek help, and expected to be learning and improving their teaching practice. In the integrated professional culture new

teachers felt sustained and supported by their more experienced colleagues. The novice teachers in these environments also reported that mentoring relationships were both meaningful and supportive; classroom observations and feedback were frequent and helpful; and meetings among teachers were focused on important issues of teaching and learning.

At the college level, reward and advancement are frequently based on a instructor's accomplishment and productivity in research rather than in teaching ability or quality. The emphasis on research productivity commonly explains the apparent lack of faculty involvement in improving teaching merit (Stevens, 1998). To improve teaching is the ultimate goal of assessment of teaching. However, the reasons usually given for assessing teaching are certification, recertification, annual evaluation, and merit raises (Tuckman, 1995). When thinking of assessment in these terms, they represent "accountability" and are often found to constrain teachers rather than inspire them (McLaughlin, 1991). As Tuckman (1995) states, "given that most teacher turnover is for reasons other than incompetence, the greatest need for members of a profession who are likely to spend their lives in it is for self-improvement" (p. 134). With properly developed and utilized assessment tools, such self-improvement is possible. Supportive environments, as reported by Newmann and Wehlage (1995), Louis, Kruse, and Marks (as cited in Kardos & Johnson, 2007), and Dee (2004), encourage teachers to strive and improve upon their practice, making themselves better instructors.

Self Determination Theory

Human beings are thought to naturally strive to elaborate and build upon their personal interests. Humans have a tendency to naturally seek out challenges in order to

branch out and discover new perspectives. “By stretching their capacities and expressing their talents and propensities, people actualize their human potentials” (Deci & Ryan, 2002, p. 3). The point of view of integrating the human with the potential to act from a rational sense of self is seen in both psychodynamic and humanistic theories of personality and in cognitive theories of development (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

Self Determination Theory assumes that all individuals have natural, innate, and constructive tendencies to develop an even more detailed and integrated sense of self (Deci & Ryan, 2002). There are definite social-contextual factors that support this innate tendency. There are also specifiable factors that prevent and delay this essential process of human nature. Self Determination Theory predicts a wide range of developmental outcomes of human beings ranging from an active and integrated self to a highly fragmented and sometimes passive, reactive, or alienated self, as a function of those specific social-environmental conditions.

Self Determination Theory has four sub-theories which all relate to specific phenomena. Individually, they each cover specific concepts of basic psychological needs. When combined together, they make up Self Determination Theory. The four sub-theories are Cognitive Evaluation Theory, Organismic Integration Theory, Causality Orientations Theory, and Basic Needs Theory. The current study will only focus on Cognitive Evaluation Theory.

Cognitive Evaluation Theory. Cognitive Evaluation Theory was formulated to describe the effects of social contexts on people’s intrinsic motivation. “It [Cognitive Evaluation Theory] describes contextual elements as autonomy supportive (informational), controlling, and amotivating, and it links these types of contextual

elements to the different motivations” (Deci & Ryan, 2002, p. 9). Intrinsically motivated behaviors are those in which individuals have an innate tendency to engage in activities based on their interests and feel satisfaction from participation in those activities. Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, is based on contingent outcomes and rewards. Locus of causality can describe the two types of motivation; the locus of causality for intrinsically motivated behaviors can be perceived as having an internal locus of causality whereas extrinsic motivation can be perceived as external to the individual (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Intrinsically motivated behaviors are thought to have been undermined when those behaviors are paired with external factors or rewards (extrinsic motivation). However, the type of external reward determines whether or not intrinsic motivation is undermined. Tangible rewards, such as money, are found to decrease intrinsic motivation when they were expected and when attaining those rewards required participation in an activity. On the other hand, external rewards such as positive feedback or verbal praise enhance rather than hinder intrinsic motivation.

Cognitive Evaluation Theory was developed to account for reward effects on intrinsic motivation. “The theory suggests that the needs for competence and autonomy are integrally involved in intrinsic motivation and that contextual events, such as the offer of a reward, the provision of positive feedback, or the imposition of a deadline, are likely to affect intrinsic motivation to the extent that they are experienced as supporting versus thwarting satisfaction of these needs” (Deci & Ryan, 2002, p. 11). It has been suggested by Deci and Ryan (as cited in Deci & Ryan, 2002) that there are two cognitive processes through which contextual factors affect intrinsic motivation. Those two processes are change in *perceived locus of causality* and change in *perceived competence*.

Perceived locus of causality refers to the perception one takes towards an event. It also relates to the need for autonomy. When an individual perceives an event with a more external locus of causality, it is found that intrinsic motivation tends to decrease. When an individual perceives an event with an internal locus of causality, intrinsic motivation increases. “The second process, change in perceived competence, relates to the need for competence: when an event increases perceived competence, intrinsic motivation will tend to be enhanced; whereas, when an event diminishes perceived competence, intrinsic motivation will be undermined” (Deci & Ryan, 2002, p. 11). Deci and Ryan (2002) state that intrinsic motivation tends to increase when positive feedback is given. However, this is the case only when people feel a sense of autonomy with respect to the activity for which they perceived themselves to be competent.

Positive feedback, rewards, or deadlines tend to have a functional meaning in Cognitive Evaluation Theory. However, in the 1980s, it was suggested that the interpersonal climate in which they are administered can significantly influence the functional meaning. Ryan (1982) showed that when positive feedback is given within a pressuring climate such that people “should do well,” the positive feedback goes from informational feedback to controlling feedback. When the positive feedback is given in a context that supports autonomy, the feedback tends to be less controlling and more informational.

Self Determination Theory's three basic needs. Self Determination Theory proposes three needs that describe environments that support versus hinder effective and healthy functioning: *competence, relatedness, and autonomy*. These three needs provide a basis for categorizing aspects of the environment as supportive versus non-supportive.

Human beings have these specific needs that must be met in order to continue, persevere, and thrive. The social environments that allow these three needs to be met are predicted to maintain healthy functioning. The absence of needs or withholding essential needs can lead to a lack of growth. Providing needs however allow humans to maintain growth and development. Self Determination Theory refers to this concept of *needs* as basic psychological needs. According to Self Determination Theory basic needs are universal. They represent natural requirements rather than acquired motives. Whether they are aware of it or not, humans tend to strive for these basic needs. Oftentimes humans even head toward circumstances that will support and provide these needs.

The first of the basic needs proposed by Self Determination Theory is *competence*. “Competence refers to feeling effective in one’s ongoing interactions with the social environment and experiencing opportunities to exercise and express one’s capacities” (Deci & Ryan, 2002, p. 7). In order to fulfill the need for competence, people seek out challenges that have the potential to maximize their capacities and to continuously attempt to sustain and enhance their skills and capacities through activity. Competence can be considered more of a felt sense of confidence rather than an achieved skill or ability.

The second of the basic needs is *relatedness*. Relatedness refers to feeling connected to others, as well as caring for and being cared for by others. Relatedness can also refer to having a sense of belongingness both with other individuals and with one’s community. “The need to feel oneself as being in relation to others is thus not concerned with the attainment of a certain outcome or a formal status, but instead concerns the

psychological sense of being with others in secure communion or unity” (Deci & Ryan, 2002, p. 7).

The third and final need proposed by Self Determination Theory is *autonomy*. “Autonomy refers to being the perceived origin or source of one’s own behavior” (Deci & Ryan, 2002, p. 8). Autonomy involves humans acting based on personal interest and incorporated values. Autonomy refers to the ability of a person to make informed, unforced decisions. When being autonomous, individuals experience their behavior as an expression of the self. In situations that evoke autonomy, individuals feel value with their decisions and experiences.

Competence Valuation

Perceived competence and competence valuation have emerged as two processes seen as important mediators of intrinsic motivation effects (Elliot et al.). Perceived competence is considered the extent to which a person believes that he or she has done well at an activity or is able to perform well at that activity. Perceived competence is acknowledged as an influence on intrinsic motivation following feedback, either during or after a task has been completed. Performance feedback is hypothesized to influence perceptions of competence, which in turn influence intrinsic motivation (Elliot et al., 2000). The degree to which a person actually cares about completing a task successfully is considered competence valuation (Harackiewicz & Manderlink, 1984). According to Elliot et al., one aspect of performance context (e.g., the offering of a reward) is hypothesized to influence how important it is to do well at the beginning of a task, which in turn influences intrinsic motivation. “In achievement settings, competence is the self-attribute that is evaluated because individuals are commonly provided with positive or

negative competence information (feedback) following performance of a task” (Elliot et al., p. 782). In the first of two studies, Elliot et al., found that participants reported higher competence valuation following positive performance feedback relative to negative performance feedback. The positive feedback also led participants to higher perceptions of competence at the task and perceived competence was found to be a positive predictor of task enjoyment (Elliot et al.). In the second study, results from the first were replicated and expanded upon. Performance feedback was found to have a direct influence on intrinsic motivation which was influenced by both competence valuation and perceived competence. These participants who received positive feedback reported higher competence valuation and perceived competence which led to enhanced task enjoyment.

Sources of Feedback for College Instructors

As stated by Feldman and Paulsen (1999), in a supportive teaching culture, informative feedback comes from several different sources including colleagues, consultants, chairs, students and teachers themselves. These sources of feedback address the needs of faculty for self-determination and excellence in teaching, provide opportunities to learn and achieve and to stimulate, inform, and support efforts to improve instruction. Weimer (1990) states, “instructional improvement uses the input acquired from others (students, colleagues, or both) to clarify, elaborate, and correct faculty members’ understanding of how they teach” (p. 53). In the current study the various sources of feedback to be examined include institutional student ratings, consultation/mentoring with other faculty, soliciting feedback from students, self-assessment, self-observation, peer/administrator observation, and team teaching.

Institutional student ratings. The most prevalent form of feedback in colleges and universities is student feedback. End of semester evaluations by students often give instructors a direct form of feedback on the students' likes and dislikes of the instructor's teaching. Student feedback can include responses to standard questions provided by the college or university and can also include open-ended comments made by the students in reference to the identified instructor. Student ratings have been used for four purposes: (a) to provide formative feedback to faculty about the effectiveness of their teaching with the intention of bringing about improvement; (b) as a summative measure of teaching effectiveness to be used in personnel decisions; (c) as a source of information for students in the selection of instructors and courses; and (d) as a source of data for research on teaching (Marsh, 1987).

Hoyt and Pallett (1999) point out that student feedback has considerable credibility for several reasons. First, input is received from a relatively high number of raters so that reliability is usually quite high. Second, ratings are made by those who have consistently observed the teacher over many hours, so that they are based on representative behavior. Thirdly, observations about student learning, the object of instruction, are made by those who have been personally affected and therefore have high face validity. Nasser and Fresko (2002) found that instructors believe that instruction can be improved through students' course evaluations. One instructor stated that the feedback from students stimulated more thought about course content and brought about motivation to search for new reading materials to use with students. However, few instructors, 3% to 10%, reported having made substantial alterations in their teaching. There is much debate over the validity of institutional student ratings. Nasser and Fresko

believe however that using results of student evaluations to improve instruction is more a function of willingness and ability to change than a belief in the validity of the evaluation tools and the reliability of the results.

Consultation with faculty. In order to produce improvement in instruction it is essential that instructors who wish to improve their teaching be provided with expert consultants to assist and support them (Nasser & Fresko, 2002). Emery (1997) found that junior faculty, in comparison to senior faculty, tend to perceive teaching consultation ‘instrumentally,’ in that improved instruction leads to greater intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Piccinin, Cristi, and McCoy (1999) found that all faculty members (junior, senior, and part-time) revealed a significant overall improvement in their student ratings after consultation and interventions. The participants were also found to maintain the wanted effects of consultation over time.

After seeing high levels of faculty turnover and student dissatisfaction, Park University administrators developed a system of four formative reviews in which an evaluator (a faculty member) works with a teacher on various aspects of teaching (Mandernach, 2006). Following the implementation of the new system, faculty retention went up and student evaluations and satisfaction were largely positive. Wasserstein, Quistberg, and Shea (2007) also found that satisfaction with mentoring was associated with greater job satisfaction and less expectation of leaving their teaching position in the future.

Soliciting feedback from students. Institutional student ratings are a very impersonal way for instructors to receive feedback on their teaching. These student ratings are also mainly completed at the end of the semester once the teaching is over.

While some instructors are satisfied with institutional student ratings, others prefer to solicit feedback from their students in order to better their teaching throughout the semester. Interested in teacher reflection and professional development, over the course of ten years Hoban and Hastings (2006) developed four procedures for collecting student feedback. Those four procedures included: (a) conducting interviews with students; (b) asking students to write about their class experiences in learning logs; (c) asking students to complete a classroom observation schedule; and (d) asking students to fill in a survey. When tried in the classroom, the four methods were found to stimulate critical reflection in teachers and encourage a change in the way the classrooms were run. Lang (2007) recommends a technique called the “Minute Paper” (Angelo & Cross, 1993) that provides instructors with feedback on either a single teaching session or an entire unit. The “Minute Paper” consists of the instructor asking students to respond briefly to two questions such as, “What was the most important thing learned in class today?” and “What unanswered questions do you have about today’s class?” Like others, Lang also recommends administering an end of the class survey containing two basic questions: “What classroom activities or assignments have been most effective in helping you learn this semester, and why?” and “What classroom activities or assignments have been least effective in helping you learn this semester, and why?” By soliciting feedback from students on more specific details of the class and the instructor, teachers are able to also reflect more deeply on specific issues of their teaching (Lang, 2006).

Self-assessment. Teacher’s self-assessment can be a powerful tool for self-improvement. Self-assessment is an instrument for professional growth that provides opportunities for peers and change agents to influence teacher practice (Ross & Bruce,

2007). The process that is self-assessment can include reflection, self-judgments, and self-reactions. “Self-assessments contribute to teachers’ beliefs about their ability to bring about student learning; i.e., teacher efficacy, a form of professional self-efficacy” (Ross & Bruce, 2007, p. 147). With successful performances, teachers become more confident about their future because they believe that through their own actions, they have helped students learn. Self-assessment activities have been shown to be functional strategies for maintaining motivation to teach well, as well as for improving instruction (Amundsen, Gryspeerd, & Moxness, 1993). By collecting their own data on what is working and what is not, teachers are able to show what it means to be professional about teaching—being actively engaged in monitoring the impact of one’s work and committed to improving effectiveness (Smith, 2001).

Self-observation. Self-observation, also known as self-monitoring is, as stated by Schunk (1995), deliberate attention to aspects of one’s behaviors. In a classroom setting video feedback is often used as a direct observation technique for teachers. Dawson, Dawson, and Forness (2001) found that teachers felt video feedback had been primarily responsible for a change in their teaching behavior after viewing video footage of their teaching. Self-observation with the use of video feedback has been found to be an effective method to challenge and change distorted perceptions of one’s performance (Rodebaugh & Rapee, 2005). In their study on video feedback and social phobia, Rodebaugh and Rapee found that participants who had a more negatively distorted initial impression of themselves giving a speech, benefited from observing themselves on video. After viewing the video footage, a higher self-perception was obtained and carried over in a second performance.

Peer/administrator observation. Peer observations can be very helpful to teachers because of the directed attention towards specific aspects of the teacher's performance. As Ross and Bruce (2007) state, peers are able to influence teacher practice by observation and suggesting specific strategies to implement. Peer feedback may influence teacher judgments about the degree of their goal attainment (Ross & Bruce, 2007). Peers also have the opportunity to influence teacher efficacy. Bandura (1997) proposed three sources of efficacy information provided by peer observations: social persuasion (telling colleagues they are capable of performing a task), vicarious experience (highlighting the successful performance of someone similar to the teacher), and managing physiological and emotional states (strengthening positive feelings arising from teaching and interpreting them as indicative of teaching ability or reducing negative feelings arising from teaching, such as stress). The process of peer observation is only successful and beneficial if the faculty involved is invested in the process. In a study on peer observations by Kohut, Burnap, and Yon (2007), observers and observees both found value in the peer observation process as well as pre- and post-observation meetings regarding information about the class and information obtained from the actual observation. Mento and Giampetro-Meyer (2000) found that faculty members participating in a peer observation/feedback process indicated that the feedback they received about their teaching was truly developmental, helpful, and extremely valuable.

Team teaching (peer coaching, co-teaching). As Ross and Bruce (2007) explain, peer coaching is a process that pairs teachers of equal experience and competence together. The pair then observes each other teach, negotiate improvement goals, devise strategies to implement the goals, observe teaching with new goals in place, and provide

one another with feedback. Peer coaching has been found to increase teacher execution of preferred teaching practices and contributes to higher teacher efficacy (Kohler, Ezell, & Paluselli, 1999). Through their research, Roth and Tobin (2004) have found that co-teaching serves as a powerful framework that provides new opportunities for enhancing student learning as well as for learning how to teach. Roth and Tobin state that co-teaching responds to the need of teachers inexperienced in one or more areas to learn to teach “at the elbow” of another teacher. Co-teaching is about evolving and becoming a better teacher while teaching.

In a study by Buskist (2002), award winning college and university instructors were surveyed on numerous aspects of effective teaching. The study examined characteristics of the instructors and focused on the effective teaching habits of those individuals. Two general themes were seen in the instructors’ responses to a question of how they taught themselves to become effective teachers. Respondents stressed the role of early experiences, experimentation with teaching methods, and deliberately seeking feedback on their teaching as key to their development as effective instructors. With the help of feedback, the award winning instructors were able to receive constructive information on areas they were excelling in and areas in which improvement could be made.

Purpose of Current Study

As Perie et al. (1997) state, teacher job satisfaction contributes not only to teachers’ motivation and improvement, but is also linked to students’ learning and development. Self Determination Theory proposed that human beings have a predisposition to strive for improvement to become better, more integrated individuals.

Cognitive Evaluation Theory, a sub-theory of Self Determination Theory, takes the notion of self-improvement further incorporating intrinsically motivated behaviors. When individuals partake in intrinsically motivated behaviors and activities, they feel a greater sense of satisfaction. External rewards, such as feedback, tend to enhance intrinsic motivation. University instructors generally receive feedback from students at a semester's end through institutional student ratings. Although this source of feedback is the most common source available to instructors, there are many other sources existing to aide instructors in self-improvement. There is little known as regards to the sources of instructional feedback that college instructors utilize. There is also little known about whether the utilization of these source relates to instructors' motivation and job satisfaction.

Objective 1. The current study will provide a descriptive analysis of the use of instructional feedback sources. The study will describe the sources of feedback utilized by university instructors. Along with utilization of the various feedback sources, instructors' perceptions of value with regard to those sources will be examined. Seven feedback sources were examined: institutional student ratings, consultation with faculty, soliciting feedback from students, self-assessment, self-observation, peer/administrator observation, and team teaching.

Objective 2. The current study examined correlations between job satisfaction and frequency of use of each source of feedback and the scores on the three basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness). As Dee (2004) found, faculty turnover intent was low to moderate in respondents who reported high levels of autonomy and communication openness. Ouyang and Paprock (2006) found that teacher

job satisfaction was influenced by administrative support, school characteristics, and interactions with students and colleagues.

Objective 3. Research on Self Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2002) suggests that external rewards such as positive feedback enhance, rather than deter, intrinsic motivation. The present study examined the relationships among the three basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) and the utilization of seven various feedback sources. Analysis was made by looking at the correlations between the frequency of use for each source of feedback and the scores on the three basic needs.

Method

Participants

Participants included 126 instructors from Western Kentucky University (WKU; males $n = 58$; females $n = 68$). An online survey was administered through the faculty's university email (see Appendix A for demographics questionnaire). Participants read an informed consent statement and then chose if they wished to participate (Appendix B). The survey was accessible to participants for approximately one week. If participants chose, their names were entered into a drawing to receive four meal vouchers for the Fresh Food Company located on WKU's campus as an incentive for participation. A total of 20 participants were chosen as recipients for the meal vouchers. This study was reviewed and approved by the University's Human Subjects Review Board (Appendix C).

Representation of instructors from the various colleges throughout WKU is shown in Table 1. The mean number of years teaching at the college level for respondents was 12.06 ($SD = 7.77$). When asked to report teaching position at WKU, the following were obtained: (a) Instructor [$f = 35$]; (b) Visiting Professor [$f = 4$]; (c) Assistant Professor [$f = 43$]; (d) Associate Professor [$f = 25$]; (e) Professor [$f = 14$]; and (f) Department Head [$f = 3$]. The mean number of students per section of class taught was 30.74 ($SD = 16.98$). When asked to report the primary level of classes taught, the following were reported: (a) Remedial [$f = 2$]; (b) 100 and 200 level Undergraduate [$f = 53$]; (c) 300 and 400 level Undergraduate [$f = 56$]; and (d) Graduate [$f = 13$]. The majority of respondents ($f = 109$) reported that the primary format of classes taught was in face-to-face interaction with students. Respondents were asked, with reference to the number of hours spent working

per week, to report what percentage of that time was spent on teaching related activities.

The mean percentage of time spent on teaching related activities per week was 64%.

When asked if any previous teaching awards at the college level had been awarded to the participants, 44 participants responded that they had won some type of award for their teaching. When asked if any previous training had been obtained in soliciting feedback from students, 32 participants reported that they had received some type of previous training.

Table 1

Representation of Instructors (n = 126)

<i>Associated College</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Potter College of Arts & Letters	31	25
Ogden College of Science and Engineering	30	24
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	20	16
College of Health and Human Services	17	13
Gordon Ford College of Business	9	7
University College	5	4
Unreported	14	11

Measures

Source of feedback questionnaire. For the present study, a source of feedback questionnaire was created (see Appendix D). The feedback questionnaire examined sources of feedback utilized by the participants. Those sources of feedback include institutional student ratings, soliciting feedback from students, self-assessment, self-observation, peer/administrator observation, and team teaching. Various Likert scales were presented and used throughout the feedback questionnaire.

Basic Needs Satisfaction. The Basic Needs Satisfaction questionnaire (Deci et al., 2001) was adapted from the original version to assess basic psychological needs for teaching. The measure assessed participants' satisfaction with their job in teaching within the last academic year and is based on the Self Determination Theory model (see Appendix E). The questionnaire is based on the proposal that with the satisfaction of basic needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) teachers will show greater job satisfaction. Twenty-three items were presented to the participants and they responded to each item using a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 (not true at all) to 5 (very true). Higher scores indicate higher levels of basic needs satisfaction. Deci et al. (2001) reported Cronbach's alpha for the total-need satisfaction scale in an American sample of participants to be .89. Baard, Deci, and Ryan (2004) found intrinsic need satisfaction to be positively correlated with work performance ratings (job satisfaction) and with psychological adjustment. For the current study, the questionnaire was broken down into subscales to measure autonomy, competence, relatedness with students, and relatedness with colleagues. The following Cronbach's alphas were obtained for each

subscale: (a) autonomy [$\alpha = .71$]; (b) competence [$\alpha = .78$]; (c) relatedness with students [$\alpha = .83$]; and (d) relatedness with colleagues [$\alpha = .81$].

Present Job Satisfaction. The Present Job Satisfaction questionnaire was used to assess participants' satisfaction with their job in reference to teaching at WKU (see Appendix F). Four questions were presented to the participants. The four questions used have been used frequently as measures of job satisfaction (Larkin, 1990; Oshagbemi 1995; Oshagbemi, 1999). Each question had five response choices, numbered one through five. A combined score of 20 on the four questions indicates that the participant is very satisfied with their job. A combined score of four suggests that the participant is very dissatisfied with their job. The Cronbach's alpha obtained in the present study was $\alpha = .82$.

Competence Valuation. A two item scale was used to assess competence valuation: "It is important to me to receive positive feedback ratings in regards to my teaching" and "I care very much about how well I perform as a teacher." A 7-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) were used. Responses can be summed to form a competence valuation index (Cronbach's $\alpha = .82$; Elliot et al., 2000). The current study obtained Cronbach's $\alpha = .78$ for the competence valuation measure.

Results

Objective 1. The purpose of the first objective was to provide a descriptive analysis of use of instructional feedback sources used by instructors at the college level. Other information gathered included examples of how each source is used and interest in learning more about how to use each source. When asked to select the most helpful source of feedback from the seven presented, respondents rated soliciting feedback from students as the most helpful for improving an instructor's effectiveness ($f = 40$), and institutional student ratings (SITE ratings at WKU) as the least helpful source of feedback ($f = 63$). Likewise, when asked to rate the usefulness (1 = not useful at all; 4 = very useful) of each source of feedback for improving teaching, respondents rated soliciting feedback from students as the most useful source ($M = 3.05$; $SD = .91$), and the least useful was institutional student ratings ($M = 2.06$; $SD = .97$) (see Table 2).

Table 2

Most and Least Helpful Sources (n = 126); Usefulness of Sources

	Consult. with Faculty	Institutional Student Rating	Peer/Admin. Obs.	Self- Assess.	Self- Obs.	Solicit. Feedback	Team Teach.
*Most Helpful	21	9	23	7	5	40	17
*Least Helpful	5	63	12	17	9	6	13
**Useful.	2.98 (.84)	2.06 (.97)	2.81 (.93)	2.80 (.93)	2.80 (.83)	3.05 (.91)	2.65 (1.02)

Note. * Frequencies; ** Mean (Standard Deviation; Not all of the 126 participants responded to every item for the usefulness questions

For utilization of the sources of feedback participants were asked to identify how often they use each particular source of feedback to help improve teaching (1 = never; 3 = sometimes; 5 = always). As can be seen in Table 3, self-assessment was found to be the most utilized source of feedback during a typical school year ($M = 3.69$; $SD = 1.16$), and self-observation was the least utilized ($M = 1.55$; $SD = .89$). When asked if participants would be interested in learning more about utilizing each source of feedback to improve their teaching (1 = strongly disagree; 4 = strongly agree) respondents showed the greatest interest in learning more about how to use consultation with faculty ($M = 2.91$; $SD = .72$) and the least interest for the utilization of institutional student ratings ($M = 1.80$; $SD = .88$).

When soliciting feedback from students, 76% of respondents reported that they collect that information through open verbal discussions with students. Participants were asked if it was necessary to regularly seek feedback in order to improve competence in

Table 3

Utilization and Desire for More Information on Sources

	Consult. with Faculty <i>n</i> = 126	Institutional Student Rating <i>n</i> = 125	Peer/Admi n. Obs. <i>n</i> = 124	Self- Assess <i>n</i> = 124	Self- Obs. <i>n</i> = 125	Solicit. Feed. <i>n</i> = 125	Team Teach. <i>n</i> = 125
*Utiliza -tion	3.17 (.83)	2.94 (1.19)	1.99 (.98)	3.69 (1.16)	1.55 (.89)	3.47 (.96)	1.74 (1.06)
*Desire for more info.	2.91 (.72)	1.80 (.88)	2.43 (.92)	2.62 (.76)	2.30 (.84)	2.65 (.76)	2.50 (.87)

Note. *Mean (Standard Deviation)

the classroom (1 = strongly disagree; 4 = strongly agree). When responding, participants agreed that it is important to seek instructional feedback on a regular basis ($M = 3.01$; $SD = .98$). Respondents were asked to provide examples of how they utilize each source of feedback in the study. Tables 4 - 10 contain the breakdown of categories for each source of feedback and a verbatim example for each category. All exemplars provided by respondents were reviewed and placed into broad categories that were created based on general themes seen in the exemplars. Table 4 provides examples of how institutional student ratings (SITE ratings at WKU) are used by instructors to help improve their teaching. Two main themes are present in the categorical breakdown of examples: (a) instructors feel that SITE evaluations are not useful; and (b) instructors use the information gained from the evaluations to alter some type of class material.

Table 4

Examples of How Information Gained from Institutional Student Ratings is used to Improve Teaching (n = 96)

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Have not used them/SITE evals are not useful	31
<i>*I don't really. I feel that many of the comments are often rushed and do not really reflect upon what took place in my classroom.</i>	
Alter assignments, rubrics, textbooks, etc.	25
<i>*Students comments can lead you to continue or discontinue some practices, i. e. on line assignments, posting notes etc.</i>	
Consider student comments (non-specific examples)	20
<i>*With the written comments, I check for a pattern of good or bad comments, categorize them, assign a value and see if I can alter or increase my behavior. I also look to see that I am generally in the top with good ratings as compared to colleagues.</i>	

Table 4 (continued)

Review comments regarding class content	8
<i>* I look at comments regarding content. If students mention that a particular content of the course was not necessary or beneficial to them, then I may consider tweaking that component of the course.</i>	
Changed something about personal presentation style	7
<i>*I get useful information from some of the open-ended comments that are specific about the effectiveness of a particular assignment or teaching practice. Whether the evaluation of the practice is a positive or negative one, it helps me adapt my teaching...</i>	
Discuss evaluation results with students/discuss importance of evals	3
<i>* I strongly urge students to write positive and/or negative remarks with particular examples. That's what I can use the most.</i>	
Make classes easier	2
<i>*I have actually made classes easier because students said they did not want to do the work. Since I am untenured, and most of my advancement relies on these SITE evaluations, I am playing the game, and appeasing the students.</i>	
Miscellaneous	1
<i>Note. First line represents categories of responses; * represents an exemplar</i>	

Table 5 provides examples of how consultation with other faculty members is used to help improve teaching. One main theme was present throughout the participants' responses and that was that instructors gain advice on classroom and/or assignment policies from consultation with other faculty members.

Table 5

Examples of how Consultation with Other Faculty Members is used to Improve Teaching (n = 96)

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Advice on classroom and assignment policies	45
<i>*I have gotten a great deal of advice regarding policies such as make-up tests, dropping test grades, curving, etc.</i>	
Use suggestions to improve teaching	15
<i>*I take suggestions and use them as ways of creating new directions in teaching.</i>	
Introduce new topics/activities/approaches to class	12
<i>*I typically consult with other faculty when developing new class projects. It may be to develop the project, get ideas for a new project, explore ways to implement or operationalize the project, and/or it may be to review it for potential 'glitches' or issues in implementation.</i>	
General advice/consultation	10
<i>*I regularly speak with the head of the subject I teach, and also with other people who teach the same course. Since there is a very wide variety of styles and expectations amongst those teaching this course and no overall guidelines, I hope to achieve some balance of standards and expectations.</i>	
Advice on tests/exams	3
<i>*A faculty told me they allowed multiple test attempts because it provided students with more "book" time. I've incorporated that into some of my courses.</i>	
Nothing/NA	2
<i>*I don't speak with other faculty enough...I teach as an adjunct.</i>	
Peer review	1
<i>*We do peer review. Also I have earned advanced certification as a nurse faculty, To recertify I have to keep an electronic portfolio based on a self-assessment of expert nurse faculty standards showing continual improvement.</i>	
Miscellaneous	7

Note. First line represents categories of responses; * represents an exemplar

Table 6 contains the categorical breakdown of how non-university student feedback is used to improve teaching. The main theme seen in the participants' responses was that the instructors have discussions with students to hear their opinions on how the class is going.

Table 6

Examples of how Non-University Student Feedback is used to Improve Teaching (n = 125)

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Ask students' opinions/ideas; discussions in class	28
<i>*We talk about it in class, during the semester, not when it's evaluation time and too late to make changes.</i>	
Create surveys for class; Blackboard surveys; anonymous feedback	18
<i>*I do surveys for all my courses - they are submitted anonymously (on-line) - we have debriefing sessions at the end of every semester - this works great with graduate students.</i>	
Mid-year/semester student feedback	9
<i>*I ask students at mid-term for suggestions to improve the class; I summarize responses and address them -- either in explaining why it's not possible to enact suggestions or by enacting them.</i>	
Alter assignments/course	7
<i>*I have changed course teaching strategies, requirements, ordering of the timing of tests etc.</i>	
One-on-one interviews with students	6
<i>*Sometimes, particularly in a one-on-one help session, a student is able to verbalize a common problem or misunderstanding which helps me understand their thinking better and allows me to create a new explanation, or a new way to present the material.</i>	

Table 6 (*continued*)

Information gained from conferences or journal articles	5
<i>*Read about university instruction Attend sessions at conferences on instruction.</i>	
Ask past students for feedback	2
<i>*I occasionally ask students I have had in class before how they enjoyed the course and what things would they change if they could. I typically try to adapt my course to include the changes recommended.</i>	
Obtain feedback from outside sources	2
<i>*I occasionally will have guest speakers who can also offer content evaluation as experts.</i>	
Miscellaneous	13

Note. First line represents categories of responses; * represents an exemplar

Two main themes were seen in responses regarding how self-assessment is used to improve teaching: (a) instructors' reflection on their teaching; and (b) review student performance/understanding on assignments. Table 7 contains the categorical breakdown of responses by participants.

Table 7

Examples of how Self-Assessment is used to Improve Teaching (n = 90)

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Review student performance/understanding on assignments, tests, etc.	21
<i>*I look at student performance on exams or other projects and reflect on where they made mistakes and alter/adapt my instructions.</i>	
Reflect on class afterward	21
<i>*Reflect after a class as to how it went, what the students seemed to understand and not understand, if they were bored and how might I present the same info differently next time.</i>	

Table 7 (continued)

Annual/semester self-evaluation and make necessary changes to improve	11
<i>*At the end of the semester, I systematically mentally review the class and try to see it how students see it. Then, I make changes as needed. I also try to evaluate what went well and what went not so well from my perspective and change what needs to be changed there, too.</i>	
Review and update course material	10
<i>*Constantly review & update lecture topics to keep them current and relevant.</i>	
Change what needs to be changed	8
<i>*If, in my assessment, things did not go as well as planned, I make changes and reassess after the changes were implemented.</i>	
Read books on self-assessment/use material from conferences	3
<i>*There are times when I know I'm losing steam late in the semester or that I'm weak on a certain topic and need to improve. I use this info to revive my teaching and seek professional development for weak areas.</i>	
Reflection	3
<i>*I think about what I do.</i>	
Use videotaping to review teaching	2
<i>*Videotaping allows me to review my teaching style, presentation skills, and effectiveness in soliciting student interaction by reviewing myself in a lecture session.</i>	
Reflection in conjunction with SITE evals	2
<i>*I use SITE scores and my own interpretation of the "mood" of the class throughout the semester to see how things are going.</i>	
Create goals for myself	2
<i>*I use it to set goals for myself.</i>	
Miscellaneous	7

Note. First line represents categories of responses; * represents an exemplar

Table 8 contains the categorical breakdown of participants' responses for how self-observation is used to improve teaching. One main theme was present in responses; through self-observation, participants most frequently altered their teaching style or presentation.

Table 8

Examples of how Self-Observation is Used to Improve Teaching (n = 37)

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Changed teaching presentation after watching video	7
<i>*I tend to talk to the left side of the classroom. Taping myself helped me identify this problem and I now make conscious efforts to correct for that tendency.</i>	
Videotape through IVS classes/ITV tapes	5
<i>*I watch myself on ITV while it is happening, but it would be better to watch myself after teaching a lesson on ITV to really see what the students see daily.</i>	
Use of Tegrity Software	3
<i>*I taped my lectures using Tegrity and realized some things about the way I talk that made me rethink my approach.</i>	
Have not tried it, but think it would be useful	2
<i>*Haven't used it. But I think it would help my delivery.</i>	
Tried it but did not find useful	1
<i>*Didn't find it very useful.</i>	
Miscellaneous	19

Note. First line represents categories of responses; * represents an exemplar

Table 9 contains examples of how instructors use information gained from peer/administrator observation to improve teaching. Two themes emerged from the participants' responses: (a) gain information on class/presentation style; and (b) observations do not provide useful information.

Table 9

Examples of how Information Gained from Peer/Administrator Observations is used to Improve Teaching (n = 69)

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Use peer evaluation to gain feedback (non-specific)	18
<i>*I always have a peer-evaluation at least once per semester. I ask someone who has not taught the class, our department has a form to complete for this purpose, and I pay attention to their feedback.</i>	
Gained information on the way class is run/presentation style	9
<i>*I have had peers sit in on classes and give me feedback on presentation style. I try to incorporate this feedback into my teaching.</i>	
Used it but did not gain any real information	7
<i>*I've only had this done a handful of times, and most of the time the comments are along the lines of "you're doing just fine..."</i>	
Not a good idea; not useful	6
<i>*I have never found observations to be beneficial. There is never any advice given, only compliments. However, I would not care for that person's advice or critique unless I thought them to be an expert and a dynamic teacher.</i>	
Use feedback to learn strengths/weaknesses	4
<i>*Feedback from dept. head helps me take stock of strengths and areas for improvement in general--no specific example comes to mind.</i>	
Asked for feedback, but did not get any	2
<i>*This is rather humorous. There was a time when I asked for this kind of observation and feedback on a fairly regular basis. It was never taken seriously, and no one ever observed me in class. I stopped asking.</i>	

Table 9 (continued)

Miscellaneous	23
---------------	----

Note. First line represents categories of responses; * represents an exemplar

Table 10 includes the categorical breakdown of how instructors use team teaching to improve their teaching. Two themes emerged in responses including: (a) exposure to others' ideas and perspectives; and (b) team teaching is hard to carry through at the college level and/or participants have not tried team teaching because of its difficulty.

Table 10

Examples of how Team Teaching is used to Improve Teaching (n = 49)

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Share ideas; others' perspective; exposure to others' techniques	13
<p><i>*I have had at least one course each semester that is "team taught". We develop the syllabus together, set student goals, establish grading principles that we both will follow, and provide feedback to each other related to teaching (for both online and F2F courses). As we "bounce ideas" off each other, I am challenged to be more creative in my teaching and to rise to the level of my partner. When things go wrong (for instance one semester we had a group of students that would not participate well in discussions) we can discuss it, problem solve, but more importantly know that it is not just an isolated issue in MY teaching - we BOTH we having the problem.</i></p>	
Have never used team teaching	6
<p><i>*I've never used it as a way to improve teaching.</i></p>	
Not useful; tried but did not have a good experience	4
<p><i>*This is a very time consuming technique and only works when everyone is really committed to making an effort. My experience has been that with all of the other demands on our time, few of us can sustain that commitment for a full semester.</i></p>	

Table 10 (*continued*)

Team teaching is beneficial to students and faculty	3
<i>*Team teaching gives the student multiple inputs on content. I teach in a clinical oriented area. It always helps to have another person input on clinical experience for myself and the student.</i>	
Would like to team teach	3
<i>*I would love to do more of this -- joint assignments between different graduate courses.</i>	
Used to train/help graduate assistants	2
<i>*I have used team teaching mainly to train graduate students so that they can independently teach their own sections of a multi-section lab. I also participate in a course with five teachers, each teaches a three week module. Most of the time we do not visit each others modules. Such visits would be helpful in providing a better continuity to the course.</i>	
Currently team teaching	2
<i>*I am using a team teaching approach for the first time this semester. We have not really evaluated it yet.</i>	
Team taught in the past, but not currently	1
<i>*I haven't peer taught in several years. I'd like the opportunity to do so.</i>	
Miscellaneous	15

Note. First line represents categories of responses; * represents an exemplar

Because institutional student ratings are the most prevalent source of feedback used by administrators to evaluate teaching at the college level, this type of feedback source was closely reviewed as part of the current study. When asked if institutional student ratings are a good source of information in planning changes in teaching, instructors somewhat disagreed (1 = strongly disagree; 4 = strongly agree) ($M = 2.19$; $SD = .78$). Participants also somewhat disagreed that student ratings influenced instructional decisions made in the classroom ($M = 2.28$; $SD = .85$). When asked if participants felt

that open-ended student comments from student ratings improved teaching, respondents somewhat disagreed ($M = 2.35$; $SD = .97$). When asked what changes respondents would like to make to the SITE evaluations administered at WKU, various suggestions were given. The categorical breakdown of suggestions for change to the SITE evaluations is included in Table 11. Of those suggestions made, three main themes emerged: (a) questions (changing existing or adding questions); (b) timing (when given during the semester); and (c) use of (not using for promotion, using with other measures, etc.).

Table 11

Suggestions for Change to SITE Evaluations (n = 96)

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Restructure questions/add or remove specific questions	19
<i>*Change the questions to what the students really know, not what they might expect. Provide more open ended questions or at least encourage more open ended questions.</i>	
Get rid of SITE evaluations	12
<i>*Dispose of them and start over with a validated instrument that tells us something about instructional competence. The current instrument was begun as a form of confidential self help and now is a widely distributed, highly quantified, student blog.</i>	
Encourage students to take evaluations more seriously/train students to give constructive feedback	12
<i>*I would encourage comments from more students by having the proctor reminding the students that they can do so, and by providing enough time for them to write.</i>	
Ask specific open-ended questions	9
<i>*More open ended questions regarding attitudes towards assignments and policies.</i>	

Table 11 (continued)

Move to end of the semester/change time-frame given	8
<i>*Site evaluations are being given earlier than ever. A number of students have remarked that it is too early to evaluate the course. The last week of class seems much more relevant to the purpose of these evaluations.</i>	
Unsure of changes to be made	8
<i>*Since the scores on SITE evaluations have been used as a quantitative measure of teaching performance in Salary decisions and tenure/promotion I found that it was very self-defeating to put my own questions on the SITE survey that would give me specific feedback on different teaching styles and methods. Therefore, I go with the default SITE questions and try to find other ways to get feedback from the students that will be truly helpful.</i>	
Allow teachers/departments to add questions	5
<i>*Instructors adding their own questions to their SITEs. These questions could be tailored to specific assignments and practices.</i>	
Link comments to expected grades/class GPA	3
<i>*Tie student comments to performance in class. It is often the students that do not show up for class, turn in late work, and are doing poorly in a course that give you poor evaluations.</i>	
Do not use them for promotion/tenure	3
<i>*Not useful. SITEs are used against faculty when they wish to fire a faculty. For most faculty they have no value. It is useful to see if students have strong negative reaction, but 3.5 or 3.8 have no value.</i>	
Get results back faster	2
<i>*Get them back faster! For example if I had great feedback from the fall semester and would like to make changes, we don't get them back until late February. What good does that do if it is something that needed to be changed at the beginning of the semester or on the syllabus?</i>	
Use with additional measures	2
<i>*I'm not sure what changes I would make. I think it would be helpful in addition to SITE evaluations to have a panel of students, as well as peers or superiors, who are trained to evaluate instructors over time and are not anonymous.</i>	

Table 11 (*continued*)

Put online and make available at other times	2
*Administer them online during the next semester following the class. I think often students cannot see the value of what you taught them until they move into the next level of classes. They are overwhelmed during the class with tests, papers, etc. and cannot give a true representation of their accomplishments until later. As the saying goes "hindsight is 20/20". I have found this to be true in classes where I was the student also.	
Do not include student comments	1
*Do not include the personal student comments. They often do not pertain to improving teaching, but are personal attacks on the teacher.	
Miscellaneous	12
<i>Note.</i> First line represents categories of responses; * represents an exemplar	

Objective 2. Objective 2 examined the association among job satisfaction and the utilization of the seven sources of feedback and fulfillment of the three basic psychological needs. Job satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated with competence valuation (actually caring about completing a task successfully) ($r = .296, p = .001$). Job satisfaction was also significantly correlated with the basic needs: autonomy ($r = .455, p < 0.01$), competence ($r = .456, p < 0.01$), relatedness with students ($r = .350, p < 0.01$), and relatedness with colleagues ($r = .279, p = .002$). Two other items from the basic needs measure were found to be significantly correlated with job satisfaction: enjoyment ($r = .600, p < 0.01$), and effort ($r = .381, p < 0.01$). In examining the relationship between job satisfaction and the utilization of the various sources of instructional feedback, job satisfaction was only significantly correlated with the utilization of institutional student ratings ($r = .248, p = .005$) (see Table 12).

Objective 3. The third objective of the study was to explore the relationships among the three basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) and

the utilization of feedback sources. The first two basic needs, autonomy and competence, were not significantly correlated with the utilization of any of the seven sources of feedback.

The need for relatedness was broken down into relatedness with students and relatedness with colleagues. Student relatedness was found to be significantly correlated with the utilization of institutional student ratings ($r = .247, p = .006$). Colleague relatedness was found to be significantly correlated with the utilization of peer/administrator observations ($r = .258, p = .004$) and consultation with other faculty members ($r = .327, p < 0.01$) (see Table 12).

Table 12

Pearson Correlations for Study Measures

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.
1. Job Satisfaction															
2. Competence Valuation	.296*														
3. Autonomy	.455*	.043													
4. Competence	.456*	.085	.558*												
5. Relatedness → Student	.350*	.083	.480*	.673*											
6. Relatedness → Colleague	.279*	.167	.372*	.240*	.328*										
7. Improve → Feedback	.124	.251*	.049	.176	-.024	.108									
8. SITE Utilization	.248*	.129	.091	.169	.247*	-.125	-.013								
9. CWF Utilization	.128	.159	.037	.006	.004	.327*	.068	-.064							
10. FFS Utilization	.187	.017	.004	.100	.113	.134	.074	.030	.310*						
11. SA Utilization	.168	.232*	-.048	.166	.033	-.042	.124	.065	.230	.306*					
12. SO Utilization	.182	.010	.122	.129	.015	.011	-.056	-.032	.183	.049	.201				
13. PAO Utilization	.046	.003	-.071	.081	.094	.258*	.000	.062	.408*	.294*	.164	.176			
14. TT Utilization	.082	.084	-.150	-.019	.037	.064	.039	.004	.253*	.143	.135	.186	.382*		
15. Enjoyment (basic needs)	.600*	.252*	.452*	.674*	.627*	.278*	.116	.30*	.194	.217	.220	.136	.118	.016	
16. Effort (basic needs)	.381*	.222	.33*	.589*	.585*	.300*	.117	.209	.248*	.254*	.259*	.061	.196	.117	.692*

Note. *Significant at the 0.01 level

Discussion

Objective 1. There is a limited amount of literature and research that examines the various sources of instructional feedback utilized at the college level. Supportive teaching environments include informative feedback from several different sources including students, colleagues, consultants, and teachers themselves (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999). The purpose of the first objective was to provide a descriptive analysis of use of instructional feedback sources used by instructors at the college level. Although it is known that obtaining feedback from various sources is beneficial to instructors, the most prevalent source of feedback provided to instructors at the college level appears to be institutional student ratings. In the current study, the overall feeling is that instructors are unsatisfied with the institutional student ratings administered at WKU. Participants indicated that they do not feel as though the ratings are a good source of information for planning changes in their teaching and do not influence instructional decisions. Participants also reported that institutional student ratings were the least helpful source of feedback. Similar to Nasser and Fresko's (2002) study on institutional student ratings, where few instructors, 3% to 10%, made substantial alterations to their teaching based on information gained from institutional student ratings, the current study found that instructors somewhat disagreed that institutional student ratings influenced instructional decisions and somewhat disagreed that the student ratings were a good source of information in planning changes in teaching.

A main theme seen in participants' responses regarding changes to the SITE evaluations was to include more specific questions regarding their teaching (Table 11). In reviewing the results of the current study administrators may want to consider altering

the current rating system to allow for more questions that address specific topics. Hoban and Hastings (2006) found that when more specific information was collected from students, critical reflection was stimulated in teachers and encouraged a change in the way classrooms were run. Feedback with more specific details about the class and the instructor make teachers better able to focus on specific issues of their teaching (Lang, 2006). More specific feedback is often collected when instructors solicit feedback on their own from students. In the current study soliciting feedback from students was rated as the most helpful and useful source of feedback for improving teaching implying that when instructors are able to ask specific questions to their students, they gain valuable information in regard to their teaching and effectiveness.

Although soliciting feedback from students was seen as the most helpful and useful source of feedback, the most utilized source of feedback reported by participants was self-assessment. It may be that self-assessment is easily accessible to instructors and there is no official training in utilization necessary. These factors may make self-assessment a more appealing source of feedback for instructors. Self-assessment, as stated by Amundsen et al. (1993), has been shown to be functional for maintaining motivation to teach well as well as for improving instruction. When instructors self-assess and make necessary changes they become more confident because they believe that through their own actions they have helped not only themselves but their students. Instructors who are feeling less confident about their teaching may consider utilizing self-assessment more. Through personal reflection and assessment instructors will be able to pinpoint specific areas that need to be focused on and make necessary changes.

Objective 2. The purpose of the second objective was to examine the association among job satisfaction and the utilization of the seven sources of feedback and fulfillment of the three basic psychological needs. The only source of feedback that was found to be significantly correlated with job satisfaction was utilization of institutional student ratings. This is an interesting finding considering that institutional student ratings were found to be the least helpful and least useful source of feedback. This finding may exist because institutional student ratings are the only source of feedback that all instructors have access to. It may also be that instructors who try to improve their teaching, regardless of the source of feedback used, are more satisfied with their jobs in contrast to those who do not try to improve. The fact that job satisfaction was linked with institutional student ratings may encourage administrators to alter the current rating system. By bettering the current rating system, instructors will gain more beneficial information thus leading to greater job satisfaction. Participants provided multiple exemplars of changes to be made to the SITE ratings (Table 11). By considering and utilizing these suggested changes, instructors may feel more supported by the administrators and feel as though they have a voice, which may lead to an increase in continued job satisfaction.

In the current study, job satisfaction at WKU was linked with the fulfillment of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. In addition to the three basic needs, job satisfaction was also linked with the fulfillment of enjoyment on the job and effort put into the job. As Dee (2004) found, faculty turnover intent was low to moderate when respondents reported high levels of autonomy and higher levels of communication openness. With fulfillment of the basic needs at WKU instructors appear to feel more

satisfied with their jobs. Increased opportunities to fulfill the basic needs may lead to an increase in job satisfaction. Environments that allow the basic needs to be met are predicted to maintain healthy functioning (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

Objective 3. The purpose of the third objective was to explore the relationships among the three basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) and the utilization of feedback sources. In the current study, autonomy and competence were not significantly correlated with any of the sources of instructional feedback. Relatedness with students was found to be significantly correlated with the utilization of institutional student ratings. Relatedness with colleagues was significantly correlated with the utilization of consultation with faculty members and utilization of peer/administrator observation. Cognitive Evaluation Theory suggests that the needs for competence and autonomy are involved in intrinsic motivation and that a contextual event, such as positive feedback, is likely to effect intrinsic motivation and be experienced as supporting satisfaction of those needs (Deci & Ryan, 2002). When positive feedback is given in a context that supports the basic needs, the feedback tends to be less controlling and more informational (Ryan, 1982). Administrators may take these findings into consideration by providing more support and opportunities for improvement to instructors. This may include giving instructors constructive feedback on areas that could be improved. The current study found that administrators are rarely conducting in-class observations and when they do, feedback is often uninformative. By providing more useful instructional feedback to the instructors, administrators would aide in partial fulfillment of the basic psychological needs.

It is unknown why autonomy and competence were not significantly correlated with any of the sources of instructional feedback in the current study. As stated in Self-Determination Theory competence is attained when people seek challenges that have the potential to maximize their capacities and enhance their skills (Deci & Ryan, 2002). With autonomy individuals feel value with their decisions and experiences (Deci & Ryan, 2002). It would seem likely that gaining feedback on teaching would lead to opportunities to change and enhance personal skills. Institutional student ratings at WKU are imposed upon instructors and there is no choice in whether they are administered or not. Not having a choice about student ratings likely hinders autonomy. Also, many instructors do not view institutional student ratings as a valid measure of their competence as an instructor. This may explain why there is no connection between fulfillment of competence and the utilization of the student ratings. It is likely that these psychological needs are being met by other means for instructors at WKU; however, those means are unknown with the results of the current study.

Limitations

A main limitation of the current study is the generalizability of results. The results of this study are limited because participants were only from WKU and participants were only volunteers; not all faculty members participated. A second limitation to the study is that participants completed the surveys through self-report. There was no control for social desirability bias. A third limitation of the current study is that 35% of participants reported receiving some type of teaching award at the college level. Because of this relatively high percentage, the sample of participants may be biased with better teachers.

Future Research

Kardos and Johnson (2007) found that when new teachers (novice teachers) were given assistance, encouraged to seek help, and expected to be learning and improving their teaching practice, they felt continuous support and encouragement from more experienced colleagues through mentoring relationships. Further examination of these mentoring relationships and other support systems that colleges and Universities provide to their faculty, would be another step in the fulfillment of psychological basic needs research for instructors.

Another expansion of research would be to examine types of training programs available to college instructors regarding the collection of instructional feedback. In the current study many instructors who reported receiving previous training in soliciting feedback reported that the training came from courses taken in their program of studies or certification classes. Very few participants were able to provide the name of an official training program or center in which they received training. With more awareness of training programs or services, college instructors would be more apt to collect feedback about their teaching if institutional student ratings do not provide adequate information.

Another future study would be experimental research where faculty members who are receiving training on how to solicit feedback from students are compared to a wait list control group with regard to job satisfaction and basic needs fulfillment. A comparison would be made between faculty members receiving training in one source to faculty receiving training in another source of feedback.

A final branch of research would be a study on how to facilitate the basic psychological needs. For instance, which need is most important for job satisfaction and which methods are most effective for facilitating fulfillment of each need?

Conclusion. The overall feeling regarding institutional student ratings at WKU is that instructors are not satisfied with the current rating system. Although much of the information regarding institutional student ratings was negative, significant correlations were shown between important factors (i.e., job satisfaction and fulfillment of relatedness). It may be that instructors who are looking to improve their teaching are willing to use any type of feedback that is easily accessible and requires no training in utilization. Institutional student ratings are accessible to all instructors across campus and although the feedback provided may not be the most valuable source of information, instructors may have a willingness to be open to that information. The factors of accessibility and no necessary training in utilization is also seen in the most helpful and useful source of feedback (soliciting feedback from students) and in the most utilized source of feedback (self-assessment). If there is a willingness to improve through the utilization of instructional feedback, instructors appear to be using those sources that they have easy access to and do not require any formal training to utilize.

References

- Amundsen, C., Gryspeerdt, D., & Moxness, K. (1993). Practice-centered inquiry: Developing more effective teaching. *Review of Higher Education, 16*(3), 329-353.
- Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baard, P. P., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*, 2045-2068.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Barnes, L., Agago, M., & Combs, W. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(4), 457-469.
- Buskist, W. (2002). Effective teaching: Perspectives and insights from Division Two's 2- and 4-year awardees. *Teaching of Psychology, 29*(3), 188-193.
- Dawson, P. J., Dawson, K. E., & Forness, S. R. (1975). Effect of video feedback on teacher behavior. *The Journal of Educational Research, 68*(5), 197-201.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Gagne, M., Leone, D. R., Usunov, J., & Kornazheva, B. P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former Eastern Bloc country: A cross-cultural study of self-determination. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin, 27*(8), 930-942.
- Dee, J. R. (2004). Turnover intent in an urban community college: Strategies for faculty retention. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 28*, 593-607.

- Elliot, A. J., Faler, J., McGregor, H. A., Campbell, W. K., Sedikides, C., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2000). Competence valuation as a strategic intrinsic motivation process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 780-794.
- Emery, L. (1997). Interest in teaching improvement: Differences for junior faculty. *Journal of Staff, Program, & Organizational Development*, 15, 29-34.
- Feldman, K. A., & Paulsen, M. B. (1999). Faculty motivation: The role of a supportive teaching culture. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 78, 71-78.
- Harackiewicz, J. M., & Manderlink, G. (1984). A process analysis of the effects of performance-contingent rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 20, 531-551.
- Hoban, G., & Hastings, G. (2006). Developing different forms of student feedback to promote teacher reflection: A 10-year collaboration. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(8), 1006-1019.
- Hoyt, D. P., & Pallett, W. H. (1999). *Appraising teaching effectiveness: Beyond student ratings*. IDEA paper No. 36. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Johnsrud, L., & Rosser, V. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multi-level explanation. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 518-542.
- Kardos, S. M., & Johnson, S. M. (2007). On their own and presumed expert: New teachers' experiences with their colleagues. *Teachers College Record*, 109(12).
- Kohler, F. W., Ezell, H. K., & Paluselli, M. (1999). Promoting changes in teachers' conduct of student pair activities: An examination of reciprocal peer coaching. *Journal of Special Education*, 33(3), 154-165.

- Kohut, G. F., Burnap, C., & Yon, M. G. (2007). Peer observation of teaching: Perceptions of the observer and the observed. *College Teaching*, 55(1), 19-25.
- Lang, J. M. (2006). Finishing strong. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(15).
- Lang, J. M. (2007). Did you learn anything? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(27), C1-C4.
- Larkin, J. M. (1990, Spring). Does gender affect internal auditors' performance? *The Woman CPA*, 20-24.
- Mandernach, J. (2006, June 1). Add a little mentoring for more effective instructor evaluation. *Distance Education Report*, 5.
- Manger, T., & Eikeland, O. (1990). Factors predicting staff's intentions to leave the university. *Higher Education*, 19(3), 281-291.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11(3), 253-388.
- McBride, S., Munday, R., & Tunnell, J. (1992). Community college faculty job satisfaction and propensity to leave. *Community/Junior College Quarterly*, 16, 157-165.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1991). Test-based accountability as a reform strategy. *Phi Delta Dappan*, 73, 248-250.
- Mento, A. J., & Giampetro-Meyer, A. (2000). Peer observation of teaching as a true developmental opportunity. *College Teaching*, 48(1), 28-31.
- Nasser, F., & Fresko, B. (2002). Faculty views of student evaluation of college teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(2), 187-198.

- Newmann, F. M., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators by the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools*. Madison, WI: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.
- Oshagbemi, T. (1995). Job satisfaction of workers in higher education. *Reflections on Higher Education*, 7(8), 65-89.
- Oshagbemi, T. (1999). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single versus multiple-item measures? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14(5), 388-403.
- Ouyang, M., & Paprock, K. (2006, February). *Teacher job satisfaction and retention: A comparison study between the U.S. and China*. Paper presented at the Academy of Human Resource Development International Conference, Columbus, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED492688).
- Perie, M., Baker, D. P., & Whitener, S. (1997, July). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensations*. U.S. Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1-144.
- Piccinin, S., Cristi, C., & McCoy, M. (1999). The impact of individual consultation on student ratings of teaching. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 4, 75-88.
- Rodebaugh, T. L., & Rapee, R. M. (2005). Those who think they look worst respond best: Self-observer discrepancy predicts response to video feedback following a speech task. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 29(6), 705-715.
- Ross, J. A., & Bruce, C. D. (2007). Teacher self-assessment: A mechanism for facilitating professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 146-159.

- Roth, W., & Tobin, K. (2004). Coteaching: From theory to practice. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 10(2), 161-180.
- Ryan, R. M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 450-461.
- Sargent, T., & Hannum, E. (2005). Keeping teachers happy: Job satisfaction among primary school teachers in rural Northwest China. *Comparative Education Review*, 49(2), 173-204.
- Schunk, D. H. (1995, August). *Development of strategic competence through self-regulation and attributions*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Smart, J. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education*, 31(5), 405-424.
- Smith, R. (2001). Formative evaluation and the scholarship of teaching and learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 88, 51-62.
- Stevens, E. (1998, Autumn). Tinkering with teaching. *The Review of Higher Education*, 12(1), 63-78.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1995). Assessing effective teaching. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 7(2), 127-138.
- Wasserstein, A. G., Quistberg, D. A., & Shea, J. A. (2007). Mentoring at the University of Pennsylvania: Results of a faculty survey. *Society of General Internal Medicine*, 22, 210-214.

Weimer, M. (1990). *Improving college teaching: Strategies for developing effectiveness*.

San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A
Demographics Questionnaire

Demographics

1. Gender: _____
2. Years teaching at the college level: _____
3. Teaching position :
 - Instructor ____
 - Professor ____
 - Assistant Professor ____
 - Associate Professor ____
 - Visiting Professor ____
 - Department Head ____
4. Level of classes taught (check all that apply)
 - Remedial ____
 - Undergraduate (100 & 200) ____
 - Undergraduate (300 & 400) ____
 - Graduate ____
5. Typical number of students in each class:
 - Remedial _____
 - Undergraduate (100 & 200) _____
 - Undergraduate (300 & 400) _____
 - Graduate _____
6. Subject area taught: _____
7. Primary format of class (face-to-face, online, etc.): _____
8. Indicate if you have won previous teaching awards from: (answer all that apply)
 - Department: _____
 - College: _____
 - University: _____
 - Other: _____
9. Have you ever had any previous training on how to solicit feedback from students? If yes, please explain the type of training:

10. What percent of time would you say you spend on teaching related activities per week (0 to 100%)?

For your participation in the current study, you are eligible for four meal vouchers (\$6.00 each; \$24 total) at the Fresh Food Company located on Western's campus. A total of 20 participants will be chosen as recipients for the meal vouchers. Please provide your name and email address if you wish to take part in the drawing. This information will not be linked to your questionnaire responses in order to maintain anonymity.

Name: _____

Email Address: _____

Appendix B
Informed Consent

Informed Consent

Study Name: *An Examination of Sources of Instructional Feedback and the Connection with Self Determination Theory and Job Satisfaction*

You are being asked to complete a survey. The purposes of this survey are to examine the various sources of instructional feedback utilized by University instructors and the connection with motivation and job satisfaction. By completing the survey packet you are consenting to participate in this research endeavor.

For your participation, your name may be entered into a drawing for four meal vouchers (\$6.00 each; \$24 total) at the Fresh Food Company located on Western's campus. A total of 20 participants will be chosen as recipients for the meal vouchers. You understand that there are no other direct benefits to you and that you will receive no monetary compensation for participation in this study.

Refusal to participate in the survey will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

You understand that your responses will be confidential. No identifying information, including your name and email address, will be connected to your responses. The entire experiment should take approximately 30 minutes.

If you have any questions about the research please contact Paige Birkholz at 502-321-8027 or Dr. Steven Wininger at 745-4421.

THE DATED APPROVAL ON THIS PREAMBLE STATEMENT INDICATES THAT THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD Sean Rubino, Compliance Manager
TELEPHONE: (270) 745-4652

APPROVED 03/04/08 EXPIRES 08/15/08

HS08-139

Appendix C

Human Subjects Review Board Letter

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Human Subjects Review Board
Office of Sponsored Programs
301 Potter Hall
270-745-4652; Fax 270-745-4211
E-mail: Sean.Rubino@wku.edu

In future correspondence please refer to HS08-139, February 4, 2008

Paige Birkholz
c/o Dr. Steve Wininger
Psychology
WKU

Dear Paige:

Your research project, "An Examination of Sources of Instructional Feedback and the Connection with Self-Determination Theory and Job Satisfaction," was reviewed by the HSRB and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk. Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects' welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

1. In addition, the IRB found that you need to orient participants as follows: (1) signed informed consent is not required as participation and completion of the survey will imply consent; (2) Provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data. (3) Appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects.

This project is therefore approved at the Expedited Review Level until August 15, 2008

2. Please note that the institution is not responsible for any actions regarding this protocol before approval. If you expand the project at a later date to use other

instruments please re-apply. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the above address. Please report any changes to this approved protocol to this office. A Continuing Review protocol will be sent to you in the future to determine the status of the project.

Sincerely,

Sean Rubino, M.P.A.
Compliance Manager
Office of Sponsored Programs
Western Kentucky University

cc: HS file number Birkholz HS08-139

Appendix D

Sources of Feedback Questionnaire

Sources of Feedback Questionnaire

General Feedback

1. Which of the following sources of feedback is the most helpful in improving an instructor's effectiveness (select one):
 - a. Institutional student ratings (SITE evaluations at WKU)
 - b. Consultation with faculty (the process of a faculty member seeking information on ways to improve their teaching from other faculty members)
 - c. Soliciting feedback from students (soliciting feedback from students can include interviewing students, using learning logs, mini-surveys, etc.)
 - d. Self-assessment (self-reflections, self-judgments, and self-reactions)
 - e. Self-observation (taping yourself, either video or audio, in order to gain useful information to help improve your teaching)
 - f. Peer/administrator observation (can include peers/administrators sitting in on classes or watching videos of your teaching together)
 - g. Team teaching (peer coaching, co-teaching) (persistent shared planning, are both in the classroom at the same time for the majority of the time, and negotiate goals, methods, and strategies)
 - h. Other: _____

2. Which of the following sources of feedback is the least helpful in improving an instructor's effectiveness (select one):
 - a. Institutional student ratings
 - b. Consultation with faculty
 - c. Soliciting feedback from students
 - d. Self-assessment
 - e. Self-observation
 - f. Peer/administrator observation
 - g. Team teaching (peer coaching, co-teaching)

3. How would you rate the usefulness of the following sources of feedback for improving teaching using the following scale:

1=not useful at all 2=somewhat useful 3=useful 4=very useful

 - a. Institutional student ratings
 - b. Consultation with faculty
 - c. Soliciting feedback from students
 - d. Self-assessment
 - e. Self-observation
 - f. Peer/administrator observation
 - g. Team teaching (peer coaching, co-teaching)

4. In order to improve an instructor's competence in the classroom, it is essential to seek regular feedback

1 = strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

Institutional Student Ratings

SITE evaluations administered at WKU

1. During the course of a typical school year, how often do you utilize SITE evaluations to help improve your teaching?

1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = most of the time 5 = always

2. Student ratings are a good source of information for planning changes in teaching
 1= strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
3. Student ratings influence my instructional decisions
 1= strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
4. The open-ended student comments on SITE evaluations help me improve my teaching
 1= strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
5. Rate each of the following with regards to usefulness of the information gained:
 1=not useful 2=somewhat useful 3=useful 4=very useful
- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| a. General SITE items | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. Departmental SITE items | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. Open ended student comments | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
6. In regards to SITE evaluations, what changes would you make to the SITE evaluations at WKU in order to gain more useful information about your teaching?

7. Please provide examples for how you use information gained from institutional student ratings to improve your teaching?

8. I would be interested in having a consultant review my SITE ratings to help me interpret the results.
 1= strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

Consultation with faculty

Consultation refers to the process of a faculty member seeking information on ways to improve their teaching from other faculty members.

1. During the course of a typical school year, how often do you use consultation with other faculty members?
 1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = most of the time 5 = always

2. If faced with a dilemma in regards to my teaching, I prefer to discuss the issue with other faculty members.
- 1 = strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree
3. When consulting with other faculty members, what do you wish to gain from the consultation?
-
4. Please provide examples of how you use consultation with other faculty members to improve your teaching.
-
5. I would be interested in having this source of feedback available to me at WKU.
- 1 = strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

Soliciting feedback from students

While most all colleges and universities conduct end of the semester student ratings, professors may choose to solicit feedback from students at other times throughout the semester. Soliciting feedback from students can include interviewing students, using learning logs, mini-surveys, etc.

1. During the course of a typical school year, how often do you solicit feedback from students?
- 1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = most of the time 5 = always
2. If you do seek additional feedback from students, how do you collect that information? Check all that apply:
- ___ open-ended written student comments
 - ___ open verbal discussion with the instructor
 - ___ close-ended questions or ratings
 - ___ planned focus groups led by persons other than the instructor
3. Please provide examples of how you use non-university student feedback to improve your teaching.
-
4. I would be interested in learning how to solicit feedback from students
- 1 = strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

Self-Assessment

Self-assessments can include self-reflection, self-judgments, and self-reactions.

1. During the course of a typical school year, how often do you utilize self-assessment?
1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = most of the time 5 = always

2. Please provide examples of how you use self-assessment to improve your teaching.

3. I would be interested in learning more about how to conduct self-assessments
1 = strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

Self-Observation

Self-observation includes taping yourself, either video or audio, in order to gain useful information to help improve your teaching

1. How often do you use self-observation in a typical academic year?
1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = most of the time 5 = always

2. Please provide examples of how you use self-observation to improve your teaching.

3. I would be interested in gaining more information about how to use self-observations in order to improve my teaching.
1 = strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

Peer/Administrator Observation

Peers/administrators can provide useful information to each other because of the directed attention towards specific aspects of the teacher's performance. This can include peers sitting in on classes or watching videos of your teaching together.

1. How often do you utilize peer/administrator observations per year?
1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = most of the time 5 = always

2. Please provide examples of how you use information gained from peer/administrator observations to improve your teaching.

3. I would like for my peers/administrators to conduct observations in my classroom to help improve my teaching?
1 = strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

Team Teaching (peer coaching, co-teaching)

Team teaching can include two instructors of equal ability level, working together. The two instructors have persistent shared planning, are both in the classroom at the same time for the majority of the time, and negotiate goals, methods, and strategies.

1. How often do you use team teaching during a typical academic year?

1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = most of the time 5 = always

2. Please provide examples of how you use team teaching to improve your teaching.
-

3. I would be interested in gaining more information on how to use team teaching to improve my teaching?

1 = strongly disagree 2 = somewhat disagree 3 = agree 4 = strongly agree

Appendix E
Basic Needs Satisfaction

Basic Needs Satisfaction

The following questions concern your feelings about your teaching during the last year (spring 2007 semester through fall 2007 semester). If you have been teaching for less than a year, this concerns the entire time you have been teaching. Please indicate how true each of the following statements are for your given experiences as an instructor. Remember that your department head/dean will never know how you responded to the questions. Please use the following scale in responding to the items:

1	2	3	4	5
not true at all		somewhat true		very true
1. I feel like I have a lot of choices in deciding how to teach				1 2 3 4 5
2. I really like the students I teach				1 2 3 4 5
3. I do <u>not</u> feel very confident in my ability to teach				1 2 3 4 5
4. Others tell me I am a good teacher				1 2 3 4 5
5. I teach because I have to				1 2 3 4 5
6. I get along well with the students I teach				1 2 3 4 5
7. I do <u>not</u> interact with other colleagues much when I am at school				1 2 3 4 5
8. I feel free to express my ideas and opinions while teaching				1 2 3 4 5
9. I consider my colleagues I work with to be my friends				1 2 3 4 5
10. I do <u>not</u> think I am a very good teacher				1 2 3 4 5
11. I do <u>not</u> really have a choice with regards to deciding what to teach				1 2 3 4 5
12. Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from teaching				1 2 3 4 5
13. I do <u>not</u> really have a choice with regards to deciding when to teach (days and times)				1 2 3 4 5
14. Compared to my colleagues, I think I am a pretty good teacher				1 2 3 4 5
15. My colleagues care about me				1 2 3 4 5
16. There are <u>not</u> many colleagues that I am close to				1 2 3 4 5
17. I feel like I can pretty much be myself when teaching				1 2 3 4 5
18. My students do <u>not</u> seem to like me much				1 2 3 4 5
19. When I am teaching I often do <u>not</u> feel very confident that the students are learning the material				1 2 3 4 5
20. I do <u>not</u> really have many choices in terms of how to teach				1 2 3 4 5
21. Students in my classes are pretty friendly towards me				1 2 3 4 5
22. I enjoy teaching				1 2 3 4 5
23. I put a lot of effort into teaching				1 2 3 4 5

Appendix F
Present Job Satisfaction

Present Job Satisfaction

Please answer the following questions in regards to your teaching experience at Western Kentucky University.

- I. Which one of the following indicates how much of the time you feel satisfied with your job?
 1. Never
 2. Seldom
 3. About half of the time
 4. Most of the time
 5. All of the time

- II. Which one of the following statements best describes how you feel about your job?
 1. I hate it
 2. I dislike it
 3. I am indifferent to it
 4. I like it
 5. I love it

- III. Which one of the following statements best describes how you feel about changing your current job?
 1. I would quit this job at once if I could
 2. I would like to change my job soon
 3. I am not sure if I would exchange my present job for a similar one
 4. I am not eager to change my job, but I would do so if I could get a better job
 5. I would not exchange my job for any other

- IV. Which of one of the following statements best describes how you think you compared with other people?
 1. No one dislikes his/her job more than I dislike mine
 2. I dislike my job more than most people dislike theirs
 3. I like my job about as well as most people like theirs
 4. I like my job better than most people like theirs
 5. No one likes his/her job better than I like mine