Teaching Survey Evaluations Scores and a Lecture's Direct Control of their Performance: an Empirical Investigation

Patrick Foley
School of Management and Information Systems
Victoria University
patrick.foley@vu.edu.au

Dr Ann Mitsis
Faculty of Business and Enterprise Honours Coordinator
Marketing and International Studies
Swinburne University of Technology
AMITSIS@groupwise.swin.edu.au

1

ABSTRACT

Teaching evaluation scores though often organisationally portrayed as an objective measure of teaching quality can also be legitimately seen as a measure of customer service satisfaction that occur within a service context. Within the customer service literature there is range of demographic, cultural and personality trait and service context variables that have been identified as explaining variation in customer service satisfaction ratings. These factors explained variation even when the customer service presentation is identical. This paper examines the possibility that such factors might also apply to teaching evaluations within a University setting. The sample was Business Postgraduate students (n= 548). The study found that 43.4% of the variation in teacher evaluations by student can be accounted for my factors beyond the direct control of the lecturer. Implications of these findings for the growing use of teaching evaluation scores are examined and recommendations for their appropriate use are identified.

INTRODUCTION

Doing a performance appraisal well is a difficult process especially in a University context with academic staff. Nankervis, Compton and Baird (2005) note that, at the end of a typical performance interview, employees are often less certain where they stand than before an appraisal interview and tend to evaluate their supervisors less favourably. Nevertheless considerable agreement exists regarding the importance of performance appraisal processes in organizations.

In an academic environment, such as universities, Dilts et al. (1994) argue that academic performance appraisal systems are an important factor in increasing the overall effectiveness of an academic organization. Furthermore, they suggest that the motivational aspects of performance-based systems can be an exceedingly important tool in accomplishing the university's objectives. Generally, performance appraisal is a process of determining and evaluating an individual's performance at his job (Gilbertson & Stone, 1985), that should be conducted formally, rationally, and objectively (Vasu et al.,1983), otherwise it can create negative results, like resentment and resistance among employees, rather than improved performance (Charles, 2001; Nankervis et al., 2005).

Within Australia's higher education sector the academic staff performance evaluation mechanisms do not take into account customer segment variations, which results in customer segment differences not being controlled for in internal university evaluations. Teaching evaluation scores are increasingly being used to evaluate the performance of academic staff in universities and sometimes play an important part in the determination of tenure and promotion. Within some universities' scores on single items such as a good teaching score are used as a global measure of teaching quality in these decision making processes. However the use of such measures, even when they form part of a reliable scale is that the performance being evaluated is a reflection of the actual actions of the actor being evaluated and that exogenous factors do not significantly shape the judgements of those doing the evaluations.

Kotler and Keller (2006) and Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1988) outline two rationales as to why variation in consumers' needs translate into different satisfaction levels with a product or service. Kotler and Keller (2006) present the argument that perceptual differences particularly in engagement can vary from: selective attraction to selective distortion to selective retention. This is where the consumer's buyer readiness plays a significant role with their levels of satisfaction (Kotler & Keller, 2006). This argument may also be valid within a higher education context, whereby variation in students' needs translates to different satisfaction levels with university services. Parasuraman et al.'s (1988) quality service model which focuses on the gap between expected service and perceived service, may also apply within in a university context where differences in student needs may affect different satisfaction levels with university services. Students in Australia's higher education system potentially possess many differences, some of which may include: individual personality orientation differences, cultural background and differences in the perceived level of organisational support. The aim of this study is to determine if these factors explain variation in student evaluation of academic teaching performance

LITERATURE REVIEW

That personality orientations and emotions can influence consumer service expectations and levels of satisfaction is understood in other service industries but is rarely discussed in an academic context in relation to students' evaluations of teaching (Gountas & Gountas, 2007). Watson, Clark and Tellegen (1988) in reviewing a wide variety of research studies on personality, discovered consistent relationships among various measures of negative emotions and suggested that these scales were measuring a global construct. This global construct they called Negative Affectivity (NA) and perceived it as the tendency to more commonly experience negative emotions, feel distressed, and be critical of oneself and others. Levin and Stokes (1989) built on research done by Watson et al. (1988) and applied it to their own research in organizational behavior. They investigated the role of NA as a dispositional determinant of job satisfaction. They posited that because high levels of NA had been found to be associated with a type of cognitive bias through which people approach and interpret their life experiences, this same affective tendency might particularly influence how people experience and evaluate their jobs. The results of their study and others (see (Cropanzano, Weiss, Hale, & Reb, 2003; Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998; Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne;, 1999) showed that NA was significantly associated with task/job satisfaction, indicating that an individual's satisfaction with his or her job may be impacted by one's temperament and overall disposition to experience a negative affect. Because this relationship between NA and job satisfaction has been found in organizational behavior research (Cropanzano et al., 2003; Shaw, Duffy, Abdulla, & Singh, 2000; Shaw, Duffy, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1999), would it not seem likely that the same relationship might be found in students' satisfaction with their teaching experience?

Different cultural customs are also drivers of different attitudes (see: Hall & Hall, 1990; Hampden-Turner, 1994; Hofstede, 1980, 2001; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005; Trompenaars, 1994). Hofstede's (1980; 1991; 2001) cultural values framework is one of the most commonly cited (see: Moon & Franke, 2000; Robertson, 2000; Robertson & Hoffman, 2000);

3

and the GLOBE study of 62 societies also adopted elements of Hofstede's Cultural Values Framework (see: House & Javidan, 2004). He identified four dimensions within his Cultural Values Framework: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, and masculinity/femininity. The power distance dimension has been described as the way people within a society expect power distribution to be unequally distributed (Hofstede, 1980; 1991; 2001). A society with low power distance values represents a more democratic society. Uncertainty avoidance is reflected in a society's comfort level towards ambiguous or unknown situations (Hofstede, 1980; 1991; 2001). The individualism/collectivism dimension presents polar opposites, where high collectivism represents strong and cohesive relationships within a society. Many Anglo-Saxon societies are highly individualist. Hofstede's (1980; 1991; 2001) masculinity/femininity dimension are also opposites. Femininity has been described as where both men and women are focused on life quality issues, whereas masculinity separates the genders and expects males to be focused on material success and females on life quality issues. Anglo-Saxon societies have a tendency to score high on masculinity.

In previous studies conducted within an Australian higher education context, Mitsis and Foley (2004b; 2004c; 2004d; 2005a; 2005b) found that business students' high masculinity and uncertainty avoidance cultural values predict both student-driven and teacher-driven learning style preferences (Passman, 2003). The only distinguishing cultural factor was students' collectivism cultural orientation which was also found to predict students' teacher-driven learning style preference. Therefore this suggests that students who hold high Collectivist beliefs are more likely to prefer a Teacher-Driven learning preference, which is uncharacteristic according to available literature (see: Campbell et al., 2001; Hassall & Joyce, 2001; Lavelle & Guarino, 2003; Webb, 1997). Business students with high Anglo-Saxon enculturation and cultural value profiles were found to be active learners, or student-driven; and those with low Anglo-Saxon enculturation and cultural value profiles were found to hold reflective theorist learning preferences, otherwise known as a teacher-driven preference

4

(Mitsis & Foley, 2004a, 2004d). It seems possible that teaching styles more consistent with a teacher-driven learning preference is preferred by students with High Collectivism and Uncertainty Avoidance cultural values (Merriam & Mohamad, 2000) and may be evaluated more highly (see: Mitsis and Foley(2004b; 2004c; 2004d; 2005a; 2005b).

As alluded to by Hofstede's (1980; 1991) masculinity/femininity dimension, there appears to be differences in training perceptions between females and males. This is confirmed in Sharp's (2001) and Kobayashi's studies respectively. Sharp (2001) found gender differences in perceptions of importance, usefulness and time management in a leadership training context, where females rated planning and knowledge creation as most important and males rated completing tasks and developing skills and techniques as most important. Sharp's (2001) study identified that the gender mindset differs within a skill certification context. Kobayashi's study mirrored Sharp's (2001) findings and also confirmed gender differences towards learning.

Participants' age has been investigated within a training setting with mixed results. For example, Warr and Bunce's (1995) study found that participants' age had no significant associations with training factors like learning; whereas a study conducted by Colquitt, LePine and Noe (2000) found that age was a significant predictor of training outcomes, especially for younger participants. Therefore it seems possible that age and cultural values might also effect students' evaluation of their teaching performance.

McInnis, Griffin, James and Coates (2001) developed and tested the extended course experience questionnaire (ECEQ) the: student support scale; learning resources scale; learning community scale; intellectual motivation scale; and graduate qualities scale. The learning resources scale and the learning community scale measures major dimensions of a students' holistic educational experience that are not directly controllable by the academic being evaluated by student assessments. This study focuses the effects of two ECEQ scales: learning community and learning resources as part of the context in which student evaluations

occur. In addition to these scales a generalised helpfulness scale was developed from the work of Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (2006). These three scales were used to access the context that the student evaluations are conducted in and assess differences in the perceived level of organisational support. Perceived organisational support is an organisational context level construct that represents the global belief that employees have towards an organisation based on one's evaluation of one's contribution to it and its concern for its well-being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). We contend the perceived level of positive organisational support may be a key context variable in upward performance appraisals (Carl P. Maertz Jr, Rodger W. Griffeth, Nathanael S. Campbell, & David G. Allen, 2007; Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004; Coyle-Shapiro, 2004).

METHODOLOGY

A sample of 548 postgraduate business students studying in an on-campus mode of a large metropolitan university in Melbourne, Australia was selected. The data from this study was drawn from a larger study. Participants were asked to provide demographic profile details, which included their gender and age, as well as being asked to respond to questions related to their culture, feelings and course experiences. Specifically, students responded to: 1.Levin and Stokes (1989) Negative Affectivity Scale, 2.Robertson and Hoffman's cultural values scales -collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, and power distance, 3. McInnis et al.'s (2001) ECEQ scales – learning community and learning resources, 4. Podsakoff and Mackenzie's (1994) Helping Scale, and 5. A single item based on overall teaching satisfaction "Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of teaching provided by teachers in this course".

Gender was a dichotomous variable where male was coded 1 and female was coded 0. Participants' age was also a dichotomous variable where ≤ 30 years of age was coded 1 and all other ages were coded 0. The negative affectivity, cultural values, ECEQ, Helping, and overall teaching satisfaction items were coded: 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS v. 14. This study's hypotheses are:

H1: After controlling for business students' demographics (gender and age), business students' negative affectivity will explain unique variance in business students' satisfaction with teaching quality.

H2: After controlling for business students' demographics (gender and age) and negative affectivity, students' culturally-anchored values will explain unique variance in business students' satisfaction with teaching quality.

H3: After controlling for business students' demographics (gender and age), negative affectivity, and culturally-anchored values, students' perceptions of a supportive university learning environment, will explain unique variance in business students' satisfaction with teaching quality.

H4: After controlling for business students' demographics (gender and age), negative affectivity, culturally-anchored values, and perceptions of a supportive university learning environment, students' interaction effects between negative affectivity and administrative support (helping) will explain unique variance in business students' satisfaction with teaching quality.

To test hypotheses one to four, a hierarchical regression analysis with five sets was conducted. The first set involved business students' demographic variables of gender and age, which acted as control variables. Step two of the hierarchical regression analysis involved entering students' negative affectivity perceptions. The third step involved entering the culturally-anchored values into the hierarchical regression analysis. Step four of the analysis involved the supportive university learning environment variables to be entered, and step five added the interaction effect between negative affectivity and perceptions of administrative supports (helping) into the equation.

RESULTS

This section is presented in two sections. Section one presents the correlations table and section two discusses the testing of hypotheses one through to four. Table 1 reveals good Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for: negative affectivity (0.762); the culturally-anchored values

7

(high collectivism 0.800; high uncertainty avoidance 0.804; high masculinity 0.851; and high power distance 0.875); and the supportive university environment variables (learning community 0.830; learning resource 0.826; and helping 0.812).

…………………Insert Table 1: Correlations Table about here…………………

The five stage hierarchical regression analysis, to test hypotheses one through to four is presented below.

Stage 1: Demographics

The first step of the five stage hierarchical regression involved entering the demographic variables gender and age. These demographic variables act as controls. The multiple R (.190) was statistically significant, R^2 =.036, F (2, 494) = 9.278, $p<.001$ (see Table 2 below).

…………….. Insert Table 2: Stage 1 Model Summary about here……………………

Table 3 highlights that the standardized regression coefficient (β) for one control variable age (β = -.169, $p<.001$) was significant. Of the 3.6% explained variance, the squared semi-partial correlations (sr_i^2) show that age explained 2.8% ($sr_i^2 = -.167^2$) of this variance when all other variables in the equation were controlled for. In step 1, gender did not significantly explain any additional unique variation.

………. Insert Table 3: Stage 1 Regression about here………………

Stage 2: Negative Affectivity

The second step (Model 2) of the five stage hierarchical regression involved entering the negative affectivity variable after the demographic variables into the hierarchical regression. The introduction of the negative affectivity variable caused R^2 to change from .036 in model 1 to .079 in model 2 (see Table 4). This was significant change in R^2 (ΔR^2 = .042, $p<0.001$). The multiple R (.280) was statistically significant, R^2 = .079, F (3, 493) = 14.014, $p<0.001$.

………. Insert Table 4: Stage 2 Model Summary about here………………

Table 4 indicates that the standardized regression coefficient (β) for one demographic variable age (β = -.173, *p*<.001) and negative affectivity (β= .206, p<.001) were significant.

…… …. Insert Table 5: Stage 2 Regression about here………………

Stage 3: Culture

The third step (Model 3), culturally-anchored variables were added after the demographic and negative affectivity variables into the hierarchical regression. The introduction of the culturally-anchored values (collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, and power distance) caused R^2 to change from .079 in model 2 to .130 in model 3. This was a significant change in R^2 (ΔR^2 = .052, *p*<0.001). The multiple *R* (.361) was statistically significant, R^2 =. .130, F (7, 496) = 10.463, p< .001.

…… Insert Table 6: Stage 3 Model Summary about here…..

Table 7 indicates that the standardized regression coefficient (β) for one demographic variable, age (β= -.174, p<.001), the negative affectivity variable (β = .150, *p*<.01), and one culturally-anchored variable, uncertainty avoidance (β = .194, *p*<.001) were significant.

…… Table 7: Stage 3 Regression about here…..

Stage 4: Supportive Environment

The fourth step (Model 4), a supportive university environment variables were added after the demographic, negative affectivity, and culturally-anchored variables into the hierarchical regression. The introduction of the supportive university environment variables (learning community, learning resources and administrative support (helping)) caused R^2 to change from .130 in model 3 to .441 in model 4. This was a

significant change in R^2 (ΔR^2 = .311, p<0.001). The multiple R (.664) was statistically significant, R^2 = .441, F (10, 496) = 38.418, p< .001.

…… Insert Table 8: Stage 4 Model Summary about here…..

Table 9 indicates that the standardized regression coefficient (β) for one demographic variable, age (β= -.110, p<.001), the negative affectivity variable (β = .098, p<.005), and three supportive university environment variables: learning community (β = .293, p<.001), learning resources (β = .303, p<.001), and administrative support (helping) (β = .124, p<.005) were significant.

…… Insert Table 9: Stage 4 Regression about here…..

Stage 5: Negative Affectivity and Administrative Support Interaction Effect

The fifth step (Model 5), the negative affectivity and administrative support interaction effect variable was added after the demographic, negative affectivity, culturally-anchored values, and supportive university environment variables into the hierarchical regression. The introduction of the negative affectivity and administrative support interaction effect variable caused R^2 to change from .441 in model 4 to .447 in model 5. This was a significant change in R^2 (ΔR^2 = .005, p<0.05). The multiple R (.668) was statistically significant, R^2 = .447, F (11, 496) = 35.575, p< .001.

…… Insert Table 10: Stage 5 Hierarchical Model Summary about here…..

In total 44.7% (43.4% adjusted) variation in "Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of teaching provided by teachers in this course" was accounted for by the supportive university environment variables after the 3.6% variance by the demographic set of variables, the 11.5% variance by negative affectivity, 28.1% variance by the culturally-anchored values, and 44.1% variance by the supportive university environment variables. Table 11 indicates that the standardized regression coefficient (β) for one demographic variable, age (β= -.112, p<.005), the negative affectivity

variable (β = .353, p<.01), and three supportive university environment variables: learning community (β = .292, p<.001), learning resources (β = .305, p<.001), and administrative support (helping) (β = .505, p<.01), and the negative affectivity and administrative support interaction effect (β = -.509, p<.01) were significant.

…… Insert Table 11: Stage 5 Regression about here…..

Of the 44.7% explained variance, the squared semi-partial correlations (sr_i^2) show that the most important variables in terms of unique variance explained were age 1.1% (sr_i^2 = -.107^2), negative affectivity 0.9% (sr_i^2 = .093^2), learning community 4.3% (sr_i^2 = .208^2), learning resources 5.2% (sr_i^2 = .228^2) and administrative support (helping) explained 0.8% (sr_i^2 = .092^2) of variance when all variables in the equation were controlled for.

Discussion

The four hypotheses were supported either fully or partially. For hypothesis one Age explained unique variation in teacher evaluations but not gender. The second hypothesis was fully supported as negative affectivity explained additional variation in students' teaching evaluations after age and gender were controlled for. The third hypothesis was partially supported with Uncertainty avoidance explaining additional variation after all other variables on the regression equation were controlled for. The fourth hypothesis was fully supported with all organisational support variables explained unique variation after all other variables were controlled for. The interaction effect between negative affectivity and perception of administrative helping behaviour was also a significant relationship. All steps in the hierarchical relationship produced significant increases in explained variation with the full model accounting for 43.4% of the variation in teacher evaluations by student.

11

Our contention is, that the use of the student teaching evaluation score may be appropriate as part of the performance evaluation process, to the extent that such information is used as a formative evaluation instrument for developmental purposes. This information may not be as appropriate if it forms part of a summative evaluation in performance evaluations. Other factors such as age, negative affectivity, cultural values and organisation contextual variables also explain variation in teaching evaluation scores. Therefore, variation in evaluation scores may be due to variation in student population characteristics and only consistently low teaching evaluation scores across different student populations in different contexts might be indicative of poor teaching. Just as student demographic, personality and cultural value characteristic variables can explain variation in good teaching scores so can context variables such as the quality of the learning community, the student experiences, and the general helpfulness of university staff. Most of these factors are beyond the direct control of an individual lecturer being evaluated but seem consistent with academic teaching experience and with student evaluations. Lack of sensitivity to the factors identified in this study by senior academics during a performance appraisal may lead to an academic becoming cynical about a process that when use well can lead to beneficial professional development and reflection.

CONCLUSION

Within Australia's higher education sector the academic staff performance evaluation mechanisms do not take into account customer segment variations. This study suggests that the performance being evaluated when students surveys are conducted to create a good teaching score is not only a reflection of the actual actions of the actor being evaluated and but also contain exogenous factors that significantly shape the judgement of the individual student doing the evaluations.

REFERENCES:

Campbell, J., Smith, D., Boulton-Lewis, G., Brownlee, J., Burnett, P. C., Carrington, S., et al. (2001). Students' perceptions of teaching and learning: The influence of students' approaches to learning and teachers' approaches to teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 7*(2), 173-187.

Carl P. Maertz Jr, Rodger W. Griffeth, Nathanael S. Campbell, & David G. Allen. (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(8), 1059-1075.

Charles, M. (2001). Performance Evaluation Guide Can Help Prevent Disasters. *Business Journal, 15*(19), 9.

Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive Effects of Personality and Perceptions of the Work Situation on Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 599-609.

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: A meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 678-707.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M. (2004). *The employment relationship : examining psychological and contextual perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cropanzano, R., Weiss, H. M., Hale, J. M. S., & Reb, J. (2003). The Structure of Affect: Reconsidering the Relationship Between Negative and Positive Affectivity. *Journal of Management, 29*(6), 831-857.

Dilts, D. A., Haber, L. J., & Bialik, D. (1994). Assessing What Professors Do: An Introduction to Academic Performance Appraisal in Higher Education. Connecticut, The USA: Greenwood Press.

Dobbins, G. H., Cardy, R. L. L., & Platz-Vieno, S. J. (1990). A Contingency Approach to Appraisal Satisfaction: An Initial Investigation of the Joint Effects of Organizational Variables and Appraisal Charachetistics. Journal of Management, 16(3), 619-632.

Elicker, J. D., Levy, P. E., & Hall, R. J. (2006). The Role of Leader-Member Exchange in the Performance Appraisal Process. *Journal of Management, 32*(4), 531-551.

Gilbertson, D. W., & Stone, R. J. (1985). *Human Resource Management: Cases and Reading* (2nd ed.). Australia: McGraw-Hill.

Gountas, J., & Gountas, S. (2007). Personality orientations, emotional states, customer satisfaction, and intention to repurchase. *Journal of Business Research, 60*(1), 72-75.

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences*. Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press.

Hampden-Turner, C. (1994). Getting wiser about the Asians. *Director, June*, 44-47.

Hassall, T., & Joyce, J. (2001). Approaches to learning of management accounting students. *Education and Training, 43*(3), 145-152.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Abridged ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organisations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organisations across nations* (2 ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival* (2nd ed.). Sydney: McGraw-Hill.

House, R. J., & Javidan, M. (2004). Overview of GLOBE. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organisations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. California: Sage Publications.

Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (2006). *Managing human resources through strategic partnerships* (9th ed.). Mason, Ohio: Thomson/South-Western.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. (1998). The power of being positive: The relationship between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance, 11*, 167-187.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 17-34.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne;, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(1), 107-122.

Kobayashi, Y. (2002). The role of gender in foreign language learning attitudes: Japanese female students' attitudes towards English learning. *Gender and Education, 14*(2), 181-197.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2006). *Marketing managment* (12 ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Kuehn, K. W., & Al Busaidi, Y. (2002). Citizenship behavior in a non-Western context: An examination of the role of satisfaction, commitment and job characteristics on self-reported OCB. *International Journal of Commerce & Management, 12*(2), 107-125.

Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1994). *Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal* (2nd ed.). Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Pub. Company.

Lavelle, E., & Guarino, A. J. (2003). A multidimensional approach to understanding college writing processes. *Educational Psychology, 23*(3), 295-305.

Levin, I., & Stokes, J. P. (1989). Dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(5), 752-758.

Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (2004). The Social Context of Performance Appraisal: A Review and Framework for the Future. *Journal of Management, 30*(6), 881-905.

McInnis, C., Griffin, P., James, R., & Coates, H. (2001). *Development of the course experience questionnaire (CEQ)*. Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Merriam, S. B., & Mohamad, M. (2000). How cultural values shape learning in older adulthood: The case of Malaysia. *Adult Education Quarterly, 51*(1), 45-63.

Meyer, J. P., & Smith, C. A. (2000). HRM practices and organizational commitment: Test of a mediation model. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 17*(4), 319-331.

Mitsis, A., & Foley, P. (2004a). *The effect of students' citizenship and English language of instruction on course experience questionnaire elements importance ratings.* Paper presented at the Academy of World Business, Marketing & Management Development, Gold Coast International Hotel, Queensland, Australia.

Mitsis, A., & Foley, P. (2004b). *The effect of students' cultural values on the teacher-driven learning style preference.* Paper presented at the Australia and New Zealand Academy of Management, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Mitsis, A., & Foley, P. (2004c). *The effect of students' cultural values on their student-driven learning preference.* Paper presented at the The Internationalisation of Education in New Zealand: Successes, Challenges and Opportunities, Auckland, New Zealand.

Mitsis, A., & Foley, P. (2004d). *The interaction between business students' Anglo-Saxon enculturation, cultural values, and learning style preferences: An S.E.M exploration.* Paper presented at the Academy of World Business, Marketing & Management Development, Gold Coast International Hotel, Queensland, Australia.

Mitsis, A., & Foley, P. (2005a). *Business students' cultural values as antecedents to student and teacher-driven learning styles.* Paper presented at the American Academy of Management : A new vision of management in the 21st century, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mitsis, A., & Foley, P. (2005b). *Cultural values and student learning style preferences: Implications for course satisfaction.* Paper presented at theGeert Hofstede Seminar, Melbourne, Australia.

Moon, Y. S., & Franke, G. R. (2000). Cultural influences on agency practitioner's ethical perceptions: A comparison of Korea and the U.S. *Journal of Advertising, 29*(1), 51-65.

Nankervis, A. R., Compton, R. L., & Baird, M. (2005). *Human resource management : strategies and processes* (5th ed.). Southbank, Vic.: Thomson Learning.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior : its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Orr, S. (2000). The organisational determinants of success for delivering fee-paying graduate courses. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 14*(2), 54.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multi item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64*(1), 12-40.

Passman, R. (2003). Experiences with student-centred teaching and learning in high-stakes assessment environments. *Education, 122*(1), 189-199.

Pennington, G., & O'Neil, M. (1994). Enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 2*(3), 13-18.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Mackenzie, S. B. (1994). Organisational citizenship behaviours and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 3*(1), 351-363.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 698-714.

Roberts, G. E. (1992). Linkages Between Performance Appraisal System Effectiveness and Rater and Rate Acceptance: Evidence from a Survey of Municipal Personnel Administrators. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 12*, 19-41.

Robertson, C. J. (2000). The global dispersion of Chinese values: A three-country study of Confucian Dynamism. *Management International Review, 40*, 253-268.

Robertson, C. J., & Hoffman, J. J. (2000). How different are we? An investigation of Confucian values in the United States. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 12*(1), 34-47.

Sharp, B. (2001). Take me to your (male) leader. *Gender and Education, 13*(1), 77-86.

Shaw, J. D., Duffy, M. K., Abdulla, M. H. A., & Singh, R. (2000). The Moderating Role of Positive Affectivity: Empirical Evidence from Bank Employees in the United Arab Emirates. *Journal of Management, 26*(1), 139-154.

Shaw, J. D., Duffy, M. K., Jenkins, G. D., Jr., & Gupta, N. (1999). Positive and Negative Affect, Signal Sensitivity, and Pay Satisfaction. *Journal of Management, 25*(2), 189-205.

Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding the waves of culture*. New York: Irwin.

Tziner, A., Joanis, C., & Murphy, K. R. (2000). A comparison of three methods of performance appraisal with regard to goal properties, goal perception, and ratee satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management, 25*(2), 175.

Vasu, M., Stewart, D. W., & Garson, G. D. (1983). *Organizational Behavior and Public Management* (3rd ed.). New York: Marcel Dekker Inc.

Warr, P., & Bunce, D. (1995). Trainee characteristics and the outcomes of open learning. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 347-375.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(6), 1063-1070.

Webb, G. (1997). Deconstructing deep and surface: Towards a critique of phenomenongraphy. *Higher Education, 33*, 195-212.

William, R. S. (1999). *Performance management: Perspective on Employee Performance*. London, UK: Thomson Business Press.

Table 1: Correlations Table

N = 548. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Cronbach's Alphas on the diagonal.

Variable	Mean	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
1. Gender (Male coded 1)	-	-	-											
2. Age (≤ 30 years coded 1)	-	-	-.146**	-										
3. Negative Affectivity	4.237	0.676	-.055*	.018	.762									
4. Collectivism	4.708	1.048	-.056	-.012	-.364**	.800								
5. Uncertainty Avoidance	5.352	0.957	.109*	.018	-.247**	.416**	.804							
6. Masculinity	3.332	1.559	.101*	.120**	-.411**	.258**	-.031	.851						
7. Power Distance	3.080	1.261	.281**	.106*	-.445**	.200**	-.114**	.588**	.875					
8. Learning Community	4.538	1.074	.063	-.060	-.214**	.364**	.275**	.133**	.096*	.830				
9. Learning Resources	4.731	1.128	.104	-.074	-.196**	.238**	.259**	.103*	.046	.633**	.826			
10. Administrative Support (Helping)	4.289	1.068	.025	-.103**	-.220**	.283**	.252**	.152**	.100*	.582**	.549**	.812		
11. Negative Affectivity and Administrative Support Interaction Effect	18.357	6.045	.044	-.075	.664**	.395**	.315**	.338**	.313**	.539**	.508**	.863**	.896	
12. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of teaching provided by teachers in this course	4.550	1.482	.096*	-.162**	-.200**	.198**	.277**	.041	-.004	.559**	.577**	.480**	.454**	-

Table 2: Stage 1 Model Summary

Model	*R*	*R* Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.
1	.190	.036	.032	9.278	1.458	.000

Table 3: Stage 1 Regression

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		b	**SE**	**β**			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	4.794	.141		33.978	.000			
	Gender	.191	.133	.064	1.439	.151	.091	.065	.064
	Age	-.529	.140	-.169	-3.782	.000	-.179	-.168	-.167

Table 4: Stage 2 Model Summary

Model	*R*	*R* Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.
1	.190	.036	.032	9.278	1.458	.000
2	.280	.079	.073	14.014	1.427	.000

Table 5: Stage 2 Regression

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		b	**SE**	**β**			Zero-order	Partial	Part
2	(Constant)	2.874	.426		6.745	.000			
	Gender	.215	.130	.072	1.654	.099	.091	.074	.071
	Age	-.541	.137	-.173	-3.952	.000	-.179	-.175	-.171
	Negative Affectivity	.452	.095	-.206	-4.762	.000	-.199	-.210	-.206

Table 6: Stage 3 Model Summary

Model	*R*	*R* Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.
1	.190	.036	.032	9.278	1.458	.000
2	.280	.079	.073	14.014	1.427	.000
3	.361	.130	.118	10.463	1.392	.000

Table 7: Stage 3 Regression

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		b	SE	β			Zero-order	Partial	Part
3	(Constant)	1.517	.492		3.081	.002			
	Gender	.127	.139	.043	.916	.360	.091	.041	.039
	Age	-.543	.137	-.174	-3.962	.000	-.179	-.176	-.167
	Negative Affectivity	.328	.116	-.150	-2.822	.005	-.199	-.127	-.119
	Collectivism	.096	.071	.068	1.351	.177	.205	.061	.057
	Uncertainty Avoidance	.300	.077	.194	3.901	.000	.264	.174	.165
	Masculinity	.010	.056	.011	.187	.852	.048	.008	.008
	Power Distance	-.052	.066	-.044	-.782	.432	.004	-.035	-.033

Table 8: Stage 4 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.
1	.190	.036	.032	9.278	1.458	.000
2	.280	.079	.073	14.014	1.427	.000
3	.361	.130	.118	10.463	1.392	.000
4	.664	.441	.430	38.418	1.119	.000

Table 9: Stage 4 Regression

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		b	SE	β			Zero-order	Partial	Part
4	(Constant)	-.508	.415		-1.223	.222			
	Gender	.146	.112	.049	1.302	.193	.091	.059	.044
	Age	-.344	.111	-.110	-3.098	.002	-.179	-.139	-.105
	Negative Affectivity	.216	.094	-.098	-2.303	.022	-.199	-.104	-.078
	Collectivism	-.093	.059	-.066	-1.585	.114	.205	-.072	-.054
	Uncertainty Avoidance	.102	.063	.066	1.609	.108	.264	.073	.055
	Masculinity	-.052	.045	-.054	-1.152	.250	.048	-.052	-.039
	Power Distance	-.030	.053	-.025	-.558	.577	.004	-.025	-.019
	Learning Community	.404	.066	.293	6.158	.000	.565	.269	.209
	Learning Resources	.398	.059	.303	6.691	.000	.571	.290	.227
	Administrative Support (Helping)	.172	.060	.124	2.849	.005	.471	.128	.097

Table 10: Stage 5 Hierarchical Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	R Square Change	F Change	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig F Change.
1	.190	.036	.032	.036	9.278	1.458	.000
2	.280	.079	.073	.042	14.014	1.427	.000
3	.361	.130	.118	.052	10.463	1.392	.000
4	.664	.441	.430	.311	38.418	1.119	.000
5	.668	.447	.434	.005	35.575	1.115	.036

Table 11: Stage 5 Regression

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		b	SE	β			Zero-order	Partial	Part
5	(Constant)	-2.848	1.186		-2.402	.017			
	Gender	.154	.112	.052	1.374	.170	.091	.062	.046
	Age	-.350	.111	-.112	-3.160	.002	-.179	-.142	-.107
	Negative Affectivity	.774	.281	.353	-2.754	.006	-.199	-.124	-.093
	Collectivism	-.099	.059	-.070	-1.687	.092	.205	-.076	-.057
	Uncertainty Avoidance	.098	.063	.063	1.558	.120	.264	.071	.053
	Masculinity	-.047	.045	-.050	-1.056	.292	.048	-.048	-.036
	Power Distance	-.024	.053	-.021	-.455	.649	.004	-.021	-.015
	Learning Community	.402	.065	.292	6.159	.000	.565	.269	.208
	Learning Resources	.400	.059	.305	6.752	.000	.571	.293	.228
	Administrative Support (Helping)	.701	.258	.505	2.713	.007	.471	.122	.092
	Negative Affectivity and Administrative Support Interaction Effect	-.125	.059	-.509	-2.106	.036	.442	-.095	-.071

22