



142
406
THS

Thesis
1
200



This is to certify that the
thesis entitled

Positive and Negative Instructor Feedback to Students From
High and Low Power Distance Cultures:
Expectations and Responses

presented by

Wonsun Kim

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

M.A degree in Communication

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Wonsun Kim".

Major Professor's Signature

05/07/2010

Date

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

**POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS FROM
HIGH AND LOW POWER DISTANCE CULTURES:
EXPECTATION AND RESPONSES**

By

Wonsun Kim

A THESIS

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of**

MASTER OF ARTS

Communication

2010

ABSTRACT

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS FROM HIGH AND LOW POWER DISTANCE CULTURES: EXPECTATION AND RESPONSES

By

Wonsun Kim

This study examined the different expectations of feedback types, impact of feedback types on motivation, student satisfaction, and culture. U. S. American and Korean undergraduates read a hypothetical scenario depicting a situation in which an instructor provides a student with positive feedback or negative feedback. The finding indicated that students' belief on power distance was an important factor for the effect of expectation about positive and negative feedback. Moreover, American students indicated lower satisfaction than Korean students for negative feedback. In general, positive feedback yielded higher satisfaction than negative feedback. Grade C condition indicated lower satisfaction with instruction than those in no grade condition and grade A condition. Implications, limitations and future direction of the research were discussed.

Keywords: Feedback, Expectancy Violation, Power distance, Satisfaction, Cultural difference, Korea, USA

Copyright by

Wonsun Kim

2010

TALBE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
Feedback and Motivation.....	3
Cultural Differences.....	4
Expectancy Violation Theory.....	7
Overview of the Preliminary Research.....	10
PRELIMINARY STUDY.....	11
PRELIMINARY STUDY MTHOD.....	13
PRELIMINARY STUDY RESTULS.....	15
PRELIMINARY STUDY discussion.....	18
MAIN STUDY.....	20
MAIN STUDY METHOD.....	22
MAIN STUDY RESULT.....	28
MAIN STUDY DISCUSSION.....	33
APPENDICES.....	42
Preliminary Study Questionnaire.....	42
Main Study Questionnaire.....	45
Vignettes.....	50
REFERENCES.....	53

LISTS OF TABLES

TABLE 1. Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations of Variables (Preliminary Study).....	40
TABLE 2. Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations of Variables (Main Study).....	41

INTRODUCTION

Feedback can be considered an essential part of information processing and knowledge transfer in many areas. Especially in the education field, feedback plays an important role because it provides guidance on how students perform in class and how teachers can help students at an adequate level. Evaluative feedback is most effective when students believe it is useful, high quality information (King, Schrodts, & Weisel, 2008). Moreover, it has long been acknowledged that feedback may influence individuals' achievement and motivation (Goethals & Darley, 1987; Levine, 1983). As a result, college students are likely to consider feedback from their instructors as crucial (Rakoczy, Klieme, Buergermeister, & Harks, 2008). Here, feedback is conceptualized as “information provided by an agent regarding perspectives of one’s performance or understanding” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 81). Feedback is divided into two dimensions, which are positive feedback and negative feedback. According to Geddes and Linnehan (1996), positive and negative feedback are conceptually distinguished by their underlying factor structures, and they argued that negative feedback has more complex patterns than positive.

Students from different cultures may have different expectations concerning positive and negative feedback. The content of each culture’s expectancies can vary substantially along cultural dimensions such as high and low power distance. Each culture has its own set of expectations for a given type of encounter (Burgoon, 1988), including instructor and student interactions. Among the various cultural dimensions, the power distance dimension provides a particularly relevant conceptual background when examining students’ perceptions of instructor communication behaviors. Power distance

refers to the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions perceive and accept that power is distributed unequally (Hofstede, 2001). For example, people in Korea are described as showing substantially high power distance compared to U.S. Americans. (Hofstede, 2001; Merritt, 2000).

Based on Expectancy Violation Theory (EVT) (Burgoon, 1988), the current study aims to compare how students from different culture types with regard to power distance expect and respond to positive and negative instructor feedback. Also this study investigates how these different expectations and responses affect student satisfaction with an instructor. This line of inquiry may suggest a way toward effective communication between instructors and especially international students in the United States, given that an increasing number of international students are coming to the United States to study (Institute of International Education, 2007). This study begins with a discussion of feedback and motivation, and goes on to explain different cultural values. It then offers its predictions regarding how students from high and low power distance cultures expect certain types of feedback and how these expectations might be violated. Finally, the study investigates how such violations could influence student motivation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Feedback and Motivation

Researchers who study student reactions to instructor feedback make three claims: first, students are likely to read and make use of instructor feedback (Beach, 1979; Lynch & Kleman, 1978); second, students are able to distinguish among different types of feedback and discover some are more helpful than others (Land & Evans, 1987; Odell, 1989); third, students are pleased about feedback that reflects an instructor's concern for their ideas. It is important that instructors should consider how their feedback is being perceived in relation to their actual intentions because instructors' assessments such as grades and feedback are crucial to students (Rakoczy et al., 2008; Straub, 1997).

Feedback is generally divided into that which is positive (e.g., compliments) versus negative (e.g., criticisms). Positive feedback is conceptualized as any type of feedback drawing attention to the positive aspects of a performance situation, e.g. praise, and negative feedback as any type of feedback drawing attention to the negative aspects of a performance situation, e.g. criticism ((Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Feedback has both educationally positive purposes and negative consequences. In other words, not all students do their work at the same level of quality; thus, feedback can be a measure of work quality. Feedback may motivate some students to study harder and become more committed to their work, but may evoke negative feelings for others.

Rakoczy et al. (2008) examined how different types of feedback influence student learning since instructor feedback is anticipated to initiate certain cognitive and/or emotional processes that impact motivation and accomplishment. According to self-determination theory, people have psychological needs for competence, autonomy,

and social relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 1991). The achievement of these needs is accompanied by positive emotional experiences (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Thus, meeting these needs allows individuals to build up intrinsic motivation and to attain a more in-depth understanding of learning content (Voll-meyer & Rheinberg, 2005).

Students in different cultures may have different perceptions of instructor positive and negative feedback. In lower power distance cultures, the majority of students are more likely to expect to receive positive feedback from the instructor because positive feedback is the most common (Hufton et al., 2008). According to Homes and Smith (2003), students are sensitive to critical comments about their performance and view their assignments as self-expression. Specifically, when faculty provide negative feedback, students may have difficulty in separating criticism of self from criticism of their work. In contrast, in higher power distance cultures, students are more likely to expect to receive negative feedback because criticisms traditionally have been the most common type of feedback for motivating students' learning processes (Hufton et al., 2008). From this point of view, cultural background can have a significant impact on students' expectations and responses to instructors' positive and negative feedback.

Cultural Differences

Among the many cultural dimensions, the power distance dimension provides a relevant conceptual background for investigating students' perceptions of instructor communication behaviors. According to Hofstede (2001), power distance refers to the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions within a given culture perceive and accept that power is distributed unequally. Power distance guides attitudes and behaviors of individual members of a culture. Cultural characteristics

are manifested in educational practices in such a way that individual instructors' teaching behaviors can vary across cultures. For example, the student-teacher relationship differs in cultures with varying degrees of power distance. Teaching and learning in higher power distance cultures tend to be more teacher-dominant and less student-oriented than in lower power distance cultures (Hofstede, 2001).

Instructors from high and low power distance countries have different ways to present feedback based on their teaching behaviors, and have dissimilar perceptions about what influences student motivation (Hufton et al., 2003). Hufton et al. (2003) have investigated student motivation in three different cultures: Sunderland in the north-east of England, eastern Kentucky in the United States and St. Petersburg in the Russian Federation. They argued that instructors from those countries have different opinions about effective types of feedback (positive vs. negative) on student motivation. In terms of praise and criticism, teachers in the United States and England tend to think that lower-achieving students may be demotivated by negative feedback, and that only high-achieving students can accept criticism of their performance since they believe that the feedback is an outcome of a test. On the other hand, in Russia, teachers generally and rather directly criticize all student work which falls below an acceptable level.

Additionally, Alexander (2000) argued that teachers in England and the United States tend to offer evaluative and highly positive feedback in order to promote student self-esteem and enthusiasm. By contrast, in Russia, he claimed "praise was reserved only for exceptional performance while in England and the United States merely doing what is required is often greeted by hyperbole" (Alexander, 2000, p. 375). Russia is a high power distance country, and this perspective implies that although an instructor provides

students with negative feedback (i.e., criticism), students may accept this feedback in this type of culture. Alexander (2000) argued that such an environment leads students in Russia or other high power distance cultures to put in more effort in order to earn much more sparingly given praise, a circumstance which leads to increased motivation.

Another important cultural dimension to explain why cultures differently affect students' expectations and responses to their instructor's positive and negative feedback is Confucian heritage. For example, Korea is one of the Asian countries the education style of which comes from a Confucian heritage (Ho, Pen, & Chan, 2001), and it is also a country that is substantially higher in power distance than the United States (Hofstede, 2001; Merritt, 2000). In education from a Confucian heritage, restrictions on students' freedom of action and a lack of free exchange between teachers and students characterize the teacher-student relationship (Ho et al., 2001). Classrooms in Asia tend to be teacher-oriented, and teachers tend to be authoritative (Biggs, 1991; Leung, 2005). In higher power distance cultures, including many countries in Asia, teacher-student inequality leads to teacher-centered education (Hofstede, 2001). Students rarely contradict their teachers publicly. Quality of learning depends largely on the ability of instructors. In lower power distance cultures, both teachers and students are relatively equal and treat one another accordingly. Education is student-centered, with an emphasis on student initiative. Asian international students in the United States notice the democratic nature of the instructor-student relationship and the openness of U.S. instructors to exchanges and arguments (Lieberman, 1994). Instructors in Korea and in the United States may differ in the extent to which they use instructor decision authority in college classrooms. Thus, different relationships between instructors and students may lead to different student

expectations and responses to instructor feedback.

All cultures have specific communication expectancies based on their cognitive schemata for processing social information (Planalp, 1985; Schank & Abelson, 1977). In other words, every culture guides people's anticipations as to how others will behave. In intercultural communication, then, interactants tend to adjust and influence their behaviors toward one another through the lens of expectations to a certain extent. Within and between cultures this communication pattern of adaptation that occurs in such interactions can be examined through Expectancy Violation Theory.

Expectancy Violation Theory

Expectation Violation Theory (EVT) can provide an explanation of how interpersonal communication patterns are related to an individual's expectations in interactions and responses to violations of expectations. EVT puts forward the premise that individuals have expectations about what interactions should be like (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). Although EVT was originally formulated to explain the effect of proxemic violations in interactions, the theory has later been broadly applied in explaining and predicting behavior in other contexts, such as marketing (Brandt, 1988; Sirgy, 1984), marital/relational satisfaction (Joyce, Ogrodniczuk, Piper, & McCallum, 2003; Kelley, 1991), causal attribution (Kanazawa, 1992), counterfactual thinking (Sanna & Turley, 1996), and the anticipation of pain from surgery (Arntz, vanEck, & Heijmans, 1980). Although the effect of EVT was expanded to include a variety of disciplines, these investigations are within the scope of mainstream U.S. culture. Burgoon and Hubbard (2005) pointed out that "what has yet to be resolved is when expectancy violations are harmful or helpful and whether conclusions about the effects of violations generalize

beyond Western cultures” (p. 150).

The three crucial constructs of EVT are expectancies, expectancy violations, and communicator and behavior valence. One main assumption of EVT is that communication expectancies are specific patterns of expected verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Burgoon & Walther, 1990). One meaning of expectancies refers to “the degree to which a behavior is regarded as appropriate, desired, or preferred” (Burgoon & Hubbard, 2005, p. 151). In a simple way, expectations are usually considered to be a result of previous experience. People expect other people or situations to behave in certain ways based on their past experience or learning; however, expectations can be influenced by numerous factors. Burgoon and Hubbard (2005) report that individuals have different expectations based on (a) characteristics of communicators such as personality, physical appearance, and language style, (b) relationship factors such as degree of familiarity and liking, and (c) context characteristics including formality, privacy and so on. However, the presence of expectations is not identical across cultures. In this sense, expectancy refers to “communicative acts that are modal (most typical) in a given culture or subculture” (Burgoon & Hubbard, 2005, p. 151). The content of each culture’s expectancies will vary substantially along cultural dimensions such as high and low power distance. Each type of culture will have its own set of expectancies for a given type of encounter. That is, cultures are not uniform in the degree to which communication behavior is regulated by rules and social norms. Expectations about the interaction norms of other cultures can be an important factor when individuals experience and evaluate their interactions with others in a different culture (Hess, Blairy, & Kleck, 2000). When there is no certain information as to individuals, expectancies are more likely to be

stereotypic (Hamilton, Sherman, & Ruvolo, 1990).

Another assumption of EVT is that when individuals interact with one another, their expectations can be met or violated. Burgoon and Hubbard (2005) conceptualized expectancy violations as “actions sufficiently discrepant from the expectancy to be noticeable and classified as outside the expectancy range” (p. 154). When an act of a person A violates a person B’s expectation during an interaction, person B considers the actor (i.e., person A) and the violated act and evaluates the negative or positive value of the violation. Interactions with increasing pleasantness and frequent behavioral involvement are generally perceived as positive expectancy violations, whereas reduced pleasantness and involvement are negative violations (Burgoon, Le Poire, & Rosenthal, 1995).

Expectancy violations can occur when the feedback of instructors is not consistent with students’ initial expectations. Positive and negative violations of expectancy in instructor feedback (e.g., compliments and criticisms) have an impact on student motivation (Rakoczy et al., 2008). For example, negative violation of students’ expectancies might decrease their motivation, whereas the positive violation of students’ expectations might increase their motivation.

When a positive violation occurs, a positive outcome can happen (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). When a negative violation occurs, a negative outcome can happen (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). For example, previous studies showed that positive violations generate high attraction ratings, high credibility ratings, and generally positive relational evaluations, whereas negative violations negatively influence these ratings, as compared to no-violation conditions (Afifi & Burgoon, 2000).

In light of the aforementioned discussion concerning instructors' different tendencies of giving feedback in different cultures, it is likely that students from high power distance cultures (e.g., Korea) expect negative feedback from an instructor whereas students from low power distance cultures (e.g., America) expect positive feedback from an instructor. In other words, when Koreans receive positive feedback, a positive violation can occur which may increase subsequent learning motivation (i.e., positive responses resulting from positive violations of expectancies). In contrast, when Americans receive negative feedback from their instructors, a negative violation may occur which decreases the student's motivation. (i.e., negative responses resulting from negative violations of expectancies).

Overview of the Preliminary Research

In order to test some of these claims, a preliminary study was conducted having two purposes. The first was to check measurement quality before using the measures for the main study. The second was to determine whether Koreans and Americans would differ with regard to their expectations concerning positive and negative feedback. If Koreans and Americans do not differ in their expectations concerning positive and negative feedback, receiving the same feedback will not result in different types of violations. Thus, it was necessary to check the assumption before conducting the main study.

PRELIMINARY STUDY

Because the current research investigates whether Koreans and Americans may differ in their expectations concerning instructor feedback due to their cultural differences in terms of power distance and teacher-student relationships, it will be important to examine whether Koreans and Americans indeed differ regarding their belief in power distance. Previous research shows that Asian countries tend to be higher in power distance than the United States (Hofstede, 2001; Merritt, 2000). Thus, it is predicted that Koreans' belief in power distance will be stronger than that of Americans.

H1: Koreans will show stronger belief in power distance than will Americans.

This preliminary study was designed to examine whether Koreans and Americans would differ with regard to their expectations of feedback types, impact of feedback types on motivation, and the effect of power distance on the relationship between feedback types and motivation. According to Hufton et al (2003), based on their teaching behaviors, instructors from high and low power distance countries have different tendencies in presenting feedback and dissimilar perceptions about what influences student motivation. Thus, students from high power distance cultures may be more likely to expect negative feedback (criticisms) from faculty whereas students from low power distance cultures may be more likely to expect positive feedback (compliments) from faculty. Thus, the following hypothesis is advanced concerning differences between Korean and American students.

H2: American students will be more likely to expect positive rather than negative feedback from their professors in the United States, whereas Koreans will be more likely to expect negative rather than positive feedback from their

professors in Korea.

By receiving feedback, students can become aware of how well or poorly they perform on the various tasks set by teachers. Feedback has an impact on individuals' achievement and motivation (Goethals & Darley, 1987; Levine, 1983; Marshall & Weinstein, 1984). Positive feedback can encourage students and negative feedback can point out areas in which students need to improve. Although Koreans may receive more negative than positive feedback than Americans due to cultural differences, it remains to be seen whether Koreans consider negative feedback more helpful and motivating than positive feedback. In one sense, it is possible that Korean students may also consider positive feedback to be helpful and motivating as much as American students do. Therefore, the following research questions were posed:

RQ1: Will positive feedback and negative feedback differently motivate
Americans and Koreans?

PRELIMINARY STUDY METHOD

Participants

Participants were 125 undergraduates (age $M = 20.09$, $SD = 1.67$, 54% women) at Michigan State University in the United States and 111 undergraduates (age $M = 23.01$, $SD = 2.17$, 31% women) in Korea. The US sample was 77% Caucasian American, 11.1% African American, 2.4% Asian American, 2.4% mixed, 0.8 % Pacific Islander, 0.8 % Native American, 4.0 % Other, and 1.6 % unidentified. Korean participants were all ethnically Korean.

Instrument

The questionnaire was produced in both English and Korean. The English version of the questionnaire was compared with the Korean version using various methods, such as back-translation and inspection by speakers fluent in both languages, to ensure equivalence in meaning. Participants completed the questionnaire in their native languages. All measures used a 5-point Likert scale response format (e.g., 1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). Appendix 1 shows the measurement items.

Expectations concerning positive and negative feedback. Items measuring expectations concerning positive and negative feedback were developed based on Burnett's (2002) teacher feedback scale. Burnett's scale consists of 5 items concerning positive feedback and 5 items concerning negative feedback. The author of the current paper prepared an additional 2 items concerning positive feedback and 2 items concerning negative feedback. The measurement items asked how often students expected professors to provide positive or negative feedback (1 = *never*; 5 = *always*). Expected positive feedback was measured with seven items (e.g., "How often do you

expect professors to provide positive feedback on students' work through comments on papers, oral discussions etc.” and “How often do you expect your professors to say ‘excellent work, well done’.”). Reliabilities (Cronbach’s α) were .92 in the United States and .85 in Korea. Expected negative feedback was measured with seven items (e.g., “How often do you expect professors to provide negative feedback on students' work through comments on papers, oral discussions etc.” and “How often do you expect your professors to say ‘that’s not good enough’.”). Reliabilities (Cronbach’s α) were .73 in the United States and .76 in Korea.

Motivation. The measure for student motivation resulting from positive or negative feedback was created by the author. Motivation resulting from positive feedback was measured using three items (e.g., “Positive feedback motivates students to study harder.”). Reliabilities (Cronbach’s α) were .77 in the United States and .81 in Korea. Motivation resulting from negative feedback was measured using two items (e.g., “Negative feedback motivates students to study harder.”). Reliabilities (Cronbach’s α) were .85 in the US and .71 in Korea.

Power distance. Students’ belief in power distance was measured with five items created by Yoo and Donthu’s (2002) power distance scale. The scale showed adequate psychometric properties in terms of reliability and validity (Yoo & Donthus, 2002). Example items are “People in higher positions should make most decisions without consulting people in lower positions,” and “People in lower positions should not disagree with decisions made by people in higher positions.” Reliabilities (Cronbach’s α) were .83 in the US and .75 in Korea.

Table 1 shows means, standard deviations, and correlations of the variables.

-- Insert Table 1 about here --

PRELIMINARY STUDY RESULTS

Differences in Power Distance Belief between Korean and American Students

Hypothesis 1 predicted that Koreans would show stronger belief in power distance than would Americans. Consistent with H1, Koreans ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 0.69$) indicated a stronger belief in power distance than Americans ($M = 2.19$, $SD = 0.69$), $t(241) = 5.29$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .10$.

Differences between Koreans and Americans in Terms of Expected Feedback Types

Hypothesis 2 predicted that Americans would be more likely to expect positive feedback than negative feedback from their professors in the United States, whereas Koreans would be more likely to expect negative feedback than positive feedback from their professors in Korea. To test the hypothesis 2, a 2 (culture: U.S. and Korea) x 2 (feedback type: positive and negative) mixed design ANOVA was conducted. Culture was the between-subjects variable and type of feedback was the within-subjects variable. The main effect of culture was not significant, $F(1, 245) = 3.19$, $p = .07$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. However, the main effect of feedback type was significant, $F(1, 245) = 9.32$, $p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. This finding indicated that students expected more positive feedback overall ($M = 2.93$, $SD = 0.75$) than negative feedback from their professors ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 0.62$). The interaction between culture and types of feedback was significant, $F(1, 245) = 40.14$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .14$.

Paired-samples t-tests were conducted to probe the pattern of the significant interaction of feedback types by cultures. Students in the United States had higher expectations of positive feedback ($M = 3.01$, $SD = 0.79$) than negative feedback ($M =$

2.58, $SD = 0.59$), $t(125) = 6.84, p < .001$. However, students in Korea had higher expectations of negative feedback ($M = 3.00, SD = 0.57$) than positive feedback ($M = 2.85, SD = 0.69$), $t(120) = -2.25, p = .03$. The data were consistent with H2.

Differences in Motivation between Korean and American Students

Research Question 1 asked whether Koreans and Americans would differ in the extent to which they believed each type of feedback would motivate students. A 2 (culture: U.S. and Korea) x 2 (feedback type affecting motivation: positive and negative) mixed design ANOVA was conducted to test this research question. Culture was the between-subjects variable and motivation was the within-subjects variable with two levels (resulting from positive feedback and negative feedback). The main effect of culture was not significant, $F(1, 243) = 2.68, p = .10$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. However, the main effect of feedback type affecting motivation was significant, $F(1, 243) = 114.247, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .32$. This result indicated that students were more motivated by positive feedback ($M = 3.86, SD = 0.72$) than by negative feedback from their professors ($M = 3.12, SD = 0.90$). The interaction between culture and types of motivation was not significant, $F(1, 243) = 2.73, p = .10$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$.

Additional Analyses

The correlations in Table 1 showed that the correlation between power distance and positive feedback expectation was positive among Koreans, $r(115) = .44, p < .001$, but it was negative but not significant among Americans, $r(124) = -.16, p = .08$. These two correlations significantly differed from one another, $z = 4.86, p < .001$. That is, among Koreans, students with stronger belief on power distance were more likely to expect positive feedback from their professors. The correlation between power distance

and negative feedback expectation was positive among Koreans, $r(115) = .40, p < .001$, and it was negative but not significant among Americans, $r(124) = -.13, p = .66$. These two correlations significantly differed from one another, $z = 3.51, p < .001$. That is, among Koreans, students with stronger belief on power distance were more likely to expect negative feedback from their professors.

The correlation between power distance and motivation from negative feedback was positive among Koreans ($r[140] = .24, p = .01$), but it was not among Americans ($r[124] = -.16, p = .07$). These two correlations significantly differed from one another, $z = 3.11, p < .001$. That is, among Koreans, students with stronger belief on power distance were more likely to consider negative feedback to be motivating. The correlation between power distance and motivation from positive feedback did not differ between Koreans ($r[115] = -.15, p = .12$) and Americans ($r[226] = -.36, p < .001$), $z = 1.78, p = .08$.

PRELIMINARY STUDY DISCUSSION

The major findings of the preliminary study were: 1) Korean students' belief in power distance was stronger than that of American students, 2) American students had higher expectations of positive feedback than did Koreans, whereas Koreans had higher expectations of negative feedback than did Americans; 3) without much cultural difference, students in both Korea and the United States indicated that positive feedback would motivate them to study more than negative feedback.

These findings indicate that although Korean students have lower expectations of positive feedback and higher expectations of negative feedback than American students do, Korean students acknowledge the positive role of positive feedback for their studying behavior as much as Americans do. This result may imply that Korean students' desire to receive positive feedback from their instructors is as strong as that of American students, but Korean students simply don't receive such feedback as often as their American counterparts. The question then arises of how Korean students will view their instructor when they actually receive positive feedback (or negative feedback). Thus, the main study herein examines the responses of Korean and American students to positive and negative feedback.

Overview of the main Research

The primary prediction of the main study is that Koreans and Americans will respond differently to violations of expectations about positive and negative feedback. This primary prediction was based on the assumption that Koreans and Americans will differ in their expectations about positive and negative feedback. Because of the differences in expectations, when Korean and American students receive the same

feedback, the extent to which the feedback meets or violates students' expectations can differ.

Korean students believe it is less likely that they will receive positive feedback from their teachers. When an instructor provides positive feedback, such feedback is more likely to be a positive violation of the expectation for Korean students than for American students. On the other hand, American students' expectation about negative feedback can be lower than Korean students' expectations. Thus, when an instructor provides negative feedback, such feedback is more likely to be a negative violation of the expectations of American students than of Korean students. The main study herein proceeds from the prediction that when students receive positive feedback from their instructors, Korean students' satisfaction with the instructor will be higher than that of American students, and that when students receive negative feedback from their instructor, American students' satisfaction with the instructor will be lower than that of Korean students.

MAIN STUDY

When an instructor provides students with feedback that is different from the students' initial expectations, students' satisfaction with the instructor may increase or decrease. Student satisfaction refers to "a positive affective state resulting from the appraisal of one's academic experiences" (Park, Lee, Yun, & Kim, 2009, p. 192). As shown in the preliminary study findings, Korean students indicated lower expectations of positive feedback than American students. But receiving positive feedback is usually a pleasant experience. As shown in the preliminary study findings, both Korean and American students believed that positive feedback could motivate them to study harder. Expectancy violation occurs when a person's action differs from the expected range of the action (Burgoon & Hubbard, 2005). When an instructor provides positive feedback, such feedback is more likely to be a positive violation of the expectation for Korean students than for American students. On the other hand, American students' expectations of negative feedback were lower than Korean students' expectations. Thus, when an instructor provides negative feedback, such feedback is more likely to be a negative violation of the expectation for American students than for Korean students.

When a violation occurs in a pleasant direction, a positive outcome can happen, but when a violation occurs in an unpleasant direction, a negative outcome can happen. Receiving negative feedback from a teacher can be an unpleasant experience, whereas receiving positive feedback from a teacher can be a pleasant experience. Because receiving positive feedback is more likely to be a positive violation of expectancy among Korean students than among American students, it is predicted that Korean students will indicate greater satisfaction than will American students.

H3: When students receive positive feedback from their instructor, Korean students' satisfaction with the instructor will be higher than that of American students.

On the other hand, receiving negative feedback is more likely to be a negative violation of expectancy among American students than among Korean students, so it is predicted that Korean students will indicate greater satisfaction upon receiving such feedback than will American students. Thus, a hypothesis is advanced as follows:

H4: When students receive negative feedback from their instructor, American students' satisfaction with the instructor will be lower than that of Korean students.

Although feedback type is a main focus of this paper, this study will include grade as a variable because grade often affects student satisfaction substantially. Because cultural differences were not predicted for students' expectation about a specific grade, no specific hypothesis is advanced here. But the current study will examine a possibility that the effects of positive and negative feedback on student satisfaction with instruction will vary with grade students receive (e.g., no grade, grade A, and grade C).

MAIN STUDY METHOD

Participants

Participants were 228 undergraduates (age $M = 20.41$, $SD = 1.63$, 53.51% women) at a large Midwestern university in the United States and 142 undergraduates (age $M = 21.06$, $SD = 2.92$, 57.45% women) in Korea. The U.S. sample was 78.95% Caucasian American, 14.48% African American, 1.75% Asian American, 1.32% Hispanic, 1.32% mixed, 0.88 % Pacific Islander, and 1.32 % unidentified. Korean participants were all ethnically Korean.

Design

An experimental design was used for this study in such a way that participants were randomly assigned to one of six conditions (i.e., six vignettes). In condition one, participants read a description of a class and an instructor who provides positive feedback. In condition two, participants read a description of a class and an instructor who provides positive feedback and a grade of A. In condition three, participants read a description of a class and an instructor who provides positive feedback and a grade of C. In condition four, participants read a description of a class and an instructor who provides negative feedback. In condition five, participants read a description of a class and an instructor who provides negative feedback and a grade of A. In condition six, participants read a description of a class and an instructor who provides negative feedback and a grade of C. A manipulation check was done in such a way that participants were asked to evaluate the extent to which feedback is positive or negative. Then, participants' satisfaction level with the instructor was assessed.

Before reading the vignettes, participants were asked to indicate their expectation

of positive and negative feedback, motivation resulting from positive and negative feedback, and belief in power distance. The measures for these variables were included in the main study again to establish Koreans' and Americans' baseline expectancies concerning positive and negative feedback. In sum, the questionnaire for this main study consisted of two sections: first, measurements for expectation, motivation, and power distance; second, each of the vignettes, manipulation check items, and student satisfaction items.

Measurement

The questionnaire was produced in both English and Korean. The English version of the questionnaire was compared to the Korean version using various methods, such as back-translation and inspection by speakers fluent in both languages, to ensure equivalence in meaning. Participants completed the questionnaire in their native languages. All measures used a 5-point Likert scale response format (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). All measurement items for expectations concerning positive and negative feedback, motivation, and power distance from the preliminary study were included in the main study. Additionally, the instructional feedback orientation scale, academic performance scale, feedback degree, and teacher evaluation scale were added in the main study. The first section of the questionnaire included measurement items for expectations concerning positive and negative feedback, motivation, instructional feedback, academic performance, and power distance. Then, a vignette was presented. The second section of the questionnaire included measurement items for feedback degree and teacher evaluation for each situation depicted in the vignettes. Appendix 2 lists the scale items for the main study.

Expectations concerning positive and negative feedback. Items measuring expectations concerning positive and negative feedback were developed based on Burnett's (2002) teacher feedback scale. Burnett's scale consists of 5 items for positive feedback and 5 items for negative feedback. The author of the current paper prepared 2 additional items for positive feedback and another 2 items for negative feedback. The measurement items asked about how often students expect professors to provide positive or negative feedback (1 = *never*; 5 = *always*). The 7 items for positive feedback expectation (e.g., "How often do you expect professors to provide positive feedback on students' work through comments on papers, oral discussions etc." and "How often do you expect your professors to say 'excellent work, well done'.") had reliabilities (Cronbach's α) of .90 in the US and .87 in Korea. The 7 items for negative feedback expectation (e.g., "How often do you expect professors to provide negative feedback on students' work through comments on papers, oral discussions etc." and "How often do you expect your professors to say 'that's not good enough'.") had reliabilities (Cronbach's α) of .75 in the US and .80 in Korea.

Motivation. Student motivation resulting from positive or negative feedback was measured with items created by the author. Motivation resulting from positive feedback was measured with 7 items (e.g., "Positive feedback motivates students to study harder." and "Positive feedback from my teachers motivates me to improve my performance."). Reliabilities (Cronbach's α) were .86 in the US and .89 in Korea. Motivation resulting from negative feedback was measured with 6 items (e.g., "Negative feedback motivates students to study harder" and "I usually am able to improve my performance based on negative feedback."). Reliabilities (Cronbach's α) were .89 in the US and .88 in Korea.

Power distance. Students' belief in power distance was measured with five items created for Yoo and Donthu's (2002) power distance scale. The scale showed adequate psychometric properties with regard to reliability and validity (Yoo & Donthus, 2002). Example items were "People in higher positions should make most decisions without consulting people in lower positions" and "People in lower positions should not disagree with decisions made by people in higher positions." Reliabilities (Cronbach's α) were .76 in the US and .65 in Korea.

Table 2 shows means, standard deviations, and correlations of the variables.

-- Insert Table 2 about here --

Manipulation

Situation types. This study used a 2 (feedback type: positive and negative) x 3 (grade type: no grade, grade A, and grade C) design. For the feedback type, two vignettes were prepared with one depicting a situation in which an instructor provides a student with positive feedback and another depicting a situation in which an instructor provides a student with negative feedback. To create three conditions of the grade, the feedback in each vignette was accompanied by no mentioning of grade (see below for vignettes), grade A (i.e., you received a grade of "A" for this paper), or grade C (i.e., you received a grade of "C" for this paper.). Participants were randomly assigned to one of the six vignettes, and were instructed to imagine that they are in the situation as vividly as they can. The English versions of the vignettes are presented below. See appendix 3 for all the six vignettes.

Positive feedback vignette: Imagine that you are taking one of the required classes in your department. Two exams and two papers are given during the course of the

semester. Each exam is 30 % of your grade and each paper is 20 % of your grade. During the semester, you submitted your papers and received the papers back with feedback from your professor. He/she said in your paper “Good job! Your ideas are solid, and it’s very well-organized. Keep up the good work.”

Negative feedback vignette: Imagine that you are taking one of the required classes in your department. Two exams and two papers are given during the course of the semester. Each exam is 30 % of your grade and each paper is 20 % of your grade. During the semester, you submitted your papers and received the papers back with feedback from your professor. He/she said in your paper “Your idea is not interesting, and your paper needs a lot of editing. Organization is not coherent throughout the paper. This is not good enough. You should do better next time.”

Manipulation check. Six items assessed whether participants considered the positive feedback in vignettes as positive and the negative feedback as negative. Three items ($\alpha = .92$ in Korea and $.95$ in the US) assessed positive feedback (e.g., "This feedback is positive.") and three items ($\alpha = .87$ in Korea and $.90$ in the US) assessed negative feedback (e.g., "This feedback is a form of criticism."). The positive feedback vignettes were considered as more positive ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.17$ in Korea and $M = 3.91$, $SD = 0.92$ in the US) than the negative feedback vignettes ($M = 2.31$, $SD = 1.17$ in Korea and $M = 1.92$, $SD = 0.89$ in the US), $t(140) = 8.00$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .31$ in Korea, $t(223) = 16.37$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .55$ in the US. The negative feedback vignettes were considered as

more negative ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.73$ in Korea and $M = 3.69$, $SD = 0.89$ in the US) than the positive feedback vignettes ($M = 2.12$, $SD = 0.94$ in Korea and $M = 1.95$, $SD = 0.87$ in the US), $t(140) = 10.90$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .46$ in Korea, $t(223) = 14.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .49$ in the US.

Dependent Variable

Student satisfaction with instruction. The measure for student satisfaction with an instruction included items from university instructor and course evaluation forms available at the websites of the Netherland research school of SENSE, the University of the South, and Pennsylvania State University. After selecting items relevant to the current study and creating additional items, a total of 16 items were used. Example items are “I am satisfied with the professor’s coaching during the course” and “I would recommend this course to another student.” Reliabilities (Cronbach’s α) were .94 in the US and .94 in Korea.

Motivation from feedback. The measure for motivation from instructor feedback used after participants read the vignette. Student motivation resulting from instructor feedback was measured with 9 items created by the author. Example items are “This feedback can help me want to learn more.” and “This feedback from my teachers motivates me to improve my performance.”). Reliabilities (Cronbach’s α) were .92 in the US and .94 in Korea.

MAIN STUDY RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Differences in power distance between Korea and Americans. Hypothesis 1 in the preliminary study predicted that Koreans would show stronger belief on power distance than Americans would. Inconsistent with H1, Koreans ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 0.60$) and Americans ($M = 2.16$, $SD = 0.59$) did not differ in power distance, $t(368) = 0.17$, $p = .87$, $\eta^2 = .00$.

Differences between Koreans and Americans in expected feedback types.

Hypothesis 2 in the preliminary study predicted that Americans would be more likely to expect positive feedback than negative feedback from their professors in the United States, whereas Koreans would be more likely to expect negative feedback than positive feedback from their professors in Korea. To test the hypothesis 2, a 2 (culture: U.S. and Korea) x 2 (feedback type: positive and negative) mixed design ANOVA was conducted. Culture was the between-subjects variable and type of feedback was the within-subjects variable. The main effect of culture was significant, $F(1, 368) = 9.91$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. The main effect of feedback type was significant, $F(1, 368) = 11.96$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .24$. Koreans ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 0.41$) were more likely to expect feedback than Americans ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.62$). This finding indicated that students expected more positive feedback overall ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 0.73$) than negative feedback from their professors ($M = 2.55$, $SD = 0.59$). The interaction between culture and types of feedback was not significant, $F(1, 368) = 0.15$, $p < .70$, partial $\eta^2 = .00$. The data were inconsistent with H2.

Differences in Motivation between Korea and Americans. Research question 1 in

the preliminary study asked whether Koreans and Americans would differ in the extent to which they believed each type of feedback would motivate students. A 2 (culture: U.S. and Korea) x 2 (feedback type affecting motivation: positive and negative) mixed design ANOVA was conducted to test this research question. Culture was the between subjects variable and motivation was the within subjects variable with two levels (resulting from positive feedback and negative feedback). The main effect of culture was significant, $F(1, 368) = 4.37, p = .04$, partial $\eta^2 = .01$. The main effect of feedback type affecting motivation was significant, $F(1, 368) = 322.26, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .47$. This indicated that students were more motivated by positive feedback ($M = 3.89, SD = 0.63$) than by negative feedback from their professors ($M = 3.09, SD = 0.84$). The interaction between culture and types of motivation was significant, $F(1, 368) = 92.00, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .20$. Koreans ($M = 4.12, SD = 0.58$) indicated positive feedback to be more motivating than did Americans ($M = 3.75, SD = 0.62$), $t(368) = 5.78, p < .001$, while Americans ($M = 3.33, SD = 0.78$) indicated negative feedback to be more motivating than did Koreans ($M = 2.72, SD = 0.81$), $t(368) = 7.14, p < .001$.

Additional analyses. Inconsistent with H1 and H2, Korean and American participants in the main study did not differ in power distance and both Koreans and Americans had stronger expectation about positive feedback than negative feedback. These findings were inconsistent with the findings of the preliminary study. However, the correlations in Table 2 showed that the correlation between power distance and positive feedback expectation was negative among Koreans, $r(140) = -.27, p = .001$, but it was positive but not significant among Americans, $r(226) = .11, p = .10$. These two correlations significantly differed from one another, $z = 3.61, p < .001$. That is, among

Koreans, students with stronger belief on power distance were less likely to expect positive feedback from their professors. The correlation between power distance and negative feedback expectation was positive among Koreans, $r(140) = .32, p < .001$, and it was positive but not significant among Americans, $r(226) = .13, p = .05$. These two correlations significantly differed from one another, $z = 1.86, p = .03$ (one-tailed). That is, among Koreans, students with stronger belief on power distance were more likely to expect negative feedback from their professors.

The correlation between power distance and motivation from positive feedback did not differ between Koreans ($r[140] = -.14, p = .10$) and Americans ($r[226] = -.13, p = .06$), $z = 0.14, p = .88$. The correlation between power distance and motivation from negative feedback did not differ between Koreans ($r[140] = .20, p = .02$) and Americans ($r[226] = .08, p = .26$), $z = 1.17, p = .24$.

Main Analyses

Hypothesis 3 predicted that Korean students would indicate higher satisfaction than American students for positive feedback. Hypothesis 4 predicted that American students would indicate lower satisfaction than Korean students for negative feedback. These two hypotheses were tested with a 2 (culture: Koreans and Americans) x 2 (feedback type: positive and negative) x 3 (grade type: no grade, grade A, and grade C) between-subject ANOVA.

Two-way interaction of culture by feedback type was significant, $F(1, 355) = 7.62, p = .006, \eta^2 = .016$. For positive feedback, Korean students ($M = 3.39, SD = 0.81$) and American students ($M = 3.21, SD = 0.78$) did not differ in their satisfaction, $t(192) = 1.52, p = .13$. The data were not consistent with H3. For negative feedback, American

students ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 0.68$) indicated lower satisfaction than did Korean students ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.60$), $t(171) = 4.26$, $p < .001$. The data were consistent with H4.

Culture had a significant main effect, $F(1, 355) = 11.38$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .023$. Across all the vignettes, Korean students indicated higher satisfaction ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.72$) than American students ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 0.76$). Feedback type had a significant main effect, $F(1, 355) = 10.81$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .022$. In general, positive feedback yielded higher satisfaction ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 0.80$) than negative feedback ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 0.68$). Grade type had a significant main effect, $F(2, 355) = 31.08$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .125$. A post hoc comparison using Tukey's test showed that participants in grade C condition indicated lower satisfaction with instruction ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.76$) than those in no grade condition ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.60$) and grade A condition ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.74$). No grade condition did not differ from grade A condition.

Two-way interaction of feedback type by grade type was significant, $F(2, 355) = 14.08$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .055$. For negative feedback, no grade condition ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.67$), grade A condition ($M = 3.01$, $SD = 0.73$), and grade C condition ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 0.65$) did not differ from one another, $F(2, 170) = 1.70$, $p = .19$. For positive feedback, no grade condition ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.49$) and grade A condition ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 0.58$) did not differ from one another, but both conditions yielded higher satisfaction than did grade C condition ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 0.65$), $F(2, 191) = 49.17$, $p < .001$. Two-way interaction of culture by grade type was not significant, $F(2, 355) = 0.78$, $p = .46$, $\eta^2 = .00$. Three-way interaction of culture by feedback type by grade type was not significant, $F(2, 355) = 0.03$, $p = .97$, $\eta^2 = .00$.

Additional analyses. A 2 (culture: Koreans and Americans) x 2 (feedback type:

positive and negative) x 3 (grade type: no grade, grade A, and grade C) between-subject ANOVA was conducted on motivation from feedback. Culture had a significant main effect, $F(1, 355) = 35.96, p < .001, \eta^2 = .069$. Koreans ($M = 3.39, SD = 0.79$) indicated the feedback in the vignettes to be more motivating than did Americans ($M = 2.82, SD = 0.87$). Culture had a significant main effect, $F(1, 355) = 35.96, p < .001, \eta^2 = .069$. Grade type had a significant main effect, $F(2, 355) = 26.12, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$. A post hoc comparison using Tukey's test showed that participants in grade C condition indicated lower satisfaction with instruction ($M = 2.57, SD = 0.84$) than those in no grade condition ($M = 3.24, SD = 0.74$) and grade A condition ($M = 3.32, SD = 0.87$). No grade condition did not differ from grade A condition. Feedback type did not have a significant main effect, $F(1, 355) = 2.66, p = .10, \eta^2 = .005$.

Two-way interaction of feedback type by grade type was significant, $F(2, 355) = 14.45, p < .001, \eta^2 = .055$. For negative feedback, no grade condition ($M = 3.15, SD = 0.79$), grade A condition ($M = 2.92, SD = 0.93$), and grade C condition ($M = 2.85, SD = 0.71$) did not differ from one another, $F(2, 170) = 2.15, p = .12$. For positive feedback, no grade condition ($M = 3.32, SD = 0.69$) and grade A condition ($M = 3.65, SD = 0.66$) did not differ from one another, but both conditions yielded higher satisfaction than did grade C condition ($M = 2.32, SD = 0.88$), $F(2, 191) = 55.98, p < .001$. Two-way interaction of culture by feedback type was not significant, $F(1, 355) = 0.40, p = .53, \eta^2 = .00$. Two-way interaction of culture by grade type was not significant, $F(2, 355) = 2.61, p = .08, \eta^2 = .01$. Three-way interaction of culture by feedback type by grade type was not significant, $F(2, 355) = 1.53, p = .22, \eta^2 = .006$.

MAIN STUDY DISCUSSION

The current study was designed to examine cultural differences in students' responses to different feedback provided by their instructors. The major findings were: 1) Students' belief on power distance was an important factor for their expectation about positive and negative feedback.; 2) American students indicated lower satisfaction than Korean students for negative feedback.; 3) In general, positive feedback yielded higher satisfaction than negative feedback.; 4) Compared to receiving no grade or grade A, receiving grade C resulted in lower satisfaction with instruction. The findings and implications thereof are discussed below in more detail.

Negative Feedback

The cultural differences in students' expectations about instructor feedback and their responses to it were more evident with negative feedback than positive feedback. The findings about negative feedback were consistent across the preliminary study and the main study. American students had lower expectation about negative feedback than Korean students. Students' belief on power distance was positively related to expectation about negative feedback more substantially among Koreans than Americans. Negative feedback in the vignettes lowered American students' satisfaction more so than Korean students' satisfaction. Korea, as a higher power distance culture than America, has more teacher-oriented education system (Hofstede, 2001). Past research implied that teachers in lower power distance cultures are more likely to offer positive feedback and believe in positive feedback's motivating effect than teachers in higher power distance (e.g., Alexander, 2000; Hofton et al., 2003). Homes and Smith (2003) found that U.S. students are sensitive to critical comments about their performance and view their assignments as

self-expression. Praise could be a prevalent strategy for instructors in order to promote students' self-esteem and enthusiasm in the U.S. Thus, students are more exposed to positive feedback than negative feedback. When American students receive negative feedback from a professor, their expectancy is negatively violated. When a negative violation occurs, a negative outcome can happen (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). One of the negative outcomes could be a low satisfaction with their professor and class and another outcome is to be a lowered motivation to continue studying.

Positive Feedback

For positive feedback, the preliminary study showed that Koreans had higher expectation for positive feedback than negative feedback while Americans had higher expectation for negative feedback than positive feedback. But in the main study both Koreans and Americans had higher expectation about positive feedback than negative feedback. Actually, if Koreans and Americans in the main study were compared for positive feedback only, Koreans ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 0.69$) had slightly higher expectation about positive feedback than did Americans ($M = 2.96$, $SD = 0.75$), $t(368) = 2.44$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Also in the main study, Koreans and Americans did not differ in their satisfaction when receiving positive feedback. Among Koreans, the correlation between power distance and expectation about positive feedback was positive in the preliminary study, but it was negative in the main study. Overall, the findings regarding expectation about positive feedback and students' responses to positive feedback seemed to be inconclusive about cultural differences and inconsistent with the current study's predictions. Furthermore, Korean students in the preliminary study and the main study considered positive feedback to be motivating to a greater extent than American students.

A possibility for these findings might be that the education culture and practices in Korea may be changing. For the last a few years, universities in Korea have started implementing teaching evaluation. A few universities (e.g., Chung-Ang University in Seoul, Korea) have made all the professors' teaching evaluation scores public and have provided various incentives to professors with higher teaching evaluation and punishments to those with lower teaching evaluation. Thus, as it becomes more necessary to have a higher teaching evaluation, Korean professors may have made changes in their instruction styles and have been offering more positive feedback than before teaching evaluation was adopted. Praise may be effective simply because it creates a positive mood (Delin & Baumeister, 1994) or because it makes people feel good about themselves (Blumenfeld et al., 1982). Barker (1992) discovered that students in college perceive praise as their competence or value of their accomplishment. Perhaps positive feedback may bring good feelings about students' accomplishment and it may be related with high student satisfaction in their classes and for their professors. Possibly, there is no cultural boundaries in that praise and positive feedback help students feel good.

Grade and Feedback Congruency

The current study showed that the grade affected students' satisfaction with instruction. This finding is no surprise. In relation with feedback, however, an interesting finding was that grade A received along with negative feedback did not increase satisfaction more than grade C received along with negative feedback did. On the other hand, grade C received along with positive feedback resulted in much lower satisfaction than grade A received along with positive feedback. It seems that when students receive grade C, it does not matter whether an instructor provides negative or positive feedback.

When students receive grade A, however, feedback valence congruent with the grade can increase student satisfaction much more than feedback incongruent with the grade (i.e., negative feedback). In short, (in)congruency of grade and feedback does not affect satisfaction with instruction for negative feedback, but it does for positive feedback.

This finding about the congruency effect of grade and feedback was also evident with students' motivation from feedback; when receiving negative feedback, grade did not matter much for the extent to which students find the feedback to be motivating. One difference, however, was that although students' satisfaction with instruction did not differ for grade C with positive feedback ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 0.83$) and grade C with negative feedback ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 0.65$), $t(121) = 1.62$, $p = .11$, $\eta^2 = .02$, students' motivation from feedback was much lower for grade C with positive feedback ($M = 2.32$, $SD = 0.88$) than grade C with negative feedback ($M = 2.85$, $SD = 0.71$), $t(121) = 3.60$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .10$. One possible explanation for this finding might be that, when receiving grade C, students might have questioned the sincerity or even veracity of the positive feedback. Students might have considered the positive feedback as sarcasm or poking fun at the performance. Because this study did not measure students' evaluation of the feedback itself directly, it remains unexplained at this point how students interpreted the positive feedback provided along with different grades. Future studies may investigate whether grade and feedback incongruency is a form of expectation violation, and if so, which of the grade or feedback valence serves as an expectation and a violation.

Cross-Cultural Implications

The current findings may provide a couple of implications for intercultural and instructional communication in classroom settings. First, Korean international students

coming to the US may need to be provided with information about American instructors' general teaching practices. Increased knowledge about similarities and differences between instructors in Korea and those in the US may help Korean international students' academic adjustment. If Korean international students receive negative feedback less often in the US than when they were in Korea, it is possible that they may think they are doing well with their study when in fact it may not be the case.

Second, when instructors from Korea come to the US and teach American students, they need to be more careful when providing students with negative feedback. The current finding does not necessarily mean that instructors should not offer negative feedback at all, because American participants in both preliminary and main studies indicated negative feedback to be somewhat moderately motivating on average. Foreign instructors unfamiliar with American culture and American students' expectation about, and responses to, negative feedback may experience culture shock if they do not quickly learn and develop effective ways to motivate students and let them know what needs to be improved without hurting their feelings.

Limitations and Directions for Future Studies

The current study has a few limitations and suggestions for future studies in the areas of intercultural and instructional communication. First, using a paper-pencil instrument to examine student's expectancy violation with regard to feedback types is limited in realism. In this study, participants only read hypothetical vignettes. Thus, it is questionable whether the participants would respond similarly in a real-life expectation violation and response to positive and negative feedback as to how they did in the questionnaires. Using an experiment in the lab with controlled settings and observation of

people's behaviors in the naturalistic setting can address the limitations of self-reported measurement in the future.

Second, the current findings could be restricted to Korean students. It would be interesting to inspect whether similar or different patterns of findings would be observed with students from other high power distance countries such as Japan, China, Russia, and etc. Additionally, because Korean participants in the main study did not differ from American participants for their belief on power distance, future studies may need to examine whether the teacher-student relationship in universities in Korea have changed in recent years, and if so, how similar or different the teacher-student relationship in Korea is to other cultures.

Third, feedback types investigated in the current study were dichotomous in nature (i.e., positive vs. negative). In a real classroom setting over a semester period, instructors may provide various feedback varying in valence in degree. Additionally, instructors may provide feedback that contains both positive and negative comments. Future studies may need to examine how students respond to feedback differing in degree and whether students pay selective attention to a particular type of feedback when the feedback contains multiple types of comments.

Finally, it would be interesting to investigate individual differences about feedback types and student satisfaction with cultural differences. For example, not all students do their work at the same level of quality and their feedback should different based on their performance. That is, future research should examine whether individuals would deviate their expectations about instructor feedback based on students' performance and how those expectation are different between low-accomplishing

students and high-accomplishing students.

TABLE 1
Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations of Variables (Preliminary Study)

	EPF	ENF	MPF	MNF	PD
American Students (<i>df</i> = 125)					
Expected Positive Feedback (EPF)	—				
Expected Negative Feedback (ENF)	.52***				
Motivation from Positive Feedback (MPF)	.42***	.31***			
Motivation from Negative Feedback (MNF)	.13	.10	.09		
Power Distance (PD)	-.16	-.04	-.36***	-.16	
<i>M</i>	3.01	2.58	3.74	3.12	2.19
<i>SD</i>	0.79	0.59	0.75	0.96	0.69
Korean Students (<i>df</i> = 113)					
Expected Positive Feedback (EPF)	—				
Expected Negative Feedback (ENF)	.24**				
Motivation from Positive Feedback (MPF)	.04	.14			
Motivation from Negative Feedback (MNF)	.21**	.38***	.11		
Power Distance (PD)	.44***	.40***	-.15	.24**	
<i>M</i>	2.85	3.00	3.99	3.14	2.66
<i>SD</i>	0.69	0.57	0.66	0.84	0.69

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

TABLE 2
Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations of Variables (Main Study)

	EPF	ENF	MPF	MNF	PD
American Students (<i>df</i> = 227)					
Expected Positive Feedback (EPF)	—				
Expected Negative Feedback (ENF)	.50***				
Motivation from Positive Feedback (MPF)	.34***	.04			
Motivation from Negative Feedback (MNF)	.18**	.14*	.15*		
Power Distance (PD)	.11*	.13*	-.12	.08	
<i>M</i>	2.96	2.49	3.75	3.33	2.15
<i>SD</i>	0.75	0.57	0.62	0.78	0.59
	EPF	ENF	MPF	MNF	PD
Korean Students (<i>df</i> = 140)					
Expected Positive Feedback (EPF)	—				
Expected Negative Feedback (ENF)	.27**				
Motivation from Positive Feedback (MPF)	.36***	-.21*			
Motivation from Negative Feedback (MNF)	.02	.24**	-.02		
Power Distance (PD)	-.27**	.32***	-.14	.20*	
<i>M</i>	3.14	2.64	4.12	2.72	2.14
<i>SD</i>	0.69	0.62	0.58	0.81	0.60

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

APPENDIX A

Preliminary Study Questionnaire

Expected Positive Feedback (Burnett, 2002; items [# 6 and #7] were created for this study)

How often do you expect your professors to say....

1. Keep up the good work.
2. That's really good work.
3. Lovely work.
4. Well done!
5. Excellent work, well done.

How often do you expect to your professors to ...

6. Praise students' work, action, or comments.
7. Provide positive feedback on students' work through comments on papers, oral discussions, and etc.

Expected Negative Feedback (Burnett, 2002; items [# 6 and #7] were created for this study)

How often do you expect your professors to say....

1. Come on, you can do better
2. Do that again, please.
3. That's very untidy work.
4. That was a silly thing to do.
5. That's not good enough.

How often do you expect to your professors to ...

6. Criticize or point out faults in students' work action or comments.

7. Provide negative feedback on students' work through comments on papers, oral discussions, and etc.

Motivation from Positive feedback (created by the author)

1. Praise benefits students
2. Positive feedback can help students want to learn more.
3. Positive feedback motivates students to study harder.

Motivation from Negative feedback (created by the author)

1. Negative feedback can help students want to learn more.
2. Negative feedback motivates students to study harder.

Power Distance (Yoo & Donthu, 2002)

1. People in higher positions should make most decisions without consulting people in lower positions.
2. People in higher positions should not ask the opinions of people in lower positions too frequently.
3. People in higher positions should avoid social interaction with people in lower positions.
4. People in higher positions should not delegate important tasks to people in lower positions.
5. People in lower positions should not disagree with decisions made by people in higher positions.

Demographic background information

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1. Age _____

2. Gender

☐ Male

☐ Female

3. Major _____

4. Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____ Graduate _____

5. Please indicate your ethnicity (check one)

_____ Caucasian/European American

_____ Hispanic

_____ African American

_____ Pacific Islander

_____ Native American

_____ Mixed (please specify _____)

_____ Asian American

_____ Other (please specify _____)

6. International student

_____ yes

_____ no

7. If you are an international student, which country are you from?

8. Cumulative GPA: _____

Thank you again for your participation!!

APPENDIX B
Main Study Questionnaire

(* indicates the reversed item)

Expected Positive Feedback (Burnett, 2002; items [# 6 and #7] were created for this study)

How often do you expect your professors to say....

1. Keep up the good work.
2. That's really good work.
3. Lovely work.
4. Well done!
5. Excellent work, well done.

How often do you expect to your professors to ...

6. Praise students' work, action, or comments.
7. Provide positive feedback on students' work through comments on papers, oral discussions, and etc.

Expected Negative Feedback (Burnett, 2002; items [# 6 and #7] were created for this study)

How often do you expect your professors to say....

1. Come on, you can do better
2. Do that again, please.
3. That's very untidy work.
4. That was a silly thing to do.
5. That's not good enough.

How often do you expect to your professors to ...

6. Criticize or point out faults in students' work action or comments.

7. Provide negative feedback on students' work through comments on papers, oral discussions, and etc.

Motivation from Positive feedback (created by the author)

1. Praise benefits students.
2. Positive feedback can help students want to learn more.
3. Positive feedback motivates students to study harder.
4. Positive feedback from teachers is vitally important in improving my performance.
5. Positive feedback provides clear direction on how to improve my performance.
6. Positive feedback from my teachers motivates me to improve my performance.
7. I usually am able to improve my performance based on positive feedback.

Motivation from Negative feedback (created by the author)

1. Negative feedback can help students want to learn more.
2. Negative feedback motivates students to study harder.
3. Negative feedback from teachers is vitally important in improving my performance.
4. Negative feedback from my teachers motivates me to improve my performance.
5. I usually am able to improve my performance based on negative feedback.
6. Negative feedback provides clear direction on how to improve my performance.

Power Distance (Yoo & Donthu, 2002)

1. People in higher positions should make most decisions without consulting people in lower positions.
2. People in higher positions should not ask the opinions of people in lower positions too frequently.
3. People in higher positions should avoid social interaction with people in lower positions.
4. People in higher positions should not delegate important tasks to people in lower positions.

5. People in lower positions should not disagree with decisions made by people in higher positions.

Vignette 1: Positive feedback+ no grade

***INSTRUCTION:** The following questions concern a specific vignette. Please read the vignette carefully, imagine that you are in the situation as vividly as you can, and use the scales to indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the number that best reflects your opinion*

Imagine that you are taking one of the required classes in your department. Two exams and two papers are given during the course of the semester. Each exam is 30 % of your grade and each paper is 20 % of your grade. During the semester, you submitted your papers and received the papers back with feedback from your professor. He/she said in your paper “Good job! Your ideas are solid, and this paper is very well-organized. Keep up the good work.”

The following questions are about feedback described above (“Good job! Your ideas are solid, and this paper is very well-organized. Keep up the good work.”)

Feedback valence (These items are created for this study by the author)

1. This feedback is positive.
2. This feedback is a form of praise.
3. This is one of an example of negative feedback.
4. This is one of an example of positive feedback.
5. This is a negative feedback.
6. This feedback is a form of criticism.

The following questions are your **general reaction about this class regarding feedback** from your professor. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling the number that best reflects your opinion.

Teacher evaluation

Evaluation for instructor/professor ([#1] is from the PhD course evaluation form of the Netherland research school of SENSE; [#3 and #4] are from the Student

Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ); Other item are created by the author based on the some university course evaluation forms.)

1. I am satisfied with the professor coaching during the course.
2. The teaching (feedback from the instructor etc) in this part of the course was good.
3. I am satisfied with the professor.
4. I am satisfied with professor's comment.
5. I would like to take another class taught by same professor.
6. I have learned nothing with the professor. *

Evaluation for class ([#2 and #7] are from the University of South course evaluation form; [#1 and #11] are from the schreyer institute for teaching excellence of Pennsylvania State University; [#6 and #11] are from the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ); Other item are created by the author based on the some university course evaluation forms.)

1. I would like to take this course again.
2. The feedback on the paper was what I expected from the professor.
3. I would be unable to use the information from this class. *
4. After I receive this feedback, it provides clear direction on how to improve my performance.
5. I am satisfied with quality of this course.
6. I would recommend this course to another student.
7. I have learned a great deal in this class.
8. This class does not help to improve my performance. *
9. I have learned nothing in this class. *
10. I am satisfied with feedback provided by the professor.

Motivation from feedback.

1. This feedback benefits me.

2. This feedback can help me want to learn more.
3. This feedback motivates me to study harder.
4. This feedback from my professor is vitally important in improving my performance.
5. This feedback provides clear direction on how to improve my performance.
6. This feedback from my professor motivates me to improve my performance.
7. This feedback enables me to improve my performance.
8. This feedback is not helpful to motivate me. *
9. I do not know how to improve my performance based on this feedback. *

APPENDIX C

Vignettes

Vignette One (positive feedback):

Imagine that you are taking one of the required classes in your department. Two exams and two papers are given during the course of the semester. Each exam is 30 % of your grade and each paper is 20 % of your grade. During the semester, you submitted your papers and received the papers back with feedback from your professor. He/she said in your paper “Good job! Your ideas are solid, and it’s very well-organized. Keep up the good work.”

Vignette Two (positive feedback + a grade of A):

Imagine that you are taking one of the required classes in your department. Two exams and two papers are given during the course of the semester. Each exam is 30 % of your grade and each paper is 20 % of your grade. During the semester, you submitted your papers and received the papers back with feedback and grade from your professor. He/she said in your paper “Good job! Your ideas are solid, and this paper is very well-organized. Keep up the good work.”, and you received a grade of “A” for this paper.

Vignette Three (positive feedback + a grade of C):

Imagine that you are taking one of the required classes in your department. Two exams and two papers are given during the course of the semester. Each exam is 30 % of your grade and each paper is 20 % of your grade. During the semester, you submitted your papers and received the papers back with feedback and grade from your professor. He/she said in your paper “Good job! Your ideas are solid, and this paper is very well-organized. Keep up the good work.”, but you received

a grade of “C” for this paper.

Vignette Four (negative feedback):

Imagine that you are taking one of the required classes in your department. Two exams and two papers are given during the course of the semester. Each exam is 30 % of your grade and each paper is 20 % of your grade. During the semester, you submitted your papers and received the papers back with feedback from your professor. He/she said in your paper “Your idea is not interesting, and your paper needs a lot of editing. Organization is not coherent throughout the paper. This is not good enough. You should do better next time.”

Vignette Five (negative feedback + a grade of A):

Imagine that you are taking one of the required classes in your department. Two exams and two papers are given during the course of the semester. Each exam is 30 % of your grade and each paper is 20 % of your grade. During the semester, you submitted your papers and received the papers back with feedback and grade from your professor. He/she said in your paper “Your idea is not interesting, and your paper needs a lot of editing. Organization is not coherent throughout the paper. This is not good enough.”, but you received a grade of “A” for this paper.

Vignette Six (negative feedback + a grade of C):

Imagine that you are taking one of the required classes in your department. Two exams and two papers are given during the course of the semester. Each exam is 30 % of your grade and each paper is 20 % of your grade. During the semester, you submitted your papers and received the papers back with feedback and grade from your professor. He/she said in your paper “Your idea is not interesting, and

your paper needs a lot of editing. Organization is not coherent throughout the paper. This is not good enough.”, and you received a grade of “C” for this paper.

REFERENCES

- Afifi, W. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (2000). The impact of violations on uncertainty and the consequences for attractiveness. *Human Communication Research*, 26, 203–233.
- Alexander, R. (2000). *Culture and Pedagogy*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford: Malden.
- Arntz, A., vanEck, M., & Heijmans, M. (1980). Predictions of dental pain: The fear of any expected evil is worse than the evil itself. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 28, 29–41.
- Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1989). *Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire Manual*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Beach, R. (1979). The effects of between-draft teacher evaluation versus student self-evaluation on high school students' revising of rough drafts. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 13, 111-119.
- Biggs, J. B. (1991). Approaches to learning in secondary and tertiary students in Hong Kong: Some comparative studies. *Education Research Journal*, 6, 27-39.
- Brandt, D. R. (1988). How service markets can identify value enhancing service elements. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 2, 35-41.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1988). Cross-cultural and intercultural applications of expectancy violations theory. In W. B. Gudykunst & S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), *Culture and interpersonal communication* (pp. 194-214). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. *Communication Monographs*, 55, 58-79.
- Burgoon, J. K., & Hubbard, A. S. E. (2005). Cross-cultural and intercultural applications of expectancy violations theory and interaction adaptation theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 149-171). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burgoon, J. K., Le Poire, B. A., & Rosenthal, R. (1995). Effects of preinteraction expectancies and target communication on perceiver reciprocity and compensation in dyadic interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 31, 287-321.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Perspectives on motivation* (Vol. 38, pp. 237-288). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 81-112.
- Hess, U., Blairy, S., & Kleck, R. E. (2000). The influence of facial emotion displays, gender, and ethnicity on judgments of dominance and affiliation. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 24, 265-283.
- Ho, D. Y., Peng, S., & Chan, S. F. (2001). Authority and learning in Confucian-heritage education: A relational methodological analysis. In C. Y. Chiu, F. Salili, F. Salili & Y. Y. Hong (Eds.), *Multiple competencies and self-regulated learning: Implications for multicultural education* (pp. 29-47). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Pub.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holmes, L., & Smith, L. J. (2003). Student evaluations of faculty grading methods. *Journal of Education for Business*, 78, 318-323.
- Huften, N. R., Elliott, J. G., & Illushin, L. (2003). Teachers' beliefs about student motivation: similarities and differences across cultures, *Comparative Education*, 39, 367-389.
- Institute of International Education. (2007, November 12). Open doors report. Retrieved January 30, 2008, from <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>
- Joyce, A. S., Ogrodniczuk, J. S., Piper, W. E., & McCallum, M. (2003). The alliance as mediator of expectancy effects in short-term individual therapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 672-679.
- Kanazawa, S. (1992). Outcome or expectancy? Antecedent of spontaneous causal attribution. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 659-668.
- Kelley, D. L. (1991). Understanding marital satisfaction and couple type as functions of relational expectations. *Human Communication Research*, 18, 40-69.
- King, P. E., Young, M. J., & Behnke, R. R. (2000). Public speaking performance improvement as a function of information processing in immediate and delayed feedback interventions. *Communication Education*, 49, 365-374.
- Land, R. E., & Evans, S. (1987). What our students taught us about paper marking, *English Journal*, 76, 113-116.
- Leung, F. K. S. (2005). Some characteristics of East Asian mathematics classrooms based on data from the TIMSS 1999 video study. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 60, 199-215.

- Liberman, K. (1994). Asian student perspectives on American university instruction. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 18, 173-192.
- Lynch, C., & Kleman, P. (1978). Evaluating our evaluations. *College English*, 40, 166-180.
- Marsh, H. W., Fleiner, H., & Thomas, C.S. (1975). Validity and usefulness of student evaluations of instructional quality. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67, 833-839.
- Merritt, A. C. (2000). Culture in the cockpit. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 283-301.
- Odell, L. (1989). Responding to student writing: Goals, methods, alternatives. *Freshman English News*, 17, 3-11.
- Park, H. S., Lee, S. A., Yun, D., & Kim, W. (2009). The impact of instructor decision authority and verbal and nonverbal immediacy on Korean student satisfaction in the US and South Korea. *Communication Education*, 58, 189-212.
- Rakoczy, K., Klieme, E., Burgermeister, A., & Harks, B. (2008). The interplay between student evaluation and instruction: grading and feedback in mathematics classrooms. *Zeitschrift Fur Psychologie-Journal of Psychology*, 216, 111-124.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). An overview of self-determination theory: An organism dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3–33). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Sanna, L. J., & Turley, K. J. (1996). Antecedents to spontaneous counterfactual thinking: Effects of expectancy violation and outcome valence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 906–919.
- Sirgy, M. J. (1984). A social cognition model of consumer satisfaction/ dissatisfaction. *Psychology and Marketing*, 1, 27–44.
- Smith, L. J. (2008). Grading written projects: what approaches do students find most helpful? *Journal of Education for Business*, 83, 325-330.
- Straub, R. (1997). Students' reactions to teacher comments: An exploratory study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 31, 91-119.
- Vollmeyer, R., & Rheinberg, F. (2005). A surprising effect of feedback on learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 15, 589–602.

Yoo, B., & Donthu, N. (2002). The effects of marketing education and individual cultural values on marketing ethics of students. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 24, 92-103.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03063 4939