

**EFFECTS OF THE LEARNING-ORIENTED AND WORK-ORIENTED
STRATEGIES ON THE ACADEMIC CLASSROOM ACHIEVEMENT
OF SEVENTH GRADE LANGUAGE ARTS STUDENTS**



JOLENE A. JENKINS

To the Graduate Council:


I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Jolene A. Jenkins entitled "Effects Of The Learning-Oriented And Work-Oriented Strategies On The Classroom Achievement Of Seventh Grade Language Arts Students." I have examined the final copy of this field study for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Education Specialist, with a major in Education.


Dr. George Rawlins, Major Professor

We have read this field study
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:


Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an Ed.S. degree at Austin Peay State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgement of the source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature

John A. Santana

Date

July 19, 1994

**EFFECTS OF THE LEARNING-ORIENTED AND WORK-ORIENTED
STRATEGIES ON THE ACADEMIC CLASSROOM ACHIEVEMENT
OF SEVENTH GRADE LANGUAGE ARTS STUDENTS**

**A Field Study
Presented For The
Education Specialist
Degree
Austin Peay State University**

**Jolene A. Jenkins
August, 1994**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are several people who have been helpful in the preparation and implementation of this research effort.

I would especially like to thank my committee chairman, Dr. George Rawlins for his support, faith in my ability, and suggestions into my research and the writing of this thesis.

I would also like to thank my husband, Jason, and my children, Mandy and Melissa, for their patience and understanding this past year. Their encouragement was very important in this research effort. I will be forever grateful.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of the learning-oriented and work-oriented teacher strategies on the academic achievement of seventh grade language arts students. The group targeted for study was the entire seventh grade Kiowa language arts students (68 students, ages 11-14) at Mahaffey Middle School, Ft. Campbell, Kentucky. Four existing classes, equally divided into two groups based on the third quarter raw score mean of each class, differed only in the teacher motivational strategies employed in the classroom. Fourth quarter class means served as the measurement unit for analysis.

Utilizing a nonequivalent control group design and applying a t-test for independent samples, it was concluded that after a nine week period there was no significant difference ($p=.05$) in the academic classroom achievement between students in a seventh grade language arts learning-oriented classroom and those in a work-oriented classroom.

Although the overall means of the two groups did not differ significantly, analysis of the means for each individual test given during the study showed the two groups to differ significantly on the final test given after the nine weeks of implementing the experimental learning-oriented strategies. Based on the final test's maximum score of one hundred, the learning-oriented group mean was 86.03 as compared to a 76.03 mean for the work-oriented group. In testing the significance of these means ($p=.05$ and 66 degrees of freedom), a significant difference ($t=2.16$) was found in favor of the learning-oriented group.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
1. Introduction.	1
Purpose of the Study.	2
Importance of the Study.	3
Limitation of the Study.	4
Statement of the Hypothesis.	5
2. Review of Related Literature.	6
3. Method.	16
Subjects.	16
Instrument.	17
Design.	17
Procedure.	18
4. Presentation of Data	20
5. Discussion.	23
Appendices	
A. Learning-Oriented Strategies.	26
B. Work-Oriented Strategies.	29
C. Letter to Parents.	32
List of References.	34

Chapter 1

Introduction

A major concern among teachers and educational systems has been how to motivate students to attain higher academic achievement both in the classroom and on standardized achievement tests. In recent years, as educational systems have begun striving for “effective schools”, administrators have requested that teachers explore and initiate motivational strategies within the classroom to improve academic achievement of students.

Although a recent emphasis has been placed on how to encourage student motivation towards learning and thus improve academic achievement, motivating learners has been a major concern for numerous teachers throughout the history of education. The idea of implementing different motivational strategies to increase student achievement dates back to the Puritans in Colonial America who thought corporal punishment a means to force student learning.

In 1805, the Monitorial System of Instruction was introduced into the United States. With this system, embarrassment replaced, in part, the use of physical punishment (Ediger,1982). It was believed that embarrassing students in order to motivate students to gain higher achievement was a more humane method of motivation.

As educators gained knowledge of motivating factors attributing to academic achievement, strategies used by teachers began to change. B.F. Skinner (Ediger,1982) theorized that individuals seek rewards and attempt to avoid punishment. In this reinforcement strategy, extrinsic rewards were given to students achieving specific

objectives.

A different approach from that of extrinsic reinforcement stated that “learning is its own reward” (Ediger, 1982). Extrinsic rewards, such as prizes or free time for work completion or high achievement, were not emphasized. Motivation became more intrinsic, and the teacher’s responsibility was to develop strategies or methods of learning which stimulated a student’s desire to learn.

More recently, research has been done on how strategies interacted with each other to create a particular orientation toward instruction. Marshall (1987a) investigated the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivational strategies on student academic achievement. Rewards and punishment were a major source of motivation in a “work-oriented” classroom. Motivational strategies toward learning and thinking were the basis of a learning orientation or what Brophy (1983) termed “motivation to learn”.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of the learning-oriented and work-oriented teacher strategies on the academic achievement of seventh grade language arts students.

Definition of Terms

Definition of the following terms is based upon their usage within this investigation.

Learning orientation– Teacher strategies emphasizing to students the meaningfulness, value, and personal benefit of learning skills

and concepts in order to engage in and complete tasks. Emphasis is placed on student learning rather than just performing and encourages student responsibility for learning.

Work orientation- Teacher strategies emphasizing student performance to complete tasks through exogenous factors such as rewards and threats of punishment. Learning remains teacher directed with the teacher retaining control over the student's work and learning.

Academic achievement- Improvement in students' classroom objective test scores.

Statement of the Hypothesis

Research evidence suggested a correlation between teacher motivational orientations and student academic achievement, but results did not endorse one orientation over another. Therefore, it was hypothesized there would be no significant difference in the academic classroom achievement between students in a seventh grade language arts learning-oriented classroom and those students in a work-oriented classroom.

Importance of the Study

The importance of student motivation as one of the elements that contribute to the learning process has been known by educators for many years. The underlying implication of student motivation appears to lie in the process of how students are taught, rather than what they are taught.

From this study and its findings there may be an interest generated in how strategies interact with each other to create a particular orientation towards learning. This knowledge may help educators analyze the effectiveness of their current instructional strategies and to develop new strategies in relationship to optimum student achievement.

Limitation of the Study

(1) The study was limited to data collected from 68 students divided within four existing classrooms at Mahaffey Middle School in the Fort Campbell school district.

(2) Since the data was collected over a nine week time period, the results may prove unreliable in future examinations.

(3) This study addressed only those strategies found within a learning or work orientation. It did not address other variables, such as teachers' beliefs in the nature of ability, that may affect a teacher's instructional orientation and thus student motivation to achieve.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

In recent years, the public has become concerned with the realization that the academic performance of students has been declining. In response to this, attention to the need to maximize student learning has increased. Already known was that factors other than ability influenced whether students sought or avoided challenges, persisted or withdrew in the face of difficulty, or used and developed their skills effectively (Dweck, 1986). Thus, beginning in the 1960s, researchers began to concentrate on specific behaviors of teachers and students, relate student-teacher interactions to student learning, and study teaching in its natural setting (Pratton, 1986).

To understand the student-teacher interactions, one must first look at the role of student motivation towards achievement. Most teachers believe student motivation makes a significant contribution to school performance (Christophel, 1990). Motivation to accomplish goals, expressing an interest and making an effort toward schoolwork, confidence in one's own ability, and persistence when academically challenged are aspects of motivation that come to mind in relationship to the academic classroom (Ames, 1990).

From research on student motivation, educators have learned that motivation for schooling revolved around two points. On the one hand, the reward system was structured to make schooling an "exchange of performance for grades" (Becker, 1968, p. 68). Students performed to attain a grade or to confirm their own competence. On the other hand, Dweck (1968) suggested that many of the tasks and materials within

schools appeal to students who feel personally challenged to figure out how it all works. Students who were inclined to approach schoolwork from the point of learning and mastering the material, learning/mastery orientation, tended to differ in their work styles from students whose goal was to attain a grade, the performance/work orientation.

According to Brophy (1987), a student's motivation towards learning is often stimulated through various forms of modeling, communication of expectations, instruction, or socialization by teachers through the development of instructional goals and strategies. Marshall (1987a) stated that teachers use a variety of strategies to convey information about why students are to accomplish educational tasks. According to these views, teachers are active agents within the educational environment, and therefore have the capability of stimulating the development of student motivation towards learning and academic achievement.

If teachers are capable of stimulating student learning and academic achievement, the following questions then arise: "What teaching activities enhance student learning? Are certain teaching styles, strategies, and motivational orientations more effective than others in helping young people increase their academic achievement?" (Silvernail, 1979, p. 8).

A teacher's views on motivation and learning, the nature of student ability, and one's own effectiveness formed the basis for techniques or strategies used in the classroom to motivate students to learn concepts, complete tasks, and assume responsibility. These strategies combined to produce a work or learning orientation towards instruction and student motivation. Each motivational orientation had different characteristics.

In the work -oriented classroom, the teacher's emphasis was on doing and completing work. Teachers attempted to motivate students to complete their work for exogenous rather than endogeneous reasons. Motivational statements referred to accountability, time reminders, demands, rewards, and threats of negative consequences for incomplete work. When students were off task in a work-oriented classroom, teacher statements were designed to redirect the student's attention from the off-task behavior. In this orientation, the teacher retained control for overseeing students' work, rather than sharing responsibility for monitoring and evaluating learning with the student (Marshall, 1987a,b).

The learning or motivation-to-learn orientation (Brophy, 1987) differed from the work orientation. In the learning-oriented classroom, the emphasis was on learning and thinking. In learning-oriented classrooms, teachers attempted to motivate students to learn rather than simply complete their work. Here motivation to learn referred not just to the motivation that drives later performance, but also to the motivation underlying the information-processing activities, such as paying attention to lessons that occur in learning. Students were encouraged to engage in tasks for endogeneous reasons. Students in a learning-oriented classroom perceived a task as an end in itself rather than as a means to another goal, such as a reward. Advocates of the learning orientation used strategies that focus on the personal benefit of learning, emphasizing the purpose of the task or student interest as well as student responsibility in the learning process. These strategies included positive motivational statements challenging students to use their minds and to evaluate their own learning. Many lessons were

related to student interest and personal experiences. Only a small percentage of time (10%) was spent on teacher statements toward accountability, time limits, rewards, or threats (Marshall, 1987b).

Although little research was available comparing specific teacher motivational orientations with their effect upon student's motivation to learn and thus student achievement, individual motivational factors, and teacher strategies have been investigated at various grade levels. Flanders (1970) concluded that student learning was affected by teacher influence in the classroom, and that this influence was established through the teacher's verbal behavior. Flanders described direct, related to work/performance orientation, or indirect, related to learning orientation, influences in such areas as student talk, use of student ideas, verbal praise, and criticism.

With respect to academic learning, some research findings appear to support the superiority of the indirect style (Flanders, 1970; Furst, 1967; Hunter, 1968; Weber, 1968). Samph (1974) found that the language development and overall achievement of sixth grade students was greater for students exposed to an indirect teaching style. Similar results were reported for junior high school students in mathematics, social studies, and language arts (Flanders, 1970). Indirectness also enhanced the achievement of secondary general science and chemistry students (Campbell, 1971; Wolfson, 1973). Wolfson (1973) concluded that secondary students retained more information when taught by indirect teachers.

The Texas Junior High Study (Evertson, 1978) revealed that student talk, the use of student ideas, and praise of student contributions correlated positively with learning gains in seventh and eighth grade

math classes. Data for English classes were inconclusive. This data suggested that greater student learning at the middle and upper grades may be associated with strategies found within a learning orientation.

Not all evidence supported the indirect teaching style, however. Several researchers reported that indirectness was unrelated to pupil achievement, especially in the second through fourth grades (Allen, 1970; Soar, 1968, 1976; Thompson and Bowers, 1968). In studying secondary science, mathematics, and economics, Cook (1967), and Furst (1967) came to the same conclusions. While generally supporting the indirect style, Flanders (1967) also reported mixed results in some cases. Powell (1968) explored the long term effects of exposure to indirect and direct styles. He discovered that the superior effects of exposure to indirect styles decreased over time. Student learning from indirect style teachers for the first three years of their schooling scored higher on arithmetic achievement tests, and about the same on reading achievement tests, as those learning from more direct teachers. However, by the end of the fourth grade, there were no significant differences in the achievement of the two groups, regardless of the student's exposure to either the direct or indirect teaching style. From this information, it did not appear that indirectness was superior in all cases.

The effectiveness of direct/indirect teaching styles on the achievement of fifty-five classrooms of third through sixth grade students was assessed by Soar (1968,). An analysis of the data on reading comprehension, vocabulary, and creativity resulted in no clear evidence in favor of either the direct or indirect styles. It was hypothesized that the level of thinking/reasoning required in different learning tasks is related to different optimum levels of indirectness. In addition, there

was an upper limit to the degree of indirectness that was associated with student academic gain, and beyond that point, students would actually learn less rather than more.

Along this same line, Bennett (1976) studied the informal/formal dimensions of teacher effectiveness. Selecting a sample of third and fourth year primary teachers which reflected these styles, Bennett followed the progress of their students for one year. Analysis of pre- and post-test achievement scores showed the following results:

Reading: Students taught by formal and mixed styles showed significantly superior progress as compared with those taught by informal styles.

Mathematics: Students taught by formal styles showed significantly superior progress to that of those taught by mixed and informal styles.

English: Students taught by formal styles showed significantly superior progress as compared with those taught by mixed and informal styles. Mixed students also showed progress significantly superior to that of informal students.

Bennett's results revealed that pupils taught by formal styles, and in some cases mixed styles, made greater progress than those taught by informal styles. With a few exceptions, reading in particular, gains were consistent across student achievement levels.

Another variable that has been reported in the literature was the effect of teacher's verbal behavior on academic achievement. Here, too, the evidence was sometimes contradictory. Armento (1977) stated that there was little evidence suggesting which particular teacher verbal behaviors consistently related to student achievement.

Some researchers have found correlations between teacher praise and student gains. Research which showed a positive correlation included a study by Fortune (1967) involving preschool children and a study related to disadvantaged children in kindergarten and first grade completed by Soar (1971). Various samples of third through seventh grade students investigated by Flanders (1970), Perkins (1965), and Wright and Nuthall (1970) reported a positive correlation of praise to student achievement.

Deci (1980) indicated that when students were given positive verbal information or competence feedback on their performance, they were more motivated to return to task. Butler (1987) stated that students who were more involved in a task expressed more interest and scored highest on divergent thinking on a post-test.

In contrast, several researchers have found verbal praise to be unrelated to student achievement at different grade levels. Perkins (1965) found it unrelated to achievement at the second grade level, while Spaulding (1965) reported similar results at the upper elementary level. These results were consistent with findings by Flanders (1970) for middle school students. Rosenshine (1976) found overall teacher praise showed consistent, positive, but low correlations with student achievement. Rosenshine noted that praise of student academic responses had higher correlations than praise for student behavior.

In a study involving 124 fifth grade students, Thompson and Hunnicutt (1962) reported that verbal praise and criticism were equally effective as various work-oriented motivators on a cancellation test. Either was more effective than no extraneous incentives. Findings also showed that praise had a more positive effect with introverts, and that criticism was more effective with extroverts. Silvernail (1979) stated

that mild criticism may be related to achievement in high socioeconomic and academic ability students, but extreme criticism related negatively with student academic gains under all circumstances.

After conducting a large scale field observation study of second and third grade students and their teachers over a two year period, Brophy and Evertson (1976) found only a weak positive relationship between teacher praise and the achievement of students of low socioeconomic status and a tendency for a negative correlation with achievement in students of high socioeconomic status.

Weiner and Kukla (1968) suggested that students with high achievement motivation and academic success records responded better to criticism than to praise. They also stated that students with low achievement motivation and records of academic failure related and responded better to praise.

A strategy found within the work-orientation and investigated through research related to rewards. In relationship to extrinsic rewards, Slavin (1987) found significantly greater achievement in grades 2-12 classes using group rewards compared to classes using no extrinsic rewards. Slavin's (1988) position was that extrinsic rewards promoted student motivation and learning.

Harter (1981) found that intrinsically motivated elementary children in grades three through six manifested greater actual achievement than did the extrinsically (reward) oriented student. Schaps and Lewis (1991) stated that extrinsic rewards were not needed to stimulate students' engagement and perseverance. Rather, the rewards may undermine intrinsic motivation.

Clifford (1990) held a similar view. She stated that rewards were a

form of constraint, and that intrinsic motivation and performance deteriorated when external constraints such as evaluation by others, deadlines, threats, bribes and rewards were emphasized. This belief was also held by Boggiano and Main (1986) who reported that means-end contingencies decreased interest in the first task and increased interest in the second task.

Externally imposed constraints, including material rewards, decreased task interest, reduced creativity, hindered performance, and encouraged passivity on the part of the learner (Lepper and Hodell, 1989). Kruglanski (1977) added that imposed constraints prompted students to exert the minimum amount of effort to obtain the maximum amount of reward. Newby (1991) reported that students in classrooms where either rewards or punishment were delivered were observed to have lower levels of on-task behaviors.

Referring to several research findings, Deci (1980) indicated that rewards appeared, under some circumstances, to undermine motivation that was originally intrinsic. Rosenfield (1980) reported that rewards administered as primarily informational tended to increase intrinsic motivation, whereas rewards administered in a controlling manner tended to have no effect or a negative effect on a student's motivation to learn. Harter (1981) conducted a classroom motivation study and reported that rewards administered by a control oriented teacher and seen as controlling had a detrimental effect on intrinsic motivation.

Chance (1993) stated that the decline of motivation due to rewards occurs only under certain conditions. Rewards reduced motivation to achieve when given without regard to performance or when the performance standard was too high for students to consistently succeed.

When students had a high rate of success and the successes were rewarded, the rewards did not create a negative effect. Chance concluded that extrinsic rewards could either enhance or reduce interest and motivation to achieve depending on how they were used.

In regard to teacher control and creative writing tasks, Boyer (1970) stated that students of teachers with low creativity, using controlling and correcting methods, did not do as well on creative writing tasks as they had before they were taught by such teachers.

Grossnickle (1988) cited achievement motivation training courses for adolescents in grades six through twelve which contained aspects of the learning oriented strategies. Although no conclusive evidence was established to prove that academic motivation training actually raises grades or improves daily class performance as measured by tests, etc., long range life management skills were shown to be effectively developed. Indirect benefits included: improved attendance, positive attitude towards studies and school, and problem-solving/planning skills to enhance self-esteem through goal setting and risk-taking efforts.

Similar to the focus of the learning orientation, a study on a procedure termed Immediate Feedback System (Griffin, 1989) focused on providing seventh grade students with immediate feedback in regard to progress, stimulating self-motivating achievement, providing a goal setting stimulus for future academic progress, and increasing student responsibility. Griffin reported one third of students using Immediate Feedback System, as compared to a control group where the teacher retained control of learning and grades, increased their grades by one or more letter grades as measured by teacher graded tests. Furthermore, at the end of a six-week grading period, the class had one-fourth fewer

failures. When the control group was later treated with the same Feedback System, students showed similar increases in achievement.

To build a conceptualization of student motivation to learn and how it is influenced by various teacher strategies, Marshall (1987) explored the strategies in three fifth grade classrooms with three different orientations toward motivation and learning. Although Marshall highlighted the learning orientation, his report of the findings of prior-year and year-end achievement scores, based on grade equivalent scores, stated a .92 mean gain in the learning orientation compared to a 1.57 gain in the work-oriented classroom.

While research to date has indicated a linkage between teacher motivational orientations and strategies that specifically affect a student's motivation to learn and thus academic achievement, research has not yet endorsed one strategy over another. Research did, however, indicate that teacher motivational strategies affect, positively or negatively, student academic achievement.

Chapter 3

Method

The review of literature revealed that teacher motivational strategies do affect student academic achievement. Based on this information, it was decided that a study could be conducted to investigate the effects of the learning-oriented and the work-oriented teacher strategies on academic achievement.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were the entire population of the seventh grade Kiowa team language arts students (68 students, ages 11-14) enrolled at Mahaffey Middle School, Ft. Campbell, Kentucky. Fort Campbell is a military base, and the children who attended Mahaffey Middle School were from a mixed cultural background - Caucasian (non Hispanic), African American, Hispanic, Korean, Guamanian, Asian, German, and Polynesian. English was the primary language of all the subjects. The students were children of the upper officer and middle enlisted ranks. Of the 68 Kiowa language arts students, 53% were boys.

The subjects were already divided into four existing classes. The four classes were equally divided into two groups based on the third quarter raw score mean of each class and the class mean on last year's 1993 California Achievement Test language arts composite score, so that each group was equivalent in terms of group raw score mean, range of individual raw scores, and number of students. One group was randomly assigned to receive teacher strategies supporting the learning

orientation (see appendix A). The remaining group was designated as the control group, receiving work-oriented strategies (see appendix B) based on reward and punishment.

Instrument

Because of the limited time available for execution of this study, the raw score mean became the measuring unit for this study. Effectiveness of the learning orientation strategies was determined by comparing the mean of the raw scores of three objective tests for each group. Textbook objective tests utilized to evaluate student learning of the studied concepts were published by McDougal, Littell, and Company.

Design

The design utilized in this study was the nonequivalent control group design (see Table 1). This design was chosen because it was not possible to randomly assign subjects to groups. Although existing groups were used, it was possible to make the groups equivalent in terms of group raw score means, range of individual raw scores and number of students. Third quarter raw score means were used as a pretest and as a means for checking initial group equivalence. Groups were randomly assigned a treatment.

Table 1

Nonequivalent control group design

<u>Group</u>	<u>Assignment</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Pretest</u>	<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Post test</u>
1	existing group	34	3rd quarter raw scores	Regular instructional program-work oriented strategies	4th quarter test score
2	existing group	34	3rd quarter raw scores	Regular instructional program - learning-oriented strategies	4th quarter test score

Procedure

At the end of the third quarter of the 1993-'94 school year, third quarter raw score means were calculated for individual students and for each seventh grade language arts class as a whole. Individual 1993 California Achievement Test language arts total composite scores were also ascertained, and the mean calculated for each class. The four existing seventh grade classes were then divided into two groups. Each group was composed of two classes, with the group composition selected on the basis of the means of the third quarter raw score. Each of the two groups were equivalent in regard to the group raw score mean, raw score range of individual students within the group, and number of students.

Based on the toss of a coin, one group was randomly selected as the experimental group to receive the learning orientation strategies. The remaining group became the control group, receiving work-related, performance oriented teacher strategies based on reward and punishment. Although two existing classes were considered a group, each class continued to meet as a separate class due to the existing school schedule of classes.

During the nine week time period of this study, all classes met in the same classroom. All students received forty-five minutes of language arts instruction per day. Both groups were taught by the same teacher, participated in the same curriculum, and used the same textbook, materials, and tests. The groups differed only in the teacher motivational strategies employed in the classroom (See appendix A,B).

At the end of the fourth quarter, the raw score mean for objective tests was calculated for each student. The mean was then computed for each group, and the means compared using a t-test for independent samples and a .05 probability level. While ideally, subjects should have been exposed to the experimental treatment for a longer period of time in order to accurately assess its effectiveness, it was only possible to conduct this study for nine weeks.

Chapter 4

Presentation of Data

Third quarter language arts raw scores were obtained for all subjects. Examination of the means, as well as a t-test for independent sample ($p = .05$) indicated the groups were equivalent in language arts classroom achievement at the end of the third quarter of the 1993-94 school year (see Table 2). Random assignment of classes to groups made the t-test for independent samples the appropriate test of significance.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-Tests for Learning-Oriented Group and Work-Oriented Group (Control Group).

Test	Group		<i>t</i>
	Experimental	Control	
(Pretest)			^a
<u>M</u>	83.44	83.41	.0145
<u>SD</u>	9.16	7.81	
(Post test)			^b
<u>M</u>	78.97	74.32	1.13
<u>SD</u>	11.82	20.93	

Note : Maximum score = 100

(a) $df = 66, p > .05$

(b) $df = 66, p > .05$

At the end of the fourth quarter ,the last week in May, test scores for three objective tests were totaled and raw score means were calculated for all students in the study. A t-test for independent samples was again used to compare the language arts scores of the two groups. Results showed that the means for the two groups did not differ significantly (see Table 2). Therefore, the original hypothesis that there is no difference in the academic classroom achievement between students in a seventh grade language arts learning-oriented classroom and those in a work-oriented classroom was supported.

Although the overall means of the two groups did not differ significantly, analysis of the means for each individual test showed the two groups to differ significantly on the final test given after nine weeks of implementing the experimental learning-oriented strategies (see Table 3). Based on the final test's maximum score of one hundred, the learning-oriented group achieved a mean of 86.03, whereas the work-related group mean was 76.03. In testing the significance of the difference between these two means, a significant difference ($t=2.16$) was found in favor of the learning-oriented group. Results of the final test did not support the original hypothesis.

Table 3

Test Means and t Score for Learning-Oriented and Work-Oriented (Control) Groups

Test	Time after implementing treatment	Group		t
		Experimental	Control	
#1 M	3 weeks	74.21	73.53	
#2 M	6 weeks	83.91	81.71	
#3 M	9 weeks	86.03	76.03	2.16

Note: for each test
Maximum score = 100
df = 66, $p < .05$

Chapter 5

Discussion

This study was an effort to determine the influence of teacher motivational orientations upon the language skill development and academic achievement of seventh grade students. Results of this study supported the research hypothesis; there was no significant difference in the academic classroom achievement between seventh grade language arts students in a learning-oriented classroom and a work-oriented classroom. The results were consistent with those of Griffen (1989), Grossnickle (1988), and Rosenshine (1976).

This finding indicated that these orientations or preferences toward learning could be more stable in students than educators might like to believe. Students may have formed performance or learning orientations with respect to academic work early in their school years. As students continued through the grades, they adapted to the demands of the school culture, which typically reinforced a performance orientation.

Although overall results of this investigation showed no significant difference, it should be noted that comparison of individual tests showed a significant difference between the two groups on the test given after nine weeks of implementing this study. The group mean on the final test was greater for the learning-oriented group (mean=86.03) than for the work-oriented group and statistical analysis of these two means resulted in a significant difference ($t=2.16$) in favor of the learning orientation. Several implications might be drawn from the improvement of the learning orientation group compared to the performance orientation group on the final test scores.

One implication suggests that time and maturation are factors in the effectiveness of learning-oriented strategies on classroom academic achievement of seventh grade language arts students. Although student motivation to learn cannot be taught as directly as a concept or a skill, there is the potential for it to be developed in students over time by teachers who systematically socialize their students using learning-oriented strategies as part of a larger package of appropriate curriculum and instruction. This would suggest that student motivation to learn and its activation in particular situations is an acquired competence developed through general experience but stimulated directly through modeling, communication of expectations, and direct instruction or socialization by teachers. It further implies that students adapt to the particular teaching orientation and suggests student motivation to learn is sensitive to environmental manipulation

A second implication is that in certain situations or with certain populations, a work orientation may be more adaptive. Situations occur for students, such as those requiring guidance in the mastery of new skills, in which a work orientation would initially be the most realistic. In such situations, one would predict a shift towards the learning orientation as one internalized the knowledge, the information, and the rules necessary to perform the skill.

The results of this study by no means completely clarify the relationship of teacher motivational orientation to student academic achievement, but they are never-the-less interesting. Seventh grade students continue to be a diverse collection of talents, personalities, aspirations, and skills which require the teacher to occasionally assess his motivational orientation in relationship to student academic

achievement. Implication of this effort was to increase teachers' awareness of their classroom behavior and motivational orientation as a means for greater student growth and achievement in language arts instruction. Further research would be necessary before endorsing one orientation over another.

Appendix A

Learning-Oriented Strategies

Learning-Oriented Strategies

1. Teacher emphasizes to students the meaningfulness, value, and benefits of learning concepts and skills in order to engage students in academic tasks.
2. Teacher introduces lessons with a motivational statement or activity.
3. Teacher uses motivational statements to challenge students to use their minds or to keep students focused on tasks.

Examples: a.) "Get your brain started... You're going to think."

b.) "I challenge you."

c.) "I'm going to trick you."

d.) "Don't be fooled."

e.) "Look bright-eyed and bushy-tailed."

f.) "I can hear the wheels (brain) turning."

g.) "You may be next."

h.) "Be creative."

i.) "Ready: Look alert."

4. Teacher challenges class to try to attain a certain standard of excellence.
5. Teacher personalizes beliefs, attitudes, or experiences to illustrate the importance of a task.
6. Teacher ties the task to the personal lives or interests of the students.
7. Teacher expresses interest in students' opinions.
8. Teacher presents some tasks in game form or include humor, such as silly sentences.
9. Teacher allows students a choice of topics.

10. Teacher expresses positive expectations that students can do tasks.
11. Teacher models behavior for students.
Example - "I'm doing heavy thinking."
12. Teacher shows enthusiasm for task.
13. Students keep a daily assignment/grade folder which allows them to check their progress at anytime and encourages student responsibility for learning.
14. Teacher states the purpose of a task.
15. Class discussions center on learning rather than just performing.
16. Teacher teases in a kind manner and threats in jest concerning behavior.
17. Teacher includes statements of continuity with previous lessons.

Appendix B

Work-Oriented Strategies

Work-Related Strategies

1. Teacher attempts to motivate students to complete their for exogenous reasons (reward or punishment). Emphasis is on performing (completing a task) rather than on learning.

2. Use of individual rewards for daily task completion.

Examples: a.) free time- game playing, use of classroom computer free reading, or working on homework for another class.

 b.) pass to school library

 c.) pass to school computer room

 d.) do school related errands for teacher

3. Use of group reward for weekly completion of all tasks by all students.

Examples: a.) a treat such as candy or gum

 b.) game playing or free time on last day of the week for all students in individual classes

 c.) no homework on last day of the week

4. Use of discipline policy for individual student's incompleteness of all tasks. All offenses documented.

 a.) first offense - verbal warning

 b.) second offense - after school detention

 c.) third + offenses - in-school suspension (i.s.s.) for language class time only in order to complete work

 d.) behavioral problems - Student is removed from the the classroom and sent to in-school suspension or to the principal's office.

5. Teacher uses matter-of-fact statements such as "Open your books to

page 132," or "All right, quickly, let's correct the first exercise."

6. Teacher uses motivational statements referring to external sources such as accountability, time limits, and demands.

Examples:

- a.) "The test is Thursday."
- b.) "You have ten minutes left to complete the assignment."
- c.) The assignment must be completed by class tomorrow.

7. Teacher uses examples of students who are doing their work in order to encourage work completion.

Example: "Five students are almost finished."

Appendix C
Letter to Parents

LETTER TO PARENTS

TO: Parents and Guardians of Seventh Grade Kiowa Students

FROM: Jolene Jenkins, Kiowa Language Arts Teacher

RE: Learning-Oriented and Work-Oriented Strategies

Dear Parent or Guardian:

As a degree requirement an investigation during the fourth quarter is being made into the effects of the learning-oriented and work-oriented strategies on the classroom achievement of seventh grade Kiowa language arts students. Your response will greatly enhance the possibility for success in this research.

During this investigation the Kiowa language arts students will remain in their present classes but be considered as two groups. Each group will receive the same instruction and use the same textbook. The groups will differ only in regard to the teacher strategies used to foster academic achievement.

While your cooperation is most urgently requested, your child's participation is completely voluntary. The data acquired from this investigation will not be used for any other purpose than for this specific investigation. You may refuse your child's participation without any negative consequences whatsoever.

With these assurances I sincerely hope that you will allow your child to participate in the research investigation. Please respond by checking either the yes or no blanks at the bottom of this page and returning your response by Friday, March 3, 1994. If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at Mahaffey Middle School.

Thank you for your participation in this study.

_____ Yes, my child _____ may participate in this investigation.

_____ No, my child _____ may not participate in this investigation.

Parent Signature

List of References

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Allen D.I. 1970. "Some Effects of Advance Organizers and the Level of Questions on the Learning and Retention of Written Social Studies Material." Journal of Educational Psychology, 61,333-339.
- Ames, C. 1990. "Motivation: What Teachers Need to Know." Teachers College Record, 91, 409-421.
- Armento, B.J. 1977. "Teachers Behaviors Related to Student Achievement on a Social Studies Concept Test." Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 46-52.
- Becker, H.S., Geir, B., and Hughes, E. 1968. Making the Grade: the Academic Side of College Life. New York: Wiley.
- Bennett, N. 1976. Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Boggiano, A.K. and Main, D.S. 1986. "Enhancing Children's Interest in Activities Used as Rewards: The Bonus Effect." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1116-1126.
- Boyer, J.L. 1970. "Research Related to Academic Achievement: An Illustrative Review." Theory Into Practice, 9 (1), 33-45.
- Brophy, J. 1983. "Conceptualizing Student Motivation." Educational Psychologist, 18, 200-215.
- Brophy, J. 1987. "Synthesis of Research on Strategies for Motivating Students to Learn." Educational Leadership, October, 40-48.
- Brophy J. and Evertson, C. 1976. Learning from Teaching: A Developmental Perspective. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Butler, R. 1987. "Task-Involving and Ego-Involving Properties of Evaluation: Effects of Different Feedback Conditions on Motivational Perceptions, Interest and Performance." Journal of Educational Psychology, 79 (4), 474-482.
- Campbell, J.R. 1971. "Cognitive and Affective Process Development and Its Relation to a Teacher's Interaction Ratio." Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 8 (4), 317-323.
- Chance, P. 1993. "The Hidden Treasures of Extrinsic Rewards." Phi Delta Kappan, 58, 42-46.

- Christophel, D.M. 1990. "Relationship Among Teacher Immediacy Behaviors, Student Motivation, and Learning." Communication Education, 39 (4), 323-340.
- Clifford, M.M. 1990. "Students Need Challenge, Not Easy Success." Educational Leadership, 48 (1), 22-26.
- Cook, R.E. 1967. Effects of Teacher Methodology Upon Certain Achievements of Students in Secondary School Biology." Dissertation Abstract 28, Issue 08A, 3066.
- Deci, E.L. 1980. The Psychology of Self-Determination. Lexington, Massachusetts : Heath.
- Dweck, C.S. 1986. "Motivational Processes Affecting Learning." American Psychologist, 41 (10), 1040-1048.
- Ediger, M. 1982. "Milestones in Motivation." Educational Leadership, 39, 42-43.
- Evertson, C.M. 1978. "Texas Junior High School Study: Final Report of Process-Outcome Relationships. Austin: University of Texas. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 173 744.)
- Flanders, N.A. 1970. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Flanders, N.A. 1967. "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement." In Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research and Application, edited by E.J. Amidon and J.B. Hough. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 217-242.
- Fortune, J.C. 1967. A Study of the Generalities of Presenting Behaviors in Teaching. Project No. 6-8468. U.S. Office of Education. Memphis: Memphis State University.
- Furst, N.F. 1967. "The Multiple Languages of the Classroom." Paper presented at Annual Conference of American Educational Research Association. New York.
- Griffen, N.C. 1989. "Immediate Feedback." Middle School Journal, January, 21-23.
- Grossnickle, D.R. 1988. "Achievement Motivation Skill Training: Assisting Unmotivated Students." NASSP Bulletin, January, 24-27.
- Harter, S. 1981. "A New Self-Report Scale of Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic

Orientation in the Classroom: Motivational and Informational Components." Developmental Psychology, 17, 300-312.

Hunter, C.P. 1968. "Classroom Climate and Pupil Characteristics in Special Classes for the Educationally Handicapped." Dissertation Abstract, 29, issue 03A, 0814.

Kruglanski, A., Stein, C., and Ritter, A. 1977. "Contingencies of Exogenous Reward and Task Performance on the 'Minimax' Strategy in Instrumental Behavior." Journal of Applied Social Psychology 2, 141-148.

Lepper, M.R. and Hodell, M. 1989. "Intrinsic Motivation in the Classroom." In Motivation in Education, vol. 3, edited by C. Ames and R. Ames. New York: Academic Press.

Marshall, H. 1987. "Building a Learning Orientation." Theory Into Practice, 26, 8-14.

Marshall, H. 1987. "Motivational Strategies of Three Fifth-Grade Teachers." Elementary School Journal, 88 (2), 135-150.

Newby, T.J. 1991. "Classroom Motivation: Strategies of First Year Teachers." Journal of Educational Psychology, 83 (2), 195-200.

Perkins, H.D. 1965. "Classroom Behavior and Underachievement." American Educational Research Journal, 2, 1-12.

Powell, E.R. 1968. "Teacher Behavior and Pupil Achievement." Paper presented at Annual Conference of American Educational Research Association. Chicago.

Pratton, J. and Hales, L. 1986. "The Effects of Active Participation on Student Learning." Journal of Educational Research, 79 (4), 210-215.

Rosenfield, D., Folger, R., and Adelman, H.F. 1980. "When Rewards Reflect Competence: A Qualification of the Overjustification Effect." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39 (3), 368-376.

Rosenshine, B. 1976. "Recent Research on Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement." Journal of Teacher Education, 27 (1), 61-65.

Samph, Thomas. 1974. "Teacher Behavior and the Reading Performance of Below-Average Achievers." Journal of Educational Research, 67 (6), 268-270.

Schaps, E. and Lewis, C. 1991. "Extrinsic Rewards are Education's Past, Not It's Present." Educational Leadership, 48 (7), 81.

- Silvernail, D. 1979. "Teaching Styles as Related to Student Achievement." Washington D.C.: National Education Association. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 177 156)
- Slavin, R.E. 1987. "Cooperative Learning: Where Behavioral and Humanistic Approaches to Classroom Motivation Meet." Elementary School Journal, 88 (1), 29-35.
- Slavin, R.E. 1988. "Group Rewards Make Groupwork Work". Educational Leadership, 48, 89-93.
- Slavin, R.E. 1988. "Cooperative Learning and Student Achievement". Educational Leadership, 46 (2), 31-33.
- Soar, R.S. 1968. "Optimum Teacher-Pupil Interaction for Pupil Growth." Educational Leadership, 26 275-280.
- Soar R.S. 1971. "The Validation of an Observation System for Classroom Management." Paper presented a Annual Conference of American Educational Research Association. New York.
- Soar, R.S. and Soar, R.M. 1976. "An Attempt to Identify Measures of Teacher Effectiveness From Four Studies." Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 261-267.
- Spaulding, R.L. 1965. Achievement, Creativity, and Self-Concept Correlates of Teacher-Pupil Transactions in Elementary School Classrooms. Project No. 1352. U.S. Office of Education. Hempstead, New York: Hofstra University.
- Thompson, G.R. and Bowers, N.C. 1968. "Fourth Grade Achievement as Related to Creativity, Intelligence and Teaching Style." Paper presented at Annual Conference of American Educational Research Association. Chicago.
- Thompson, G.R. and Hunnicutt, C. 1962. "The Effect of Repeated Praise or Blame on the Work Achievement of Introverts and Extroverts." Readings in Educational Psychology. edited by Victor Noll and Rachel P. Noll. New York: MacMillan Company.
- Weber, W.A. 1968. "A Relationship Between Teacher Behavior and Pupil Creativity in the Elementary School." Dissertation Abstract, 29, issue 01A, 0159.
- Weiner, B. and Kukla, R. 1970. "An Attributional Analysis of Achievement Motivation," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15, 1-20.

- Wolfson, M.L. 1973. "A Consideration of Direct and Indirect Teaching Styles With Respect to Achievement and Retention of Learning in Science Classes." Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 10 (4), 285-290.
- Wright, C.J. and Nuthall, G. 1970. "Relationships Between Teacher Behaviors and Pupil Achievement in Three Experimental Elementary Science Lessons." American Educational Research Journal, 7 (4), 477-491.