



An evaluation of motivation in students

Mahdiyeh Akbarzadeh¹, Dr. Masud Tajaldini²

¹MSc in literature of English, Islamic Azad University, Kerman Branch, Iran

²Associate Professor in Department of English Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Islamic Azad University, Kerman Branch, Iran

Mahdiyeakbarzadeh96@gmail.com

Abstract: This paper examines the motivation of a group of students. An expected outcome of the study is the enhancement of the student experience, through improving both the study environment and the goals that are set so that each contributes in a positive way to every student's motivation. The study attempts to measure 'intrinsic' and 'extrinsic' motivation of students by employing qualitative data-gathering methods, including questionnaires and semistructured interviews. Historic data has also been consulted to supply additional evidence, for instance the personal statement and the grades and subjects obtained prior to entry, which help identify primary influences in students' motivation. Whilst most students may be expected to demonstrate both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, this, limited, study indicates that many at student operate more intrinsically. If confirmed by more extensive research, such a finding suggests that students might benefit from more loosely specified assignments; giving them freedom to choose from their laboratory work and assignments aspects in which they have a greater personal interest. This hypothesis is supported by comments received at interview with students.

[Mahdiyeh Akbarzadeh, Masud Tajaldini. **An evaluation of motivation in students.** *Nat Sci* 2021;19(2):37-41].
ISSN 1545-0740 (print); ISSN 2375-7167 (online). <http://www.sciencepub.net/nature>. 5.
doi:[10.7537/marsnsj190221.05](https://doi.org/10.7537/marsnsj190221.05).

Keywords: motivation; intrinsic' and 'extrinsic; student's

1. Introduction

An unpublished departmental survey between 1997 and 2000 found there to be little correlation between a student's performance in school or college and the performance in the department. Part of the purpose of this investigation is to find other metrics which might be used to predict success at University. Subsequently, the importance of student motivation and learning at University has been confirmed by the National Student Survey. Thus, a study of student motivation may enable pedagogical interventions to be adjusted to enhance students' learning experiences. One result of this would be improved student engagement and satisfaction; an additional effect could also be reduced attrition.

Previous studies (for example Bagg, 1970; Bridges, 2001 and Furnham et. al, 2003) have attempted to identify metrics which accurately predict student success; ranging from the use of A level grades to specific aspects of a student's personality. The use Innovation, Good Practice and Research in Engineering Education EE2008 The Higher Education Academy Engineering Subject Centre and the UK Centre for Materials Education 2 of A levels, in particular, was expected to anticipate performance at University – but has been judged unsatisfactory (Fullick and Fullick, 1991). However, personality

traits were found to be correlated with academic performance by Furnham et. al (2003).

Based on the results from an extensive study, McManus and Richards (1984a) suggest that academic ability should be only one of the factors used in appraising students for entry to higher education courses. They suggest (1984b) that entry criteria could also include personal interests and community service – qualities used when assessing candidates in interview.

A study by Hoad–Reddick and Macfarlane (1999) classified data from the UCAS form of dentistry applicants. Their categories included information on the choice of career, team and leadership experience, evidence of manual dexterity and other extra curricular activities. Although, when correlating this information with student performance, they found only that those students who had taken biology were less likely to fail.

A Treasury report (2003) states that output is not only affected by the input standard and the quality of the institution, but also by the motivation of the student. It is also suggested elsewhere that an increase in the motivation of students can be linked to reduced dropout rates and increased success in students

(Kushman, Sieber and Harold, 2000). Studies into the way that motivation is nurtured have found a positive correlation between actively developing a 'motivating environment' and student performance (Rebolledo-Medez, et. al, 2006; Turner and Patrick, 2004).

Investigations with high school and college students have found that the context with which work is presented as well as the learning environment had an effect on a student's learning and performance. Vansteenkiste et. al (2004) classified motivation as either a student's desire for money and self-image (extrinsic) or a student's desire for personal growth (intrinsic). They developed learning material and set it in either an intrinsic or extrinsic context. They found that setting work in an intrinsic context improved the student's performance. They also used either a controlling learning environment or an autonomy-supporting learning environment. They found that the autonomy-supporting learning environment aided the student's learning and performance more than the controlling learning environment.

Motivation

Motivation has been conceptualised in different ways by different theorists. For example, by evaluating the time they spent on the task, assessing personality traits, or various cognitive-based processes (Atkinson and Raynor, 1978; Dweck 1988). Many studies on motivation have focused on the goals that students can set and how they achieve those goals (Bandura, 1977; Dweck, 1986). They have not identified the reasons why students have a desire to achieve those goals. Self-determination theory addresses the cause of this desire and suggests that people wish to develop themselves and to master challenges that confront them. Self-determination theory identifies two causes of desire to study; the need for recognition, praise and/or money (extrinsic motivation) and the need to fulfill an interest (intrinsic motivation) (Deci et. al, 1991). Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation can be loosely linked with the theory of learning styles proposed by Marton and Säljö (1976). Intrinsically motivated students can be thought of as taking on a 'deep' learning style, they try to understand the reasoning behind the academic work that they are doing. Extrinsically motivated students can be referred to as 'surface' learners, learning the facts that they think they will be tested on. Self-determination theory also states that Innovation, Good Practice and Research in Engineering Education EE2008 The Higher Education Academy Engineering Subject Centre and the UK Centre for Materials Education 3 environment affects self-determination (Vansteenkiste et. al, 2004). An engineering department may therefore consider how

to increase students' self determination by adjusting pedagogical interventions and enhancing their learning experiences. In a previous study, Baillie and Fitzgerald interviewed students who withdrew from Imperial College engineering degrees, in order to discover the reasons why they had left (Baillie and Fitzgerald, 2000). They suggest that students were more extrinsically motivated by living in London and by the University's reputation; than intrinsically engaged by a desire to learn about engineering. In another study, Rowe (2001) found that first year engineering students succeeded by having a 'reproducing/surface' rather than a 'deep' learning style, which may further indicate that current HE assessments do not necessarily require successful students to be intrinsically motivated.

Context and Practice

The learning culture of a department is required to ensure that students' self-determination is increased; and to include this in assessing departmental performance. This is recognized in the collection of student feedback from every module; and the National Student Survey. We require all students to develop a constructivist approach to knowledge of their subject area, rather than merely rewarding their ability to learn by rote and/or their exam technique.

The department has historically used 'traditional' engineering teaching methods, which are geared towards the students knowing how to solve set problems rather than encouraging them to explore, challenge and thus construct 'their own' knowledge. However, some pedagogical approaches are used which assist students to explore their own understanding: project-based learning is used in all electronic engineering units in the first and second year, problem-based learning is used in first year software engineering units; and seminars are run for third and fourth year electronic manufacturing and technology exploration units. These are increasingly successful as lecturers learn how to use them to their full potential and adjust them to the characteristics of our student body. This study attempts to measure the motivation of students, with the purpose of discovering how to further assist teachers in the department to plan and design pedagogical interventions that will support students' active engagement.

2. Material and Methods

The methodology of this study consists of three parts:

1. recording a quantifier of student motivation before entering the department.

2. designing, piloting and implementing a questionnaire 3. informal conversations/interviews with students.

Student motivation before entering

the department The motivation of students is inferable from the ‘personal statement’ on their UCAS application form. Each personal statement was rated on a scale of one to three. An assessment of motivation has been made against judgements of the relative merits of the quality and quantity of evidence submitted in relation to the topics that they wanted to study. For example, if the student only stated their interest in generic terms then they are awarded a “1”. Examples of such statements include “I have been interested in electronics since an early age” and “I would like to study electronics because I feel it is a fast moving industry”.

A student’s statement would be awarded a rating of “2” if they cited an example of their interest in the topics. This rating reflects an apparently more substantial knowledge base. Examples of statements that would be awarded “2” are “I have been learning C and C++” and “I have built some digital electronic projects”

A student’s statement would be awarded a “3” if they gave evidence of their interest. Typically it might include a detailed example of an electronic or software project – for instance “I have built a sound sampling system with a PIC 16F870, the details are on www.homewebsite.com/applicant” The personal statement rating is awarded based on the highest rated statement in the personal statement.

Designing, piloting and implementing a questionnaire

The questions employed in the questionnaire have been based on the results of investigations performed by Waugh (Waugh, 2002), Jacobs and Newstead (Jacobs and Newstead, 2000), Ray (Ray, 1981), Carré (Carré, 2000) and Gore (Gore, 2006). In addition to this the Self-Determination Scale, the Perceived Competency Scale and the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory have been interrogated to identify any sections or questions that had not been included. These scales and inventories are available on the website of Deci and Ryan (<http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/>). The questionnaire originally consisted of a set of 53 questions and 20 words/statements using the Likert scale.

The 53 questions were grouped into twelve different sub categories; standards, goals, tasks, effort, values, ability, interest, learning from others, responsibility for learning, extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards and social rewards. Also included in the questionnaire were 20 words/statements that form part of a projective test. The use of these tests is

sometimes considered controversial (Klinger, 1966; Entwisle, 1972), but it was felt that such a test may provide an insight into aspects not otherwise testable in the more conventional part of the questionnaire.

Informal conversations with students

After the questionnaire results had been collated, opportunities for informal discussions with students were seized upon. This was opportunistic and involved inviting each student to elaborate on his reflections about the difference in experience between school/college and University, and how that experience affects their motivation. It also invited comment on how some of the pedagogical interventions used in University could ensure engagement and promote interest in the material.

Methodological limitations

The assessment of motivation from the personal statement may not relate to the motivation of the student because of advice that the student received from either school teachers or from their parents. To test the repeatability of this methodology, 15 personal statements were assessed twice, with varying periods between their original assessment and their second assessment (from 6 months to two years). The second assessment rated the personal statements exactly the same. The limitation of the questionnaire is associated with the limitation of the Likert scale. It is assumed that the difference between each successive point on the Likert scale is the same.

This means that the difference between “strongly agree” and “agree” is the same as “neither agree nor disagree” and “agree”. The questionnaire also has a large number of questions, so the student might not fully reflect on the question before answering. When piloting this questionnaire, it was answered in 5–15 minutes.

3. Results

All of the results from the questionnaire were tabulated and coded with ‘1’ as “strongly agree”, ‘2’ as “agree”, ‘3’ as “neither agree nor disagree”, ‘4’ as “disagree” and ‘5’ as “strongly disagree”. For each completed return, the student’s UCAS points and qualifications were also tabulated, along with the student’s performance in each topic at University and the motivation rating of their personal statement.

Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation

A comparison was made between those students who presented as more strongly intrinsic; those as more strongly extrinsic; and those who scored the same in the two areas. In order to achieve this, all responses from the intrinsic and extrinsic section of the questionnaire were compared.

The findings suggest that more students are intrinsically motivated than are extrinsically motivated. However, for nearly all students the

average response of intrinsic motivation and that of extrinsic motivation were only marginally different. The closeness of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation has been noted in another study (Leo and Galloway, 1996). Four students presented large differences between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation levels. Three of these were much more intrinsically motivated and they were all third years, with fail, 2:2 and 2:1 performances over their academic career. One was a first year who had entered University with relatively poor A-level results and perhaps was now determined to get results.

There were no significant differences in motivation levels between the different years of study.

Comment

Two concerns emerge from this brief study. One is how we can improve the performance of students so that they achieve higher grades. The other is how we can improve the learning process of our students. Counter-intuitively, these may not be completely correlated, for the student who has perfected an examination and coursework technique may only have mastered 'surface' learning, that is learning for assessment. Students who exhibit both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational characteristics in approaching their discipline, may also want to develop themselves, and to be rewarded for that development, rather than simply pass exams.

While at University, students spend much of their time being assessed. This may encourage an attitude where they only work if there are marks attached to the outcome. The current method of assessing with constrained coursework and exams might not be the best way of nurturing development. Pressure to meet assessment requirements within an externally-determined time limit may not promote 'deep' learning among students who profit from opportunities to research, learn and develop. Conversations with students showed that they felt the use of open projects and seminars enabled them to fully explore and challenge their own knowledge.

A third year student suggested it was only important to succeed in 'the here and now' since what has been studied earlier merely serves as a ticket to get to 'where he is now'. This attitude is contingent with the feeling that the University experience will not matter as soon as they leave because they will then be faced with the 'real' challenge of work.

4. Discussions

This study suggests another, concerning what can be done to promote active learning while still ensuring that academic standards are maintained. The challenge is to seek to fulfill our students' intrinsic motivation by providing them with opportunities for independent, self-developmental learning.

This ambition must, of course, recognize the context where undergraduate studies are recognized as appropriate, within the public domain: a degree, organized as units or modules which the student has to pass. The place and priority awarded to study of a personal project may call for further attention.

References

1. Atkinson J., & Raynor J., (1974). *Personality, Motivation and Achievement*. Washington DC: Hemisphere.
2. Bagg D.G., (1970). A-levels and University Performance, *Nature*, Vol. 225, pp. 1105-1108.
3. Baillie C., & Fitzgerald G., (2000). Motivation and attrition in engineering students, *European Journal of Engineering Education*, Vol. 25(2), pp. 145-155.
4. Bandura A., (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioural change, *Psychological Review*, 84, pp. 191-215.
5. Bridges K.R., (2001). Using attributional style to predict academic performance: how does it compare to traditional methods?, *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 31(5), Oct 2001, pp. 723-730.
6. HM Treasury <http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/7/9/ACF614.pdf> (9/11/07).
7. Carré P., (2000). Motivation in adult education: from engagement to performance. In *Proceedings of the 41 st Annual Adult Education Research Conference*, Vancouver, Canada.
8. Deci E.L., Vallerand R.J., Pelletier L.G., Ryan R.M., (1991). Motivation and education: the self-determination perspective, *Educational Psychologist*, Vol. 26, pp. 325-346.
9. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.
10. Dweck C.S., (1986). Motivation processes affecting learning, *American Psychologist*, 41, pp. 1040-1048.
11. Dweck C.S., & Leggett E.L., (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality, *Psychological Review*, 95, pp. 256-273.
12. Entwisle, D.R. (1972). To dispel fantasies about fantasy-based measures of achievement motivation, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 77(6), pp. 377-391.
13. Fullick A., & Fullick P., (1991). Talking Point: Time for a new approach to A levels, *New Scientist*, Issue 1784, August 1991, pp 6.
14. Furnham A., Chamorro-Premuzic T., & McDougall F. (2003). *Personality, cognitive*

- ability, and beliefs about intelligence as predictors of academic performance, *Learning and Individual Differences*, Vol. 14, pp. 49–66.
15. Klinger, E. (1966). Fantasy need achievement as a motivational construct, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 66(4), pp. 291–308.
 16. Gore P. A., (2006). Academic self-efficacy as a predictor of college outcomes: two incremental validity studies, *Journal of Career Assessment*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 92– 115.
 17. Hoad-Reddick G., Macfarlane T.V., (1999). An analysis of an admissions system: can performance in the first year of the dental course be predicted?, *British Dental Journal*, Vol. 186(3), February 1999, pp 138–142.
 18. Jacobs P.A., Newstead S.E. (2000), The nature and development of student motivation, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 70, pp 243–254.
 19. Kushman, J. W., Sieber, C., & Harold, K. P. (2000). This isn't the place for me: School dropout. In D. Capuzzi & D. R. Gross (Eds.), *Youth at risk: A prevention resource 48 for counselors, teachers, and parents* (3rd ed., pp. 471-507). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
 20. Leo E.L., Galloway D., (1996). Evaluating research on motivation: generating more heat than light?, *Evaluation and Research in Education*, Vol. 10(1), pp. 35–47.
 21. Marton F., & Säljö R., (1976). On qualitative differences in learning – 1: outcome and process, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 46, pp. 4–11.

2/22/2021