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TEACHERS WHO love teaching
TEACH CHILDREN to love learning.
Self Determination Theory
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Self Determination Theory within Education
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- Relatedness

2. Reeve (2009)
Elements of an autonomy supportive teaching style

- Autonomy
- Structure
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Importance of an autonomy supporting teaching style
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Factors which might influence the autonomy supporting teaching style?

- Experienced pressure from the working environment
- Intrinsic motivation of the lecturer
- Mindset of the lecturer

4 Pelletier, Séguin-Lévesque, & Legault, 2002
5 Dweck, 2000
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Hypothesis

The offering of an autonomy supportive teaching style to students is positively related to lecturers who experience autonomy themselves within their social working environment, who are intrinsically motivated, and who have a growth mindset.
Method: context

• Honours Education within Higher Education
• Characteristics of Honours students:
  Intrinsic motivated
  Want to get the best out of it
  Curious and broad interests
  Wellbeing by undertaking activities
  Prefer autonomy when working on assignments or personal development

5 (Wolfensberger & Offringa, 2012)
(Tiesinga & Wolfensberger, 2014)
(Van der Rijst & Wolfensberger, 2014)
(Vansteenkiste, Lens, & Deci, 2006)
(Wolfensberger, 2012)
Method

• N = 47 honours lecturers
• 6 Universities of Applied Sciences
• May to September 2014
Method: questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>“I let my honours students take a lot of decisions by themselves” (12 items, $\alpha = .81$)</td>
<td>Teacher As a Social Context Questionnaire (TASCQ) (Belmont, Skinner, Wellborn, &amp; Connell, 1989), 5 point scale: 1 = completely not true and 5 is completely true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>“I talk with my honours students about their expectations against them” (15 items, $\alpha = .70$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>“I know the students in my honours group well” (14 items, $\alpha = .88$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method: questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived pressure</td>
<td>“It is important from the organisation that my honours students are having high results” (17 items, ( \alpha = .65 ))</td>
<td>Constraints at Work Questionnaire (Pelletier, Séguin-Lévesque, &amp; Legault, 2002), 17 items, 7 point scale: 1 is completely not and 7 is completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset related to intelligence</td>
<td>“Your intelligence is something about you that you can’t change very much” (3 items, ( \alpha = .90 ))</td>
<td>Theory of Intelligence Scale – Self Form For Adults (Dweck, 2000) 3 items, 6 point scale: 1 is strongly disagree and 6 is strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation of the lecturer</td>
<td>“I find it important to be challenged to get the most out of myself” (7 items, ( \alpha = .75 ))</td>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (Wolfensberger, 2012) 5 point scale, 1 is strongly disagree and 5 is strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method of analysis

Spearman’s rho
General results

Tabel 1: Scores respondents on predictors of the autonomy supportive teaching style (1 t/m 3) and (b) aspects of the autonomy supportive teaching style (4 t/m 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (1)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset (2)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived pressure (3)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (4)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure (5)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness (6)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spearman’s Rho
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-0.37*

-0.32*

0.35*
### Spearman’s Rho

Tabel 2: Spearman Correlation between (a) predictors of the autonomy supportive teaching style (1 t/m 3) and (b) aspects of the autonomy supportive teaching style (4 t/m 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (1)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset (2)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived pressure (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: number of respondents between brackets  
* $p < .05$,  ** $p < .01$
Conclusions

• Elements of the autonomy supportive teaching style are used a lot
• More perceived pressure significant
  less structure and
  less autonomy

• Fixed mindset significant
  more structure
Summary

- Perceived pressure
- Mindset
- Motivation
  - Autonomy
  - Structure
  - Relatedness
- Intrinsic motivation
- Autonomy supportive teaching style
- Perseverance
- Function in class
- Academic performance
- Wellbeing and involvement
Follow up for the education practice

• Lessons to learn for facilitators of education: importance of control room for lecturers within policy and curriculum development

• Topics for professionalisation
Follow up research

• Do programme managers offer autonomy to individual lecturers and on which aspects?

• Teaching style: what is the right balance between autonomy and structure for students of regular programmes and honours programmes
Thanks you for your attention!
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