University of Northern Iowa

UNI ScholarWorks

1988

Use of a Dr. Madeline Hunter based evaluation instrument to assess and improve a teacher's ability to motivate students

Gordon L. Nordgren
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

Use of a Dr. Madeline Hunter based evaluation instrument to assess and improve a teacher's ability to motivate students

Abstract

A simplified application of motivation and learning theory was developed by Dr. Madeline Hunter at the experimental school at U.C.L.A. in the 1970's. She converted theory into practice by demonstrating ways to manipulate classroom variables to improve student performance. Within this structure, teachers learn to create appropriate levels of concern or tension within the learner, set a feeling tone or climate in the classroom, create interest through lesson design, provide opportunities for success, give immediate feedback or knowledge of results, and relate activities to rewards in order to motivate students. Hunter draws upon the work of a wide variety of theorists. She uses concepts and practices advocated by Rogers, Maslow, Skinner, Thorndike, Bloom and Bruner. This research paper will describe and evaluate ways a Madeline Hunter trained instructor can increase his/her motivational effectiveness.

USE OF A DR. MADELINE HUNTER BASED EVALUATION INSTRUMENT TO
ASSESS AND IMPROVE A TEACHER'S ABILITY TO MOTIVATE STUDENTS

———————

A Research Paper

Presented to the

Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations

University of Northern Iowa

———————

20: 299

Research

———————

by

Gordon L. Nordgren

June, 1988

This Research Paper by: Gordon L. Nordgren

Entitled: USE OF A DR. MADELINE HUNTER BASED EVALUATION
          INSTRUMENT TO ASSESS AND IMPROVE A TEACHER'S
          ABILITY TO MOTIVATE STUDENTS

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education: Educational
Psychology: Teaching

_____
Co-Director of Research Paper
Len Froyen

_____
Co-Director of Research Paper
Barry Wilson

_____
Graduate Faculty Adviser
Len Froyen

_____
Head,Department of Educational
    Psychology and Foundations
Larry L. Kavich

 July 19, 1988
Date Approved

This is to certify that

<u>   Gordon L. Nordgren   </u>

X Satisfactorily completed the comprehensive oral examination

___ Did not satisfactorily complete the comprehensive oral examination

For the Master of Arts in Education degree with a major in Educational
Psychology: Teaching at the University of Northern Iowa
at Cedar Falls on <u>July 19, 1988</u> .

Examining Committee

_____
Chairperson, Len Froyen

_____
Member, Barry Wilson

_____
Member, Elton Green

_____
Member

Transmitted by:

_____
Lawrence L. Kavich, Head
Department of Educational Psychology
and Foundations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Hunter's Six Factor Motivation Model

A simplified application of motivation and learning theory was developed by Dr. Madeline Hunter at the experimental school at U.C.L.A. in the 1970's. She converted theory into practice by demonstrating ways to manipulate classroom variables to improve student performance. Within this structure, teachers learn to create appropriate levels of concern or tension within the learner, set a feeling tone or climate in the classroom, create interest through lesson design, provide opportunities for success, give immediate feedback or knowledge of results, and relate activities to rewards in order to motivate students. Hunter draws upon the work of a wide variety of theorists. She uses concepts and practices advocated by Rogers, Maslow, Skinner, Thorndike, Bloom and Bruner. This research paper will describe and evaluate ways a Madeline Hunter trained instructor can increase his/her motivational effectiveness.

Hunter (1979) and her colleagues have isolated and identified certain characteristics that they believe to be key teacher motivation variables. Farrell (1982) outlines these elements or nutrients. He uses riding a bicycle as the key metaphor to illustrate the way intrinsic motivation is learned in increments and how certain factors are controlled by the teacher. He also points out how learning to fly a plane can be compared to her method by citing the importance of direct and immediate feedback and verbal reinforcement. He explains that the thrust of Hunter's work has been the development of a system of teacher

evaluation and instructional improvement which allows the good instructor to bring to a conscious level that which he or she does intuitively. It thereby makes the less able teacher aware of specific conditions that influence learning.

Even though these variables can be separated, no one of the conditions is to be regarded as more potent than the others. Individual learners respond to the manipulation of different variables. Thus, the actual importance of each variable varies with the individual and the situation. Therefore, the teacher is free to choose variables, and if one appears to be beyond his/her control, Hunter's system allows flexibilty for change. By providing an opportunity for student input, the teacher using Hunter's model can receive the immediate feedback he/she needs to adapt his/her motivational practices.

Although the model is popular and has been widely used in the 1980's, little systematic research has tested its effectiveness. A staff project conducted in the Napa County, California schools did point out that providing teachers with evaluation data promoted positive classroom changes. Students were more engaged in their work and their achievement gains were steady according to Stallings, Robbins, Presbrey and Scott (1986). Their study indicates that Hunter has taken other's research and translated it into ideas and methods that teachers find helpful in their classrooms.

The Teachers Role in Motivation

Instructors should provide a framework which allows students to set obtainable goals. Teachers need to educate their students in aspects of achievement motivation so students may challenge themselves. The tone

of the classroom needs to be conducive to the establishment of positive student self-concepts. Hunter (1981) contends that she has identified the variables that promote healthy learning and should be present in every learning situation.

Hunter (1981) points out that Stanford research shows that teachers grow for about five years, then plateau because nobody is helping them. She claims ruts and boredom cause teachers to operate like surgeons who hadn't washed their hands, weren't using sterile instruments, and who were making much too big of an incision. She asserts that teachers need to clean up these sloppy habits by learning about motivational techniques. She proposes the use of guided practice to construct an educational program like an aircraft trainer. Consequently, a teacher is not going to wreck a class if the consequences of an action are learned before the act is committed.

Since motivation is so critical and complex, the teacher should learn how to manipulate Hunter's six components. Applying these six components will encourage students to develop an intrinsic search for information, as well as help them reach for the extrinsic reward of a grade. The teacher can model the behavior he/she wants from students and can personalize instruction. The teacher can innovate and experiment with the lesson design so the students can see the subject matter as relevant and remain interested. Opportunities for mastery and self-confidence can improve a student's chances of succeeding. The feeling tone of the classroom can be positive by setting the correct goal structure for various activities. The teacher can provide immediate feedback which can be used for measurement of progress. By applying these six components, the instructor is able to use techniques

applying these six components, the instructor is able to use techniques that can prevent motivational problems, and can employ techniques designed to solve problems that arise during instruction. Hunter's six components can also be used to help teachers assess their perception of students, the teaching situation, goals, assumptions about student motivation, and the self-concept as a motivational variable.

Statement of the Problem

Can an instrument based on Madeling Hunter's six-factor motivational model be used to assess a teacher's instructional strengths and weaknesses? Can teachers use the results of this appraisal process to identify specific ways to capitalize on their strengths and offset their weaknesses as a motivational influence in the classroom?

Significance of the Study

A common complaint of educators is their inability to motivate students. An instrument which can give teachers immediate feedback on their motivational strengths and weaknesses will help improve instruction. No matter what grade level, teachers need to stimulate their students to reach their full potential. As Madeline Hunter (1986) has illustrated, teachers who practice her reccommended strategies improve student time on task and achievement. Teachers who use this self-development program have an opportunity to systematically apply the Hunter model. Teachers need time to gradually master and internalize new professional skills. The questionnaire approach provides teachers a procedure for making self-growth an on-going activity. This research paper is designed to show how a non-threatening student questionnaire

can provide the immediate feedback a teacher needs in order to use the Hunter motivational training model.

Definition of Terms

In this paper, there are some terms which require definition. T.A.I.I. is the abbreviation for The Teaching Appraisal for Instructional Improvement (Hunter, 1976). It refers to questions used by a trained observer to identify teaching behavior that increase the probability of learning. C.T.I. is the abbreviation for Clinical Theory of Instruction (Hunter and Russell, 1979). It is a prescriptive theory of instruction which outlines cause-effect relationships in intruction which can be made by a decision-making professional.

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

Three areas of literature were reviewed to develop criteria for evaluating Madeline Hunter's motivational training ideas and practices. The importance of student motivation in the classroom and theories of student motivation were used to supply this criteria. The results of this review were then used to examine Hunter's six motivation factors. This material then served as the basis for proposing procedures for the student assessment of teacher motivational practices. These three areas of the literature provide a framework for understanding and applying Madeline Hunter's motivational model.

The Importance of Motivation

Motivation can be defined as a state of need or desire that activates the person to do something that will satisfy that need or desire. According to Madeline Hunter this motivational state is an unresolved need or desire existing within the student. As a result of these unresolved needs or desires, a student can be induced to change his/her behavior in order to achieve some goal. Wanting or needing that goal causes the student to take action. A teacher influences this inner state of need or desire by manipulating environmental variables. Thus, one does not actually motivate the student, but a teacher can arrange conditions that will increase the probability that the motivation to learn will be stronger.

Schools and teachers are in the business of transmitting information. This need for information is a basic need existing within all humans. A teacher can arrange the conditions which intensify this

need but usually the final motivational decision rests with the student. Teachers constantly look for methods of putting life into learning instead of requiring dull memorization and recall. Usually teachers attempt to direct students toward academic goals and create a learning environment. However, there are a variety of different theories as to how to influence student motivation in the classroom.

The Expectancy Model was developed by Vroom (1964) and viewed motivation as a drive or force within individuals to perform particular actions. His hedonistic theory would point out that the nature of students is to maximize pleasure and minimize pain. The more likely and desirable the results of a given action, the stronger the drive to perform that action. According to his research, when students have a strong belief that their own actions will affect selected outcomes, they will develop higher expectations of success and be more strongly motivated to try. Henson (1976) supported this theory by relating college students' studying time and grades to the perceived attractiveness of the outcome. The strongest relationship was for students who had high self-esteem and internal locus of control. Atkinson (1964) referred to this motivational process as setting the correct level of aspiration. Goals need to be set in realistic and attainable terms. Helping students set high expectations and a feeling of control over their destiny, influences student motivation according to Vroom.

The Job Factors Approach developed by Herzberg (1966) maintained that all human beings have two basic types of needs which they seek to fulfill: the need to avoid pain and the need for psychological growth. For a student, these needs are gratified depending on the task and the

environment of the classroom. By reaching goals, students are given a sense of achievement which is a strong motivator. Students can take pride in their accomplishments, as well as providing educational closure by setting attainable goals. To Herzberg, motivation can be influenced by giving recognition of achievement and responsibility to students.

According to Maslow (1968), there is a hierarchy of needs that influences a person's choices. Level one needs such as food, rest, air, and physical comfort are fairly easy for most students to attain. Level two needs which involve security and safety are within reach in all orderly and well-structured classrooms. Higher level needs such as belongingness, esteem and self-actualization are very difficult for many students to reach. Some students do not feel accepted by others; they feel incompetent, thus not reaching their full potentials. Students who experience failure, students who are unable to contribute, and those with low self-esteem find it difficult to attain the high level needs.

An understanding of the importance of classroom climate was furthered by Erickson (1968). He viewed teenagers as struggling for personal identity and confused about ther roles in life. He describes other developmental crises that affect school age children, such as industry versus inferiority in elementary youth. Erickson claims that children must master skills and take pride in their competence, that too much criticism of their work can lead to long-term feelings of inferiority. Erickson believed motivation is a matter of building confidence in students as these crises are challenged and successfully solved. Teachers need to help students solve these psychosocial problems to be effective motivators and help students acquire socialization skills.

Another humanistic approach to student motivation was advocated by Rogers (1969). He believed teachers should give approval or unconditional positive regard to all students. Rogers believed human potential for good and for self-fulfillment outweighed the potential for evil and despair. Thus, Rogers saw improvement in student motivation by having teachers remain positive and receptive to students.

Bloom (1968) has concentrated on increasing student motivation by offering them an intellectual challenge. By concentraing on different levels of questioning, Bloom organized a systematic method to improve critical thinking skills. Students could be challenged on an appropriate level and stimulate interest at the same time.

Skinner (1968) has used a behavioral approach to motivational problems by using positive, negative reinforcement and punishment to shape behavior. By concentrating on specific behavior, this motivational approach would reward positive behavior and use aversive consequences to rid students of non-productive behavior. Controlling student behavior choices by systematically using rewards is highly effective with all students, but the types of reinforcers must be chosen with a mind toward the age and grade level of the students.

A combination of these student motivational approaches is advocated by Glasser (1969). Allowing students input in classroom meetings allows open feedback to prevent motivational problems. Glasser sees solving student motivation problems as a matter of correcting faulty pictures or perceptions. Establishing this type of open feedback is best attained in a democratic classroom with the teacher serving as a guide and facilitator of learning.

Whereas, many student motivation theorists deal with classroom

atmosphere, Ames and Ames (1984) concentrate on types of goal structures that motivate students. Goal structure defines the relationship between and among students as they seek various goals. There are three basic types of goal structures. In a competitive goal structure, rewards are given to the best or highest performers; this demands student attention to social comparison information. An individualistic goal structure specifies there is an independence of goals and one student is not dependent upon another student achieving the goal. Student's attainments are neither positively nor negatively related to other's attainments. In a cooperative goal structure, a goal is shared by a set of individuals. The actions of the individuals are interdependent so these efforts converge toward a common goal. Ames and Ames (1984) believe it is not that one structure fosters more motivation or achievement that another, but the structures reflect different ways of thinking and attending to the performance situaiton. Long-term implications for goals such as personal involvement in one's learning and self-directed learning could enhance motivation.

Theories of Student Motivation Compared to the Hunter Model

Previous theories of student motivation can all be compared to the six variables in Hunter's Motivational Theory. For teachers using the Hunter model, knowing how other theories compare is beneficial in assessing their own strengths and weaknesses in affecting student motivation. Since instructors are usually not able to select talented learners, they must possess skills to develop the talent that exists within each learner.

The relation of the activity to reward is the first Hunter

motivational variable. Before students commit to a learning activity
they ask the question, "What's in it for me?". Initially most motivation
is extrinsic. A learner attempts to gain status, approval, grades or
avoidance of unpleasant circumstances. Teachers gradually introduce
motivational procedures that cause students to measure their performance
internally, rather than striving to surpass other's achievements. This
intrinsic motivation occurs when learning becomes its own reward.

Several researchers would support Hunter's notion that if the
activity itself is rewarding, it produces a situation where motivation
is intrinsic. Herzberg (1966) looked for the factors of a job which
satisfied the need to avoid pain and the need for psychlogical growth.
He identified intrinsic factors which would motivate students such as
achievement, recognition, resposibility, advancement, and the
possibility of growth. Skinner (1968) saw this same correlation between
the activity and the reward. Proper positive reinforcement can create
the extrinsic motivation which can eventually lead to success and
eventually an intrinsic enjoyment of learning. The relation of activity
to reward is also a critical element of Ames and Ames (1984)
individualistic goal structure. When students challenge themselves,
they have already tried self-improvement and will probably show improved
effort. So just as Hunter asserts, the activity of learning itself is
the reward for the effort.

The second variable in Hunter's system involves the level of
concern or tension within the learner. This factor needs to exist to a
moderate degree.   Too much tension may divert the learner's energy into
dealing with tension rather than the learning task. Not enough tension
will not excite the learner to complete the activity. Hunter does not

want the learner to remain unconcerned, because learning does not occur with that attitude. On the other hand, the over-anxious learner often needs assurance that the task can be successfully completed. Hunter strives to have the instructor determine the appropriate level of concern.

The humanistic theories of student motivation involve this slant towards student concern. Maslow (1968) would see students experiencing tension trying to develop a sense of belonging in the classroom. Erickson (1968) would point to some source of tension within teenage learners due to their role confusion about an uncertain identity. Rogers (1969) would encourage teachers to defuse tension by accepting student concerns and to get students in touch with their true selves. Humanistic motivators would agree with Hunter that level of concern is a key motivational element.

Interest in learning activities is Hunter's third variable. Student's attentions follow their interests, so meaningful learning involves hooking into the student's self-interest and making the learning different, novel and vivid so the learner's interest is aroused. Interest is generated as the learner gets personally involved in the learning task, and changing routines or techniques arouse the learner's interest in the task. Consequently, the more interest teachers generate, the greater the learning dividends.

Interest improvement is the goal of almost all student motivation theorists. Vroom (1964) developed the idea that students are looking for pleasurable learning, and high interest activities accomplish that. Student questioning strategies encouraged by Bloom (1968) also improve student interest by challenging the student to think critically.

Jacobson (1984) explains how the Cedar Rapids, Iowa plan used their mastery teaching program to evoke student interest by improving teacher's lesson design. Ames and Ames (1984) raised thir students' interest levels by encouraging students to focus on problem solving. Thus, individual students could develop strategies to increase their own interest and evaluate their own performance. Dull, repetitious learning tasks need a spark to increase student interst thus improving motivation, as Hunter predicts.

Success is the crucial fourth factor in the Hunter program. The task must be set the right level of difficulty; motivation increases as an individual begins to experience success. When the task is too difficult, the learner becomes frustrated, and when it is too easy, the learner becomes indifferent or bored. Hunter urges teachers to create different degrees of difficulty for different learners. By diagnosing individual student's strengths and weaknesses, a teacher knows the individual's potential for succeeding at various types of tasks. As a result, students continue to be motivated in activities because they feel they have experienced success.

Since success at the right degree of difficulty increases motivation, theorists such as Atkinson (1964) concentrate on the correct level of aspiration. The task mastery approach of Ames and Ames (1984) involves studentss setting individual goals. Studies (Covington, 1984 and Nicholls, 1984) have shown evidence of intrinsic motivation and positive self-competence perceptions among children in mastery-oriented environments. Student perception of success is seen as important by Hunter and other motivation theorists.

Feeling tone established by the teacher is Hunter's fifth variable.

The teacher, through verbal and nonverbal messages, establishes a pleasant, unpleasant, or neutral learning environment. Both pleasant and unpleasant feeling tones can increase a student's motivation to learn, while a neutral environment rarely affects motivation. Hunter realizes that teachers attempt to stay in the pleasant realm, but readily move to unpleasant when it is needed. Neutral feeling tone can be useful only to wait for an appropriate time to correct a problem. Classroom atmosphere definitely affects student motivation.

How one goes about establishing this feeling tone depends on the student motivation theorist. Humanistic theorists recommend the pleasant feeling tone. Maslow (1968) wants students to feel safe and secure. Rogers (1969) thinks that students need total acceptance, so they feel worthwhile to themselves and others. Behaviorists such as Skinner (1968) do not worry about feeling tone, but instead concentrate on the students' actions. Depending on the goal structure, a variety of feeling tones could be achieved according to Ames and Ames (1984). Under a competitive framework, a student's ability would determine his/her perception of the classroom. A low ability student could easily remain in the unpleasant or neutral feeling tone. Although the same student, involved in a individualistic goal structure, would likely make effort-related perceptions. Meanwhile, a cooperative goal structure usually produces a climate in which the student's loyalty to the group determines the classroom feeling tone. Glasser (1969) would advocate these of class meetings as a method of influencing feeling tone. It is clear that feeling tone can be attacked from a wide variety of angles; yet, as Hunter indicated, the neutral feeling tone should be avoided.

Hunter's sixth variable involved the knowledge of results. All of

us want to know how we are doing. Knowing we are on the right track
reinforces our performance. Hunter believes unproductive behavior needs
to be changed before it becomes too ingrained. Learners need feedback
while they are learning if they are to be motivated. Many times the
report card is too late. The more immediate and specific the feedback,
the more helpful it is to the learner. Not only is the learner's
confidence improved, but errors can be corrected. While intrinsically
motivated learners sometimes develop standards for their own
performance, extrinsic learners need concrete feedback on performance.
Knowledge of results helps students develop their enthusiasm for
learning.

All student motivational theorists realize how critical feedback
is to students. Vroom (1964) especially, notes that no matter how high
the expectation is set, a student needs to examine his/her progress.
Skinner (1968) demonstrated with his learning theory that student
motivation improved the most with quick and specific knowledge of
results. Ames and Ames (1984) saw these correlations in their use of
different goal structures. Competitive goal systems make students
aware even at a young age, of social comparison. Whereas, results in
the individualistic and cooperative structures relate more to
performance over time and the continuity of performance. Knowledge of
results can improve student satisfaction and improve pupil motivation.

Student Assessment of Teacher's Motivational Practices

Even though instructors constantly grade their students, rarely do
students get the opportunity to evaluate the teacher. Giving students
responsibility to influence their learning environment can become the

basis for building a foundation for motivation. Students can improve

their self-reliance like workers whose morale improves because they know

the management listens to their concerns. Although the teacher controls

the academic planning, student input regarding motivational planning can

improve the organization of both. By learning problem solving

strategies, students will be more likely to objectively evaluate, rather

than blame the teacher for all motivational problems.

Student motivation is directly affected daily by the teacher. Yet,

like many administrators who make evaluations based on limited trips to

the classroom, instructors who seek only oral feedback in a classroom

may miss significant input because some students are afraid to speak

out. Ideally, a teacher could meet one on one with each student, but

there is not enough time to rely exclusively on this method of feedback.

By using diagnostic questions on a survey instrument, a quick,

non-threatening approach can help teachers gain student feedback

regarding a teacher's motivation skills. The student's perception of

the teacher, the teaching situation, goals, and assumptions about

student motivation can be analyzed. Since Hunter's motivational

strategy is widely used by instructors, students should be able to

identify key motivational components. Little has been done to

demonstrate the usefulness of Hunter's motivation model as a tool for

teacher evauluation and motivational improvement.

Advantages of the Hunter Motivational Model

Hunter has developed observable techniques to help teachers improve

their motivational practices. Using the (Teaching Appraisal for

Instructional Improvement), Hunter (1976) allows a trained observer to

identify teaching behavior which research and classroom evidence would support as increasing the probabiity of learning. This model makes use of the job factors and expectancies approach by providing four components necessary to professional development: 1) identification of teacher decisions, 2) inservice to combine the science and art of teaching, 3) films and tapes to see how it works, and 4) diagnostic-prescriptive instruments to evaluate teacher performance. She further developed the (Clinical Theory of Instruction) which California uses in a Professional Development Center. The state of Washington uses what they call the Instruction Theory Into Practice. Arkansas and Louisiana have implemented the C.T.I. as a statewide effort to increase the effectiveness of schools. Many foreign countries are utilizing translations of concepts and the principles of C.T.I. in both international and local schools as well as teacher preparation institutions.

The advantage of Hunter's work is that it is easy to apply and understand. First, it minimizes the use of technical jargon when describing and explaining the factors that influence motivation to learn. Hunter's approach also concentrates on training teachers thereby converting concepts of motivation to specific instructional techniques. The other theories that have been discussed also identify significant variables, but often fail to recommend specific methods for improving the performance of teachers.

The second advantage is Hunter's provisions for the use of both visual aids and systematic planning to provide concrete examples for correcting common motivational deficiencies in a teacher's plan. The third advantage of her approach is that it allows enough flexibility to

be adaptable to teacher instructional preference and skills. The Hunter model could be viewed as consistent with the individualistic goal-structure framework, because the teacher perceives any problem as a primary way of improving his/her competence. Certain aspects of the Hunter theory of motivation also complement the cooperative goal structure, as problems can be perceived as both a challenge and a chance to work with students to improve some aspect of motivation to learn. The Hunter methods could also be termed task-mastery oriented. They provide direct instructions to handle problems and improve learning and retention. In conclusion, a very attractive approach is offered to educators who want dynamic methods to increase pupil motivation.

CHAPTER III

Design of the Study

This study was designed to examine the benefits of using a student

evaluation instrument, based on the Madeline Hunter model, to survey the

motivational practices of a teacher. The instrument was administered to

two different sets of classes. First, the researcher will explain how

the classroom questionnaire was developed. Then the process for

collecting and analyzing data will be discussed. Finally, limitations

of the researcher's study will be explained.

Development of the Classroom Questionnaire

The original idea for collecting student input was developed by

Mark Dunn, a Miami Springs Junior High School social studies instructor.

He adapted a survey used by Dade County Public Schools in Miami,

Florida for use in his own classroom. This researcher revised Dunn's

questions to fit student motivation concerns based on six aspects of

Madeline Hunter's model. Variations of this survey have been used for

the past six years in Vinton, Iowa at both the junior and senior high

levels.

Items within the Classroom Instruction Questionnaire (Appendix A)

were designed to pinpoint strengths and weaknesses in instructional

techniques. The thirty multiple choice questions were arranged so that

each of Hunter's six components were represented by five questions. An

optional open-ended question is provided at the end of the survey which

further aids student involvement in the process. Each question was

aimed at soliciting informaiton about a teacher's motivational

behaviors, such as teacher compliments, patience, explanations, and
discipline techniques. Thus, students would be able to rate their
instructor on a wide range of motivational tasks.

Teachers can then take the results of this survey and add the point
values for each group of five questions by using the Student Evaluation
of Instructor form (Appendix B). Each of Hunter's six components is
worth a total of twenty-five points. Instuctors can easily see the areas
that need improvement. This procedure gives teachers a quick method of
comparing motivational strengths and weaknesses in their classroom.
Since the evaluation process is conducted by individual instructors and
is not a required or mandated evaluation, the instructors who use it
must already possess an interest in personal motivational improvement.

Data Collection

Data were collected from each of five fall 1986 and 1987 classes at
Washington High School in Vinton, Iowa. The Social Psychology class was
a mixture of both juniors and seniors. Psychology was predominantly
seniors and Global Studies was a required course for seniors. In
addition, United States History was a required course for freshman.

Before the students received their midterm grades, the instructor
announced to the students that they would be given an opportunity to
rate the instructor. Usually, students are curious about the purpose
behind a questionnaire. They want to know who will interpret the
results and some may want to put their names on their survey. The
instructor did not specify that the questions involved motivation and
asked only that students answer them honestly. He stressed that their
answers would be kept confidential and they were not required to place

their names on the survey. Although not all students took the task seriously, the majority realized that this was a chance to air their opinions and compliment or criticize classroom procedures. Another key point is that students answered individually and did not make it a group answer; otherwise, some students might have succumbed to peer pressure.

After obtaining the scores, the teacher was able to compare the motivation on a class-by-class basis. An average score of three on one question would lead to a fifteen point score on one variable. Therefore, the instructor should receive at least fifteen points to indicate that he was adequately motivating students. Excellence in motivation would mean scores closer to the perfect total of twenty-five for each variable while scores in the twenty range show an above average success rate.

Data Analysis Procedure

After collecting scores from the students on the classroom instruction questionnaire (Appendix A), each set of five questions was added together on the Student Evaluation of Instructor form (Appendix B). Then the results from each class were added together to obtain mean ratings for each of the Hunter variables. These average ratings were then compared in two different tables (Table 1 and Table 2) to analyze strengths and weaknesses during 1986 and 1987.

Limitations of the Study

In this study there are several limitations. The research was collected at midterm with no replication of the instrument to check for improvement with the same set of students at the end of the semester.

Thus, changes noted in the second year of the study may be due to
differences in the population rather than actual changes in the
instructor's performance. The survey itself is also limited to
secondary students, and within this population, there may be
considerable differences between 9th and 12th grade students. Thus,
results from these two groups may not be comparable. The questionnaire
may not be applicable to all educational courses and to those required
rather than elective. The evaluation also has not been done by students
in larger or smaller schools, so the findings may not be generalizable.

CHAPTER IV

Results

The study was conducted as described in Chapter III of this research paper. An explanation was given to the students, and they individually responded to the questionnaire. The results were then tabulated by this researcher. Tables 1 and 2, on the following page, show the results of the student ratings.

Before trying to pinpoint specific motivational improvements the researcher examined the overall comparisons in mean ratings. A motivational strategy can be perceived differently by various classes and levels of students. The psychology classes in this study were elective courses which could account for higher overall scores, since students had chosen this course. Both Table 1 and Table 2 may reflect this motivational preconception. The slightly lower averages in U.S. History and Global Studies may be attributed to these being required courses. Instructors also need to remember that motivation is most effective if it is dealt with on an individual basis. Consequently, comparing class averages can only provide a partial picture. The averaged comparisons do not account for individual motivational problems. However, since the instrument is effective in providing data concerning strengths and weaknesses of the instructor, each of Hunter's six motivational variables can be discussed according to the results.

Table 1

1986 Results of the Classroom Instruction Questionnaire

Class	Grade Level	Number of Students	Mean ratings of Hunter's variables					
			1	2	3	4	5	6
Social Psychology	11	20	17.4	21.8	21.3	17.7	20.2	20.6
Psychology	12	22	18.9	19.5	22.5	17.7	20.4	21.0
U.S. History	9	20	19.4	22.0	22.2	19.5	20.3	20.3
Global Studies (Section 1)	12	24	17.6	17.8	18.8	15.8	19.5	19.6
Global Studies (Section 2)	12	15	18.7	19.9	20.5	18.1	20.9	20.7

Hunter's Variables
1. Reward
2. Level of Concern
3. Interest
4. Success
5. Feeling Tone
6. Knowledge of Results

Table 2

1987 Results of the Classroom Instruction Questionnaire

Class	Grade Level	Number of Students	Mean ratings of Hunter's variables					
			1	2	3	4	5	6
Social Psychology	11	20	17.8	21.8	21.2	18.6	21.1	21.6
Psychology	12	20	17.8	20.4	21.6	18.1	19.4	20.6
U.S. History	9	20	15.1	19.6	19.7	16.6	17.8	18.3
Global Studies (Section 1)	12	23	16.4	17.7	18.9	17.3	17.8	18.2
Global Studies (Section 2)	12	22	15.2	17.9	22.3	16.1	17.9	18.4

Hunter's Variables
1. Reward
2. Level of Concern
3. Interest
4. Success
5. Feeling Tone
6. Knowledge of Results

Teacher Improvement

Comparing the average ratings (Table 1), the fourth variable (success) is consistently rated the worst in each class. As a result, this area is where the teacher needed to concentrate to improve as a motivator, according to Hunter. Although the success variable still needed improvement, Table 2 shows that the reward and feeling tone variable had also dropped below the other averages.

The reward variable needs considerable improvement according to the data collected. Table 1 shows that this part of the teacher's motivational style was rated lowest in two classes and next to lowest in the other three. Table 2 results indicate that the reward portion of the teaching is at the bottom in all of the courses. Hunter would advocate that these students initially need more extrinsic motivation, such as compliments or praise. This type of tangible reward can build positive feelings toward education. True commitment to the learning task involves intrinsic motivation, and the teacher in this study needed more student expression and input to develop intrinsic motivation. The instructor has since attempted to improve this motivational variable by allowing more student ratings of their own performances. Nevertheless, the teacher's competitive nature may have produced an ability-evaluative framework for some of the students as Ames and Ames (1984) described. This would account for the fact that some students did not feel as though they had been properly rewarded. As Herzberg (1966) stated in the job factors approach, improving the rewards also makes learning more enjoyable, which ultimately results in improved student motivation.

Even though the instructor attempted to improve the reward portion of his classroom behavior, this variable remained low in 1987.

Concentration on tangible rewards such as nominating students weekly for
a school-wide academic award did not help improve student ratings. The
instructor also included student ratings of classroom participation in
the grading scale, which did help raise student judgements. The teacher
needs to keep experimenting with various methods of rewarding students
to improve this aspect of his instruction. As Skinner (1968) notes,
positive reinforcement produces the best learning pay off, so the
instructor needs to focus on this type of reinforcement.

The second Hunter variable, level of concern, is rated slightly
higher, so it can be perceived as a motivational asset. According to
these results, students reported that the teacher was willing to help
them and be patient when they didn't understand. Their ratings show
that his explanations were understandable and he was interested in their
individual progress. The instructor has developed activities in each of
his courses to allow students to get to know each other, as well as the
instructor, so they feel part of the class. As Maslow (1968) advocated
in his hierarchy, this cooperation is essential to develop self-esteem
in students. Value clarification group work has helped the instructor
create this level of concern. The teacher has made an effort to find
the optimal level of concern that can motivate the students to give
their best effort, as Hunter advocates. Developing individual rapport
with students has been a strength of the instructor as demonstrated by
the senior students choosing him as faculty graduation speaker in 1986
and dedicating their yearbook to him in 1987. The instructor has tried
to avoid what Ames (1983) referred to as the moral responsibility
system, where the teacher takes the blame for student failure. An
effort has been made to let the students know that there is concern for

their progress, but it is their responsibility to accomplish the work and not to expect gifts as grades.

Interest is the instructor's strong suit as a motivator according to both Tables 1 and 2. The teacher enjoyed changing routines and attempted to use a variety of teaching materials daily. He did his best to explain why each of the courses are important and to let the students know exactly what was planned, while allowing some student input. He made a conscientious effort to not let the novelty of some of the classroom activities go overboard, yet he aroused passive students and attacked controversial issues. Much of this improvement was accomplished using questioning strategies which Bloom (1968) advocated. Lesson design was written in the Jacobson (1984) design to stimulate student interest. Getting the student personally involved in the learning task is a big part of Hunter's third variable, the interest component of motivation.

The results of this study show that the instructor needed to improve his teaching methods in setting the task at the right level of difficulty. Especially in the required courses, the instructor was forced to individualize the instructional material. Just as Hunter claimed, students need at least modest success to remain motivated. Stallings, Robbins, Presbrey, and Scott (1986) discuss this variable and encourage teachers to improve lesson design. The instructor tried to diversify the teaching activities to reach a wide range of student abilities. According to Ames and Ames (1984), and their research on the task-mastery approach, the time spent on setting the task at the correct level of difficulty paid motivational dividends. Other research on the success variable (Deci and Ryan 1980) point out that teachers should

concentrate on being more autonomy-goal oriented. The teacher should allow the students to set their own academic goals. The instructor attempted to allow this flexibility in his elective courses. Some students enjoyed setting their own goals, while others could not handle this responsibility. Avoiding a total reliance on a control-oriented style of teaching would produce the intrinsic motivation which is one of the aims of this instructor.

Hunter's fourth variable in this study, the success level, summarized in both Table 1 and 2, is a motivational weakness. The teacher needed to help students realize their own strengths and weaknesses. He also needed to give students more independent study time and improve the clarity of the homework assignments. The student motivation can be improved by adjusting to the correct level of difficulty. Even with allowing a more individualistic goal structure in 1987, improvement in this area is still needed.

Another area which can be improved is the fifth Hunter variable, the feeling tone which is established in the classroom. According to Tables 1 and 2, this variable ranks in the lower half of the six variables. The classroom discipline, rules, and organization of class can be improved. When using the competitive goal structure the student's assessments are many times associated with the teacher control of the classroom. Using techniques which Glasser (1969) advocated gave the students more input than they were used to in most conventional classrooms. However, by allowing the students to sit in a circle and by attempting group activities as often as possible, the classroom environment is not as structured as some students desire. The instructor's goal was to maintain a pleasant feeling tone, but also to

be able to move to the unpleasant when necessary. An apathetic or neutral feeling tone toward students does not motivate and the instructor avoided this approach.

Knowledge of results, the sixth Hunter motivational variable is rated slightly higher than the fourth and fifth variables. The instructor made a sincere effort to return student work as quickly as possible and tried to help students understand previous material before attempting new subjects. His goal was to provide immediate and specific feedback to build student confidence. As the expectancies approach by Vroom (1964) indicates, this may improve motivation. Although the instructor aimed for intrinsic motivation, he knew that students were concerned about extrinsic rewards and letter grades. He attempted to let the students know when the results were good enough and also when more effort was required. One change the instructor tried in 1987 was to allow more student correction of work in class. Thus, the students got immediate feedback and were able to see their mistakes. Weekly progress reports helped lower ability students monitor their progress. Thus, improvements in the knowledge of results did take place.

Improvement of the Instrument

This action research was intended to develop a better method to help any instructor evaluate his/her application of Hunter's Instructional Theory Into Practice yet this student evaluation does contain limitations. Just as Hunter (1985) has been challenged to defend the validity of her work and respond to the shortcomings, there are also drawbacks in this study.

The survey may be worthwhile for only secondary students. The

thirty questions would be difficult for elementary students to read and answer. An even simpler format would be needed for younger students to evaluate their teachers. Further adjustments of the thirty questions would be needed in specialized departments such as art, vocational subjects, physical education and special education. Some teachers would also want to reduce or expand the number of questions in the survey to fit their specific teaching styles. There is room for alteration and/or improvement in the Classroom Instruction Questionnaire.

In this study, the delivery of the instrument was also a weakness. The survey could have been readministered at the end of the courses to compare actual changes in each class. The validity and reliability has not been established for this instrument. For professional duplication and accuracy, students would need to be sampled randomly to provide meaningful statistics. No control group took the survey to compare to the experimental classes. To obtain true objectivity, a third party would administer the survey to the students so the presence of the instructor would not influence the ratings.

Even though the aim of this study was to assess overall motivation, there may be other specific areas which could benefit from this evaluation instrument. The impact of a specific technique, for example, lesson design could be evaluated for its motivational benefits. Classroom discipline techniques could be changed and the effects on motivation surveyed.

Ultimately, it is the finding of this researcher that teachers can use an instrument like this to benefit their motivational abilities. Using the instrument based on Madeline Hunter's six-factor motivational model can allow a teacher to assess his/her instructional strengths and

weaknesses. This assessment can then be used to search out and develop

new ways to positively influence the behavior choices of students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ames, C.,& Ames, R. (1984). Systems of student and teacher
   motivation: Toward a Qualitative Definition. Journal of
   Educational Psychology, 76, 535-556.

Ames, R. (1975). Teacher's attributions of responsibility:
   Some unexpected nondefensive effects. Journal of
   Educational Psychology, 67, 688-696.

Ames, R. (1983). Teachers, attributions for their own
   teaching. In J. Levine & M. Wang (Eds.), Teacher and
   student perceptions, 105-124. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Atkinson, J.W. (1964). An Introduction to Motivation.
   Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Bloom, B.S. (1968). Learning for Mastery. Evaluation
   Comment, 1 (2), Los Angeles: Center for the Study of
   Evaluation of Instructional Programs, University of
   California.

Covington, M. (1984). The motive for self-worth. In R.
   Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education:
   Student motivation, 17-113. New York: Academic Press.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1980). The empirical exploration
   of intrinsic motivational processes. Advances in
   experimental social psychology (Vol. 13). New York: Academic
   Press.

Erickson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis. New
   York: Norton.

Farrell, J. A. (1982). Motivation and Learning- Its as Easy as
   Riding a Bike. N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 66, 5-8.

Glasser, W. (1969). Schools Without Failure. New York:
   Harper and Row.

Henson, R. (1976). Expectancy beliefs, ability, and personality
   in predicting academic performance. Journal of Educational
   Research, 70, 41-44.

Herzberg, F. & others (1957). Job Attitudes: Review of
   Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Services
   of Pittsburgh.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the Nature of Man. New York:
   World.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Synderman, B. (1957). The
   Motivation To Work. Neew York: Wiley.

Hunter, M. (1967). Motivation Theory for Teachers. TIP Publications, P.O. Box 514, El Segundo, California 90245.

Hunter, M. (1967). Reinforcement Theory for Teachers. TIP Publications, P.O. Box 514, El Segundo, California 90245.

Hunter, M. (1967). Retention Theory for Teachers. TIP Publications, P.O. Box 514, El Segundo, California 90245.

Hunter, M. (1969). Teach More- Faster. TIP Publications, P.O. Box 514, El Segundo, California 90245.

Hunter, M. (1971). Teach for Transfer. TIP Publications, P.O. Box 514, El Segundo, California 90245.

Hunter, M. (1976). Teacher Competency: Problem, Theory, and Practice. The Early and Middle Childhood Years of Schooling, 15 (2): April.

Hunter, M. (1979). Teaching is Decision Making. Educational Leadership, 37, 62-67.

Hunter, M. (1981). Developing Principalss Into Effective Instructional Leaers, I.A.S.S.P. and N.C.A. Spring Meeting, April 9 and 10.

Hunter, M. (1985). What's Wrong With Madeline Hunter? Educational Leaderhip, 42(5), 57-60.

Hunter, M. (1986). Comments on the Napa County, California Follow- Through Project. The Elementry School Journal, 87, 173-179.

Hunter, M. & Russsell, D. (1979). Diagnostic teaching: C.T.I. and Clinical Supervision Plan. The Elementary School Journal, 80, 41-46.

Jacobson, W.C. (1982). Mastery Teaching. Packet compiled for the Cedar Rapids Community School District, Jefferson H.S., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404.

Jacobson, W.C. (1984). We Brought Teachers Up to Snuff, and So Can You. Executive Educator, Feb., 2, 41.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). Towards a Psychology of Being, Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

Nicholls, J.G. (1984). Conceptions of ability and achievement motivation. In R. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education: Student motivation, 39-73. New York: Academic Press.

Rogers, C.R. (1969). Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio:
    Merrill.

Slavin, R. (1986). The Napa Evaluation of Madeline Hunter's
    ITIP: Lessons Learned. The Elementary School Journal,
    87, 165-171.

Skinner, B.F. (1968). The Technology of Teaching. New
    York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Stallings, J., Robbins, P., Presbrey, L. & Scott, J. (1986)
    Effects of Instruction Based on the Madeline Hunter Model on
    Students' Achievement: Findings from a Follow-Through Project.
    The Elementary School Journal, 86(5), 571-587.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley.

Vroom, V.H. (1966). Organizational Choice: A Study of Post and
    Predecisions Processes. Organizational Behavior, and Human
    Performance, 1, 212-225.

Wlodkowski, R.J. (1978). Motivation and Teaching: A Practical
    Guide, Washington D.C.: National Education Association of the U.S..

Appendix A

CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: The purpose of this questionnaire is to help your teacher do an even better job than he/she is doing now. This will happen if you answer each question carefully and honestly. Answer each question based on what YOU think or know.

The marking scale is:

Almost Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often	Almost Always
1	2	3	4	5

____ 1. My teacher compliments me when I do a good job.
____ 2. I understand the system my teacher uses to grade scholarship.
____ 3. My teacher encourages me to express my own ideas.
____ 4. My teacher goes over tests so I can see where and why I made mistakes.
____ 5. My teacher allows me to rate my own performance.
____ 6. I know my teacher will help me when I need help.
____ 7. My teacher is patient with me when I don't understand.
____ 8. My teacher treats me with courtesy and respect.
____ 9. My teacher explains so that I can understand.
____10. My teacher is concerned about my individual progress.
____11. At the beginning of each unit my teacher explains what I will study.
____12. My teacher makes sure I understand why the subject is important.
____13. It seems to me my teacher knows the subject he/she is teaching.
____14. My teacher uses different kinds of materials to teach (films, games, etc.)
____15. My teacher's test questions are about things which have been studied or reviewed.
____16. My teacher makes me aware of my strengths and weaknesses.
____17. I understand the system my teacher uses to grade effort.
____18. It seems to me that my teacher plans ahead for the activities of the class and catches my attention at the beginning of class.
____19. My teacher gives me time in class to study independently, work with guided practice and get special help if I need it.
____20. My teacher's homework assignments are clear and easy to understand.
____21. My teacher disciplines students who are doing things wrong instead of disciplining the whole class.
____22. I agree that my teacher's rules for conduct are fair.
____23. I understand the system my teacher uses to grade conduct.
____24. My teacher admits it when he/she makes a mistake.
____25. My teacher helps me to think and learn by keeping the class organized and calm.
____26. My teacher gives me reasonable amount of time to finish tests.
____27. My teacher returns my marked and corrected test in reasonable time.
____28. My teacher helps me understand the old work before going on to new work.
____29. My teacher gives homework which helps me to understand the day's lesson.
____30. My teacher collects homework papers and returns them checked.

Optional: List any changes in this course or in the methods your teacher is using.

Appendix B

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

Directions: Add your total points for each group of five questions to determine areas which are strong and weak.

TOTAL POINTS (25) for each component

Questions

_____ 1-5   REWARD: functions to help the learner become in-terested in his own learning (extrinsic motivation)

_____ 6-10   LEVEL OF CONCERN: optimal attitude that can moti-vate a learner to a greater effort (intrinsic motivation)

_____ 11-15   INTEREST: building meaning in learning activities that are different, novel and vivid

_____ 16-20   SUCCESS: setting the task at the right level of difficulty

Use of lesson design:

1) anticipatory set
2) clear objective
3) design of instruction input
4) modeling of correct response
5) check for understanding
6) guided practice
7) independent practice

_____ 21-25   FEELING TONE: verbal and nonverbal messages the teacher uses to create the learning environment

_____ 26-30   KNOWLEDGE OF RESULTS: immediate and specific feed-back