Hermanni Ilpala

The Student Coordinator Position as a Part of University Studies

Student experiences on an autonomy supportive learning environment.

Metropolia University of Applied Sciences

Bachelor of Social Services

Degree Programme in Social Services

Bachelor's thesis

03.05.2021

Contents

List of Abbreviations:

Metropolia UAS: Metropolia University of Applied Science

HyMy-Village: Well-being and Health Village
(Original Finnish abbreviation comes from Hyvinvointia Myllypurosta = HyMy)

SDT: Self-determination Theory

STEM: Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics – A broad term used for the Academic disciplines in education.

EVC: Expectancy, Value, and Cost Model

ARCS: Attention, Relevance, Confidence, Satisfaction Model

CSDT: Center for Self-Determination Theory

Tekijä	Hermanni Ilpala
Otsikko	Kylävastaavan asema osana korkeakouluopintoja – Opiskelijoiden kokemuksia itseohjautuvasta oppimisesta.
Sivumäärä	43 sivua + 4 liitettä
Aika	03/05/2021
Tutkinto	Sosionomi AMK
Tutkinto-ohjelma	Sosiaalialan tutkinto-ohjelma
Ohjaajat	Lehtori Jyrki Konkka Lehtori Sylvia Hakari

Tämän opinnäytetyön tarkoituksena oli tutkia Metropolian Ammattikorkea koulun Kylävastaava toiminnan tieteellisiä perusteita ja avata keskustelu tästä uudesta ja kehittyvästä tavasta opiskella Metropoliassa. Kylävastaavan asema Metropolian HyMy-kylän oppimisympäristössä tarjoaa opiskelijoille uudenlaisen tavan lähestyä ja toteuttaa opintojaan. Asema tarjoaa ainutlaatuisia tehtäviä, keskittyy monialaiseen ja itsenäiseen oppimiseen, toimii ei-hierarkkisessa ja joustavassa oppimisympäristössä, joka tukee innovaatioita ja itseohjattua oppimista.

Suhteellisen lyhyen olemassaolonsa vuoksi opiskelijakoordinaattorin asemaa tai sen vaikutuksia ei juurikaan ole tutkittu tieteellisesti. Tähän tiedon puutteeseen tämä tutkielma pyrki vastaamaan teorian, opiskelijakokemuksen ja avoimen keskustelun avulla. Tavoitteena oli tarjota vankka perusta, jolle voidaan rakentaa rikas ja kattava tieteellinen keskustelu aiheesta.

Itseohjautuvuusteorian ja voimaantumisen periaatteita hyödyntäen rakennettiin kysely opiskelijakoordinaattorin tehtäviin osallistuneille opiskelijoille heidän kokemuksistaan. Nämä motivaatiota ja psykologista hyvinvointia koskevat teoriat antoivat sopivimmat puitteet ja työkalut kyselyn luomiseen ja keskustelun avaamiseen. Tutkimus toteutettiin käyttämällä online-kyselyalustaa. Kaikki kyselyyn kerätyt tiedot olivat nimettömiä. Kaikki osallistujat olivat vapaaehtoisia, aikuisia Metropolia Ammattikorkeakoulun opiskelijoita, jotka olivat osallistuneet opiskelijakoordinaattorin tehtävään.

Tutkimustulokset osoittavat, että opiskelijoiden myönteiset kokemukset korreloivat vahvasti itseohjautuvuusteorian perusperiaatteiden kanssa. Kaikki kolme perusperiaatetta: omaehtoisuus, kyvykkyys sekä yhteisöllisyys olivat selvästi havaittavissa. Tulokset osoittavat myös, että näiden perusperiaatteiden tukeminen oppimisympäristössä korreloi korkeampaan motivaatioon ja psykologiseen hyvinvointiin opiskelijoilla. Eri voimaannuttamisen elementtejä esiintyi myös opiskelijakokemuksissa. Aseman koettiin yleisesti olevan arvokas ja positiivinen kokemus opiskelijoille ja heidän opinnoilleen.

Tutkimuksen tulokset, palaute ja vahva korrelaatio taustalla oleviin teorioihin osoittivat, että opiskelijakoordinaattorin asema on erittäin arvokas ja kehittämisen sekä keskustelun arvoinen asia. Tämän tutkielman tulokset ja monet havainnot toivottavasti toimivat vankkana perustana kaikille tuleville keskusteluille aiheesta ja tarjoavat sille vahvan teoreettisen kontekstin.

Avainsanat	itseohjautuvuusteoria, voimaantuminen, oppimisympäristöt, opiskelijakokemukset, motivaatio, ammatillinen osaaminen, oppisen työkalut.

Author	Hermanni Ilpala
Title	The Student Coordinator Position as a Part of University Studies - Student experiences on an autonomy supportive learning environment.
Number of Pages	43 pages + 4 appendices
Date	03/05/2021
Degree	Bachelor of Social Services
Degree Programme	Social Services
Instructors	Jyrki Konkka, Lecturer Sylvia Hakari, Lecturer

The aim of this Bachelor's thesis was to explore the scientific foundations and open a discussion on a new and emerging way to learn within Metropolia University of Applied Sciences. The new Student Coordinator position within Metropolia's HyMy well-being village learning environment offers students an unconventional way to approach and complete their studies. The position offers unique tasks, focuses on multidisciplinary and autonomous learning, operates within a non-hierarchical structure, and provides a flexible learning environment that supports innovation and self-directed learning.

Due to its relatively short existence, not much scientific research or in-depth exploration on the position and its effects has been done. It was this lack of knowledge that this thesis aims to answer through theory, student experience, and open discussion. The aim was to provide a solid foundation upon which a rich and comprehensive scientific discussion around the subject could be built.

Utilizing the principles of self-determination theory and empowerment, a survey on student experience was conducted on the students who had taken part in the Student Coordinator position during their studies. It was these theories on motivation and psychological wellness that provided the most suitable framework and tools for facilitating and contextualizing this discussion. The survey was conducted utilizing an online survey platform. All data gathered in the survey was anonymous. All participants were voluntary, adult students of Metropolia University of Applied Sciences who had taken part in the Student Coordinator position.

The survey results show that the positive experiences of the students in this position correlated strongly with the core principles of self-determination theory: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. The results also indicate that supporting these basic principles in a learning environment correlates to higher levels of motivation and psychological wellness in students. Different elements of empowerment were also present in the student experiences. The position was generally perceived as being valuable and a positive experience to students and their studies.

The survey results, feedback and strong correlation to the underlying theories showed that the Student Coordinator position is very valuable for further development and discussion. The results and the many observations gained from this thesis will hopefully serve as a solid foundation for any future discussion around this subject and provide a strong theoretical context for it.

Keywords	self-determination theory, empowerment, learning environments, student experience, motivation, competence, university, learning tools.

1 Introduction

There is a new and unique way of learning and educating taking shape within Metropolia UAS, and it has garnered the interest of many.

The new Student Coordinator position within Metropolia's HyMy-village learning environment offers students an innovative way to approach and complete their studies. The position offers unique tasks, focuses on multidisciplinary and autonomous learning, operates within a non-hierarchical structure, and has a flexible learning environment that supports innovation and self-directed learning.

During its relatively short few years of existence, the position itself, the learning environment surrounding it and the positive experiences that students have reported has helped to foster a great amount of interest towards the subject from many different parties. While this interest has been very welcomed and has facilitated many discussions on the nature of the position itself and the topics surrounding it, not much, if any of it has been scientifically documented or properly research until now.

It was this increasing interest in the position, the amount of positive student feedback and the noticeable lack of scientific research and discussion surrounding it, that brought about the writing of this thesis. Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to identify and discuss the underlying scientific aspects of the position and everything surrounding it through these positive experiences of the students who have taken part in it.

With the position itself and the student experiences discussed and contextualized through this clarified scientific foundation, the thesis aims to build a solid foundation upon which a rich and comprehensive discussion around the subject could be built for the future.

2 Thesis background

2.1　　　Working-life partner

The working life partner for this thesis was Metropolia university of applied sciences and by extension its HyMy-Village learning environment. Metropolia is based and operates in Finland. The ministry of education and culture of Finland defines a university of applied science as follows (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2021):

> Universities of applied sciences are mainly multidisciplinary and regional higher education institutions whose activities highlight their connection to working life and regional development. They are tasked with providing education for professional expert tasks that is based on the requirements of working life and its development, as well as the premises for research and arts. In addition, they carry out applied research, development and innovation and artistic activities that serve education, support working life and regional development, as well as regenerate the industrial structure of the region.

For the purposes of this research Metropolia UAS is the host-organization, under which the learning environmental setting, HyMy-village operates. Any guidelines and regulations of the host-organization and HyMy-village itself will be considered when conducting this research. A more in-depth discussion of the HyMy-village as its own entity will be had in its own section.

2.2　　　Target group

The primary target group and beneficiary for this research will be Metropolia UAS itself, as the findings from this research will potentially yield valuable insight into how their students interact with their learning environments, and what kind of learning experiences they have had with the university during their studies. This insight could potentially prove to be very beneficial for Metropolia UAS as a whole. One such benefit, for example, could be that the findings will help their lectures to design better learning experiences for their students. While the research's specific focus lies with Metropolia UAS, the discussion and

findings could potentially offer valuable data for other Universities and similar educational institutions as well.

2.3   HyMy-Village as a Learning Environment

The exact definition of a learning environment can, depending on the setting and context, vary greatly from source to source, but for the purposes of this thesis and its discussion, the following definition of the concept will be used (Eglossary, 2013):

> Learning environment refers to the diverse physical locations, contexts, and cultures in which students learn. The term also encompasses the culture of a school or class—its presiding ethos and characteristics, including how individuals interact with and treat one another—as well as the ways in which teachers may organize an educational setting to facilitate learning—e.g., by conducting classes in relevant natural ecosystems, grouping desks in specific ways, decorating the walls with learning materials, or utilizing audio, visual, and digital technologies. And because the qualities and characteristics of a learning environment are determined by a wide variety of factors, school policies, governance structures, and other features may also be considered elements of a "learning environment."

Well-being and health village or HyMy-village for short, is a new and innovative learning and development environment based in Metropolia's Myllypuro campus. Within HyMy-Village, innovation, multi-professional cooperation, and the creation of services is the central focus. The aim is to create an authentic and safe learning environment, where students from all disciplines can innovate, practice, and offer well-being and health related services to a variety of clients. It is a campus-wide multidisciplinary effort to offer students a chance to use their own expertise within an authentic, true to life and supportive learning environment with real clients, real innovation, and real competence. All this is supported by the university in full by providing high-quality facilities, research, teaching, support, and supervision.

Currently, HyMy-village offers a wide range of individually tailored health and well-being solutions to clients that are directly linked to the different disciplines

that are based in the Myllypuro campus (Metropolia UAS 2021). As an example, a fully equipped, state of the art oral hygiene clinic within the campus, fully staffed and managed by the oral hygiene students and overseen by faculty. Another example would be the varied services that their physiotherapy students offer in their own campus clinic: Everything ranging from creating home-exercise plans for clients to on-campus treatments and exercise groups. In addition to treatment and therapy, the village also offers in-campus counselling, guidance and education to individuals and groups organized by their social work students.

2.4 The Student Coordinator Position

Student coordinators are chosen from applicants according to the needs of the HyMy-village. These applicants are from many different disciplines and varied backgrounds. Creating a strong mix of different viewpoints and expertise is what the village aims for. Depending on the studies being completed, interests and availability, the student coordinator position can last anywhere from a month to six months. During this time, students can complete anywhere from five (5) to thirty (30) credits worth of studies. These studies are usually the electives, but mandatory courses and internships can be completed as well.

A student coordinator in HyMy-village has many different responsibilities and duties. These duties vary greatly depending on the current needs of the HyMy-village as a whole, but the primary focus is on supporting ongoing projects, public outreach, ensuring effective internal communication, and co-creation of new projects and innovations within the village and Metropolia UAS. These duties place the position as an equal to all different participants in the learning environment, lectures, students, and staff alike. These duties, connections and responsibilities offer a unique environment for students to better learn and gain competence in their respective fields.

These highly varied and multifaceted tasks and responsibilities are a big part of what makes the learning environment a truly unique experience for a student.

Additionally, there are other important educational aspects involved that aim to demolish educational hierarchies and foster equal learning opportunities. These are key in achieving a truly engaging, multidisciplinary and effective learning environment.

2.5   The Need for Discussion

As mentioned in the introduction, despite the position's relative short existence it has garnered a large amount of attention and interest towards itself. This interest originates from many sources, such as students, teachers, staff, and university visitors alike. Outside interests have taken notice as well. There has even been some media attention directed towards the position (Helsingin Uutiset, 2020).

Due to this increased interest in the position and the noticeable lack of previous research or discussion surrounding it, HyMy-village is highly incentivized to receive all research and discussion surrounding the topic. The choice of examining the student experiences related to the position was decided upon careful consideration and discussions with the development leads of HyMy-village, the projects working life partners.

Another incentive for this research is the possibility that the following discussion and findings from it could potentially offer valuable data on learning environments and student experience for Metropolia UAS, its lectures, staff, and students. Additionally, other Universities and similar educational institutions could also potentially benefit from these findings as well.

3 The Theory – Self Determination Theory & Empowerment

3.1 What is SDT?

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) represents a broad framework for the study of human motivation and psychological wellness. SDT serves as a collection of theories for better understanding and contextualizing human motivation and human nature. The theory primarily focuses on the relationship and interaction between intrinsic motivation (internal, self-imposed) and extrinsic motivation (external, mandated). Intrinsic motivation being genuine internalized interest or enjoyment found in a subject or activity. Extrinsic motivation, in contrast is fuelled by external rewards such as money, prizes, acclaim, performance feedback or achievement. Of these two types of motivation, it is the intrinsic side of motivation that the theory builds most of its findings on. (Ryan, Deci, 2017)

An important aspect of SDT is its discussion on how social and cultural factors can either aid or hinder people's sense of motivation and how this in turn, affects their well-being and the quality of their performance. The three main supporting aspects discussed in the theory are the individual's experience of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. These basic psychological needs are argued to be the ones that people need to have fulfilled in their tasks to achieve high levels of motivation and psychological growth. (Ryan, Deci, 2017). It is also shown that supporting these three principles also produces high-quality engagement for activities, including enhanced performance, persistence, and creativity (Niemiec, Ryan, 2009). It can also be proposed that if any of these three psychological needs are unsupported or hindered within a setting, it will have a major negative impact on motivation and psychological wellness in that setting (Reeve, Tseng, 2011).

The exact definition of the three primary concepts of SDT are usually adapted slightly when they are applied to different settings, such as education, working

life or sports. For the purposes of this thesis, the following definitions that are adapted to the education setting specifically, are going to be used (Yarborough, Fedesco, 2020):

> Autonomy: refers to having a choice in one's own individual behaviours and feeling that those behaviours stem from individual volition rather than from external pressure or control. In educational contexts, students feel autonomous when they are given options, within a structure, about how to perform or present their work.

> Competence: refers to perceiving one's own behaviours or actions as effective and efficient. Students feel competent when they are able to track their progress in developing skills or an understanding of course material. This is often fostered when students receive clear feedback regarding their progression in the class.

> Relatedness: refers to feeling a sense of belonging, closeness, and support from others. In educational settings, relatedness is fostered when students feel connected, both intellectually and emotionally, to their peers and instructors in the class. This can often be accomplished through interactions that allow members of the class to get to know each other on a deeper, more personal level.

It is through these three (3) principles that the thesis aims to examine the unique and varied aspects of the student coordinator position and the learning environment surrounding it. The principles will also serve to better highlight and scientifically contextualize the varied experiences and feedback of students who have occupied the position.

3.2   Why SDT?

The choice of Self-determination theory as a base for this research was a rather straightforward. SDT is very well known for similar studies on learning environments, student performance, school motivation and student wellbeing.

(Black and Deci, 2000) (Niemiec, Ryan, 2009) (León, Liew, 2017) (Cheon. Et al. 2020). While there are many theories on motivation that could have been suitable, none matched the goals of the research quite as well as SDT did. SDT's good balance of focus on psychological wellness, student experience, learning environment, structures, performance and how all this links together is precisely what the research seeks to discuss.

As discussed, there are numerous studies with learning environments that have made use of SDT's principles, tools, and general framework. To best contextualise these studies for the needs of this thesis, the following studies will be discussed with a focus on and around the core concepts of the theory. This focus being intrinsic motivation and the three principles that foster it, autonomy, competence, and relatedness.

Starting off with competence related studies. When a more autonomous-supportive learning structure is used, studies have shown that there is an increase in autonomous motivation, perceived competence, and overall learning performance. One such study (Black and Deci, 2000) showed these aspects in STEM students during their laboratory courses. All students that reported their instructors or environment to being more autonomy-supportive had an increased in all these areas, when compared to their prior performance.

Studies have also shown that if students can achieve a state of internalized motivation, the more likely they are to internalize the learning experience as a part of their identity. As an example, another study on STEM students (Skinner, Saxton, Currie, Shusterman, 2017) showed that through the autonomous-supportive learning structure, the student's the basic psychological needs would be more likely to be met. This correlated with higher engagement and performance in their courses, but also fostered a greater sense of identification of being a scientist for the students.

Multiple studies on the effects of autonomy in learning have been conducted around the principles of SDT as well. While there are many benefits of autonomous motivation in learning, student performance, engagement and

effort are among the highly studied and valued. A recent 2019 Spanish study (Núñez, León, 2019) showed that the perceived autonomy of learning led to a heightened level of engagement in students. A similar, earlier, study of student achievement and effort in 2015 reported similarly positive results. This study (León, J., Núñez, J. L., Liew, J. 2015) showed that when autonomously motivated students displayed significantly greater effort in their studies.

The effects of relatedness in the learning environment have been a topic of study for many as well. A 2015 study explores the link between the social relatedness and autonomy support of a learning environment with what effects it might have on the students. The study (Streb et al, 2015) found that emphasize on these two aspects in the learning environment were correlated with higher levers of engagement and energy mobilization across all levels of education structures.

These studies show that a learning environment that uses SDT principles as its base promotes positive learning outcomes in multitude of different ways. An autonomous-supportive learning environment, when structured correctly, can help to foster all the primary principles in any environment and yield better learning outcomes (Ryan, Deci, 2017).

In addition to these specific studies there also is a large empirically based literature base that demonstrates the more general positive relations of more autonomous forms of classroom motivation with positive academic outcomes. (Howard et al., 2017) (Katz, Eilot, Nevo, 2014) (Guay, Ratelle, Roy, & Litalien, 2010)

Another more general subject of study is the benefits of intrinsic motivation on formal education. Numerous studies exist for this topic, but as an example there is a meta-analysis of the subject. The study (Taylor et al. (2014) suggested that intrinsic motivation played a significant played role in school achievement. The longitudinal meta-analysis was conducted over three empirical studies on high school and college students in Canada and Sweden. The results show that

intrinsic motivation was consistently associated with higher performance when controlling for baseline achievement, among other positives.

Another similar study (Froiland, J. M., Worrell, F. C. 2016). suggested that that intrinsic motivation was a good predictor of student engagement. The prediction was that intrinsic motivation would yield higher general achievement and performance in students. The results supported these predictions and stayed consistent even when limiting the data analysis to specific student groups with different backgrounds.

Despite the prevalence of these studies that support the importance of intrinsic motivation in education, research from multiple countries suggests that, if not adequately supported, this motivation tends to decline over the school years (Scherrer, Preckel, 2019) (Gillet, Vallerand, Lafreniere, 2012) These findings suggest that educational facilities are not creating the required need-supportive contexts that could foster this inner resource. This interpretation is supported by a 2016 study (Gnambs, Hanfstingl, 2016) that suggest a decline in intrinsic motivation is associated with a decline in performance, interest, and basic psychological need satisfaction.

This thesis aims to identify HyMy-village and the Student coordinator position as one of these autonomy-supportive learning environments. Additionally, the thesis aims to determine if the three core principles of SDT can be observed in their structure and operation. The potential of them serving as a more general template for these autonomy-supportive learning environments for university settings is also taken into consideration.

3.3   Critique

One of the main critiques of SDT has been its focus on intrinsic motivation in favour of extrinsic motivation. The primary argument being contested is one of the SDT's core statement that extrinsic rewards such as monetary payments for example, can undermine people's intrinsic motivation for the rewarded activity (Deci, 1971). This critique has been most prevalent in systems and settings

where extrinsic motivational techniques such as rewards based on performance have been traditionally used, such as grades or rewards in educational settings for example (Reiss, Sunshinsky, 1975).

This criticism aimed towards the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation mainly comes from behavioural psychologist and was a very controversial topic back when it first appeared around 1971 (Deci, 1971), (Kruglanski, et al. 1971). This was mainly because it seemed to contradict the prevailing behaviourist knowledge of that time, which held true that the selective and controlled use of rewards or reinforcement was the most suitable approach to motivation in most settings (Carton, 1996). This argument persists today, albeit in a smaller scale.

The main argument of these critiques was that extrinsic motivation, if applied correctly in the setting, would not interfere with intrinsic motivation and was an effective way of upholding motivation in these settings (Dickinson, 1989), (Carton, 1996). A meta-analysis on the subject suggested that there is no negative relationship between the two type of motivation and that there is no reason for not using external reward systems (Cameron & Pierce 1994). This meta-analysis was criticised and later found to be inaccurate and having many errors by another meta-analysis on the subject (Deci, et al. 1999).

While these criticism around SDT and the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation seems to have been resolved, it still warrants some consideration. Metropolia UAS is still an educational setting, and it still primarily operates on a grade system, which is a reward for performance system. As such, if nothing else, this system of extrinsic rewards will affect the perspectives and attitudes of the students answering the survey of this thesis and act as point of comparison.

Another critique of SDT is the argument of whether autonomy is a universal psychological characteristic and need or not. This is to say that some cultures or peoples might not have the same need for autonomy support or other SDT's principles as other do. There are cross-cultural researchers that have

specifically argued about SDT's core principles and whether they apply to students in Eastern cultures, for example (Markus, Kitayama, Heiman, 1996), (Markus, Kitayama, 2003). In essence, these studies suggested that Eastern collectivistic cultures might not value the experience of autonomy as much or in the same way that Western individualistic cultures might. While there are studies suggesting otherwise, (Chirkov et al. 2003), (Downie et al. 2004) the discussion is still ongoing.

The relevance of this critique against SDT in the context of the thesis is mixed. While there are students from many different cultural backgrounds attending Metropolia UAS and taking part in the student coordinator position, there are currently no transfer students attending. So, while the students may have varying backgrounds, they still operate under a similar cultural and societal context as students in Finland, as opposed to coming from a completely different one.

However, according to the working life partners of this thesis, the developmental leads of the student coordinator position, there are plans to include transfer students in the position in the future, so this dimension of SDT will have to be considered more in-depth when that time comes.

Lastly, in a more general form of critique that has not been directed directly towards SDT, but rather to the study of positive psychology, which SDT can be seen as a part of (Sheldon et al. 2011).

Positive psychology being a relatively new as a field of study, has its fair share of criticisms. These include such arguments as that the exitance of "positive" psychology implies that all other related fields are inherently bad or "negative" in a sense. Or the debate over what exactly does "good" or "positive" mean and how they can be interpreted drastically differently in laymen's, scientific and medical terms (Gable, Haidt, 2005). These criticisms, while not directly related to the topic of the thesis, are still worth mentioning here.

The criticism that is perhaps the most prevalent and the most applicable in relation to SDT and the thesis is the argument that positive psychology is too narrowly focused on only one aspect of very complex field. In essence, the argument is that psychology and people are both hugely complex and multidimensional entities and simply focusing on the positive aspects of them is too narrow way to approach them. That in not focusing on the whole complexity and wealth of theories and practices present in psychology you are ignoring relevant information and might potentially do more harm than good. A good discussion on the topic can be found in the 2002 study by Norem and Chang (Norem, Chang, 2002).

By this logic, the same criticism can potentially be linked to SDT because its major focus on intrinsic motivation over extrinsic motivation, as discussed earlier. While previously stated that intrinsic motivation has been shown to yield better results in educational settings and that extrinsic motivation can be, in the worst case, detrimental to it, this critique should still be considered.

The argument displays the real danger of having too narrow of a focus when conducting research using SDT's principles. While there are acknowledgments and considerations for this in the theory itself, the possibility is still there. When taking the critiques from the previously mentioned studies into account, the default surveys of STD, for example, are worded rather positively and there is not much room for negativity or feedback.

As such, the surveys for this thesis have been slightly altered in such a way to prevent this narrowing of focus. One way that this was accomplished is that the open questions of the survey were phrased in such a way that leaves them open to both negativity, honest feedback, and criticism. These steps help to alleviate the narrow focus problem, but this remains to be the biggest challenge and possible point of critique for this thesis.

3.4   Similar Models

Other theories of motivation are numerous and while interesting and applicable in their own ways, do not quite match the thesis criteria as well as SDT does.

Such as the Expectancy, Value, and Cost Model of motivation (Barron K. E., & Hulleman, C. S. 2015). Which, while dealing directly with students and the education environment and providing its own unique set of core concepts, ultimately does not provide the tools necessary to answer the questions the thesis sets out to ask. As a comparison to the core concepts of SDT, the three core concepts of the theory are, as the name suggests, expectancy, value, and cost.

Similarly, to their SDT counterparts, these three concepts are regarded as the major factors in influencing the level and quality of a student's motivation, performance, well-being, and growth. The description according to the model (Barron K. E., & Hulleman, C. S. 2015) (Hulleman et al, 2016) of these three are as follows:

> Expectancy: Refers to a student's expectation that they can succeed in the assigned task. It energizes students because they feel empowered to meet the learning objectives of the course.

> Value: Involves a student's ability to perceive the importance of engaging in a particular task. This gives meaning to the assignment or activity because students are clear on why the task or behaviour is valuable.

> Cost: Points to the barriers that impede a student's ability to be successful on an assignment, activity and/or the course at large. Therefore, students might have success expectancies and perceive high task value, however, they might also be aware of obstacles to their engagement or a potential negative affect resulting in performance of the task, which could decrease their motivation.

The student focused approach is clearly visible from these descriptions and these core concepts could easily be applied to many different educational settings. It is worth mentioning that the value aspect especially has quite a lot of overlap with to both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the form of interest in the task and its perceived utility, respectively.

However, the theories heightened focus on the student's expectations, abilities, and barriers to study, rather than the environment and supportive structures around them is the deciding factor. The student coordinator position is as much about the setting and learning environments as it is about the students themselves. As such, SDT, with its broader focus on interconnectedness between the student, the learning environment and the surrounding structure serves the underlying themes of the thesis better in this case.

On the other end of the spectrum lies another model that the thesis could have potentially used as its base. This model is known as the Attention, Relevance, Confidence, Satisfaction Model or ARCS Model for short. In contrast to the more student focused approach to the previous model, ARCS is more geared towards designing entire learning environments and devising motivational tactics to create a more supportive and better performing learning environment.

Attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction. The core concepts introduced in this model are largely drawn from similar motivational literature as the others, help to serve similar goals and there is quite a lot of overlap among them. there are some differences in their form and function, but due to these similarities, the thesis will not be describing these concepts or this model in any greater depth here. For further reading please see: (https://www.arcsmodel.com/arcs-model).

The reason why this model was not chosen for this thesis is its focus on the design aspects of learning environments and their structure, rather than any individual students experience. An opposite to the previously discussed EVC models student centred approach. As such, SDT offers the best "middle-

ground" in-between these two theories and provides the thesis with the best of both worlds.

Additionally, when considering the student coordinator positions unique focuses on independent approach, innovation, and co-creation, the SDT's core concepts offer the best match out of all three models. It should be noted that any further studies on the position with a different approach or focus could very well use one these different models as their base.

3.5   Empowerment

While SDT is the core theory around which the thesis and research is built around, there are elements of many other theories and concepts present in it. One of the more prevalent concepts present in the student coordinator position and education itself is the socio-pedagogical concept of Empowerment.

The concept of empowerment is defined by Sanna Ryynänen and Elina Nivala (2017) as an "individual process of finding one´s inner strength, of supporting personal development, and strengthening personal capabilities in order to survive difficult life situations and to find path of well-being". Additionally, Parpart. et al. (2001) relates empowerment to education by saying that it is a process where a person develops their capabilities by gaining education and new skills which help the person fight for better quality of life.

To further demonstrate the link between empowerment and education Hanna-Mari Sarlin (2007) has stated, when inspecting a report on the Finnish education system, that the Finnish education and science policy heavily leans on and encompasses the values present inside of empowerment: quality, equity, effectiveness, and equality.

The links from empowerment to the core principles and concepts of the thesis and education are quite clear from these examples, but there are even more

direct comparisons to be made. Such as the following excerpt from Lawson's 2011 (Lawson, 2011) study on empowerment in education:

> For Hodkinson & Sparkes (1993), empowerment entails the three dimensions of:
>
> Personal effectiveness – being able to do things oneself, through the acquisition of competencies such as communication and problem-solving skills, exemplified by the 'thinking skills' movement.
>
> Critical autonomy – the ability to think for oneself. D'Onofrio (1992) argued for the development of a critical attitude to received knowledge as an integral part of the empowerment process.
>
> Community – the ability to work with a group to achieve social change. Aspland. et al (1996) argued that collaborative action research by teachers empowers them to challenge centralising tendencies in education and plan transformative action at the local level.

These core principles identified here, while not identical to the core principles of STD, are clearly similar and deal with the same basic ideas of competence, autonomy, and relatedness. It is due to these similarities in core principles and empowerment's close ties to education that affirms its position as a theoretical framework alongside SDT in this thesis. This same similarity will also allow the data from the survey conducted using SDT tools to be compatible with empowerment and its theoretical framework.

4 Research Questions

The research question for this thesis stems from the need to better understand the student coordinator position's nature, the student experience and is shaped by the tools provided by the chosen theoretical framework.

The questions the research sets out to answer are as follows:

What kind of experiences are the students having with the student coordinator position?

Can these experiences be contextualized and analysed trough the scientific framework of Self-determination theory and empowerment?

If they can be, what beneficial information can be gained from these experiences that would help to facilitate discussion around the topic and potentially provide valuable information for Metropolia UAS and universities as a whole?

Can the findings from the survey serve as a foundation for additional scientific discussion and research on the subject?

5 Implementation

The thesis's focus on student experience and on identifying and discussing the underlying scientific aspects of the position lends itself well to a survey centered approach in data collection. STD also strongly supports this approach as there are well established and validated tools within it to construct the appropriate survey questions and to record, measure and discuss this gathered data.

Using the SDT framework as a base for this survey it will be focusing around the core concepts of SDT, those of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Using these core principles will provide the best structure to be able to best contextialize the student experiences and then compare them with the underlying scientific knowledge. Due to their compatility and the added depth it will provide, different dimensions of the concept of empowerment will also be considered when analyzing and discussing the findings.

The participants of this surveys will be students who have been or are currently student coordinators of HyMy-village. The survey will be conducted utilizing an online survey platform and the participants will be contacted through e-mail. The participants will have a one (1) week answer the survey, after which the responses will be collected and analyzised.

All data gathered in the survey will be completely anonymous and no personal data will be gathered. All participants will be adult students of Metropolia UAS and answering will be voluntary. The survey will also include a security statement and a participant agreement section. As such, the survey does not face any research ethical dilemmas in its implimentation. The survey and research will be conducted as a part of this thesis and will not require any funding from Metropolia UAS. There will be no reimbursement for the participants.

5.1 Survey Structure & Tools

To gain insight into both the underlying structure of the position and the experiences of it, the data will be collected through a combination of a constructed set of survey questions, drawn from the relevant tools that SDT has available and a handful of more open-ended questions regarding other aspects of the experience and feedback. These open-ended questions will also serve the purpose of combatting some of the critiques towards STD and its positive psychology roots. Questions highlighting negative experiences and possible improvements will serve this aim well while simultaneously providing a good platform for student feedback.

The question sets from STD that will be used for this survey are the The Learning Climate Questionnaire (LCQ) and the Perceived Competence Scale for Learning, which are tailored towards examining the learning environments relatedness and autonomy and measuring the level of competence that students feel in this environment, respectively. The sets in question will be altered slightly in their wording to better fit the needs of the research but will otherwise be unchanged. The questions of both sets are scored from one (1) to seven (7), where higher average scores represent a higher level of perceived autonomy, relatedness, and competence.

The survey will be provided primarily in English and in Finnish upon request. The translation to Finnish was done by the author. Both the original and the

altered sets can be viewed, in full, in the appendix of this Thesis. The base sets are freely available to be used in any non-profit SDT-related research as per the clause on the authors website (CSDT, 2021).

5.2 Open Questions

The purpose of these open-ended questions is to help address topics that are not within the structured questioners reach, such as questions about any possible criticisms or improvement ideas about the position itself. They will also serve to better highlight the individual experiences of the students and provide a platform for a more open-ended discussion and feedback of the experience.

To ensure that participants cannot be recognized from the results, the full and complete answers to the open questions will not be published in this thesis. The thesis will, however, discuss these answers and will highlight some of the recurring themes and concepts that can be recognized from them.

6 Predictions

Based on everything discussed within this thesis and the authors own personal experiences with both HyMy-village and the student coordinator position there are a few predictions that can be made about the results.

Firstly, the autonomy-supportive environment of HyMy-village and the coordinator position itself will most likely be shown to strongly correlate with positive feedback, feelings of autonomy and generally high average scores in the survey. This will most likely be true for all other aspects of the survey as well. It is expected that the general attitude towards the environment and position will be largely positive.

Secondly, as suggested by prior research, the perceived value and meaningfulness of the learning experience will most likely be higher when compared to the more traditional ones that the students have experience in their

earlier studies. The perceived competence of both students and teachers will also be higher in the same comparison.

Thirdly, the relatedness of the experience will most likely be perceived as higher comparatively. This increase in relatedness would be perceived in both environmental factors and in social relations, such as when dealing with teachers and peers.

Additionally, the perceived levels of student empowerment, while not directly evident in the questions themselves, will most likely be perceived as higher than average as well.

The exact nature of the feedback received and the general attitude of answers to the open questions are harder to predict, due to there being no previous research or surveys done on this position specifically. While a generally positive attitude is most likely, there is no research or previous experience to support this claim, as there was with the other positive predictions. There is also the possibility that some of the attitudes that the participants hold for the host-organization, Metropolia UAS, as whole will have some effect on their feedback and answers. If these attitudes are positive or negative, remains to be seen.

A relatively high level of feedback and development ideas are expected to be received through this survey. This prediction is made on the basis that the student coordinator position is built upon and supports student autonomy and competence, which in turn would translate to a higher level of participation, willingness to give feedback and share development ideas.

Overall, it can be proposed that all core aspects of the SDT and empowerment will be identified from the survey answers and that the whole experience will, on average, be perceived as a positive experience with feedback given on how to improve it in the future.

7 Survey Data

7.1 Participants

Out of the thirty (30) students contacted, ultimately eleven (11) full and complete answers to the survey were received and recorded. This indicates roughly a 36% return rate for the survey, which is a good amount of representation when considering the relatively small number of students who have had experience with the position, those who had already graduated and the handful that could not be reached for other reasons.

7.2 Measures and figures

As mentioned before the question sets taken from STD were used as a base for this survey. The sets in question were altered slightly in their wording to better fit the needs of the research but were otherwise unchanged. The questions of both sets were scored from one (1) to seven (7), where higher average scores represent a higher level of perceived autonomy, relatedness, and competence. The first set based on the LCQ was used to measure perceived autonomy and relatedness. The second set of the was used to, according to its name, measure the perceived competence of the participants. Note: Question fourteens (14) value was inverted in the survey. This means that even though the question was negative in nature, the results reflect the positive responses recorded. Ergo higher the average, less negative answer given.

The following tables show the average scores of each set of questions from all the survey responses:

SET 1: THE LEARNING CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE (LCQ)

Values: 5.9, 6.0, 6.3, 6.5, 6.7, 5.7, 6.7, 5.6, 4.7, 5.1, 6.0, 5.9, 6.3, 6.1, 5.7

X-axis labels:
1. I FEEL THAT THE…
2. THE POSITION…
3. THE POSITION…
4. THE POSITION…
5. THE POSITION…
6. THE POSITION…
7. THE POSITION…
8. I FEEL THAT THE…
9. MY INSTRUCTORS…
10. I FEEL THAT MY …
11. MY INSTRUCTORS…
12. MY INSTRUCTORS…
13. I FEEL THAT MY …
14. I DO NOT FEEL…
15. MY INSTRUCTORS…

TABLE 1

SET 2: PERCEIVED COMPETENCE SCALE

Values: 6.5, 6.6, 5.7, 6.3

X-axis labels:
1. I FEEL CONFIDENT IN MY ABILITY TO LEARN FROM THIS EXPERIENCE.
2. I AM CAPABLE OF LEARNING FROM AND PERFORMING WELL IN THIS POSITION.
3. I AM ABLE TO ACHIEVE MY GOALS IN THIS POSITION.
4. I FEEL ABLE TO TACKLE THE CHALLENGES AND DIFFICULTIES IN THIS POSITION.

TABLE 2

7.3 Open Questions

The participant answers to the open questions, while not published here, were very thoroughly answered, and will be discussed more in depth in the following results and analysis sections of the thesis.

8 Survey Results

Before going into any in-depth discussion or analysis of the survey or its implications, the results themselves deserve to be explained and laid out clearly in text.

As mentioned in the previous section, eleven (11) completed answers were received and recorded in the survey. The averages of the set question values of these answers are recorded in tables one (1) and two (2). The questions of both sets were scored from one (1) to seven (7), where higher average scores represent a higher level of perceived autonomy, relatedness, and competence.

The overall average for all the questions from both sets in the survey was six point three (6.3). The individual overall averages for the two (2) sets were similar in value. Set one (1) having an overall average of six (6) and set two's (2) value being the same as the combined value, six point three (6.3).

The first sets highest average being six point seven (6.7) and the lowest being four point seven (4.7). The second sets highest average was six point six (6.6) and the lowest was five point seven (5.7)

The first sets highest average answers being questions five (5) and seven (7). The lowest average answer being question nine (9). The second sets highest and lowest average answers were questions two (2) and three (3), respectively.

The open questions were very thoroughly answered, a vast majority of the participants answered all the questions in some way. Only a few on individual questions were left unanswered by one (1) or two (2) participants. While there were a variety of different answers and forms of feedback, common themes for these answers involved such terms as: Flexibility, variety, responsibility, trust, time management, independence, competence, collaboration, working life skills, and faith in one's own abilities.

9 Results Analysis

9.1 General overview

The averages of both sets of questions are high, remarkably so. This high average, in addition to the positive feedback and answers received through the open questions of the survey, are a strong indicator that the student coordinator position is perceived very positively by students and that their levels of perceived autonomy, relatedness, and competence are also very high. As discussed earlier, these results are indicative of exactly the type of autonomy supportive learning environment that the thesis set out to discover and define.

These high averages and overall positive results also coincide with the previously made predictions of the survey results very well as well. They also shed light on the research question of what kind of experiences students are having with the position.

A generally positive attitude and perception towards the position is good indicator that both the position and the learning environment are functioning well, but to truly understand what are the aspect that are contributing to this, a more in-depth examination and discussion of the results is required.

Starting a more in-depth discussion of the results begins with highlighting the highest and lowest average answers of both sets, the extremes so to speak, and discussing their significance and relation to each other, if any. Other relevant averages of both sets will also be discussed. To follow this up and provide additional context, a discussion of the open question answers will be had. To round things up and better conceptualize the discussion, a general overview on these different conclusions will be had in its own section as well.

9.2 Discussing Set One (1)

The first set had two (2) questions that received the highest average among the participants. These were questions five (5) and seven (7).

The questions being as follows:

Question five (5): The position makes me feel accepted by my instructors/peers.

Question seven (7): The position makes it easy for me to ask questions and seek advice from my instructors/peers.

Both questions are strongly related to the social aspects of the position, such as acceptance, confidence and to the overall relatedness of the experience. These aspects of acceptance and confidence can also be frequently observed in the answers to the open questions of this survey. This indicates that, according to the survey at least, the positions focus on a non-hierarchical structure and flexibility has been successful in creating a more equal, encouraging, and open learning environment. This sentiment is, once again, echoed in the answers to the open questions.

As contrast, the lowest average in the first set was question nine (9).

Question nine (9): My instructors make sure I really understood the goals of the position and what I need to do.

While the average score of the question, four point seven (4.7), is still quite high on the scale, it is still noticeable lower than the other questions in the survey. This question, among others that deal with direction and guidance within the position, have scored relatively low in the first set. One such example would be question ten (10), regarding the quality and clarity of given instruction by the instructors. The average of which is five point one (5.1).

The reasons behind these relatively low scores for these questions can be a little hard to decipher from the set data alone, especially because the level of willingness to seek this guidance is very high, as highlighted in the previous section. The reason behind these scores become clearer when examining the answers to the open questions of the survey.

One of the common themes throughout the open answers is the notion that the student coordinator position is quite different from the students prior learning experiences. Most participants answered that the position offered them a significantly higher level of responsibility and freedom of approach than their previous experiences. This, in combination with the positions non-hierarchical structure and its focus on autonomy-supported learning is a strong indicator that this perceived lack of clarity in instruction might not be due to the quality of instruction itself.

Rather, it could be interpreted that this sudden shift in the levels of student responsibility and autonomy is the reason for these lower scores. In essence, when compared to the more traditional and rigid coursework experience of students, this newfound level of freedom of approach and autonomy might make the students feel as if they are not receiving as much strict and clear instruction as they were before. A change from more rigid coursework to a more collaborative and open-ended developmental tasks potentially influence this as well.

This possibility also seems to be backed up by the high averages on feelings of competence in the position across the survey. As an example, both questions four (4) and fifteen (15) have high averages, six point five (6.5) and five point seven (5.7) respectively, that indicate that the feelings of student confidence and feedback from the instructors are both high. This suggested that, while the instruction is different from what the students are used to, it is still present and is effective in supporting both the students' competencies and learning experience.

Other notable scores from the first set are for questions six (6) and eight (8). The averages for them being five point seven (5.7) and five point six (5.6) respectively. Both questions deal with feelings of trust and openness in the position. The former focusing more on the students feeling of security and openness towards both peers and instructors, while the latter focuses on feelings of trust.

Like the previous discussion on students experience on the clarity of instruction, the same effect of the different learning environment might be the reason behind these scores on trust and openness. The same increased autonomy support, freedom of approach and the collaborative nature of the work could have introduced a new level of trust and openness to the environment that the students have not experienced before. This, in turn, requiring the students to adjust and adapt to this new experience and perhaps not having the time to get used to this new level of trust and openness. Which would explain the lower rating of their level of trust and security.

It should be noted, however, that this last point is mostly conjecture. The scores for these questions themselves are not that low, even when compared to other questions on the set. The concepts of trust and openness are also very personal and can be interpreted very differently by different participants. As such, while there is an indication of a cause for these scores, it is guesswork at best.

9.3 Discussing Set Two (2)

The second set of survey questions had much less deviation in its scores when compared to the first and had a higher overall average as well. Although, this was to be expected with only four (4) questions when compared to the fifteen (15) of the first set and the fact that the questions dealt with very similar topics.

With these facts considered, there is not much to be inferred from this set, outside the fact that the participants levels of perceived competence seem to be rather high. Not much else can be deduced from this, without conducting further comparative studies on the subject. Despite this, the highest and lowest averages are worth discussing.

The second sets highest and lowest average answers were questions two (2) and three (3), respectively. Starting off with the highest average question.

Question two (2): I am capable of learning from and performing well in this position.

This average, again, indicates that the perceived value (learning) of the position and the perceived competence (performance) of the student are at a high level among the participants. This suggestion also lines up with both the predictions of the thesis and the results of the first sets data. The answers to the open questions also have elements that suggest this to be true for a majority of the participants. Questions one (1) and four (4) also support this by having a nearly equal average and both dealing with feelings of competence.

The only real deviation in set two (2) happens with the lowest average question, question three (3), with its five-point seven (5.7) average.

Question three (3): I am able to achieve my goals in this position.

As it was with the previous set's questions on trust and openness, the same dilemma with inherent differences in personal definitions is strongly present here. Participants might have widely different goals and aspirations when it comes to the position itself or even studying in general. The very definition of a goal might even differ among participants. Despite this, the average is still very high even when compared to the overall survey results, so it seems safe to assume that, despite it being the lowest average in the second set, the goals of participants are still being met by being in the position.

9.4 Discussing the Open Questions

The discussion around the open questions and their answers is going to be a more complex matter than the previous one had around the question sets. This is mostly due to the lack of a clearly measurable scale or statistics and the inherent complexity of open answers and the many possible ways to interpret them. To attempt to simplify this added complexity, the discussion will divide the open questions to two (2) distinct groups. It is from these two (2) groups that the

discussion attempt to draw common themes, concepts, and other significant connections from.

The first group will be discussing the questions that were related to the more positive aspects and experiences of the student coordinator position and the learning environment surrounding it. The questions discussed in the first group are as follows:

What do you think is the best aspect of the Student supervisor position when compared to your other learning experiences?

How does the position best support your learning?

What do you see as the primary aspect of the student coordinator position experience that makes its different from your other learning experiences?

The second group will be focusing on the questions that dealt with feedback and any criticism towards the position or the learning environment surrounding it. The questions discussed in the second group are as follows:

What do you think that could be changed or developed with the position?

What are some of the challenges that you can identify within the student coordinator position?

Are there any aspects of the position that are unnecessary or make the learning experience more difficult?

These two (2) groups will hopefully aid in better understanding and contextualizing the common themes and concepts that can be observed in the answers to these questions.

Starting off with the first group of questions. While the answers to these questions were varied in nature and style, there were four (4) common themes

that could be identified from a majority of the answers, roughly 70% of them. These four (4) common themes were: independence, collaboration, responsibility, and variety.

From these common themes and the answers given by the participants, the following observations about the nature of both the position and the student experiences could be made:

1. The participants felt that their levels of independence and freedom of approach to tasks were significantly higher, when compared to their previous studies.

2. The participants felt that they collaborated more with their instructors, other students, different disciplines, and other entities, such as outside organizations and the media.

3. The participants appreciated the feelings of having more responsibility placed upon them and that they can be trusted.

4. The participants enjoyed the variety and scope of their tasks, which were seen as more comprehensive and multidisciplinary than those of their previous studies.

These observations seem to be reflected in the generally high averages of the previously discussed survey questions as well. Such as the high averages for questions about the feelings of freedom of approach and instructors understanding of different approaches for example. These being questions one (1) and fifteen (15) of set one (1), respectively. The previously discussed literature also seems to support these observations, as these feeling of added independence, trust, and collaboration in their studies can potentially lead to a higher level of student engagement overall (Núñez, León, 2019), which the voluntary answering of this survey in the first place, could be interpreted as.

The answers to the second group of feedback and criticism related questions were more varied in their nature, when compared to the first group. This might be due to the different views of the exact nature of feedback and critique for each participant. Some might see something as a problem while others do not even consider it an issue. Nevertheless, as with the previous group, a set of common themes could be observed in the answers to these questions as well, roughly 58%. These three (3) common themes were as follows: Lack of structure and clarity, miscommunication, and constant change.

Using these common themes and the answers given, the following observations of the student experience could be made:

1. The participants felt that the position lacked a clear structure, and that instructions or tasks were not always clearly defined.

2. The participants felt that miscommunication was an issue at times. This was stated to happen more frequently when working in collaboration with others, outside of the core student coordinator group.

3. The participants sometimes struggled with the rapidly changing nature of the position and the tasks they were faced with. The pressure from this phenomenon was also felt to be closely linked to the feelings of the lack of clear structure and instruction.

Most of these observations can also be linked to the survey results and their averages. This being the most evident in the theme regarding the perceived lack of structure and instruction. As previously discussed in the previous section concerning set one (1) and the relationship between questions nine (9), ten (10), four (4) and fifteen (15), this perception of a lack of structure and instruction is most likely due to the sudden shift in the levels of student responsibility and autonomy in their learning environment.

Another possible reason for this could possibly be the reported issue of miscommunication as well. Specifically, the notion of students not spending

equal amounts of time occupying the position or not completing the same studies in it causing some communication issues. This notion was evident in some of the participants answers and a general worry for the continued sharing of information between new and old student coordinators was also voiced.

Continuing the discussion on the issue of miscommunication, while there are no direct links to the set question averages for this theme, the argument could be made that the relatively low average of question nine (9), regarding instruction, could have an effect. Even though this brings us back, yet again, to the previously made observation about levels of responsibility and autonomy.

The prevailing sentiment, however, seemed to be that working with other groups, other than the immediate student coordinators was one of the main causes for these feelings. The relative short time that the position has existed and operated within the larger framework of Metropolia UAS seems to be the most likely cause, but this cannot be verified without further study.

Lastly the issue of constant change. As stated, it was felt that this issue was strongly linked to the perceived lack of structure and instruction for the participants. While this seems to be supported, again, by the low averages around the set one (1) question dealing with structure, the higher scores on set two (2), centred around competence are seemingly offsetting this assumption slightly. So, while the participants seem to be somewhat challenged by their changing responsibilities and tasks, they are still reporting high levels of competence and goals achievement. There is the fact that the average score for the latter is the lowest score on set two (2), but it is still relatively high when compared to the rest of the survey questions, so it might not have as big of an impact as it might seem. It is hard to tell from this data alone.

9.5 Analysis Conclusions

The overall positive feedback of the survey and its high averages seem to be indicative of a well-functioning, collaborative and student empowering autonomy-supportive learning environment that reinforces student competence

and learning. This claim seems to be reflected in both the set questions and the feedback received through the open questions.

The most appreciated and reported aspects of the experience being the feelings of shared relatedness, trust, responsibility, and growing personal competence. While the commonly identified issues are related to the clarity of instruction, lack of structure and miscommunication. There is also evident interplay between the highest averages, the lowest averages and the open question answers that help to define the discussion around them.

The high averages, the literature discussed, feedback received, and the observations made also demonstrated that both the core principles of SDT and empowerment can be observed and discussed within the position and its surrounding learning environment.

The biggest issue for this analysis being the fact that there is no data available to compare the results to. As such, while the average scores are high and the feedback positive, there are no solid points of comparison for them. Due to this, and the relatively small sample size of answers there is a certain element of conjecture present in the analysis as well. These issues will hopefully be resolved with the advent of future research on the topic.

10 Future Discussion and Research

As it has been stated in this thesis multiple times, both the reason for the thesis's existence and simultaneously its biggest issue is the fact that the student coordinator position nor its learning environment had been discussed or studied scientifically before. This fact is key when discussing the future directions of the discussion and research around this topic.

It was the primary goal of this thesis to answer to this lack of discussion and research by attempting to provide a strong foundation for it in the first place. What remains for the future, is to use that foundation and utilize it to further the

discussion and research around the topic. Just these results are not enough on their own to facilitate a rich and varied scientific discussion around it.

There are many ways of going about this utilization of the foundation provided, but the most direct one would be to directly utilize the survey and framework of this thesis to conduct additional studies on the subject. Additional surveys on new student coordinators should be done to see if the results here can be replicated and if they remain stable or if they will fluctuate.

The same survey should also be conducted on students who have not been part of the student coordinator position to draw parallels and to verify that the results of this survey truly are caused by the position and the learning environment itself, rather than some other factors. There should also be surveys done that focus on students of other disciplines as well. While the position is multidisciplinary in nature, it does still largely operate within the context of the well-being and health sector within the Metropolia UAS system, so there are possibilities there as well.

Another possibility would be to construct another survey, using the guidelines and resources laid out by this thesis, that is aimed towards teachers, lecturers, and other staff to gain a better understanding of their views and experiences on this phenomenon.

The scalability and reusability of this thesis's groundwork and that of SDT should be very sufficient in producing these surveys and even adding to the scale of them. They could potentially be used to produce campus or even organization wide surveys and other studies.

Additionally, as new studies and results would come in, they could potentially frame the result of this thesis in a new light and reveal new information, endorsing or otherwise.

Another angle to take could be to try and replicate the results of this thesis and its SDT and empowerment-based framework with another theoretical framework

as a base. Such as any of the previously discussed similar models as an example. Completely different theories and approached could also potentially be used, depending on the exact aim of the study in question.

Of course, other types of studies than the survey presented here could also be conducted in the same environment. The position and the environment itself could serve as a great platform for a variety of developmental and innovative studies and research. In-depth interviews, functional theses, quantitative and qualitative studies, there are endless possibilities.

Ultimately, the future direction for any discussion and research around this topic will lead whichever way people are going to take it. This thesis hopes to have given a solid foundation for this and at least a general direction of where one might go from here.

11 Conclusion

The student coordinator position within Metropolia's HyMy-village learning environment has been received very positively by the students who have taken part in it and it is viewed to be a very significant part of the participants studies. There are strong indicators that the student coordinator position facilitates high levels of empowerment and of perceived autonomy, relatedness, and competence in the students.

The overall positive feedback from the survey conducted, its high averages, the literature discussed, and the analysis of the open questions all seem to be indicative of a well-functioning, collaborative and student empowering autonomy-supportive learning environment that reinforces student competence and learning.

These results also demonstrate that both the student coordinator position itself and the HyMy-village have all the elements necessary to facilitate and support this autonomy-supportive learning environment that is highly conductive to

better learning and teaching. Additionally, they helped to demonstrate that both the core principles of SDT and empowerment can be observed and discussed within the position and its surrounding learning environment. It is these results and student experiences that are going to provide valuable information for Metropolia UAS and possibly other universities when they develop their current and future learning environments.

The fact remains, however, that not much previous research on this topic has been conducted. As such, there really is not anything to accurately compare these results to. Due to this, all observations and findings in this thesis need to be taken as they are, preliminary. This is, until other comprehensive studies can be conducted and their results to be compared to these findings.

Despite this, the results of and observation made from this thesis hope to provide a solid scientific foundation and a clear direction upon which a rich and comprehensive discussion around the subject could be built around.

References

Aspland, T., McPherson, I., Proudford, C. & Whitmore, L. (1996) Critical Collaborative Action Research as a Means of Curriculum Inquiry and Empowerment, Educational Action Research, 4(1), 93-104. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965079960040108 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Barron K. E., & Hulleman, C. S. (2015). Expectancy-value-cost model of motivation. International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 8, 503-509.

Black, A. E., & Deci, E. L. (2000). The effects of student self-regulation and instructor autonomy support on learning in a college-level natural science course: A self-determination theory perspective. Science Education, 84(6), 740–756. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-237X(200011)84:6<740::AID-SCE4>3.0.CO;2-3 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Cameron, J., & Pierce, W. D. (1994). Reinforcement, reward, and intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 64, 363-423. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.848.8473&rep=rep1&type=pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Carton, J. S. (1996). The differential effects of tangible rewards and praise on intrinsic motivation: A comparison of cognitive evaluation theory and operant theory. The Behavior Analyst, 19, 237-255. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2733619/ - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Cheon, S. H., Reeve, J., Vansteenkiste, M. (2020) When teachers learn how to provide classroom structure in an autonomy-supportive way: Benefits to teachers and their students. Teaching and Teacher Education, 90 ,103004. https://www.johnmarshallreeve.org/uploads/2/7/4/4/27446011/cheon_reeve_vansteenkiste_2020_tate.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Chirkov, V. I., Ryan, R. M., Kim, Y., & Kaplan, U. (2003). Differentiating autonomy from individualism and independence: A SDT perspective on internalization of cultural orientations and well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84,97–110. http://selfdeterminationtheory.org/SDT/documents/2003_ChirkovRyanKimKaplan.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

CSDT, 2021 – Center for Self-determination theory website. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/questionnaires/ - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

D'Onofrio, C.N. (1992) Theory and the Empowerment of Health Education Practitioners, Health Education Quarterly, 19(3), 385-403. https://doi.org/10.1177/109019819201900309 [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 18, 105-115. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/SDT/documents/1971_Deci.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. Psychological Bulletin, 125, 627-668. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.627 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Dickinson, A. M. (1989). The detrimental effects of extrinsic reinforcement on "intrinsic motivation". The Behavior Analyst, 12, 1-15. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/pmc2742036/ - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Downie, M., Koestner, R., El-Geledi, S., & Cree, K. (2004). The impact of cultural internalization and integration on well-being among tri-cultural individuals. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30,305–314. http://selfdeterminationtheory.org/SDT/documents/2004_DownieKoestnerElgelediCree_PSPB.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Eglossary, 2013 - The Glossary of Education Reform - The Glossary of
Education Reform Website – https://www.edglossary.org/learning-environment/
- [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Froiland, J. M., & Worrell, F. C. (2016). Intrinsic motivation, learning goals,
engagement, and achievement in a diverse high school. Psychology in the
Schools, 53(3),321–336. https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/wiley/intrinsic-
motivation-learning-goals-engagement-and-achievement-in-a-HYLQbXuNu6 -
[Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Gable, S. and J. Haidt (2005). "What (and Why) is Positive Psychology?"
Review of General Psychology, 9, 103 - 110.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228341568_What_and_Why_Is_Positi
ve_Psychology - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Gillet, N., Vallerand, R. J., & Lafreniere, M. K. (2012). Intrinsic and extrinsic
school motivation as a function of age: The mediating role of autonomy support.
Social Psychology of Education, 15, 77–95. https://www.lrcs.uqam.ca/wp-
content/uploads/2017/04/Intrinsic-and-extrinsic-school-motivation.pdf -
[Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Gnambs, T., & Hanfstingl, B. (2016). The decline of academic motivation during
adolescence: An accelerated longitudinal cohort analysis on the effect of
psychological need satisfaction. Educational Psychology, 36(9), 1691–1705.
https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2015.1113236 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Guay, F., Ratelle, C. F., Roy, A., & Litalien, D. (2010). Academic self-concept,
autonomous academic motivation, and academic achievement: Mediating and
additive effects. Learning and Individual Differences, 20(6), 644–653. -
[Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Helsingin Uutiset, 2020 - Jari Pietiläinen
https://www.helsinginuutiset.fi/paikalliset/3096650 [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Hodkinson, P. & Sparkes, A.C. (1993) Prevocationalism and Empowerment: some questions for PE, in J. Evans (Ed.) Equality, Education and Physical Education. London: Routledge. Howard

Howard, J. L., Gagné, M., & Bureau, J. S. (2017). Testing a continuum structure of self-determined motivation: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 143(12), 1346–1377. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000125 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Hulleman, C. S., Barron, K. E., Kosovich, J. J., & Lazowski, R. A. (2016). Student motivation: Current theories, constructs, and interventions within an expectancy-value framework. In A. A. Lipnevich et al. (Eds.), Psychosocial Skills and School Systems in the 21st Century. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Katz, I., Eilot, K., & Nevo, N. (2014). "I'll do it later": Type of motivation, self-efficacy and homework procrastination. Motivation and Emotion, 38(1), 111–119. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/2014_KatzEilotNevo.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Kruglanski, A. W., Friedman, I., & Zeevi, G. (1971). The effects of extrinsic incentive on some qualitative aspects of task performance. Journal of Personality, 39, 606-617. https://www.academia.edu/7445768/Kruglanski_Friedman_and_Zeevi_1971_The_effects_of_extrinsic_incentive_on_some_qualitative_aspects_of_task_performance - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Lawson Tony, 2011 - Empowerment in Education: liberation, governance, or a distraction? A review. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/2010_Guay_etal_LearningIndividDif.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

León, J., Núñez, J. L., & Liew, J. (2015). Self-determination and STEM education: Effects of autonomy, motivation, and self-regulated learning on high school math achievement. Learning and Individual Differences, 43, 156–163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.08.017 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

León, J.Liew, J. (2017) Profiles of adolescents´ peer and teacher relatedness: Well-being and academic achievement. Learning and Individual Differences, 54 ,41-50. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/2017_LeonLiew_ProfilesofAdolescents.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2003). Models of agency: Sociocultural diversity in the construction of action. https://web.stanford.edu/~hazelm/publications/2003%20Markus%20&%20Kitayama%20Models%20of%20Agency.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Markus, H. R., Kitayama, S., & Heiman, R. J. (1996). Culture and "basic "psychological principles. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.),Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles(pp. 857–913). New York: Guilford Press.

Metropolia University of Applied Sciences, 2021 - HyMy-Village - Wellbeing from Myllypuro Website - https://www.metropolia.fi/en/services/well-being-and-health-village - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Ministry of Education and Culture, 2021 - Higher education institutions, science agencies, research institutes and other public research organisations - https://minedu.fi/en/heis-and-science-agencies. [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Niemiec CP, Ryan RM. (2009) Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory and Research in Education*. 2009;7(2):133-144. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/2009_NiemiecRyan_TRE.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Nivala E. and Ryynänen S., 2017. Empowerment or emancipation? Interpretations from Finland and beyond. *Journal of Research in Social Pedagogy* 30, 33-46. https://doi.org/10.7179/PSRI_2017.30.03 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Norem, J. K., & Chang, E. C. (2002). The positive psychology of negative thinking. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58, 993–1001. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.10094 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Núñez, J. L., & León, J. (2019). Determinants of classroom engagement: A prospective test based on self-determination theory. Teachers and Teaching, 25(2), 147–159. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/2019_NunezLeon_Determinants.pdf - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Parpart et al. 2002. Rethinking Em(power)ment, Gender and Development: An Introduction. Parpart et al. (eds.) Rethinking Empowerment: Gender and Development in a Global/Local World. London: Routledge/Warwick Studies in Globalisation, 3-21. Power and Education, Volume 3 Number 2 2011.

Reeve, J., & Tseng, C.-M. (2011). Cortisol reactivity to a teacher's motivating style: The biology of being controlled versus supporting autonomy. Motivation and Emotion,35(1), 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-011-9204-2

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness. New York: Guilford Publishing.

Sarlin, H. 2007. Assessment Finland Indexed report. European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. https://www.european-agency.org/country-information/reports?country%5B210%5D=210 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Scherrer, V., & Preckel, F. (2019). Development of motivational variables and self-esteem during the school career: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies.

Review of Educational Research, 89(2), 211–258.
https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318819127 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Sheldon, Kennon & Ryan, Richard. (2011). Positive Psychology and Self-Determination Theory: A Natural Interface.

Skinner, E., Saxton, E., Currie, C., & Shusterman, G. (2017). A motivational account of the undergraduate experience in science: Brief measures of students' self-system appraisals, engagement in coursework, and identity as a scientist. International Journal of Science Education, 39(17), 2433–2459. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1387946 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Streb, J., Keis, O., Lau, K., Hille, L., Spitzer, M., & Sosic-Vasic, Z. (2015). Emotional engagement in kindergarten and school children: A self-determination theory perspective. Trends in Neuroscience and Education, 4(4), 102–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tine.2015.11.001 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Taylor, G., Jungert, T., Mageau, G. A., Schattke, K., Dedic, H., Rosenfield, S., & Koestner,R. (2014). A self-determination theory approach to predicting school achievement over time: The unique role of intrinsic motivation. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 39, 342–358. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.08.002 - [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Yarborough, C. B., & Fedesco, H. N. (2020). Motivating students. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. https://cft.vanderbilt.edu//cft/guides-sub-pages/motivating-students/ [Accessed on 3.5.2021]

Appendices

The Learning Climate Questionnaire (LCQ)

Perceived Autonomy Support: The Climate Questionnaires

The Learning Climate Questionnaire (LCQ)

The LCQ has a long form containing 15 items and a short form containing 6 of the items. The questionnaire is typically used with respect to specific learning settings, such as a particular class, at the college or graduate school level. Thus, the questions are sometimes adapted slightly, at least in the instructions, so the wording pertains to the particular situation being studied--an organic chemistry class, for example. In these cases, the questions pertain to the autonomy support of an individual instructor, preceptor, or professor. If, however, it is being used to assess a general learning climate in which each student has several instructors, the questions are stated with respect to the autonomy support of the faculty members in general. Below, you will find the 15-item version of the questionnaire, worded in terms of Òmy instructor.Ó If you would like to use the 6-item version, simply reconstitute the questionnaire using only items # 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, and 14.

Scoring: Scores on both the 15-item version and the 6-item version are calculated by averaging the individual item scores. However, for the long version, before averaging the item scores, you must first ÒreverseÓ the score of item 13 (i.e., subtract the score on item 13 from 8 and use the result as the item score for this item--for example, the score of 3, when reversed would become 5). Higher average scores represent a higher level of perceived autonomy support.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Learning Climate Questionnaire

This questionnaire contains items that are related to your experience with your instructor in this class. Instructors have different styles in dealing with students, and we would like to know more about how you have felt about your encounters with your instructor. Your responses are confidential. Please be honest and candid.

1.   I feel that my instructor provides me choices and options.

      1   2   3   4   5   6   7
      strongly   neutral   strongly
      disagree   agree

2.   I feel understood by my instructor.

Appendix 1

```
         1      2     3     4     5     6     7
      strongly           neutral          strongly
      disagree                             agree
```

3.   I am able to be open with my instructor during class.

```
         1      2     3     4     5     6     7
      strongly           neutral          strongly
      disagree                             agree
```

4.   My instructor conveyed confidence in my ability to do well in the course.

```
         1      2     3     4     5     6     7
      strongly           neutral          strongly
      disagree                             agree
```

5.   I feel that my instructor accepts me.

```
         1      2     3     4     5     6     7
      strongly           neutral          strongly
      disagree                             agree
```

6.   My instructor made sure I really understood the goals of the course and what I need to do.

```
         1      2     3     4     5     6     7
      strongly           neutral          strongly
      disagree                             agree
```

7.   My instructor encouraged me to ask questions.

```
         1      2     3     4     5     6     7
      strongly           neutral          strongly
      disagree                             agree
```

8.   I feel a lot of trust in my instructor.

```
         1      2     3     4     5     6     7
      strongly           neutral          strongly
      disagree                             agree
```

9.   My instructor answers my questions fully and carefully.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7
    strongly   neutral   strongly
    disagree   agree

10.   My instructor listens to how I would like to do things.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7
    strongly   neutral   strongly
    disagree   agree

11.   My instructor handles people's emotions very well.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7
    strongly   neutral   strongly
    disagree   agree

12.   I feel that my instructor cares about me as a person.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7
    strongly   neutral   strongly
    disagree   agree

13.   I don't feel very good about the way my instructor talks to me.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7
    strongly   neutral   strongly
    disagree   agree

14.   My instructor tries to understand how I see things before suggesting a new way to do things.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7
    strongly   neutral   strongly
    disagree   agree

15.   I feel able to share my feelings with my instructor.

       1   2   3   4   5   6   7
    strongly   neutral   strongly

Appendix 1

disagree   agree

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Articles that have Used the Learning Climate Questionnaire

Perceived Competence Scale

Perceived Competence Scales

Scale Description

Within Self-Determination Theory, competence is assumed to be one of three fundamental psychological needs, so the feelings or perceptions of competence with respect to an activity or domain is theorized to be important both because it facilitates peopleÕs goal attainment and also provides them with a sense of need satisfaction from engaging in an activity at which they feel effective. Thus, perceived competence has been assessed in various studies and used, along with perceived autonomy (i.e., an autonomous regulatory style) to predict maintained behavior change, effective performance, and internalization of ambient values.

The Perceived Competence Scale (PCS) is a short, 4-item questionnaire, and is one of the most face valid of the instruments designed to assess constructs from SDT. Like several of the other measures--including the Self-Regulation Questionnaires and the Perveiced Autonomy Support (Climate) Questionnaires--items on the PCS is typically written to be specific to the relevant behavior or domain being studied. The PCS assesses participantsÕ feelings of competence about, say, taking a particular college course, engaging in a healthier behavior, participating in a physical activity regularly, or following through on some commitment. In this packet, there are two versions of the questionnaire concerning the feelings of being able to stick with a treatment regimen and being about to master the material in a course.

Two examples of studies that have used the PSC are Williams, Freedman, Deci (1998) for management of glucose levels among patients with diabetes and Williams and Deci (1996) medical students learning the material in an interviewing course. The alpha measure of internal consistency for the perceived competence items in these studies was above 0.80. Additional examples of the PCS can be found in the SDT web site within the Health Care, SDT packet.

Williams, G. C., Freedman, Z.R., & Deci, E. L. (1998). Supporting autonomy to motivate glucose control in patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care, 21,* 1644-1651.

Williams, G. C., & Deci, E. L. (1996). Internalization of biopsychosocial values by medical students: A test of self-determination theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 767-779.

The Scales

Perceived Competence for Diabetes

Please respond to each of the following items in terms of how true it is for you with respect to dealing with your diabetes. Use the scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true			somewhat true			very true

1.   I feel confident in my ability to manage my diabetes.

2.   I am capable of handling my diabetes now.

3.   I am able to do my own routine diabetic care now.

4.   I feel able to meet the challenge of controlling my diabetes.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Perceived Competence for Learning

Please respond to each of the following items in terms of how true it is for you with respect to your learning in this course. Use the scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true			somewhat true			very true

1.   I feel confident in my ability to learn this material.

2.   I am capable of learning the material in this course.

3.   I am able to achieve my goals in this course.

4.   I feel able to meet the challenge of performing well in this course.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Scoring Information. A personÕs score on the PCS is calculated simply by averaging his or her responses on the four items.

The Student Coordinator Experience Survey

This questionnaire contains items that are related to your experiences with the student coordinator position and your instructors. Different learning environments and instructors have different ways of supporting students and their learning, and we would like to know more about how you have felt about your experiences with this type of learning environment and your instructors. Your responses are confidential and anonymous. Please be honest and candid. Please note that you will not be able to edit your answers after submitting and you are only allowed one submission. Make sure that your form is ready before submitting.

 1.   I feel that the position provides me with choices and options to my approach to learning tasks.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

strongly disagree.   I cannot say.   strongly agree.

 2.   The position helps me to feel understood by my instructors/peers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

strongly disagree.   I cannot say.   strongly agree.

 3.   The position encourages me to be open with my instructors/peers during tasks.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

strongly disagree.   I cannot say.   strongly agree.

4.   The position helps me to feel confident in my ability to do well in different tasks.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

strongly   I cannot say.   strongly

disagree.   agree.

5.   The position makes me feel accepted by my instructors/peers.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

strongly   I cannot say.   strongly

disagree.   agree.

6.   The position makes it easy for me to share my feelings with my instructors/peers.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

strongly   I cannot say.   strongly

disagree.   agree.

7.   The position makes it easy for me to ask questions and seek advice from my instructors/peers.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

strongly   I cannot say.   strongly

disagree.   agree.

8.　　　　I feel that the position makes it easy to trust in my instructors/peers.

1　　　　2　　　　3　　　　4　　　　5　　　　6　　　　7

strongly　　　　　　　　I cannot say.　　　　strongly

disagree.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　agree.

9.　　　　My instructors make sure I really understood the goals of the position and what I need to do.

1　　　　2　　　　3　　　　4　　　　5　　　　6　　　　7

strongly　　　　　　　　I cannot say.　　　　strongly

disagree.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　agree.

10.　　　　I feel that my instructors answer my questions fully and carefully.

1　　　　2　　　　3　　　　4　　　　5　　　　6　　　　7

strongly　　　　　　　　I cannot say.　　　　strongly

disagree.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　agree.

11.　　　　My instructors listen to how I would like to do things.

1　　　　2　　　　3　　　　4　　　　5　　　　6　　　　7

strongly　　　　　　　　I cannot say.　　　　strongly

disagree.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　agree.

12.   My instructors handle people's emotions very well.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

strongly   I cannot say.   strongly

disagree.   agree.

13.   I feel that my instructors care about me as a person.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

strongly   I cannot say.   strongly

disagree.   agree.

14.   I do not feel very good about the way my instructors talk to me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

strongly   I cannot say.   strongly

disagree.   agree.

15.   My instructors try to understand how I see things before suggesting a new way
to do things.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

strongly   I cannot say.   strongly

disagree.   agree.

During your time in the Student coordinator position, how true were the following statements in your opinion?

1.   I feel confident in my ability to learn from this experience.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Not at all
true.

Somewhat
true.

Very
true.

2.   I am capable of learning from and performing well in this position.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Not at all
true.

Somewhat
true.

Very
true.

3.   I am able to achieve my goals in this position.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Not at all
true.

Somewhat
true.

Very
true.

4.   I feel able to tackle the challenges and difficulties in this position.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Not at all
true.

Somewhat
true.

Very
true.

Please answer the following questions to share your personal experiences with the position and to give feedback on how to improve it.

What do you think is the best aspect of the Student supervisor position when compared to your other learning experiences?

What do you think that could be changed or developed with the position?

How does the position best support your learning?

What are some of the challenges that you can identify within the student supervisor position?

What do you see as the primary aspect of the student coordinator position experience that makes its different from your other learning experiences?

Are there any aspects of the position that are unnecessary or make the learning experience more difficult?

Kylävastaava kysely

Tämä kyselylomake sisältää kysymyksiä kokemuksistasi Kylävastaavan tehtävässä sekä sen aikaisista ohjaajistasi. Eri oppimisympäristöillä ja ohjaajilla on erilaisia tapoja tukea opiskelijoita ja heidän oppimistaan. Olemme kiinnostuneet juuri teidän kokemuksistanne tämän oppimisympäristön ja näiden ohjaajien kanssa. Kaikki vastaukset ovat luottamuksellisia ja nimettömiä. Ole rehellinen ja ilmaise mielipiteesi rohkeasti. Otathan huomioon, että et voi muokata vastauksiasi lähettämisen jälkeen ja sinulla on vain yksi mahdollisuus vastata. Varmista ennen lähettämistä, että lomake on täysin valmis.

1.   Minusta tuntuu, että Kylävastaavan tehtävä antaa minulle tilaa tehdä omia valintoja ja harkita eri vaihtoehtoja oppimistehtävissäni.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

2.   Tunnen, että kylävastavan tehtävässä ohjaajani sekä kanssaopiskelijani ymmärtävät minua.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

3.   Kylävastaavan tehtävä kannustaa minua olemaan avoin ohjaajien sekä kanssaopiskelijoiden kanssa tehtävien aikana.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

4.   Kylävastaavan tehtävä auttaa minua luottamaan omiin kykyihini ja menestymään hyvin erilaisissa tehtävissä.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

5.   Tunnen, että kylävastavan tehtävässä ohjaajani sekä kanssaopiskelijani hyväksyvät minut.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

6.   Tunnen, että kylävastavan tehtävässä on helppo näyttää tunteita ohjaajien sekä kanssaopiskelijoitteni kanssa.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

7.   Tunnen, että kylävastavan tehtävässä minun on helppo esittää kysymyksiä tai pyytää apua ohjaajiltani sekä kanssaopiskelijoiltani.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

8.   Tunnen, että kylävastavan tehtävässä minun on helppo luottaa ohjaajiini sekä kanssaopiskelijoihini

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

9.   Ohjaajani aina varmistavat, että ymmärsin todella tehtävän tavoitteet ja sen, mitä minun on tehtävä.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

10.   Minusta tuntuu, että ohjaajani vastaavat kysymyksiini täysin ja huolellisesti.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

11.   Ohjaajani ottavat huomioon, kuinka minä haluaisin tehdä asioita.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa

Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

12.   Ohjaajani käsittelevät ihmisten tunteita erittäin hyvin.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa
Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

13.   Minusta tuntuu, että ohjaajani välittävät minusta ihmisenä.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa
Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

14.   En pidä tavasta, jolla ohjaajani puhuttelee minua.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa
Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

15.   Ohjaajani yrittävät aina ymmärtää, miten minä näen asian, ennen kuin
ehdottavat tapaa tehdä sen.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Täysin   En osaa   Samaa
Eri mieltä.   Sanoa.   Mieltä.

Kuinka totta seuraavat väittämät ovat mielestäsi Kylävastaavan tehtävässä?

1.   Uskon oppivani tästä kokemuksesta.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Ei lainkaan   En osaa   Täysin

Totta.   Sanoa.   Totta.

2.   Pystyn oppimaan ja toimimaan hyvin tässä tehtävässä.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Ei lainkaan   En osaa   Täysin

Totta.   Sanoa.   Totta.

3.   Pystyn saavuttamaan tavoitteeni tässä tehtävässä.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Ei lainkaan   En osaa   Täysin

Totta.   Sanoa.   Totta.

4.   Minusta tuntuu pystyvän vastaamaan kylävastaavan tehtävän haasteisiin.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Ei lainkaan   En osaa   Täysin

Totta.   Sanoa.   Totta.

Vastaamalla seuraaviin kysymyksiin voit jakaa henkilökohtaisia kokemuksiasi kylävastaavan tehtävästä avoimesti ja antaa palautetta sen parantamiseksi.

Mikä on mielestäsi paras osa kylävastaavan tehtävää verrattuna muihin oppimiskokemuksiin?

Mitä mielestäsi voitaisiin muuttaa tai kehittää kylävastaavan tehtävässä?

Kuinka kylävastaavan tehtävä parhaiten tukee oppimistasi?

Minkälaisia haasteita voit tunnistaa kylävastaavan tehtävissä?

Mikä on mielestäsi merkittävin osa kylävastaava kokemustasi, joka erottaa sen muista oppimiskokemuksistasi?

Onko kylävastaavan tehtävässä jotain mikä on tarpeetonta tai jotain mikä turhaan vaikeuttaa oppimiskokemusta?