

EPSY410: Motivation and Self-Regulation in Achievement Settings
Spring 2022 (Call #8585)

Time/Place Monday and Wednesday 1:10-2:25pm/Arts & Sciences B15
Instructor: David Yun Dai, Ph.D. Office: CK221 ydai@albany.edu
Phone: 442-5068
Office Hours: Monday 10:00-12:00 & Wednesday 1:00-3:00, and by appointment

Class readings available at www.david-dai.net Find “Teaching”, then EPSY410

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to achieve three main goals: (1) to provide an overview of current theory and research on human motivation, particularly as it pertains to learning and achievement in formal and informal educational settings; (2) to help develop critical thinking with respect to the complexity of human motivation in educational settings; and (3) to facilitate understandings of implications and applications of motivational theories and principles in authentic educational settings.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND ASSIGNMENTS

1) **Class preparation and participation (5%).** I assume that everyone will be ready to discuss the assigned readings each week. You need to allocate substantial amounts of time for reading before each class (you should NOT read them too leisurely as the articles are academic writings). I expect everyone to contribute to class discussions. Unannounced quizzes will be conducted as a “warm-up” activity, and randomly “cold calls” will be made to facilitate class participation. In addition, **all students are expected to participate in a research project on motivation and learning.** This study will be used in class to illustrate how research is designed to understand specific aspects of motivation, self-regulation, and learning. All these activities will be used to assess class preparation and participation, collectively as well as individually.

Grading will be based on the following scale:

- Always well prepared, can actively participate most of the time, plus meeting minimum expectations 5%
- Generally well prepared, but not actively participate OR vice versa; falls short of meeting minimum requirements 4%
- Both preparation and participation are less than satisfactory; participation is fewer than 3 weeks 3% or less

2) **A mid-term exam (20%).** You are expected to take a midterm exam consisting of 50 multiple-choice questions, which covered the content up to the point of the exam.

3) **A short essay on a relevant theoretical concept (20%).** You are expected to write up a short paper (4 pages, double-spaced), on a motivational concept in the context of the history of motivation research and in view of its unique contributions to understanding human motivation. Both strengths and limitations should be discussed. **You will be given a set of key motivational concepts to choose from.** Your presentation can be structured in the following manner:

(a) Describe the theory or theoretical construct you have chosen in terms of its historical and theoretical origins. Historical origins involve who proposed the idea under what historical circumstances. Theoretical origins involve philosophical backgrounds and theoretical antecedents that gave rise to the idea.

(b) State clearly what phenomenon the theoretical idea attempts to explain (e.g., is the phenomenon highly specific and circumscribed or very general and occurring across many situations) and how underlying motivational processes for the phenomenon are explicated.

(c) Explain why the idea is relevant and important to the understanding of motivational issues in educational settings; provide examples to support your argument.

(d) Evaluate the idea in terms of strengths and weaknesses, from both theoretical and practical points of view (Theoretically how well the theoretical idea explains the phenomenon; is it more viable than other competing theoretical explanations? Practically speaking, do the insights provided by the idea provide clues as to how to enhance motivation, directly or indirectly?).

(e) Summarize your presentation.

For criteria to be used to evaluate your presentation, see **Appendix A** for a grading rubric.

4) **Applied Motivational Analysis of Cases (30%).** You are expected to write two 3-page case analyses, *Baiting the Hook* and *Mary Ewing* (15 points each; the two cases will be discussed respectively prior to the week when the writing is due. You are expected to use motivational theories as conceptual tools to diagnose problems and critique and evaluate teaching practices as you observed in each case.

Part 1: Your understanding of the nature of the student motivation to learn and how the learner(s) or/and the classroom conditions contributed to their motivational problems;

Part 2: What motivational theories are potentially relevant here, and of different alternative perspectives you identify as relevant, which one(s) provide more viable explanations for the problem, and why; make sure your argument is as articulate as possible;

Part 3: Your suggested solutions based on your understanding of the problem, what you suggest can be done to address motivational problems you identify. Note that solutions should derive logically from Parts 1 and 2 and should address motivational problems you have identified.

To guide your writing, a rubric is provided in **Appendix B**

5) **Culminating Group Project (25 points).** A group project will be created as your culminating work. Specifically you are expected to team up with two classmates to conceptualize a mini presentation topic relevant to motivation and self-regulation. Your

topic should be built on class readings and discussions but fully capitalizes on your individual and collective strengths and interests. Clearly some collective deliberation is needed to develop your topic. The project takes three steps: (1) Once your team is formed, you are expected to submit your idea for approval by the instructor. (2) Once it is approved, you should work together to develop a powerpoint presentation to be presented in the final three weeks of class. And (3) you should decide who will do what in writing up your presentation as a final report to be submitted at the end of the semester (May 11th 2022). This project is an exercise of your collaborative creativity, and will be graded collectively based on clarity, relevance, coherence, and creativity of (a) your group presentation in class (10%) and (b) the quality of the final paper (15%).

GRADING SCALE

Your final grade will be based on percentage of total points you achieve, using a criterion-referenced grading system:

A = 100-95% A- = 90-94% B+ = 85-89% B = 80-84% B- = 75-79% C = 70-74%

IMPORTANT DUE DATES

TBD Class presentation of the group project
 Feb. 14 *Baiting the Hook* case analysis due
 March 9 Midterm Exam due
 March 28 Group project idea due
 April 4 *Mary Ewing* case analysis due
 April 18 Paper on a theoretical idea due
 May 11 Group final report due
 (send all assignments to ydai@albany.edu)

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE and READINGS

(Additional readings might be assigned as the semester progresses)

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Topic</u> | <u>Reading</u> |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| Jan. 24 | Introduction: Why motivation and self-regulation | |
| Jan. 26 | Motivation and self-regulation in context | Ford, 1994 |
| THEME 1: Competence Beliefs and Outcome Expectations | | |
| Jan. 31 | Expectations-Value theory | Atkinson, 1957 |
| Feb. 2 | The cognitive turn of motivation theory | |
| Feb. 7 | Behavioral theory of motivation | Eisenberg & Cameron, 1999 |
| Feb. 9 | Extrinsic motivation: Rewards and incentives | |

Case Discussion: *Baiting the Hook*

Feb. 14 **Baiting the Hook case analysis Due**
Self-Efficacy: The role of personal agency Bandura, 1993

Feb. 16 Competence-based theories: Rationale or irrational?

THEME 2: Goals and Needs

Feb. 21 Goal theory (pull vs. push theory) Haimovitz & Dweck, 2016

Feb.. 23 Goals and goal orientations
Ford (1994) revisited

Feb. 28 Different responses to competition Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1994

March 2 Revisiting Atkinson (1957)

THEME 3: Intrinsic Motivation

Feb. 28 Intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivation Lepper & Hodell 1989

March 2 What exactly we mean by “intrinsic motivation”

March 7 Cognitive and social motivation Hatano, 1988

March 9 **Midterm Exam**

March 14/16 **NO CLASS** (Spring Break)

March 21 Play, flow, and live the moment Csikszentmihalyi (TBD)

March 23 Intrinsic and instrumental motivation: telic vs. autotelic

THEME 4: Developmental and Individual Differences

March 28 **Group project idea due to the instructor**
Learning engagement Bangert-Drowns & Pyke 2001

March 30 Sources of individual and developmental differences
Mary Ewing case discussion

April 4 **Mary Ewing case analysis due**
Motivation as adaptation: Cope and Grow Dai et al. 2015

April 6 Self-regulation of motivation

April 11 Ecology of learning, motivation, and development Barron, 2006

April 13 Presentations

THEME 5: Self-Regulation of Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning

April 18 **Essay on a theoretical concept due**
Delay of gratification and development Mischel et al. 2011

April 20/25 **NO CLASS** (AERA), Working on your group project

April 27 Presentations

May 2 Corno's Self-Regulation Model Corno, 2013

May 4 Presentations

May 11 **Group Project due** via ydai@albany.edu

References

- Atkinson, J. W. (1957). Motivational determinants of risk taking behavior. *Psychological Review*, *64*, 359-372.
- Bandura, A., & Jourden, F. J. (1991). Self-regulatory mechanisms governing the impact of social comparison on complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 941-951.
- Bangert-Drowns, R., E & Pyke, C. (2001). A taxonomy of student engagement with educational software: An exploration of literate thinking with electronic text. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *24*, 213-234.
- Barron, B. (2006). Interest and self-sustained learning as catalysts of development: A learning ecology perspective. *Human Development*, *49*, 193-224.
- Bidjerano, T., & Dai, D. Y. (2007). Relationship between big-five personality and self-regulated learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *17*, 69-81.
- Boekaerts, M. (1993). Being concerned with well-being and with learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*, 149-167.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2000). Autonomy and self-regulation. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 284-291.
- Corno, L. (2013). Volitional aspect of self-regulated learning. In B. Zimmerman & D. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement* (pp. XX). New York: Routledge.
- Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1994). Goal setting, achievement orientation, and intrinsic motivation: a mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*, 968-980.

- Fischer, K. W., & Connell, M. W. (2003). Two motivational systems that shape development: Epistemic and self-organizing. *BJEP Monograph Series II 2: Development and Motivation*, 103–123.
- Haimovitz, K., & Dweck, C. S. (2016). What predicts children's fixed and growth intelligence mind-sets? Not their parents' views of intelligence but their parents' views of failure. *Psychological Science*, 27, 859-869.
- Hatano, G. (1988). Social and motivational bases for mathematic understanding. In G. B. Saxe & M. G. Gearhart (Eds.), *Children's mathematics* (pp. 55-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mischel, W. et al. (2011). “Willpower” over the life span: Decomposing self-regulation. *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience*, 6, 252-256.

Appendix A: A rubric for evaluating the essay on a theoretical idea

| Criteria/Levels | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Historical and Theoretical Contexts | The theoretical idea is well “contextualized,” i.e., put in proper perspective | The idea is contextualized to some extent, but how it is related to other ideas yet distinguishes itself is not clear. | Poor contextualization. Not sufficient information about the backgrounds that gave rise to the idea. | No attempt to put the idea in proper context. |
| Accurate Exposition of the Idea | How the idea attempts to explain specific phenomenon is well articulated | Articulate of the idea is generally to the point but putative underlying processes are not fully elaborated | Articulation only partially describes the idea, with important omissions | Articulation misses the essence of the idea |
| Relevance and Importance to Education | Argument for its relevance is convincing and proper examples are provided to support the argument | Relevance/importance is adequately tapped into, but lacking in supporting evidence | Relevance/importance is only superficially discussed, with no elaboration | Relevance/importance not properly discussed in the context of education |
| Evaluation of Strengths and Weaknesses | Evaluation is fair and balanced and alternative perspectives and ideas are compared in terms of how viable competing explanations are for the phenomenon in question | Strengths and weaknesses are properly identified, but no alternative explanations are explored. | Evaluation is lopsided, skewed either positively or negatively (note this is often due to the lack of proper contextualization: why we have the idea in the first place) | Evaluation misses the mark entirely; strengths and weaknesses either misidentified or not mentioned at all. |
| Writing quality | Uses active voice, accessible language, and APA style; well organized and clear; includes title page and reference page | A few problems with organization, clarity, or conventions should have been fixed but aren’t serious enough to be distracting | Numerous errors are distracting but do not interfere with meaning | Frequent problems with organization, clarity, and/or conventions make the paper hard to read. Possible plagiarism risks the appearance of cheating |

Appendix B: A Rubric for Applied Motivational Analysis

| Criteria/Levels | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Description of what happens and what is at issue | Major symptoms of the problem are identified, and major issues identified; can “frame” the problem properly for further in-depth discussion. | Can go beyond mere redescription and “frame” the problem for further analysis, but lacks elaboration in that the argument is not fully developed evidence from the case not cited | Attempt to go beyond factual information, but problem identification is superficial, and the focus is on symptoms, not the underlying problem | Basically retells the story, without tapping into the main issues |
| Discussion and Evaluation of Alternative Theoretical Perspectives | Alternative perspectives and ideas are brought to bear on the motivational problem so that underlying processes are elucidated, and viability of these perspectives evaluated | Can bring different theoretical perspectives to bear on the problem properly, but lack of discussion of which one is more viable given the information than others | Different theoretical perspectives are incorporated, some with success, but others not well substantiated | Little theoretical analysis beyond using commonsense language to understand the problem; Underlying motivational processes not articulated. |
| Solutions based on problem identification and analysis | Solutions follow logically from problem identification and analysis and why they should work is well argued | Solutions are tied to problem analysis, but argument about their effectiveness not well developed | Solutions are connected to problem identified, but too broad and general to implement | Solutions are not connected to problems identified |
| Writing Quality | Uses active voice, accessible language, and APA style; well organized and clear; includes title page and reference page | A few problems with organization, clarity, or conventions should have been fixed but aren’t serious enough to be distracting | Numerous errors are distracting but do not interfere with meaning | Frequent problems with organization, clarity, and/or conventions make the paper hard to read. Possible plagiarism risks the appearance of cheating |