

University of Groningen

## Studying motivation in classrooms

Stroet, Kim

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2014

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Stroet, K. (2014). *Studying motivation in classrooms: effects of teaching practices on early adolescents' motivation*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. [S.n.].

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

Rating sheet  
*'need supportive teaching'*

## Appendix Rating sheet

### Rating sheet 'Need supportive teaching'

Teachers' *autonomy support/thwart*<sup>1</sup>

#### Choice vs. Control

Incorporating students' interests, preferences, choices, curiosity, or sense of challenge into the lesson.	Keeping possession of and monopolizing the learning material.
Creating opportunities for students to work in their own way.	Not allowing students to realise their action plans and disrupting their natural rhythm.
	Providing solutions before students have time to reflect by themselves.
	Includes exertion of pressure on students; e.g. via incentives, deadlines, assignments, directives, controlling questions, conditional regard, guilt induction, or shaming.

202

#### Fostering relevance vs. Forcing meaningless activities

Providing a meaningful and realistic rationale when choice is constraint, thereby taking the students' perspectives.	Actively attempting to compel students to do things they find boring or meaningless, thereby neglecting students' inner resources.
Providing a specific goal that is realistically and meaningfully connected to a referenced intrinsic goal of the learning activity (via value, meaning, use, benefit, importance).	Providing a goal that is connected to a referenced extrinsic goal of the learning activity.
	Communicating negative values on schoolwork.

#### Showing respect vs. Showing disrespect

Not only responding to, but also elaborating on the things students say.	
Listening carefully to students and acknowledging their feelings, thoughts, and perspectives.	Not allowing expression of opinions that differ from those expressed by the teacher.
Open to complaints and negative affect; accepts as OK, valid reaction.	Not allowing complaints and negative affect; it is not OK, change it.

<sup>1</sup> Need support and thwart are coded per teacher-student interaction, unless indicated otherwise.

**Clarity vs. no clarity**

Communicating clear, detailed, and consistent guidelines and expectations (coded per lesson or per phase).	Communicating unclear, vague, confusing, or contradicting guidelines and expectations (coded per lesson or per phase).
Being available to answer questions when guidelines or expectations are unclear (coded per lesson or per phase).	Not being available to answer questions when students clearly find guidelines or expectations unclear.
Clear organisation (coded per lesson or per phase).	Organisation not clear (coded per lesson or per phase).
Providing students with options to check consistency of guidelines.	Discouraging students to check consistency of guidelines.

**Guidance vs. no guidance**

Providing step-by-step directions when needed, thereby adjusting to the student(s).	
Being available to answer questions when students need help or support (coded per lesson or per phase).	Not being available to answer questions when students indicate they need help or support (coded per lesson or per phase).
Entails monitoring of and adjusting to students' comprehension (for frontal instruction coded for the whole phase).	Not monitoring of or adjusting to students' level of comprehension (for frontal instruction coded for the whole phase).

**Encouragement vs. discouragement**

Fostering students' views that success in the tasks learned in class depends mostly on internal controllable factors rather than inborn talent.	Fostering students' views that success in the tasks depends mostly on inborn talent.
Fostering non-competitive, cooperative, learning structures.	Fostering competitive learning structures.
Entails demanding effort.	Not demanding effort. Poor performance is treated evaluative.

**Informational feedback vs. evaluative feedback**

Providing students with constructive, non-comparative, feedback that is focused on helping them to gain control over valued outcomes.	Providing students with comparative feedback or feedback that is focused on evaluating their performance.
Providing students with feedback in the form of cues on how to proceed.	Providing feedback using controlling locution, e.g.: "Good, you did just as you should".

*Teachers' involvement/disaffection or rejection*

**Affection vs. disaffection**

Talking in a friendly tone.	Talking in an unfriendly tone.
Demonstrating affection and interest.	Showing a lack of interest.
Showing warmth.	
Treating students fair in the sense of being consequent (coded per lesson or per phase)	Treating students unfair in the sense of being inconsequent (coded per lesson or per phase).
Encouraging empathy and pro-social behaviour in the class.	Discouraging empathy and pro-social behaviour in the class.
Fostering a sense of connectedness and making students feel they belong to a social group.	Communicating that students do not belong.

**Attunement vs. no attunement**

Showing understanding of the students on what is of importance for them.	Showing no understanding of the students on what is of importance for them.
--	---

**Dedication of resources vs. no dedication of resources**

Being available to all students in class (coded per lesson or per phase).	Clearly neglecting some or all students in class.
	Not being available for students during the lesson, e.g. appearing occupied with other things or walking out of the classroom.

204

**Dependability vs. no dependability**

Showing availability to offer support, for example by being responsive to emotional distress.	Showing unavailability to offer support, for example by ignoring emotional distress.
Showing commitment to students' learning.	Clearly showing no commitment to students' learning.

## Literature rating sheet 'Need supportive teaching'

In the text below, an overview is given of the Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000; SDT)-literature that grounded the rating sheet 'Need supportive teaching'. Literature was included that contained operationalization of (dimensions or components of) need supportive teaching. While some general SDT-literature was included, the majority concerned educational SDT-literature.

### Need support

- Benware & Deci (1984): Passive vs active involvement with the learning material.
- Spaulding (1995): Encourage ownership by making students write for other audiences than their teachers.
- Reeve, Carrell, Jeon, & Barch (2004): Arrange learning materials so that students manipulate objects and conversations rather than passively watch and listen.
- Patrick, Hisley, & Kempler (2000); Radel, Sarrazin, Legrain, & Wild (2010): Social contagion of motivation (e.g. positive effects on motivation of enthusiasm).
- Reeve & Jang (2006): Autonomy supportive: Teachers' effort to identify students' inner resources: Time listening, time student talking, and communicating perspective-taking statements. Teachers' efforts to nurture students' inner resources: Time allowing students to work in own way, praise as informational feedback, offering encouragements, offering hints, and being responsive to student-generated questions.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Nurturing of inner resources.
- Koestner, Ryan, Bernieri, & Holt (1984): Informational like four-step sequence Ginot (1959; 1961 in Koestner et al., 1984): 1. Acknowledge the child's feelings or wishes, 2. State the limit clearly on a specified act, 3. Where possible point out alternative channels for expression of feeling, 4. Help the child express feelings of resentment which are "bound to arise" when constraints are invoked. Further, it is suggested that statements of limits should be stated succinctly and impersonally, e.g: "Walls are not for painting", rather than "You must not paint on the walls".
- Reeve & Jang (2006): Controlling: Leading students toward a teacher-defined right way of behaving: Exhibiting solutions/answers, uttering solutions/answers, and time holding/monopolizing learning materials. Pressuring language: Uttering directives/commands, making should/got to statements, and asking controlling questions.

### Autonomy support vs control

- Kaplan & Assor (2012): Four characteristics of autonomy supportive meaningful dialogue:

1. Autonomy support does not imply that teachers should always accept their students views, ignore their own personal needs, or allow students to frustrate educators own needs.
  2. When appropriate and there is no ego-involvement, teachers should share their feelings of being hurt, angry, or disappointed. Thus, an authentic autonomy supportive dialogue can involve the sharing of disagreements and negative feelings (Koestner, Ryan, Bernieri, & Holt, 1984).
  3. Importance of self-awareness and authenticity (e.g. Ryan & Deci, 2004). Otherwise elicit of self-awareness and reduce of authenticity.
  4. Taking the position of the detached technical expert can undermine the quality of autonomy support. “For example, based on their knowledge of some SDT principles teachers may offer choices and think this supports students’ need for autonomy; yet in the absence of a dialogue that truly seeks to understand the child perspective, they might fail to understand that the choices offered do not match the students’ authentic needs”(e.g. Katz & Assor, 2006).
- Reeve et al. (2004): “If the teacher cannot spark students’ interest, enjoyment, or sense of challenge, she continues to rethink how she might present that same activity so that student engagement will be more likely to include the accompanying support from students’ underlying inner motivational resources”.
  - Soenens, Sierens, Vansteenkiste, Dochy, & Goossens (2012): Psychological controlling teaching (Barber, 1996; Barber & Harmon, 2002; PCT): Use of intrusive and sometimes subtle behaviours that pressure students to think, act, and feel in particular ways (OR<sup>1</sup> respect). Common to these inductive behaviours (including guilt induction, shaming, and expression of disappointment) is that they convey a conditionally approving attitude from teachers toward students (OR choice). Teachers use their own values and opinions as an exclusive frame of reference and ignore their students’ perspective (OR respect). PCT is largely incompatible with teacher autonomy support and with need supportive teaching in general (Grolnick, 2003; Vansteenkiste, Zhou, Lens, & Soenens, 2005).
  - Soenens & Vansteenkiste (2010): Psychological control as an instance of controlling socialization.

Based on prior theorising by Assor and Kaplan (2001), Reeve et al. (2004), and by Belmont, Skinner, Wellborn, and Connell (1992), we distinguish autonomy support in four components. Below, we provide an overview of those characteristics of need supportive teaching that have been described in the literature and that we have classified as being autonomy supportive. We have further classified these characteristics along the four components of autonomy supportive teaching.

### Choice vs control

- Reeve et al. (2004): Nurturing of inner motivational resources, for example

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘OR’ refers to own remark

by finding ways to incorporate students' choices in the lessons.

- Assor, Kaplan, & Roth (2002): Enabling students to choose tasks that they perceive as consistent with their goals and interests.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Create opportunities for students to work in their own way.
- Reeve (2006): Provide students with a freedom for choice, voice, and initiative.
- Katz & Assor (2006): Overview attributes of choice that are need satisfying/ need frustrating.
- Stefanou, Perencevich, DiCintio, & Turner (2004): It is only cognitive (and not so much procedural and organisational) choice that fosters a more enduring psychological investment in deep-level thinking. Cognitive choice encourages ownership of the learning and can include teacher behaviours such as: 1. Asking students to justify or argue for their point; 2. Asking students to generate their own solution paths; 3. Asking students to evaluate their own and others' solutions or ideas (Logan, DiCintio, Cox, & Turner, 1995 in Stefanou et al., 2004). Conditions for students to become initiators of their own learning pursuits: Requiring students to: 1. Justify strategy choice; 2. Understand their own thinking or solution path; 3. Use multiple approaches to tasks. Or (4.) Declare appreciation for unanticipated solutions.
- Tsai, Kunter, Lüdtke, Trautwein, & Ryan (2008): Cognitive autonomy support: More than one student presents a solution to the task (Kunter & Baumert, 2006).
- Assor, Kaplan, & Roth (2002): Disrupting of natural rhythm, thereby not allowing students to realise their action plans.
- Assor, Kaplan, Kanat-Maymon, & Roth (2005): Not letting children work at their preferred pace, continually giving directives to children.
- Radel, Sarrazin, Legrain, & Wild (2010): Provide solutions before students have time to reflect by themselves.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Keep possession of and monopolize the learning materials; physically exhibit worked-out solutions and answers before students have time to work on the problem independently. Tell students the right answer instead of allowing them time and opportunity to discover it.
- Deci & Ryan (1994): Imposed goals.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Neglects students' inner resources (value, meaning, use, benefit, importance) and instead tries to manufacture extrinsic motivation by offering incentives, consequences, directives, deadlines, or assignments (OR also control).



- Radel et al. (2010): Attempt to motivate students by exerting pressure on them (e.g. using threats, criticism, and deadlines) (OR also controlling language).
- Assor et al. (2005; based on Deci, Ryan, & Williams, 1996): Controlling behaviours such as: Imposing deadlines, surveillance, giving directives (OR also controlling language).
- Reeve et al. (2004): Use controlling questions as a way of directing students' work (e.g. "Can you do what I showed you?").
- Vansteenkiste, Niemiec, & Soenens (2010): Controlling individuals direct the thoughts, feelings, and behaviours of those they socialize.
- Vansteenkiste et al. (2010): Use of overt, externally pressuring tactics (e.g. controlling language, punishments) or more covert, subtle techniques of manipulation, including conditional regard (Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004) (OR also discouragement), guilt induction (Vansteenkiste, Simons, Lens, Soenens, & Matos, 2005), and shaming (for a review see Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010).

#### **Informational vs controlling language**

- Reeve et al. (2004): Flexible.
- Ryan (1982): Controlling language: E.g. should, must, have to, and ought to.
- Reeve et al. (2004); Radel et al. (2010): Utter directives and commands.
- Deci & Ryan (1994): Threats of punishments. (OR also control).
- Radel et al. (2010): Attempt to motivate students by exerting pressure on them (e.g. using threats, criticism, and deadlines) (OR also control).
- Assor et al. (2005; based on Deci et al., 1996): Controlling behaviours such as: Imposing deadlines, surveillance, giving directives (OR also control).

#### **Fostering relevance vs forcing meaningless activities**

- Ryan (1982): Externally provided reason articulating why effort during the activity was useful.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Finding ways of initiating students' activity by incorporating students' interests, preferences, choices, curiosity, or sense of challenge into the lesson (OR partly also choice).
- Reeve et al. (2004): Promoting value in uninteresting activities. Identifies value, use, meaning, benefit, importance. E.g.: "This is important because..."
- Reeve et al. (2004): "This understanding allows a process of internalization to occur, as students essentially say to themselves: "Yeah, okay, that makes sense; I will do it'.

- Reeve et al. (2004): Help students coordinate their inner resources with their moment-to-moment activity, instead of pushing, pressuring, or coercing them to comply with their own agenda.
- Assor et al. (2002): Explaining the contribution of the learning task to students' personal goals.
- Vansteenkiste et al. (2010): Offer a meaningful and realistic rationale when choice is constraint.
- Vansteenkiste, Soenens, Verstuyf, & Lens (2009): Provide a specific, rather than vague, goal and realistically and meaningfully connect the referenced intrinsic goal to the learning activity so that the learners accept the promoted goal. Refrain from extrinsic goal framing as it undermines both learning and the beneficial effects of intrinsic goal framing.
- Roth, Kanat-Maymon, & Bibi (2010): Provide rationale or relevance and take the student's perspective.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Neglects students' inner resources (value, meaning, use, benefit, importance) and instead tries to manufacture extrinsic motivation by offering incentives, consequences, directives, deadlines, or assignments (OR also control).
- Assor et al. (2002): An active attempt to compel students to do things that they find boring or meaningless.

#### Showing respect vs showing disrespect

- Bozack, Vega, McCaslin, & Good (2008): Not only responding to, but also elaborating on, the things their students say and engaging students' own experiences, expertise, and perspectives in the learning process.
- Deci & Ryan (1994): Acknowledging feelings.
- Deci & Ryan (1994): Importance of considering the students' frame of reference.
- Deci & Ryan (1994; see Deci, Eghrari, Patrick, & Leone, 1994): Acknowledgement of a person's feelings, so he/she will feel understood.
- Radel et al. (2010): Listen carefully to students and acknowledge their perspectives
- Assor et al. (2002): Expression of dissatisfaction by students might cause teachers to make learning tasks more interesting or provide a more convincing rationale (OR in this case a necessary first step for providing of relevance to occur).
- Assor et al. (2002): Attempt to understand students' feelings and thoughts concerning the learning task.

- Ryan (1982): Acknowledgement of negative affect participants might experience (in particular when providing rationale).
- Reeve et al. (2004): Acknowledgement and acceptance of students' expressions of negative affect. Listens carefully; open to complaints; accepts as OK, valid reaction.
- Jang, Reeve, & Deci (2010): Inquire about and acknowledge students' feelings.
- Vansteenkiste et al. (2010): Try to understand the other's perspective.
- Assor et al. (2002): Not allowing students to inform teachers about aspects of the task and the learning context that interfere with the realisation of their interests and goals.
- Assor et al. (2005): Not allowing children to voice opinions that differ from those expressed by the teacher.
- Ryan (1982): Negative affect participants might experience is not acknowledged (in particular when providing rationale).
- Reeve et al. (2004): It is not OK, change it: Negative affect is unacceptable; tries to fix, counter, or change into something else.

Based on prior theorising by Skinner and Belmont (1993), Jang et al. (2010), and by Belmont et al. (1992), we distinguish structure into four components. Below, we provide an overview of those characteristics of need supportive teaching that have been described in the literature and that we have classified as providing students with structure. We have further classified these characteristics along the four components of providing students with structure.

210

## Structure vs chaos

### Clarity

- Vansteenkiste et al. (2010): Clarity of rules and expectations that are introduced.
- Soenens & Vansteenkiste (2010): Communication of clear and consistent guidelines and expectations; introduction of clear rules, delineate the consequences of not following the rules, and follow through when rules are transgressed (Grolnick, Deci, & Ryan, 1997); provision of help when children engage in a task or make a decision, the communication of informational feedback, and an attitude expressing confidence in the child's ability to perform and behave well (Reeve, 2002). Providing children with a sense of predictability and a sense of personal efficacy. To meet challenges and to competently execute instrumental actions.
- Jang et al. (2010): Presenting clear, understandable, explicit, and detailed directions.

- Jang et al. (2010): Clearly communicating expectations and directions, and providing consistency in the lesson (ref. provided).
- Jang et al. (2010): Teachers are confusing or contradicting, fail to communicate clear expectations and directions, and ask for outcomes without the means to attain them.

### Guidance

- Offering guidance in students' on-going activities, for example by monitoring their work or offering help or support when needed (Skinner & Belmont, 1993; Jang et al., 2010).
- Alfi, Katz, & Assor (2004): Assist students in planning their work on the task.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Offering progress-enabling hints when students seem stuck.
- Jang et al. (2010): Taking the lead during some instructional activities, providing strong guidance during the lesson, providing step-by-step directions when needed, scheduling student activities, marking the boundaries of activities and orchestrating the transitions between them.

### Optimal challenge

- Allowing experience of temporal failure (Alfi et al. 2004).
- Alfi et al. (2004): Conduct initial assessment to make the task optimally challenging.
- Alfi et al. (2004): Identify specific steps that can help students master the components that caused the temporal failure.

### Encouragement vs discouragement

- Making students feel they acquire more control over school outcomes. Teachers can encourage students by communicating positive expectations regarding their schoolwork.
- Alfi et al. (2004): Foster students' views that success in the tasks learned in class depends mostly on internal controllable factors rather than inborn talent.
- Alfi et al. (2004): Foster non-competitive, cooperative, learning structures.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Poor performance is treated as a problem that needs to be solved.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Encourage effort and persistence; praise signs of improvement and mastery.
- Review Chapter 3: Providing challenge and demanding effort.

- Review Chapter 3: Uttering positive expectations.
- Reeve et al. (2004): Poor performance is treated evaluative.

#### **Informational feedback vs evaluative feedback**

- Jang et al. (2010): Providing students with constructive, informational feedback, thereby helping them to gain control over valued outcomes.
- Deci & Ryan (1994): Positive effects of positive feedback have been found to generate effects on perceived competence only when the positive feedback resulted from self-determined action or was presented in a non-controlling style.
- Alfi et al. (2004): Provide continual, informative, non-comparative feedback that instructs pupils regarding components of the task they have mastered and components they can master following some additional practices.
- Deci, Koestner, & Ryan (2001): Overview research on effects of different types of rewards.
- Jang et al. (2010): Offering task-focused and personal control-enhancing feedback.
- Reeve (2006): Information-rich, competence-affirming utterances to identify and explain why students are doing well or making progress.
- Katz, Assor, Kanat-Maymon, & Bereby-Meyer (2006): Interest as a buffer for lack of positive feedback.
- Deci et al., (1996): Positive feedback using controlling locution, e.g.: “Good, you “did just as you should”.
- Deci et al. (1996): Potential positive effects of negative feedback not well studied.

212

Based on prior theorising by Belmont et al. (1992), we distinguish involvement into four components. Below, we provide an overview of those characteristics of need supportive teaching that have been described in the literature and that we have classified as expressing involvement. We have further classified these characteristics along the four components of expressing involvement.

#### **Involvement vs neglect or disaffection**

- Vansteenkiste et al. (2010): Fostering a sense of connectedness, love, and understanding within relationships.
- Osterman (2000): Making students feel they belong to a social group.

### Affection vs disaffection

- Hassandra, Goudan, & Chroni (2003): Friendly tone.
- Alfi et al. (2004): Demonstrate affection and interest in relation to each pupil.
- Alfi et al. (2004): Enforce rules that do not allow violence in the classroom; encourage empathy and pro-social behaviour in the class.
- Vansteenkiste et al. (2010): Warmth (or the ability to amicably connect with others and to partake in mutually enjoying activities) (Davidov & Grusec, 2006).
- Review Chapter 3: Fairness; “My teacher likes me as much as he/she likes the other students”.

### Attunement

- Belmont et al. (1992): Show understanding of the students, as well as knowledge on what is of importance for them.

### Dedication of resources

- E.g. time.

### Dependability

- Belmont et al. (1992): Demonstrating dependability and availability to offer support.
- Vansteenkiste et al. (2010): Responsiveness to distress (or the ability to empathise with and respond to others’ unpleasant feelings in a way that provides solace and comfort) (Davidov & Grusec, 2006).
- Reeve & Jang (2006): Being responsive to students’ questions and comments.

