How do Different Types of Goals and Feedback Affect Student Motivation in Latin?

by Harriet Hoath, Winner of the Roman Society PGCE Research Prize 2015

Context

This research studies whether different types of motivation have an effect on students' attitudes towards their own ability and success. This is assessed through a comparison of *process goals* and *performance goals* within a series of lessons, terms which have been adapted from the research of Dweck & Leggett (1988), amongst others as cited in the literature review. A study of such research has revealed that generally *intrinsic motivation* as 'doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable' is preferable (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55), and that this is encouraged through a focus on the process of an activity rather than an ultimate goal. The main issue here is whether students work more effectively if this goal is not made obvious to them during a lesson. The suggested benefit of focussing on *process* rather than *performance* is that students are encouraged to recognise enjoyment in each task, so that they spend time and effort improving their skills. In contrast a performance focus increases the chances of choosing an easy task or rushing through a piece of work in order to obtain the results expected (Dweck, 1999). Furthermore performance feedback seems more summative and less helpful for future work (Corpus & Lepper, 2007); comments such as "Well done you did it!" provide nothing useful,

while process feedback reflects upon skills which can be applied repeatedly.

This study took place at a school where Latin is an additional subject for high achievers. Because of this every year group has a lesson either before or after the normal school day - a clear reason for considering students' motivation. At the school every lesson begins with a *Learning Objective* which the students copy down as the first way in which they establish what they will be learning. This is therefore a key element in their motivation for the duration of the lesson and something that has been taken into account when planning the sequence.

The students are a Year 7 class of fifteen who have been studying Latin for seven weeks, having been selected as high achievers. The school is a mixed comprehensive state school in West London with generally good levels of progress, and a relatively high percentage of students on free school meals and with SEN statements (Ofsted, 2013). Because of the selection process for this class, so far all students have responded well to the course and none have been noted as underachieving. A focus group of six students who all gained the same grade (2a) in their most recent assessment has been selected, so that any results are less likely to be affected by students' ability. All students have been anonymised and are henceforth referred to as Students 1-6.

Literature Review

Types of motivation

Although subtle, there are differences in the way studies have defined types of motivation. Ryan & Deci (2000) use the terms *intrinsic* and *extrinsic*, stating the former as 'doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable' and the latter as 'doing something because it leads to a separable outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55) They insist strictly on their definitions, so that any task completed with a goal in mind becomes extrinsic, even if it is something seemingly positive, such as working hard in order to succeed in a chosen career (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 60). In a Classics context, this would mean intrinsically motivated students learnt vocabulary and grammar because they enjoyed the experience of learning, rather than in order to do well in assessments: an ideal situation, but not necessarily common.

The limit for intrinsic motivation has become more restricted in recent years. In a previous article, Benware & Deci (1984) had compared students learning in order to be tested with those learning in order to teach, discovering that the latter situation was most likely to 'facilitate intrinsic motivation' (Benware & Deci, 1984, p. 756) The problem here is that the motivation of teaching would present this 'separable outcome' (Ryan & Deci,

2000, p. 55) and so although the learning may appear more engaging and thorough, it is still extrinsic according to the definitions established in 2000. For languages specifically, in 1994 Dornyei explained Gardner's differences in motivation as the desire to interact with and even become similar to valued members of [a] community' versus 'the […] gains of […] getting a better job or a higher salary' (Dornyei, 1994, p. 274). Both present a separable outcome which makes no reference to the enjoyment of learning. Ryan & Deci (2000) provide no clear explanation for the increased severity, but it seems to make intrinsic motivation more of an abstract concept and one which cannot be realistically found in most teaching and learning. When our education system is focussed heavily on exams and achievement and most lessons begin with a *Learning Objective*, there is often some form of goal or outcome towards which the students must strive. Hattie & Timperley (2007) controversially say that 'learning experiences do not necessarily begin by asking "what are the goals?"' (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p.103) – a statement which, in the context of the classroom, might be questioned. In fact anyone setting out to learn anything would most likely have some idea of what they want to achieve as a result. However Ryan & Deci (2000) also describe something called 'integrated regulation' (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 62) involving self-determination of motivation; this is the best a teacher can hope for from extrinsically motivated students. It seems to require the student ensuring that whatever they aim for is something they have chosen themselves. This is perhaps a more realistic state for teachers to encourage among their students.

Types of goal

Dweck and Leggett (1988) establish two different types of goal as *performance* and *learning* which have clear parallels with extrinsic and intrinsic motivations. The former has students 'concerned with gaining favourable judgements of their competence' while the latter means they 'are concerned with increasing their competence' (Dweck & Leggett, 1988, p. 256). Although the learning goal involves an outcome, it is more focussed on the process of a task rather than the end result,

which is what a teacher might expect from intrinsically motivated students.

The article also use the terms '*helpless* and *mastery-oriented*' to describe different types of student (Dweck & Leggett, 1988, p. 257); the former prefers to avoid challenging tasks while the latter generally attempts and even enjoys a challenge. Later in the article *helpless* students are associated with performance goals, and *mastery-oriented* students with learning goals: 'Helpless children might be pursuing the performance goal of *proving* their ability, whereas the mastery-oriented children might be pursuing the learning goal of *improving* their ability' (Dweck & Leggett, 1988, p. 259). The issue with these definitions, however, is that it can never be absolutely certain what type of orientation a student has because there is no test which supplies a definite analysis. Furthermore Dweck & Leggett (1988) appear to work on the assumption that the helpless versus mastery labels are inflexible, and supply strict categories for each child; an assumption which is in itself defeatist and allows little room for motivation to have any effect. It might be hoped that through the right kind of support from a teacher, students could shift their attitude from helpless to mastery-oriented.

Setbacks to intrinsic motivation

When these different forms of motivation are considered, it appears that intrinsic learning and generally process-based motivation is preferable. It seems fair to assume that teachers would like their students to want to work without a need for rewards. The next question is to what extent a teacher's reaction affects the type of motivation the students display. Two extreme viewpoints arise in an interview with Kohn (Brandt, 1995) and Dweck's (1999) article on the dangers of praise. Kohn states explicitly that 'the more you reward someone for doing something, the less interest that person will tend to have in whatever he or she was rewarded to do' (Brandt, 1995, p. 2). He makes several controversial statements such as this, but then fails to provide specific examples of how he knows this is happening. He also states that 'rewards are most damaging to interest when the task is already intrinsically motivating' (Brandt, 1995, p. 2); he has a lot of faith in students wanting to accomplish tasks solely for the

enjoyment in the task; but the classroom is not necessarily this ideal world. To support this, an interesting point Kohn makes is that 'motivation is something that kids start out with' (Brandt, 1995, p. 2), explaining that grades and rewards have damaged the chances of intrinsic motivation. Exams are a necessity for the summative assessment of qualifications, and perhaps this has caused students always to expect a palpable achievement after putting effort into anything. Indeed, this is also the cause of 'teaching to the test' (Harrison, 2011, p. 224), a dramatic form of extrinsic motivation, which destroys the hope of 'teaching for understanding' (Harrison, 2011, p. 224) the preferable intrinsic method. Rewards, merits, gold stars and praise throughout education anticipate the reward of good grades that students will eventually be hoping for. Unfortunately, there is no way of proving Kohn's point, unless students begin their education with no rewards from their teachers, and continue in this manner. This is clearly something that no-one is brave enough – or mean enough – to attempt.

Types of praise: process preferable to performance

Dweck supplies further persuasive reasons as to why praise is dangerous for a child's motivation. Either a student is 'maladaptive' and 'obsessed with their intelligence' (Dweck, 1999. p. 2) and therefore sees praise as condescending and embarrassing, or a student is 'adaptive' and focussed on 'the effort and strategies they need in order to master the task' (Dweck, 1999, p. 2) and could therefore become dependent on constantly being reminded of their intelligence. A focus is placed on how the *type* of praise can affect the attitude of the student, and Dweck reveals some telling results. Students who were praised in an experiment because of their intelligence ("you must be smart at this") then chose to complete an easy task which would continue to demonstrate their ability, while those praised according to effort ("you must have worked really hard") opted for a more challenging activity. These results demonstrate that in some situations, process-focussed praise will encourage students to reflect on their strategy rather than their ability, which leads to a desire for challenge in order to challenge their strategic skills again. In

addition to this, Hattie and Temperley (2007) state that 'feedback is among the most critical influences on student learning': it should draw attention to 'the regulatory processes needed to engage with a task' rather than 'the self' (Hattie & Temperley, 2007, pp. 102-3). If a student has received praised based on their ability, they may well begin to believe that this is the most important aspect of their learning, rather than the concept of overcoming challenges in order to improve. Corpus and Lepper (2007) add further value to this argument, explaining that 'praise for a person is almost necessarily more general than praise for a performance, and thus there are more grounds for rejecting such praise', and also that *process praise* provides 'more detailed information about competence and effective problem-solving strategies that children can apply to similar situations in the future' (Corpus & Lepper, 2007, p. 488). Successful process praise needs to be specific and useful to avoid it becoming just another form of summative assessment.

There are more concerning risks when deciding on the right type of praise. As Dweck (1999) says of students praised according to ability, when facing a challenge,

> '[…] their difficulties led them to question their intelligence….The same students who had been told they were smart when they succeeded now felt dumb because they had encountered a setback'. (Dweck, 1999, p. 2).

This striking evidence suggests that ability-based praise forces students into the performance mind-set, avoiding challenge because they are afraid of the outcome. This also links in with the different types of motivation: if a teacher responds to a student's work by focussing on their effort rather than the ultimate goal of intelligence, then perhaps they begin themselves to see the rewards in working on a task for the sake of working on it. If there is a hope of having intrinsically motivated students, this appears to be the best place to start.

Types of praise: problems with process

A contradictory argument for the dangers of process-based feedback has been

found. Harari and Covington (1981) believe that praising a student for the amount of effort they put in can be interpreted as an insult to their intelligence because there is a 'student preoccupation with ability' and effort is 'perceived by students as counter-indicative of ability' (Harari & Covington, 1981, p. 26). The results of an experiment in Miller and Hom, Jr. (1997) are concurrent with this. Having been asked to choose whether they would prefer to be a praised or criticised child, it was more likely for older children to opt for the latter. Perhaps the controversial nature of this makes it even more believable. The arguments provided for not praising based on process are two-fold: firstly that the student thinks that praise means they have achieved more than is usually expected of them, and secondly that if they are praised for making more effort it means they have lower natural ability. Students want to do well without having to work hard (Miller & Hom, Jr. 1997, pp. 173-4). Perhaps, therefore, for some students teacher negativity means they have not performed to the best of their ability, which must be assumed by the student to be naturally high. Brophy (1979) also states that

> 'Praise as a consolation prize or encouragement […] is directed toward certain kinds of students whom the teachers believe need encouragement. It may well be effective in the long run'. (Brophy, 1979, p. 18).

This introduces the possibility of praise as support, rather than a more active motivation. This means that students might see praise as an indication of lower ability because those who benefit from this are 'teacher dependent but slow and plodding' (Brophy, 1979, p. 18). Some form of positive comment may be what they need, but it is inevitably clear that this is the type of student no-one wants to be. However, Harari and Covington's claim of the 'preoccupation with ability' (Harari & Covington, 1981, p. 26) is perhaps what teachers should be aiming to reduce, so that process-based praise can be taken constructively rather than as an insult. A focus on process and the avoidance of mentioning ability from the beginning of every lesson might help change students' attitudes to appreciate

applying strategy and overcoming obstacles. In fact Dweck (1999) mentions the existence of pupils who are not discouraged by an obsession with ability and achievement, as they 'liked [a] more difficult task just as much even though they missed some of the problems (Dweck, 1999, p. 2). Perhaps there is hope that, provided with the right kind of motivation, students could change their attitude.

Solutions

Each form of feedback has both benefits and dangers, but solutions for this are distinctly lacking. Kohn (Brandt, 1995, p. 5) sets out his 'three Cs of motivation': content, community and choice. The second of these is obvious; a child must feel comfortable to ask questions and make mistakes. Choice is also attainable, as a teacher can allow the class to consider how and why they are completing a task. However, when it comes to content, Kohn blames the activity when a student is off-task. It is a little extreme to remove all criticism from the child and base it solely on whatever the task may be: sometimes, no matter what they are doing, some students will not be interested. If this were not the case, we would not be concerned with how to motivate students at all. Dornyei suggests a consideration of different 'classroom goal structures', ranging from 'competitive' to 'individualistic', recommending a 'cooperative' approach so that students can share responsibility for their work (Dornyei, 1994, p. 279). However, in the end there still needs to be some form of individual assessment so that students as well as teachers can establish what learning has occurred.

What seems clear from most research is the important distinction between feedback and praise. Feedback, or process-based praise, is structured, explanatory and helpful. It provides the student with information on what they have done right, or where they have made mistakes. Praise, or specifically performance-based praise, is descriptive and causes the student to focus on their level of ability as a fixed measure (Corpus & Lepper, 2007, p. 488). This latter option is largely pointless; it may well be that students want to be congratulated on their ability but often, whether consciously or subconsciously, this is detrimental. If teachers want to motivate

their students, evidently they should avoid inflexible, conclusive assessments of their potential, and draw their attention to the fact that there is always room for improvement, and the only thing they need to think about is how to make this happen. In my own research I will be assessing how much difference there is between a focus on process and a focus on performance in class. In a series of lessons I will vary the type of objectives and feedback to fit these definitions, in order to see any change in students' attitudes towards their work.

Formative assessment

Formative assessment will vary depending on whether it focusses on process or performance. The use of traffic lights, for example, might make sense in a process-based lesson because students can provide a general evaluation of their confidence, rather than assessing strictly whether they have achieved what they were supposed to. Furthermore, discussion between students must be encouraged in this type of lesson, as Harrison states: 'listening to another student trying to explain […] the advantages and disadvantages of a particular process can help students question their own learning' (Harrison, 2011, p. 225). Therefore in the process portion of my sequence I will be using both of these techniques, as well as providing teacher feedback which explains *how* a student has completed their work. This is a method encouraged by Perrenoud: 'Teachers have a considerable challenge in needing to shift from a traditional view of feedback that is minimal or judgemental […] to one that takes learners forward' (Jones, 2011, p. 154). By describing which skills students have applied in their work, I hope to encourage them to consider these when facing future tasks.

From my own experience, mini-whiteboards have proved useful in establishing students' understanding quickly, and so they will be used in several lessons in order to check any shift in levels of understanding between process and performance-based lessons. Whiteboards may be considered a form of summative assessment, especially when they are used to demonstrate whether students have achieved a learning objective. However, as Jones states, a key feature of formative assessment is 'not being afraid to get it wrong' (Jones, 2011, p. 160), and so in order to do this I will instruct students to raise their whiteboards even if they have only written a portion of the answer, or nothing at all. In performance-focussed lessons whiteboards will be used to select especially high-achieving students in order to give them rewards, and feedback provided in books will only provide students with a basic analysis of their ability, such as "You know lots about the Roman forum!" It is intended that these differences in formative assessment will have a positive effect on how students respond to their learning.

Lesson Sequence

The sequence consisted of six lessons, of which four were 35 minutes, and two an hour each. These will be referred to as lessons 1-6. A range of topics was covered including grammar learning, passage translation and a study of Pompeii's forum. The first half of the lessons was based on processes (Hattie & Temperley, 2007) and so the learning objective and any feedback given focussed on how well the students worked, rather than what they achieved from completing a task. The second half of the lessons was based on performance (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Therefore each learning objective provided a clear goal, and feedback commented explicitly on whether each student had achieved this.

For most lessons a 'cooperative structure' of allowing students to work together (Dornyei, 1994, p. 279) was used in order to encourage them to share responsibility, but checks were also made on how individual students responded to each lesson, with focus placed on attitude towards their own ability and progress. These included a traffic-light check in the second lesson, book marking after the fourth lesson and, most significantly, a questionnaire completed by the students once the sequence had concluded. They would answer this once their books had been marked so that the type of feedback (process / performance) would positively affect their answers. The questions asked were:

• On a scale of 1-5, how much effort do you think you put into each lesson?

• On a scale of 1-5, how much did you achieve in each lesson?

• Rank lessons 1-6 in order of preference.

• Explain what you liked about your favourite/least favourite lesson.

Lesson 1 (35 minutes)

This was the first lesson after the Christmas holidays, and was therefore used to refresh students' memories of grammar. The process-based learning objective read "to apply our knowledge from last term to work on translation" which avoided any suggestion that the aim was to complete the worksheet provided. The starter asked students to discuss key terms like *nominative* and *verb* and the main activity had them identifying these in sentences, followed by short translations. Students peer-marked their work, and were asked to write two sentences of feedback – "one which explains how they worked well, and one which gives them some advice for future translation" (worded thus to avoid any performance-based praise). These instructions were included due to Harrison's recommendation of peer discussion as noted in the literature review (Harrison, 2011, p. 225).

In general, students' focus seemed unaffected by the process-based learning objective and feedback. They worked well throughout the lesson, with most completing the translations and many getting onto the extension task. In the questionnaire, the overall mark for effort was 23 / 25 and for achievement 22 / 25; students could still see that they had worked hard and gained something from this lesson. Furthermore Student 2 listed this as his favourite lesson, explaining that he 'enjoyed learning about a lot of the basic rules in Latin.' This as well as his high attainment in the main activity suggests that he did not lack anything by not having an explicit measure of his achievement; he appears to have enjoyed the activity for the sake of the activity, as Ryan & Deci (2000) would expect from an intrinsically motivated student. These results were the first indication that in order to be motivated these students perhaps did not need an aim towards which they could work.

However, there was a flaw caused by the peer-marking. Students gave each other feedback such as 'You finished the

task' and 'You have a clear understanding of nominatives and accusatives' and advice such as 'Check over your work to make sure everything is right'. This meant that students were praised with regard to the result of the activity, and advised on how to get the most marks in future, rather than being told how impressive their level of effort was or what kind of skills they had used in their work. The questionnaire was then completed after receiving this feedback, so it is a concern that students rated their work so highly because they had been thus provided with a performance-based analysis. This was perhaps detrimental to the process-based nature of the lesson, but interestingly also demonstrated that students find it difficult to avoid assessing their performance, even when the guidance is to do otherwise. As Kohn stated (Brandt, 1995, p. 2), because students have been introduced to the idea of goals from the beginning of their education, they naturally want to figure out what these are for each class. Without prompting, the students had created their own goals of completing the activity and then showing that they understood nominatives and accusatives. This may be considered a positive reaction, as it incorporates Ryan and Deci's encouragement of 'integrated regulation' (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 62), that is, allowing the students to decide what they want to achieve rather than the teacher choosing their goals for them.

A more serious problem with this lesson was that Student 1 ranked it as his least favourite, because 'all we did was writing, and no fun active activities'. This student's work is missing from his book, so the effect on his achievement cannot be noted, but when considering attitude, the focus on process appears to have been monotonous and uninspiring for this particular student, and potentially others.

Lesson 2 (35 minutes)

The process focus of this lesson began with the learning objective "to use our new understanding of verbs." The starter also linked in with this by asking the question: "When meeting a Latin verb, what do we need to consider?" Everything the students did in the lesson would require them to use their skills to the best of their ability, rather than aim

for an obvious goal, such as completing a fixed number of translations or gaining certain knowledge. The first task had them unjumbling Latin verbs into the correct order according to person, the process of which was emphasised by the encouragement of everyone to 'have a go' and not worry about making mistakes. The point was that they attempted the activity, rather than needing to prove knowledge of the correct answer immediately, as in keeping with Jones' encouragement of students 'not being afraid to get it wrong' (Jones, 2011, p. 154). A mini-whiteboard plenary of translating short sentences and transforming verbs from one person to another allowed me to see how well students had grasped verb persons. Only one of these was written into their books to check later, so when students were then asked to reflect on their effort with traffic light cards they had no marks to refer to and therefore had to consider how well they felt they had worked. The options for this check went from 'I remained focussed throughout the lesson' to 'I need to focus more in future', with the majority of students expressing the former through a green card. The most obvious effect of this lesson's set-up was that students collaborated nicely, talking only about their work and feeling confident enough to debate how to approach it. The plenary gave the impression that the class had grasped what was being asked of them, and the focus on process helped here, as all were asked to lift up their boards after a certain time, no matter what they had written down. This relieved the pressure and seemed to have a very positive effect; students relaxed into thinking about what they were doing, and after every question the number of correct translations increased. Furthermore the focus group rated both their effort and achievement as 22 / 25 in the questionnaire; this evidence suggests that a lack of explicit goal and summative marking are unnecessary for students to feel that they have achieved something.

However, Student 2 ranked this lesson as his least favourite, reasoning: 'I prefer doing translations and acting instead of using the whiteboards' and therefore comparing it unfavourably to the performance-based lesson 5. Of course drama would be an obvious preference for these younger students, but the fact that he would have liked to do a

translation in his book instead of whiteboard tasks perhaps hints at a desire to complete something more substantial which can be assessed to show off his ability to perform linguistically. On the other hand it could be that the immediate assessment of whiteboards is more daunting than the delayed marking of a written translation for this particular student. This is where the whiteboards present a flaw for the process-based nature of the lesson: the teacher's reaction in the class is a form of immediate performance-based feedback, and it could in fact be this that some students find detrimental to their motivation. This student could either be 'maladaptive' or 'adaptive' (Dweck, 1999, p. 2), because he could be concerned about receiving positive feedback within the lesson, or perhaps be embarrassed over the potential to be praised in front of his classmates. This is therefore an argument against performance-based motivation, albeit misplaced in a process-based lesson.

Lesson 3 (1 hour)

This was the final lesson in the process-based sequence, and began with the learning objective "to use our Latin skills to read about a Greek merchant". Thus students were not told that the aim was to get to the end of a translation. The starter asked students to advise the character "Bob" on translation, and then a series of tasks had them working on the Latin story *Hermogenes* from the *Cambridge Latin Course*. These included comprehension questions, a choice between translation or gap-fill, and a few discussion questions in order to check understanding of grammar and plot. The final task had students correcting "Bob's" translation, which in hindsight was misplaced in this process-based lesson, as the students discussed how well "Bob" had done rather than why he had made the mistakes he had; these ten minutes therefore disrupted the emphasis on process. Fortunately the plenary brought us back, as the students pondered whether they had taken their own advice in the starter, and what they would add to those suggestions now. The next stage was the feedback given when marking students' books. Comments were made on their translations such as 'you have remained focussed on this task and checked the

endings of those verbs' and 'you have applied your vocab learning', and of course no clear grade was provided.

Students latched onto the consideration of process from the start of the lesson, with many providing relevant advice such as 'check the endings of words' and 'think about word order'. They were able to consider what measures they would take when faced with a Latin text, without requiring a target on which to focus their efforts. Throughout the translation the atmosphere was generally positive and even when students were talking it was usually to discuss interpretations of the Latin. The students also developed personal reactions to the characters in the story, demonstrating a high level of focus by considering what was actually going on in the passage. Most students also opted to challenge themselves without the help of the gap-fill, and marking their books added to this overall positivity, as a mistake was rarely made in translation, and every student except one completed it. Finally the focus group marked their efforts as 22 / 25 and achievements as 24 / 25, showing that this lack of an explicit goal caused no obvious deterioration in their attitude.

However, it must be noted that there were a select few students who became a little distracted during the lesson, including Student 4 of the focus group. Perhaps there was a lack of incentive to get the translation finished, as this had never been stated as the point of the activity. In contrast to the view of Hattie & Timperely (2007), it may be that these students needed to ask 'What are the goals?' in order to increase focus. The attitude of Student 4 in particular will be important to consider in the contrast of performance-focussed lessons.

Lesson 4 (35 minutes)

The first performance-based lesson began with an objective which read "to know 4 things about the forum at Pompeii". This provided students with no information about what they would be doing, or what skills would be needed; it drew their attention to the end result of the lesson. If students did not know four things by the end, they had not achieved the learning objective. It was a risk to make the criteria of achievement so explicit because it

could lead to students questioning their intelligence (Dweck, 1999) if they did not complete this goal, but a reaction such as this would provide clear evidence in favour of process-based lessons.

Students watched a video about the forum and filled in a worksheet. They were told to include as much detail as possible so that their four facts would reflect thorough understanding, and warned that they would assess each other on these. Each marker would decide whether their partner knew enough to blend into the forum as a citizen (writing "ad forum!") or whether they might need to do some more research ("inveni Caecilium!"). Although not so explicit, this marking decided whether they had passed or failed the point of the lesson. Furthermore, when marking books, additional teacher comments maintained the theme of "Good work! You know lots about the forum!" and therefore provided general praise for the 'person' (Corpus & Lepper, 2007, p. 488), rather than any useful information on strategy.

Most students worked efficiently, including much detail in their image labelling as well as their four facts, and most peer-marking concluded with the instruction "ad forum!" However, there were students who did not focus immediately as the video began, and therefore missed out on some significant information, Also, after checking their books, it was clear that some peer-marking was rather lenient. The questionnaire resulted in overall marks of 18 / 25 for both effort and achievement in this lesson, making it the lowest-graded. Both Student 3 and Student 6 chose this as their least favourite lesson, explaining: 'I didn't find it that interesting and it was boring' and 'I didn't really understand about ancient Pompeii but it was interesting'. This lack of motivation appears to be caused by the topic rather than the set-up of the lesson, so does not necessarily suggest that emphasis on performance is detrimental. However, it does provide evidence that explicit goals and performance-focussed praise are not the sole basis of a successful lesson.

Lesson 5 (1 hour)

The second performance-based lesson had students translating and then

performing the Cambridge Latin Course play "in basilica." The learning objective required them "to translate accurately the story of Caecilius and Hermogenes' court case so that we can perform it dramatically!" Instructions throughout the lesson also placed emphasis on accuracy, so that students realised that the point was to get things right, rather than simply to work hard. The first half of the lesson was spent filling in a translation with missing verbs, followed by a short section of pure translation. When some students began to run out of time, another gap-fill was provided for this final section, with the warning that we needed to get to the end in order to perform a complete translation. Thus the lesson had little regard for the process that students were going through: their sole aim was to get this finished. The class was then split into three groups and given time to rehearse the scripts. Performance-based motivation was now explicitly introduced with a material form of 'extrinsic motivation' (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55). Students would vote for the group with the best performance as well as the most accurate translation. Whoever received the most number of votes would be rewarded with the 'separable outcome' (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55) of gold Roman coins to stick in their books. Kohn's belief that 'the more you reward someone for doing something, the less interest that person will tend to have in whatever he or she was rewarded to do' (Brandt, 1995, p. 2) was put to the test here.

Generally they worked hard on this task, and only a few students became distracted. Those who lost focus did so because they were finding the translation difficult, but all but one still chose not to accept an optional support sheet. By the end of the time allowed most students had completed the gap-fill and a few had reached a "vocab hunt" extension task. As soon as students saw the coins, there was uproar and several of them exclaimed that they "must win". The time for rehearsal was spent productively by all, and not a single student became distracted. It is fair to say that the nature of this lesson was relatively unique compared to the others, and that drama may be considered a particularly exciting aspect of any class. However, the students had known from the learning objective at the start that they would be performing this text; the levels of excitement reached their peak at the introduction of the rewards rather than

the nature of the activity. The dramatic performances at the conclusion of the lesson were well-rehearsed, well-spoken, and demonstrated clear understanding of the characters and plot. The questionnaire graded effort at 23 / 25 and achievement at 22 / 25, with the whole focus group rating the lesson highly and three students naming it their favourite.

Unfortunately the questionnaire also provided evidence that the dramatic nature of the lesson was a key factor in students' appreciation, as those who had named it their favourite provided reasons such as 'we did drama' and 'we got to act out which was fun' rather than any mention of achieving the objective of accurate translation. Here perhaps is the issue that Dornyei notes when the 'official goal' differs from that of the students; in fact his example reads 'the goal of a group of students may be to have fun rather than to learn, describing almost exactly what occurred in this lesson (Dornyei, 1994, p. 278). Students appeared to forget the original aim of accurate translation, and instead were mostly concerned with putting on a good show for their peers. On the other hand, this could form an argument in favour of performance goals if the acting itself, rather than the gold coins, is considered the extrinsic reward for completing translation. Students' focussed and cheerful attitude suggests that they were inspired enough to complete the task for the sake of obtaining something else; that is, the reward of putting on a dramatic performance.

However clear evidence for the negative impact of this goal can be seen in the book of Student 1, who only filled in his speaking part for the final translation: clearly he was more interested in acting rather than completing the written work. Furthermore once the lesson was over and a homework translation task had been set, Student 4 requested a support sheet similar to that provided in the lesson; when he was told that this was not an option for homework, he claimed that he would not be able to do it. He had in fact been in the winning dramatic group, but perhaps the underlying objective of reaching an "accurate" translation had remained with him and made his homework seem more of a challenge rather than a potentially pleasant learning process. For him it seems that it would have been more worthwhile to work on strategies he could transfer to his own translation, rather than

demanding he perform successfully both in the lesson and then at home.

Lesson 6 (35 minutes)

The final performance-based lesson began with the objective "to know 3 things about Latin plurals". Any discussion over how we were going to do this or what kind of skills we would apply was avoided, and emphasis was placed heavily on the possibility of gaining gold coins if what they "achieved" was "particularly impressive". Again this was a request for the students to do something for the sake of 'a separable outcome', rather than laying down the expectation that they would just enjoy the activity itself (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55). We studied the model sentences from stage 5, and students were asked to translate the plural sentences, noting down the differences between Latin singular and plural nouns and verbs. They were told that the more detail they could demonstrate at the end of the lesson, the more likely they would be to receive a coin. For the plenary, students wrote rules on mini-whiteboards, and those who had gone into particular detail were selected to show their ideas to the rest of the class, thereby gaining a gold coin for their books.

Generally students worked well, and there was encouraging silence as they were translating the sentences. Everyone was able to deduct grammatical understanding from the Latin without prompting, and interestingly several students raised their hands during the translation to share ideas, even though it was clear that these should be written in their books. This perhaps suggested a desire to prove early accomplishment of the learning objective in order to obtain rewards. The main focus of these students was on what they had been asked to achieve by the end of the lesson, rather than what they were doing in that specific activity; hence the performance goal appeared to be having an effect on how they worked. Additionally at the conclusion of the lesson some students were still determined to explain what they had noticed – albeit incorrect information about gender of verbs – so that perhaps I would reward them as well. The questionnaire marked effort at 22 / 25 and achievement at 23 / 25 within the focus group, and Student 3

chose this as their favourite, explaining: 'I learned a lot about plurals and it was very enjoyable.' For this lesson the provision of something for the students to aim towards seemed to promote their levels of motivation, maybe because they had some means of measuring their progress. On the other hand, two students had to be given warnings during the lesson because of talking through instructions and not writing the title and learning objective in time. This perhaps demonstrated a lack of focus on – and therefore motivation for – the subject, as they had not been persuaded to get the work done in order to gain the rewards. Perhaps this measure of progress had not been universally applicable for increasing motivation.

Conclusion

Setbacks

There were several issues with this lesson sequence as a research method. Firstly, any outcomes would hope to reveal something about students' attitudes, and would therefore involve at least a small amount of psychological analysis; something which, as a student teacher with no qualifications in psychology, I am incapable of fully achieving. The questionnaire completed by the focus group would therefore act as a mostly inadequate form of assessment. Furthermore students rated their effort and achievement in each lesson at no less than 3 / 5, so it was difficult to establish any clear comparison between process-based and performance-based lessons. As a high-achieving class, students focussed and performed well in every lesson, and any errors spotted in their classwork are minor. Therefore any tentative conclusions are drawn mainly from the highest and lowest ranked lessons of the focus group.

For me as the teacher, the first half of the lesson sequence seemed so subtle it was almost woolly. The process-based learning objectives made formative assessment difficult; if the students did not know exactly what they were trying to achieve, it would be nearly impossible for me to establish whether they had achieved it. Although a setback in the process, this was useful in revealing how valuable performance-based objectives are. Starting the lesson with "we are aiming to do X" and then finishing with "have we done X?"

makes it easier to work out what needs to be resolved in future lessons. However this was research into the attitudes of students rather than of the teacher; perhaps establishing my own objective criteria for each process lesson, which would not be shared with students, would have made formative assessment simpler without being detrimental to the focus on process.

A major issue was the amount of time in which to establish a comparison. Throughout most literature it is made clear that the effect of goals and feedback on student motivation is something that does not become immediately obvious. Dweck (1999) believes that focus on ability rather than effort causes students to heavily criticise themselves when faced with a setback, but this is something that could only be noted after a repeated emphasis on ability, and a continuous assessment of students' changing attitudes. In addition to this, Kohn's statement 'the more you reward someone for doing something, the less interest that person will tend to have in whatever he or she was rewarded to do' (Brandt, 1995, p. 2) would need an extended period of analysis in order to reveal any results. The only potential assessment I could make would be whether different types of motivation caused an immediate effect in class.

Finally the inclusion of a lesson in which students performed their translation was a huge error. Many students ranked Lesson 5 as their favourite, but it is difficult to know whether they enjoyed it because of the acting rather than the extrinsic motivation of gold coins (Ryan & Deci, 2000). However as has been stated, if the acting itself is considered the extrinsic reward then this goal had both a positive and negative effect on students' work.

Preference for performance

The use of gold coins in lesson 6 showed that they could promote motivation without the need for such an exciting activity, as students wanted explain grammatical discoveries even after the lesson had ended; such enthusiasm may well have been increased by the possibility of this reward. In addition to this the process-based lessons 1 and 3 in particular caused Student 1 to feel uninspired and Student 4 to get distracted, and as Student 4 became demonstrably motivated in lesson 5, it appears that for

some, a clear goal might have encouraged a higher level of focus.

Preference for process

Lesson 4 was an example of performance focus not promoting a positive attitude as this was ranked least favourite by two students. Even more dramatic was the reaction of Student 4 at the end of lesson 5 when he displayed anxiety over having to go home and complete another "accurate" translation himself; the performance goal in the lesson could have caused his requirement for a support sheet in order to complete the task, rather than opting simply to try his hardest without being afraid of making errors. In contrast lesson 3 saw students working hard, translating meticulously and developing personal reactions to the characters; in this case the emphasis on process may have promoted a more relaxed atmosphere in which students could enjoy the story without concerns over achieving anything in particular by the end of the hour.

Final comments

Overall, although not necessarily associated, there have been positive and negative reactions to both types of motivation and feedback. As a teacher I found the performance-focussed lessons more useful; the set goal meant that issues were much clearer when students could not provide evidence for completing the objective. However for some students the more relaxed atmosphere of process-focussed lessons seemed to reduce the chances of anxiety. Unfortunately nothing conclusive can be taken from this research, but the most interesting reaction has to be in lesson 1 when the students, without prompting, created their own criteria for achievement in peer assessment. As has been suggested throughout the review of literature, intrinsic motivation is hard to come by, but in this way the emphasis on process actually promoted students' 'integrated regulation' (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 62) by accidentally allowing them to decide what it was they wanted to achieve. Perhaps a focus on process for students, with a hidden performance objective for the teacher, may be the best way of encouraging this integration as the closest thing to intrinsic motivation, while still providing a measure for formative assessment.

Harriet Hoath is a teacher of Classics in a secondary school.
harriethoath@hotmail.com

References

Benware, C.A. & Deci, E.L. (1984). Quality of learning with an active versus passive motivational mindset. *American Education Research Journal, 21.*

Brandt, R. (1995). Punished by rewards? A conversation with Alfie Kohn. *Educational Leadership.* www.alfiekohn.org [Accessed 17 November 2014]

Brophy, J. (1979). Teacher praise: a functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 51.*

Corpus, J.H. & Lepper, M.R. (2007). The effects of person versus performance praise on children's motivation: gender and age as moderating factors. *Educational Psychology, 27.*

Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 78.*

Dweck, C.S. (1999). Caution – praise can be dangerous. *American Educator.* www.aft.org [Accessed 17 November 2014]

Dweck, C.S. & Leggett, E.L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95.*

Harari, O. & Covington, M.V. (1981). Reactions to achievement behaviour from a teacher and student perspective: a developmental analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 18.*

Harrison, C. (2011). *Making assessment work in the classroom.* In Dillon, J. and Maguire, M. (Eds). Becoming a Teacher: Issues in Secondary Education. *Milton Keynes: Open University Press.*

Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77.*

Jones, J. (2014). *Developments in formative assessment.* In Driscoll, J. and Macaro, E. (Eds.) Debates in Modern Languages Education. *London: Routledge.*

Miller, A.T. & Hom, Jr, H.L. (1997). Conceptions of ability and the interpretation of praise, blame, and material rewards. *The Journal of Experimental Education.*

Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2000). Intrinsic & extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Education Psychology.* www.selfdeterminationtheory.org [Accessed 13 November 2014]