Engaging in student evaluations of teaching through intrinsic motivation: an exploratory study of competence, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and relatedness

Annamarie D. Sisson & Elizabeth A. Whalen

Published online: 18 Nov 2023.

Submit your article to this journal ⬀

Article views: 65

View related articles ⬀

View Crossmark data ⬀

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Engaging in student evaluations of teaching through intrinsic motivation: an exploratory study of competence, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and relatedness

Annamarie D. Sisson [iD][a] and Elizabeth A. Whalen [iD][b]

[a]Tourism and Languages, The Business College, Edinburgh Napier University, Edinburgh, United Kingdom; [b]Tourism and Hospitality Management, College of Behavioral and Human Sciences, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN, USA

ABSTRACT

Student evaluations of teaching (SET) elicit feedback to enhance the course, teaching, and learning. However, hospitality and tourism curriculum research lacks an understanding of the dyadic relationship between the instructor and motivation and other logistics to complete SET. This remains important to uncover student competence, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and relatedness to complete SET to increase SET feedback from instructors. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient analysis was employed to test the hypotheses using data collected from 69 undergraduate hospitality and tourism students recruited through U.S. educational institutions in the northeast and southeast. Results reveal that intrinsic motivation relates positively to SET completion, showing a strong, positive correlation between all variables. The study provides contributions to instructors to offer extrinsic motivators to encourage students to recognize the value of the SET. The study is among the first to explore the intrinsic motivators and completion of SET with hospitality and tourism undergraduate students.

Introduction

Educational institutions solicit feedback on instructional techniques and educational experience through teaching evaluations. This feedback aids in necessary enhancements to the course, as well as teaching and learning (Lee & Deale, 2018). Student participation and completion of the teaching evaluations involve many factors such as grade expectation, gender, age, and motivation to want to complete them (Dawson et al., 2020). Another factor contributing to the completion of teaching evaluations is student perception (Young et al., 2019). Student evaluations of teaching (SET) provide base-level knowledge for continuous course and instructor improvement and also provide insight into the student learning experience. With retention rates on the decline (Camera, 2022), the student learning experience remains a critical determinant of institutional longevity.

SET are utilized by administration to make critical decisions for individual faculty members as these reviews are often used to determine teaching effectiveness (Miles & House, 2015). These evaluations can have long term consequences as they help determine whether faculty members have met the standards for high quality teaching that would contribute to the attainment of tenure and promotions. There have been many criticisms of SET and their development for a variety of reasons such as biases based on gender, race, age, and sexuality and the ability of SET to truly evaluate and measure teaching effectiveness (e.g., Heffernan, 2022; Kreitzer & Sweet-Cushman, 2021), and yet, they are still one of the only tools available to measure student satisfaction. As with customer reviews, providing an accurate representation of teaching effectiveness requires encouraging more participation behavior that would smooth the curves of current participants who are typically the most and least satisfied (Melián-González et al., 2013). Strategies for student engagement with SET are a crucial area of analysis as we look to provide better insights for administrative decisions. This research specifically looks at students' intrinsic motivation to participate in SET and offers strategies for student engagement.

Student motivation and determination play an important role in the completion of SET (Deale, 2019). Despite the complexity of the completion rates of SET, the extrinsic motivators and other logistics (e.g., number of reminders) can affect SET completion. Extrinsic motivators do play a role. For example, incentives such as extra points are often described as a way for instructors to boost completion rates (Dawson et al., 2020). Yet, intrinsic motivation is a much more powerful determinant of behavior (Ryan & Deci, 2000), and therefore SET must be designed to inherently enhance students' intrinsic ability to participate and the value they see in completing evaluations.

Intrinsic motivation as defined in Ryan and Deci's (2000) seminal work is "the inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise one's capacities, to explore, and to learn" (p. 70). Their examination of motivation through the cognitive evaluation theory, a subset of self-determination theory, explains the necessarily conditions for engagement in certain behaviors. Where most SET literature focuses on development and problematic outcomes, this research instead looks to understand how producing conditions for intrinsic motivation would increase response rate leading to a more comprehensive view of teaching effectiveness from the student perspective. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to examine undergraduate hospitality students' perceptions of the core components of intrinsic motivation which are competency, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and relatedness regarding participation in teaching evaluations.

Literature review

History of student evaluations

As a way to measure the ability of an instructor, the student evaluation was implemented in the 1920s by Purdue University (Stalnaker & Remmers, 1928). The Purdue Rating Scale for Instructors examined the correlation between grades and evaluation scores (Sauer, 2012) and included 10 qualities: (1) interest in subject, (2) sympathetic attitudes towards

students, (3) grading fairness, (4) liberal and progressive attitude, (5) subject matter presentation, (6) sense of humor, (7) self-reliance and confidence, (8) personal peculiarities, (9) personal appearance, and (10) stimulating intellectual curiosity (Stalnaker & Remmers, 1928).

Although student evaluations were rarely used in their inception, by the 1940s, the evaluation was sporadically administered, but it had no bearing on the instructor (Calkins & Micari, 2010). Due to an instructor shortage and support from the administration, instructors were granted autonomy from the evaluation (Calkins & Micari, 2010). Fast forward to the early 1990s, student evaluations were the primary instrument for obtaining student feedback about courses and their instructors (Perry et al., 2014). At this time, there was a transition to an online survey, however only two percent had transitioned to this format by 2000. By 2005, nearly 33% transitioned to the online format, and today it remains the most used format option to administer student evaluations (McClain et al., 2018).

Intrinsic motivation

The self-determination theory (SDT) of motivation explains three core elements that guide behavior toward action – competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000). While motivation can come from many sources such as perceived value, strong external coercion, personal commitment, or fear of consequence, intrinsic motivation is the most powerful predictor of behavior and the most likely indicator of successful outcomes (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Autonomy reflects individuals' ability to choose of their own volition to act or perform; in essence, it is "self-endorsed" behavior that reflects individualized desires or needs (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009). Competence reflects the individual's belief that they are capable of performing the task. If a person does not feel capable or competent, then that person will often opt out of trying altogether because they lack intrinsic motivation to act (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009).

Relatedness is the need to feel understood and connected to other people in meaningful ways (Patrick et al., 2007). The desire to be connected to other individuals does not manifest solely through self-traits such as esteem and happiness (Blanchard et al., 2007; Sheldon & Schuler, 2011), but is also linked to mental and physical health (Reis et al., 2000). Social environments that fulfill the need for relatedness will promote motivation for action (Shen, 2014), and when there is an opportunity for novelty and exploration, individuals will tend to feel stimulated and intrinsically motivated (Dysvik et al., 2013). Sheldon and Schuler (2011) found that desiring or wanting particular experiences produces motivation and greater attainment of motive-related goals for having those experiences. Individuals will seek out opportunities to fulfill their psychological needs because by nature, humans are active, curious, and interested (Dysvik et al., 2013), and they will desire to create interpersonal contacts and cultivate possible relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

Self-determined behavioral regulation has led to research indicating enhanced learning, interest, and enjoyment, greater vitality, and greater levels of creativity (Blanchard et al., 2007). The need for affiliation leads to the desire for affirmation and esteem from others (Sheldon & Schuler, 2011). With more opportunities to interact and share

experiences, individuals tend to show more positive affect which leads to effectiveness, connectedness, and intrinsic motivation (Patrick et al., 2007). In fact, Patrick et al. (2007) found that "relatedness was the strongest unique predictor of relationship functioning and well-being" (p. 452).

Theoretical framework

Students must choose to complete performance evaluations to allow for honesty, sincerity, and truthfulness in review. Students must believe they are capable of providing authentic feedback, they must believe they are free to respond openly without dictation or threat from outside sources (such as being told "I will be hurt if you do not give me a good review"), and they must believe their responses help them stay connected within the university culture and group, adding a sense of belonging.

In education, measuring student competencies is a crucial determinant of the abilities and performance of students (Asfani et al., 2016). We actively engage in strategies to enhance that competency across the key objectives and course outcomes. However, we do not give training or practice to completing SET which are used for important administrative decisions. Seifert and Feliks (2019) found that by improving skills for assessing faculty through a series of exercises to enhance self and peer assessment for student teachers, students felt more competent and capable of providing productive and valuable feedback. Increasing feelings of competency and ability will increase the likelihood of participation and engagement in an activity. Therefore, students who feel most competent in assessing faculty are more likely to participate in SET.

H1: Student belief of competence results in increased participation in teaching evaluations.

Evidence shows that providing students with choice in a classroom setting increases not only intrinsic motivation but also performance (Patall et al., 2010). Additionally, perceived choice results in higher levels of completion rates on homework assignments and perceived autonomy in a classroom setting (Patall et al., 2010). The incorporation of choice into classes has increased perceptions of flexibility and made learning more accessible to diverse groups of learners (Raes et al., 2020). Therefore, from the perspective of completing SET, students will be more likely to complete them like any other homework assignment, if they perceive there is a degree of choice within the task. Importantly, the choice comes not from performing or not performing the task of completing the SET, but instead from the choice within the SET to allow the student to feel a degree of autonomy and flexibility in responses. If the student perceives they have a choice, they are more likely to participate in teaching evaluations.

H2: Student perceived choice results in increased participation in teaching evaluations.

Spooren and Christiaens (2017) found a strong relationship between the perceived value of SET with the scores derived from the evaluations. Furthermore, they found that

students generally believed SET provide accountability for future teaching, however, they were uncertain about the influence the reports had on individual professors' uses of the feedback. Generally, students who perceived higher value in SET were more likely to also give higher scores on the evaluations. Extending these findings, if students perceive their feedback is valuable and feel more confident that instructors will utilize their suggestions, they should also be more likely to participate. Therefore, with perceptions of the value of completing SET, students are more likely to engage in evaluating faculty.

H3: Student belief of value/usefulness results in increased participation in teaching evaluations.

With the rise of online education, questions of how to increase student relatedness in the classroom have grown. Students have increasingly felt isolated and disconnected from their peers and instructors (Hartnett, 2015). This isolation surged during the pandemic as student needs for relatedness and connection intensified (Chiu, 2022). Face to face classes are not exempt from the need to foster relatedness to encourage student intrinsic motivation. Performance is determined by feelings of relatedness which impacts internalization of concepts and integration into the academic setting (Kaufman & Dodge, 2009). The more related a student feels to their peers and instructor in the classroom, the better the student performs in an academic setting. Therefore, if a student feels connected to the instructor, they should be more willing to engage in participation and completing teaching evaluations.

H4: Student belief of relatedness results in increased participation in teaching evaluations.

Methodology

Survey instrument

The survey instrument contained seven sections. Section one contained four self-developed qualifying questions regarding current student status, number of classes taken in the past 12 months, student major of study, and has the student completed teaching evaluation for any classes taken in the past year. Sections 2–5 contained 14 statements asking students about their competence, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and relatedness to complete teaching evaluations adapted from the intrinsic motivation inventory from Deci and Ryan (2007) using a 5-point Likert-type scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Section six contained three self-developed open-ended questions asking reasons why students complete or not complete the teaching evaluations, motivations about teaching evaluations, and student experience answering teaching evaluations. Section seven

contained four demographic questions including year in school, age, gender, and race.

Sampling and data collection

The sample of this study consisted of undergraduate hospitality students at higher education institutions in the Southeast and Northeast regions of the U.S. A questionnaire was utilized to investigate undergraduate hospitality student competence, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and relatedness regarding participation in teaching evaluations. Prior to data collection, the questionnaire was examined by two academic experts to ensure reliability of the instrument. Participants' educational institutions were provided online Qualtrics link to instructors and asked them to forward to all hospitality students within the current course offerings. Researchers allowed two weeks for data collection. The online questionnaire included a cover letter to fully explain the study, as part of the survey, prior to completing the questionnaire.

Data analysis

Two researchers analyzed the data using SPSS (v. 26) to test hypotheses. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to test hypotheses 1–4 and assess the relationship between the intrinsic motivation variables competence, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and relatedness. For sampling and analysis, according to Kline (2012), Bentler and Chou (1987), the realistic ratio of the number of respondents to the number of factors is 10:1 ratio and the minimum is 5:1. However, more recent social science research suggests rather small sample sizes hold statistical power. Wolf et al. (2013) found sample size requirements sufficient at 30, while Sideridis et al. (2014) notes 50 to 70 holds statistical weight involving four testing variables. Accordingly, given the proposed model in this study consists of four factors to be estimated, the total of 69 responses is large enough to conduct the analysis.

Results

Respondent profile

The survey was administered to undergraduate hospitality students at three higher education institutions in the Southeast and Northeast regions of the U.S. Of the 105 submitted questionnaires, 36 were removed for not completing the questionnaire, thus a total of 69 usable surveys were received. Demographics of the respondents are listed in Table 1. Responses were collected from all higher education institutions surveyed. Of the usable surveys collected, 61.1% were between 18 and 24 years of age. For gender, 54.2% were female, 36.1% were male. The respondents identified as 58.3% senior/4th year, 18.1% junior/3rd year, 11.1% sophomore/2nd year, and 4.2% freshman/1st year student.

When asked about the number of evaluations a student has completed, 54.3% of respondents indicated completing 10 or more in their academic career. Additionally, 15.3% of respondents indicated completing at least six evaluations.

Table 1. Demographics of respondents.

Variable	n	%	Variable	n	%
Gender[a]			*Race[a]*		
Male (including transgender men)	26	36.1	White/Caucasian	51	70.8
Female (including transgender women)	39	54.2	Asian	1	1.4
			Black or African American	8	11.1
Prefer not to answer	1	1.4	Other	6	8.3
Age[a]			*Year in School[a]*		
18–24	44	61.1	Freshman/1st year	3	4.2
25–34	11	15.4	Sophomore/2nd year	8	11.1
35–44	3	4.2	Junior/3rd year	13	18.1
45–54	3	4.2	Senior/4th year	42	58.3
55 or older	4	5.6			
Prefer not to answer	7	9.5			

[a] Totals may not equal 100% due to non-response.

When asked open-ended questions for reasons why respondents would or would not complete the teaching evaluation, students positively responded with, "*because I like to give teachers feedback*," "*I feel that my feedback is important to the professor and the overall program*," and "*they can help teachers and future students*." Other respondents indicated more neutral or negative about why they complete or not complete the course evaluations. Respondents wrote: "*Sometimes issues aren't addressed*," "*I usually complete the surveys especially if I had issues with the professor*," and "*I am too busy and I didn't want to*."

H1: Student belief of competence is positively correlated with participation in teaching evaluations.

When asked about motivations to complete the student evaluations, many students responded they like to receive extra credit for completing the evaluation, and it feels like the evaluations are a pertinent part of the overall learning process. Respondents were also asked to provide their experience answering student evaluations. Some responses include, "*they are usually very straightforward and easy to navigate*," "*I like them, but they are long*," and "*they are repetitive, but if it helps improve the professor then it is worth it*."

Table 2 provides descriptive statistics for the competence variable of the intrinsic motivation inventory. In this study, students strongly agreed they were pretty good at

Table 2. Competence.

Variable	Mean	SD[a]	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
I think I am pretty good at completing end of course surveys	4.01	1.26	35	48.6	20	27.8	5	6.9	7	9.7	5	6.9
I think I did pretty well at completing end of course surveys, compared to other students	3.88	1.15	26	36.1	24	33.3	13	18.1	5	6.9	4	5.6
I was pretty skilled at completing the end of course survey	3.96	1.18	31	43.1	19	26.4	15	20.8	2	2.8	5	6.9

[a]SD = standard deviation.

completing evaluations (48.6%), they do pretty well at completing evaluations as compared to their classmates (36.1%), and they are skilled at completing evaluations (43.1%).

H2: Student perceived choice is positively correlated with participation in teaching evaluations.

Table 3 provides descriptive statistics for the perceived choice variable from the intrinsic motivation inventory. Students strongly agree they believe they had some choice about completing evaluations (43.1%), that is was their choice to complete the evaluation (48.6%), and they completed the evaluation because they wanted to (45.8%).

H3: Student belief of value/usefulness is positively correlated with participation in teaching evaluations.

Table 4 provides descriptive statistics on the value/usefulness variable from the intrinsic motivation inventory. Students strongly agree that completing the evaluation is useful for the school (45.8%), could help enhance the course content (37.5%), and completing evaluations are important (38.9%). Not consistent with other results, students somewhat agree the evaluations could be of some value to them (29.2%).

Table 3. Perceived choice.

Variable	Mean	SD[a]	Strongly agree n	%	Somewhat agree n	%	Neither agree nor disagree n	%	Somewhat disagree n	%	Strongly disagree n	%
I believe I had some choice about completing the end of course survey	3.88	1.35	31	43.1	19	26.4	6	8.3	6	8.3	6	8.3
I feel like it was my choice to complete the end of course survey	3.88	1.42	35	48.6	14	19.4	4	5.6	9	12.5	7	9.7
I complete the end of course survey because I wanted to	3.83	1.43	33	45.8	15	20.8	5	6.9	8	11.1	8	11.1

Table 4. Value/Usefulness.

Variable	Mean	SD[a]	Strongly agree n	%	Somewhat agree n	%	Neither agree nor disagree n	%	Somewhat disagree n	%	Strongly disagree n	%
I believe the end of course survey could be of some value to me	3.40	1.26	14	19.4	21	29.2	20	27.8	4	5.6	9	12.5
I think that completing the end of course survey is useful for the school	4.20	1.07	33	45.8	26	36.1	3	4.2	2	2.8	4	5.6
I think completing the end of course survey could help me to enhance the course content	3.82	1.28	27	37.5	18	25.0	14	19.4	2	2.8	7	9.7
I think completing the end of course survey is important	4.03	1.11	28	38.9	24	33.3	10	13.9	2	2.8	4	5.6

Table 5. Relatedness.

Variable	Mean	SD[a]	Strongly agree		Somewhat agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Somewhat disagree		Strongly disagree	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
I felt like I could really trust the instructor	4.04	1.11	28	38.9	24	33.3	9	12.5	2	2.8	4	5.6
I'd like a chance to interact with the instructor more often	3.66	0.95	13	18.1	25	34.7	24	33.3	3	4.2	2	2.8
It is likely that the instructor and I could become closer if we interacted a lot	3.87	0.98	18	25.0	30	41.7	13	18.1	4	5.6	2	2.8
I feel close to the instructor	3.48	0.94	8	11.1	25	34.7	29	40.3	1	1.4	4	5.6

Table 6. Bivariate correlation amongst variables.

		Competence	Perceived Choice	Value/Usefulness	Relatedness
Competence	Pearson Correlation	1	.504**	.585**	.560**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
Perceived Choice	Pearson Correlation	.504**	1	.631**	.489**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
Value/Usefulness	Pearson Correlation	.585**	.631**	1	.625**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
Relatedness	Pearson Correlation	.560**	.489**	.625**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	

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

H4: Student belief of relatedness is positively correlated with participation in teaching evaluations.

Table 5 provides descriptive statistics on the relatedness variable from the intrinsic motivation inventory. In this study, students strongly agree they felt like they could trust the instructor (38.9%). Students somewhat agree they would like a chance to interact with the instructor more often (34.7%), and that it is likely the instructor and student could become closer if they interacted more often (41.7%). Additionally, students neither agree nor disagree that they feel close to the instructor (40.3%).

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between the intrinsic motivation variables competence, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and relatedness, presented in Table 6. There was a strong, positive correlation between competence and perceived choice, $r = .50$, value/usefulness, $r = .59$, and relatedness, $r = .56$, and all relationships were significant ($p = .00$). There was a strong, positive correlation between perceived choice and value/usefulness, $r = .63$, and relatedness, $r = .49$, and the relationships were significant ($p = .00$). Lastly, there was a strong, positive correlation between value/usefulness and relatedness, $r = .63$, and the relationship was significant ($p = .00$).

Discussion and conclusion

Garnering participation in SETs is essential for establishing the best chance for productive feedback at the individual level and also for the educational institution. We know from the results of this study that students like to give feedback and they know completing the SET

benefits the instructor and the program. Sometimes, the challenge with encouraging student engagement is the inherent fact that there is no direct benefit to the participant for completing the SET. Therefore, a student must choose to respond to the SET because they believe it is the right thing to do, they find value in helping future students (45.8%), or they find value in providing feedback for the instructor (37.5%). Since reasoning for participation may be seen as altruistic in some ways without direct benefit, extra credit notwithstanding, any barriers to prevent that participation must be removed.

Rather than focusing on extrinsic motivation which lacks the same power as intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000), this study evaluates student perceptions of their ability to meaningfully engage when reviewing teaching effectiveness. The results align with the theoretical understanding of intrinsic motivation as shown by the correlations between the motivation dimensions. With many of the participants indicating their responses to more than 10 past SETs, their willingness to participate in this survey may be an indicator of their participatory behaviors. Therefore, findings with high levels of perceived competence, perceived choice, and relatedness indicate that students who are willing to engage in providing feedback feel they have self-determination of behavior. The qualitative feedback provides further insight into student beliefs about the importance and value of SETs coupled with their perceptions about the design of the surveys. In this study, students indicated they do not complete the SET if they feel lazy, they do not think it will benefit future students, or the SET is too long. If designed well, meaning the length is reasonable, the questions are relevant, and there is an opportunity for individual response, then students are more willing to engage.

Theoretical implications

The self-determination theory has been applied in many settings to explain motivated action. Providing opportunities for participation through emphasizing a person's perceived competency, autonomy, and relatedness has remained a powerful predictor of a person's behavior based on intrinsic motivation. These factors remain constant when engaging in behavior that does not provide immediate benefit to the actor (student) such as completing student teaching evaluations. Therefore, this helps show that intrinsic motivation does not equate to personal gain, but instead reflects purposeful behavior.

Coinciding with SDT, intrinsic motivation or rather purposeful behavior, provides the move successful outcomes (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In this regard, the successful outcomes come in the form of completed SET. To have students fully complete the SET, they desire to be connected to their peers, the instructor (Blanchard et al., 2007; Sheldon & Schuler, 2011). As part of an academic community, students who feel most related to the university, their peers, and faculty are more likely to engage with SETs because they believe in the holistic good it provides to the program as evident in the qualitative responses from this study. Backed by SDT, a social environment where students can successfully complete SET will promote motivation to act (Shen, 2014). When there is a social component, students tend to feel stimulated and in turn, intrinsically motivated to complete SET for the betterment of maintaining that social connection with their peers, the instructor, the larger educational institution (Dysvik et al., 2013).

Practical implications

When administering SETs, in addition to possible extrinsic motivations like those proposed by Dawson et al. (2020), faculty should emphasize conditions that help promote intrinsic motivation factors. For example, faculty should encourage students to recognize the value of their feedback and the students' specific ability to provide expertise from the learner perspective. Based on prior research from Deale (2019), the student must feel motivated and determined as important factors in the completion of the SET. Students must believe they have the power to impact change and that they are qualified to do so. This comes from an institutional culture of valuing input and feedback from many perspectives and levels of power – student, staff, faculty, and administration. What makes this study unique involving hospitality students is that these students have the natural skill set to gather information through active listening (Brymer & Gray, 2006), which makes them the prime audience to fully understand how SET feedback is important and the instructor is implementing changes. When students feel they are being heard and their feedback is implemented, they may feel motivated to continue completing SET for future courses they enroll in. It is imperative for faculty to continue to communicate the importance of SET for future change. It is not enough to simply communicate how important completing the SET is, faculty must enact classroom and curriculum changes.

Faculty should also demonstrate how feedback was implemented by discussing how changes were made to classroom structure, assignments, course rules, or content based on previous student feedback. By making it clear to current students that past student engagement was utilized to create change, current students are more likely to believe in the value of their participation and be intrinsically motivated to respond to SETs based on perceived competence, choice, usefulness, and relatedness. This trickle-down effect allows the student to feel heard, relate more to their instructor, and potentially want to continue completing the SET for future courses.

The main focus of the SET is to determine how the course, the materials, and the instructor faired after the completion of the course. What about student learning preferences and their perceptions of teaching and learning at the beginning of the course? In recent research from Deale (2023), this introductory assessment was gathered to determine how adjustments could be made throughout the course to meet the needs of the student. Deale (2019) found that students preferred well-organized courses and wanted the instructor to be engaged with the students. Rather than learning this valuable information at the end of the course when the students are no longer in your classroom, it is imperative to ask students' opinions at the start, therefore making them feel useful and relate more to the instructor throughout the term.

Limitations and future research

This study, like all survey-based research, has limitations. Surveys can evaluate insight into students' behavior toward completing teaching evaluations, but other in-depth assessments often provide a more accurate and complete picture of student understanding (Besterfield-Sacre et al., 2004). Using varied methods of data collection, such as in-depth interviews, and focus groups with undergraduate hospitality students could yield more descriptive data to investigate the competence, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and

relatedness of teaching evaluations are most beneficial to undergraduate hospitality programs.

Data collected from two universities in the Southeast and Northeast region of the United States are a limitation. While data was collected regionally through Qualtrics, future studies could expand the geographic scope, but compare the undergraduate hospitality students' competence, perceived choice, value/usefulness, and relatedness of teaching evaluations from other participants in other regions of the United States or abroad. Coinciding with previous statistical power research from Kline (2012), Bentler and Chou (1987), the number of intrinsic motivation testing parameters for this study (four) coupled with the small sample size (69) may be a contributing factor inaccurately representing the general population. Future studies could expand the data collection beyond undergraduate hospitality students and evaluate graduate hospitality students or students in other majors of study. Comparing domestic versus international students is another option to enhance future studies. This could give a good insight into the value and usefulness of teaching evaluations and how to increase response rates by reaching a larger study body.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Annamarie D. Sisson 🔟 http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2654-6904
Elizabeth A. Whalen 🔟 http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8948-7323

References

Asfani, K., Suswanto, H., & Wibawa, A. P. (2016). Influential factors of students' competence. *World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education*, *14*(3), 416–420.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). *The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation*. Routledge.

Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C. P. (1987). Practical issues in structural modeling. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *16*(1), 78–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124187016001004

Besterfield-Sacre, M., Gerchak, J., Lyons, M. R., Shuman, L. J., & Wolfe, H. (2004). Scoring concept maps: An integrated rubric for assessing engineering education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *93*(2), 105–115. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00795.x

Blanchard, C. M., Mask, L., Vallerand, R. J., de la Sablonniere, R., & Provencher, P. (2007). Reciprocal relationships between contextual and situational motivation in a sport setting. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *8*(5), 854–873. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2007.03.004

Brymer, E., & Gray, T. (2006). Effective leadership: Transformational or transactional? *Journal of Outdoor & Environmental Education*, *10*(2), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03400835

Calkins, S., & Micari, M. (2010). Less-than-perfect judges: Evaluating student evaluations. *The NEA Higher Education Journal*, *1*(2), 7–22. http://www.elegantbrain.com/edu4/classes/readings/depository/TNS_560/conclus/calk_mica_set_evalu.PDF

Camera, L. (2022). College enrollment declines are here to stay. Retrieved August 7, 2023, from https://www.usnews.com/news/education-news/articles/2022-05-26/college-enrollment-declines-are-here-to-stay

Chiu, T. K. (2022). Applying the self-determination theory (SDT) to explain student engagement in online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *54*(sup1), S14–S30. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2021.1891998

Dawson, M., DeFranco, A., & Draper, J. (2020). Are all student evaluation scores created equally? Identifying factors that hospitality administrators should consider when assessing student feedback. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, *26*, 100246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2020.100246

Deale, C. S. (2019). Making memories: An example of the scholarship of teaching and learning in hospitality and tourism education. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, *31*(4), 221–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2019.1575749

Deale, C. S. (2023). What can hospitality educators learn from students about effective teaching and learning at the beginning of an asynchronous, online class? *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2023.2237419

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2007). SDT: Questionnaires: Intrinsic motivation inventory (IMI). Retrieved October 5, 2022, from http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/measures/intrins.html

Dysvik, A., Kuvaas, B., & Gagne, M. (2013). An investigation of the unique, synergistic, and balanced relationships between basic psychological needs and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *43*(5), 1050–1064. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12068

Hartnett, M. K. (2015). Influences that undermine learners' perceptions of autonomy, competence and relatedness in an online context. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *31*(1). https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1526

Heffernan, T. (2022). Sexism, racism, prejudice, and bias: A literature review and synthesis of research surrounding student evaluations of courses and teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(1), 144–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1888075

Kaufman, A., & Dodge, T. (2009). Student perceptions and motivation in the classroom: Exploring relatedness and value. *Social Psychology of Education*, *12*(1), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-008-9070-2

Kline, R. B. (2012). Assumptions in structural equation modeling. In R.H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Handbook of structural equation modeling* (pp. 111–125). The Guilford Press.

Kreitzer, R. J., & Sweet-Cushman, J. (2021). Evaluating student evaluations of teaching: A review of measurement and equity bias in SETs and recommendations for ethical reform. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *20*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09400-w

Lee, S. H., & Deale, C. S. (2018). Rapport, rigor, and rate my professor: Students' perceptions of hospitality and tourism professors. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, *19*(2), 93–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2018.1509763

McClain, L., Gulbis, A., & Hays, D. (2018). Honesty on student evaluations of teaching: Effectiveness, purpose, and timing matter! *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(3), 369–385. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1350828

Melián-González, S., Bulchand-Gidumal, J., & González López-Valcárcel, B. (2013). Online customer reviews of hotels: As participation increases, better evaluation is obtained. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, *54*(3), 274–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965513481498

Miles, P., & House, D. (2015). The tail wagging the dog: An overdue examination of student teaching evaluations. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *4*(2), 116. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n2p116

Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory & Research in Education*, *7*(2), 133–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878509104318

Patall, E. A., Cooper, H., & Wynn, S. R. (2010). The effectiveness and relative importance of choice in the classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *102*(4), 896. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019545

Patrick, H., Knee, C. R., Canevello, A., & Lonsbary, C. (2007). The role of need fulfillment in relationship functioning and well-being: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(3), 434–457. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.3.434

Perry, A. R., Wallace, S. L., Moore, S. E., & Perry-Burney, G. D. (2014). Understanding student evaluations: A black faculty perspective. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping*, *20*(1), 29–35. https://ir.library.louisville.edu/faculty/15

Raes, A., Vanneste, P., Pieters, M., Windey, I., Van Den Noortgate, W., & Depaepe, F. (2020). Learning and instruction in the hybrid virtual classroom: An investigation of students' engagement and the effect of quizzes. *Computers & Education*, *143*, 103682. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103682

Reis, H. T., Sheldon, K. M., Gable, S. L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Daily well-being: The role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*(4), 419–435. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200266002

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Sauer, T. (2012). Predictors of student course evaluations (Doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville). https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1266

Seifert, T., & Feliks, O. (2019). Online self-assessment and peer-assessment as a tool to enhance student-teachers' assessment skills. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *44*(2), 169–185. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1487023

Sheldon, K. M., & Schuler, J. (2011). Wanting, having, and needing: Integrating motive disposition theory and self-determination theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(5), 1106–1123. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024952

Shen, B. (2014). Outside-school physical activity participation and motivation in physical education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *84*(1), 40–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12004

Sideridis, G., Simos, P., Papanicolaou, A., & Fletcher, J. (2014). Using structural equation modeling to assess functional connectivity in the brain: Power and sample size considerations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *74*(5), 733–758. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164414525397

Spooren, P., & Christiaens, W. (2017). I liked your course because I believe in (the power of) student evaluations of teaching (SET). Students' perceptions of a teaching evaluation process and their relationships with SET scores. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *54*, 43–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.12.003

Stalnaker, J. M., & Remmers, H. H. (1928). Can students discriminate traits associated with success in teaching? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *12*(6), 602–610. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0070372

Wolf, E. J., Harrington, K. M., Clark, S. L., & Miller, M. W. (2013). Sample size requirements for structural equation models: An evaluation of power, bias, and solution propriety. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *73*(6), 913–934. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164413495237

Young, K., Joines, J., Standish, T., & Gallagher, V. (2019). Student evaluations of teaching: The impact of faculty procedures on response rates. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *44*(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1467878