

Chapter 2

The Importance of Motivation in Online Learning

Abstract This chapter begins by looking broadly at learning as a process of knowledge construction and the increasing role of digital technologies in this process within tertiary education contexts. This is followed by an introduction to online learning along with definitions, discussion of foundational online learning concepts and contemporary pedagogical approaches used in online learning environments. Next, the reasons why motivation is an essential consideration in online teaching and learning contexts are explored. Then, existing research into *motivation to learn* in online environments is discussed in light of contemporary theoretical motivation frameworks. Finally, self-determination theory (SDT)—an intrinsic-extrinsic theory of motivation—is discussed in detail. In particular, the continuum of human motivation that outlines a range of different types of extrinsic motivation and the underlying psychological concepts of autonomy, competence and relatedness that SDT is built on are discussed. In doing so, justification for the use of SDT as the conceptual framework for this work is provided.

Keywords e-learning • Online learning • Motivation • Self-efficacy • Interest • Goal orientation • Self-determination • Intrinsic • Extrinsic • Autonomy

2.1 Motivation and Online Education

Paris and Turner (1994) describe motivation as the ‘engine’ of learning (p. 217). Motivation can influence what we learn, how we learn and when we choose to learn (Schunk and Usher 2012). Research shows that motivated learners are more likely to undertake challenging activities, be actively engaged, enjoy and adopt a deep approach to learning and exhibit enhanced performance, persistence and creativity (Ryan and Deci 2000b). Given the important reciprocal relationship between motivation and learning (Brophy 2010), it is not surprising that motivation has been actively researched across a wide range of traditional educational settings (Schunk et al. 2014). Despite this, studies that explore *motivation to learn* in online contexts are limited in both number and scope, as others have noted (Bekele 2010).

Of the research that is available, there has been a tendency to adopt a limited view of motivation that does not acknowledge the complexity and dynamic interplay of factors underlying and influencing *motivation to learn* (Brophy 2010). Instead, designing motivating learning environments has received attention (Keller 2010). Alternatively, motivation has been viewed as a relatively stable personal characteristic and studies have focused on identifying lists of traits of successful learners (Yukselturk and Bulut 2007). Comparative studies between online and on-campus students are common using this approach (Wighting et al. 2008) and findings indicate that online students are more intrinsically motivated than their on-campus counterparts.

However, higher dropout rates associated with online courses compared to similar face-to-face ones (Park and Choi 2009) lend support to the view that motivation is more complex than the above studies suggest. Feelings of isolation (Paulus and Scherff 2008), frustrations with the technology (Hara and Kling 2003) and time constraints due to other responsibilities (Keller 1999) have all been identified as factors influencing students' decisions to withdraw from online courses. Poor motivation has also been identified as a decisive factor in contributing to the high attrition (Artino 2008; Keller 2008). Therefore, student motivation is considered a crucial factor for success in online learning environments (Artino 2008; Keller 2008) and is a primary reason for the current study. Collectively, these factors point to the need to reconsider *motivation to learn* in technology-rich environments. But before turning our attention to motivation it is important to start by defining what is meant by online learning.

2.2 Online Learning

Today, there are a plethora of terms to describe the application of digital technologies in learning including distance, online, open, flexible, blended, flipped, mixed and MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses). To help make sense of these terminologies, Bullen and Janes (2007) developed a continuum of technology use ranging from face-to-face to fully distance environments. E-learning is a common generic term used to describe anything on this continuum that incorporates digital technologies in the learning process (Nichols 2008).

2.2.1 Definition

Online learning has its roots in distance education. Bates (2005) points out that the terms 'online learning' and 'e-learning' are used interchangeably, but makes the distinction that e-learning can encompass any form of technology while online learning refers specifically to the use of the internet and the web. The term "fully online" is used by Bates (2005, p. 9) to distinguish distance courses where students

must have access to an internet capable device to undertake a course. Ally (2008) also highlights that there are many definitions of online learning that reflect the diversity of practice and technologies in use. He goes on to define it in the following way:

... the use of the internet to access materials; to interact with the content, instructor, and other learners; and to obtain support during the learning process, in order to acquire knowledge, to construct personal meaning, and to grow from the learning experience (p. 5).

Given the lack of consensus of terminology, the term *online learning* is used in this book. It is taken to encompass the definition offered by Ally and incorporates the fully online distinction used by Bates that makes cognisant the distance context of courses. In other words, *online learning* described here is taken to be a form of distance education mediated by technological tools where learners are geographically separated from the instructor and the main institution.

2.2.2 *Learner Autonomy and Control in Online Learning*

While it not the intention here to offer a comprehensive review of the history of distance education, or the place of online learning within it, it is important to discuss two theoretical concepts that have been influential in the overall development of the field and continue to influence our understanding of learning and motivation in contemporary online contexts. These concepts are *transactional distance* that encompasses the notions of structure, dialogue and autonomy suggested by Moore (1990); and the alternative concept of *learner control* (Garrison and Baynton 1987). Similar concepts exist within contemporary motivation literature, particularly those associated with self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan 1985), the motivational framework that underpins this investigation.

Moore (1990) coined the phrase *transactional distance* to define the psychological separation frequently experienced by students, as a result of the spatial and/or temporal separation between learners and instructors in a distance learning context. From this perspective, the relative amount of structure and dialogue inherent in the learning activity determines the degree of 'distance' experienced by the learner (Dron 2007). Structure refers to the design of the course and expresses the flexibility or rigidity of the teaching methods, objectives and assessment practices (Moore 1993). Dialogue refers to the degree of interaction with the instructor and is associated with the communication medium (Moore and Kearsley 2005). In Moore's theory, low dialogue and structure equate to high transactional distance and vice versa (Garrison 2000). However, the theory points out that high dialogue and structure are difficult to achieve simultaneously (Dron 2007). The theory also incorporates a third concept, learner autonomy. The greater the transactional distance (i.e. low structure and dialogue), the more responsibility is placed on the learner (Moore and Kearsley 2005). In this model, Garrison (2003) argues that autonomy is associated with independence and self-directed learning. While

Moore points out that the transactional distance model does not imply that autonomous learners do not require teachers, he does suggest that they require less dialogue and minimal structure when compared with less autonomous learners (Moore 2007).

Other researchers in the field have argued that the term *autonomy* has suffered from the lack of clear definition (Garrison 2000; Garrison and Baynton 1987). Garrison and Baynton (1987) argue that a richer, more inclusive concept is that of *learner control*, as it helps to address the confusion associated with the role of independence in distance education. In this conceptualisation, “control is concerned with the opportunity and ability to influence, direct, and determine decisions related to the education process” (p. 5). This can only be achieved by striking a balance between *independence* (being free to make choices without restrictions or outside influences); *power*—later referred to as competence—(the capability to be responsible for and take part in the learning process); and *support* (the resources, including the teacher, available to the learner throughout the learning process). In this model, support from the teacher enhances greater control on the part of the learner; it does not take away from it. Baynton (1992) tested this model via confirmatory factor analysis and found that the subsequent three main factors mirrored the proposed dimensions.

The work of other researchers has also influenced our understandings of choice, control and autonomy in distance education, most notably Candy (1991). Candy focused on self-direction and distinguished two different types: self-direction as (1) a personal characteristic; and (2) the degree of control a learner has in determining his or her learning path. This is an important distinction because it recognises that autonomy is both a personal and situational variable. In other words, the degree of autonomy a person expresses can vary from situation to situation.

Dron (2007) has built on the work of previous theorists and developed a conceptual model called *transactional control*. Transactional control has to do with choice and attempts to explain the dynamics of transactional distance. In this model, structure is equivalent to teacher control, dialogue relates to negotiated control, and autonomy relates to learner control. In other words, control is seen as a continuum from learner control at one end to teacher control at the other, which is determined by the choices made throughout the learning trajectory.

While the concepts of autonomy, independence, control and agency have been central to the development of distance education theory, other theories have also been influential.

2.2.3 Contemporary Theories of Learning

With the advent of the internet and communication technologies that enable interaction between and among student groups, contemporary learning theories increasingly inform teaching and learning practices in online contexts (Anderson and Dron 2011; McLoughlin and Lee 2008). In particular, constructivist and social

constructivist perspectives of learning have gained prominence in online education research and literature (Ally 2008; Dyke et al. 2007).

Constructivism sees the student at the centre of the learning process and actively involved in the construction of knowledge (Dalgarno 2001). Learning from this perspective, places emphasis on authentic activities, collaboration, learner control or agency, reflection, active engagement and intrinsic motivation (Herrington and Oliver 2000). There are several strands of constructivism. Two which figure prominently are cognitive constructivism and social constructivism (Dyke et al. 2007).

Individual cognitive constructivism has grown out of the foundational work of Piaget (1977) and is a theory that views the learner as agentic (i.e., the ability of an individual to make choices and act on those choices) and learning as an active process of individual meaning-making. Favoured approaches tend to be task-oriented, hands-on and self-directed (Dyke et al. 2007). Examples of cognitive constructivist methods include: active learning, problem-based learning and inquiry learning (Kirschner et al. 2006). Researchers (Lindgren and McDaniel 2012) have recognised that digital technologies present new opportunities for supporting learner agency most notably by personalising the learning experience, allowing the student to choose, assemble and construct their own representations of knowledge in their own way (Conole 2010).

The development of social constructivist theory was influenced by Vygotsky's (1978) cultural-historical theory and the writings of Dewey (1916). Social constructivism conceptualises learning as participation in shared activities where the context and the situated nature of learning are integral considerations. Social constructivist theory also acknowledges the importance of motivation and the crucial part contextual factors play in the fostering of motivation among learners (McInerney and Van Etten 2004). From this perspective, knowledge is distributed among members of a community, and learning involves individuals' abilities to participate successfully in community practices (Wenger 1998). Language is a central tool for learning and co-construction of knowledge (Dyke et al. 2007). It can be argued that the emergence of the theory of connectivism, that views learning as a process of developing networks of information, resources and people (Siemens 2005), is a logical progression of social constructivist theory in a digitally-mediated world.

The situated, social and constructed nature of learning has been recognised in the online learning literature (Howland et al. 2012). Principles such as mediation, zone of proximal development, internalisation, cognitive apprenticeship and distributed intelligence have been adopted to underpin the design and development of online learning environments (Dyke et al. 2007). Particular emphasis has been placed on the development of online learning communities (Harasim 2012) where opportunities for collaboration and interaction are realised through the use of various digital communication tools (Haythornthwaite and Andrews 2011). While there is a focus on the socially-mediated nature of learning in the sections that follow, this does not

negate the importance of individual constructions of knowledge. Learner interactions with course content in particular, frequently occur at an individual level in online learning contexts.

2.2.4 The Role of Interaction in Online Learning

Interaction has been used in online learning to denote anything from clicking on a link to interpersonal dialogue among many participants (Nichols 2008). However, for the purposes of this book, a useful starting point is the work of Moore (1989). Moore identified three types of interaction in earlier generations of distance education, namely: learner-instructor, learner-content, and learner-learner interaction. Hillman et al. (1994) added a fourth type, namely learner-interface interactions.

Learner-instructor interaction refers to exchanges that occur between learners and the teacher and are characterised by attempts to motivate and interest the learner. They also provide a mechanism for feedback allowing clarification of misunderstandings. Thach and Murphy (1995) identified seven types of learner-instructor interactions in distance education settings: (1) establishing learning outcomes/objectives; (2) providing timely, useful feedback; (3) facilitating information presentation; (4) monitoring and evaluating student progress; (5) facilitating learning activities; (6) facilitating discussions; and (7) determining learning needs and preferences. More recently, Garrison et al. (2000) have developed the concept of teaching presence as part of the community of inquiry model. Teaching presence explicates the teaching role in online environments which encompasses design and organisation, facilitating discourse and direct instruction (Garrison 2011).

Teaching presence and the effective facilitation of learner-instructor interactions, particularly via online dialogue, have continued to be an area of active research (Garrison 2011; Mishra and Juwah 2006; Rovai 2007). From this, guidelines for facilitating effective practice have emerged that build on those of Thach and Murphy (1995). For example, Rovai (2007) provides design and facilitation guidelines for effective online discussions based on research and experience. They include ways of encouraging learner motivation, incorporating opportunities for learner choice, and clarification of expectations as well as developing and nurturing a strong sense of community. Mishra and Juwah (2006) highlight the importance of establishing a purpose and context for discussions, clarifying the relevance of conversations by making links to learning outcomes and the importance of encouraging learners to participate through the provision of appropriate support.

Learner-content interaction describes the intellectual process that occurs between the learner and the resources associated with the topic of study (Moore 1989). Learner-content interactions occur when learners access such things as textual and graphical representations of the subject matter (Hirumi 2006). With the increasing availability of technology, learners can now choose from a huge variety

of information at any time or from any place. But in order to interact with content, learners need to be able to access relevant and appropriate resources which frequently require guidance from the teacher (Anderson 2006b). Availability of adequate resources has also been shown to be important from a motivational perspective (Reeve et al. 2004).

Learner-learner interactions highlight processes that take place between peers undertaking a course together (Moore 1989). This can include processes such as sharing information and understandings, working together to interpret and complete activities, solving problems, and sharing opinions or personal insights. Technology-mediated communication technologies, for example, provide learners with opportunities to collaborate and actively participate in knowledge co-construction via online discussion (Hirumi 2006).

Juwah (2006) argues that for learners to participate and have positive peer interactions, they need to know how to effectively use the digital tools and must understand how to learn. This includes having the necessary prerequisite, prior knowledge and an understanding that successful learning requires self-regulation. Even with the necessary skills, peer interactions in technology-mediated environments are complex and cover a range of intellectual (e.g., reviewing, conceptualising), social/emotional and instructional interactions (e.g., critiquing). Much of what is known today about what is required for effective peer interactions to occur in technology-mediated environments has emerged from the analysis of asynchronous discussion transcripts (De Wever et al. 2006). Garrison et al. (2000) developed the community of inquiry model that posited that interactions must consist of three core elements for effective peer learning to occur. They are: cognitive presence—the degree to which the participants can construct meaning through ongoing communication; social presence—the ability of participants to present themselves as ‘real’ to other community members; and teaching presence—the design and facilitation of the learning experience.

Learner-interface interaction refers to a learner’s ability to use the required technological tools in order to interact and communicate with the instructor, other students and the course content (Hillman et al. 1994). A learner’s belief in their ability to use the necessary technological tools to learn online has also been found to be related to performance (Moos and Azevedo 2009).

Online communities Rovai and Lucking (2003, p. 6) state that “interaction is the primary mechanism through which community is built and sustained”. Interaction between learners and the development of learning communities has gained considerable attention (Anderson 2006b; Harasim 2012; Rovai 2000) because it has been identified as a crucial factor in creating and sustaining online communities (Haythornthwaite and Andrews 2011).

The development of a supportive network among learners can foster *motivation to learn*, commitment to group goals, encourage the co-construction of knowledge (Bonk and Khoo 2014), and has been shown to be significantly related to perceived

cognitive learning (Rovai 2002). However, building such a network is not straightforward. Interaction is an essential element of a supportive community but will not occur by simply providing the technological tools to learners (Garrison 2011). Course structure (Anderson 2008), class size (Vrasidas and McIsaac 1999), prior experience (Juwah 2006), social presence (Lin et al. 2008), instructor immediacy (Shea et al. 2005), self-disclosure (Cutler 1995), collaborative learning (Boekaerts and Minnaert 2006), group facilitation (Jones and Issroff 2007), personal agency (Anderson 2006a), and the ability of learners to meet their peers' affective needs within small group settings (Anderson and Simpson 2004), have all been found to influence student interaction and their sense of being part of an online community.

The discussion to this point has identified that the adoption of social constructivist principles that encompass the concepts of collaboration, interaction, and dialogue are important underpinnings in the development of successful online learning communities. Developing and sustaining a sense of online community is also important in fostering motivation among learners (Bonk and Khoo 2014). In the section that follows, attention turns to the existing body of research that has investigated the motivation of learners in these types of online environments.

2.3 Motivation to Learn in Online Environments

The characteristics of independence, self-direction and intrinsic motivation have long been associated with distance learners (Moore 1989). Intrinsic motivation has also been identified as an important characteristic of online learners (Shroff et al. 2007). Findings from comparative studies between online and on-campus students also suggest that online learners are more intrinsically motivated compared with their on-campus counterparts at both undergraduate and postgraduate level (Huett et al. 2008; Shroff and Vogel 2009; Wighting et al. 2008).

But as Martens et al. (2004) argue, online learners are often required to be more intrinsically motivated *because* the learning environment typically relies on intrinsic motivation and the associated characteristics of curiosity and self-regulation to engage learners. In fact, the technology itself is viewed by some as inherently motivating because it provides a number of qualities that are recognised as important in the fostering of intrinsic motivation, namely challenge, curiosity, novelty and fantasy (Lepper and Malone 1987). The novelty factor tends to wear off as users become accustomed to the technology (Keller and Suzuki 2004) and intrinsic motivation can wane. Frustration with technical problems can also reduce intrinsic motivation.

While the intrinsic motivation of learners is an important consideration, contemporary research studies exploring motivation in these environments is limited in both number and scope (Bekele 2010). Recent concern over attrition rates in online courses (Lee et al. 2013), particularly within emerging technology-mediated

environments such as MOOCs (Liyanagunawardena et al. 2013), highlights the need for greater understanding of the complexity of factors that influence *motivation to learn* in online contexts.

2.3.1 What is Motivation?

Brophy (2010) defines motivation as “a theoretical construct to explain the initiation, direction, intensity, persistence, and quality of behaviour, especially goal-directed behaviour” (p. 3). Motivation involves goals that provide the impetus for purposeful action with an intended direction. Whether physical or mental, activity is an essential part of motivation. Inherent in this definition is the notion that motivation is a process rather than an end result. This has implications in terms of measurement of motivation. That is, because it cannot be observed directly it must be inferred from actions such as choice of tasks, persistence, effort and achievement, or from what individuals say about themselves (Schunk et al. 2014). Contemporary views link motivation to individuals’ cognitive and affective processes such as thoughts, beliefs, goals and emotions and emphasise the situated, interactive relationship between the learner and the learning environment that is facilitated or constrained by various social and contextual factors (Schunk et al. 2014).

2.3.2 Why is Motivation Important?

Motivation plays a crucial role in learning and can influence what, when, how we learn and is a significant factor in performance (Schunk and Usher 2012). It has been shown to play an important role in determining whether a learner persists in a course, the level of engagement shown, the quality of work produced, and the level of achievement attained. Understanding the nature of motivation and the ways in which personal histories, social factors, experiences and circumstances may influence the motivation of learners, therefore, has important practical implications for those involved in online teaching and learning.

While few would disagree that motivation is important, the complexity and multifaceted nature of the construct has resulted in the development of several theories (Schunk et al. 2014). These can be broadly conceptualised in terms of a general *expectancy—value model of motivation* (Brophy 2010). The expectancy component is concerned with learners’ beliefs about whether they are able to perform a task (Bandura 1997). The value component relates to beliefs a learner holds about the task itself (Eccles and Wigfield 2002). In addition, comprehensive reviews of the motivation literature have resulted in the development of several motivation design models. These include Keller’s (2010) ARCS model of motivation design (incorporating the four components of attention, relevance,

confidence and satisfaction) and Ginsberg and Wlodkowski's (2000) motivational framework for culturally responsive teaching. Keller's model, in particular, has been frequently used as a conceptual framework for the development of online learning environments that enhance learner motivation.

2.3.3 Motivation, the Learning Environment and the Learner

Different perspectives have been adopted when exploring *motivation to learn* in online environments. The two that feature most prominently are motivation from the perspective of instructional design and motivation viewed as a trait of the learner. The first perspective concentrates on the design of the learning environment and the factors considered necessary to provide optimum learner motivation (Keller and Deimann 2012; Zaharias and Poylymenakou 2009). The second perspective views motivation as a relatively stable personal characteristic of the learner (Wighting et al. 2008; Yukselturk and Bulut 2007). But as we begin to understand more about the nature of motivation in online contexts, a third situated perspective is emerging that acknowledges the dynamic and responsive nature of motivation to different situations (Hartnett et al. 2011; Rienties et al. 2012). Throughout the remainder of the chapter, research from all three perspectives is presented. The various motivational theories that underpin different research investigations are also discussed. The reason for this is twofold. Firstly, incorporating various motivational theories ensures that a comprehensive picture of research to-date is presented. Secondly, while self-determination theory (Ryan and Deci 2000a) is the motivational framework underpinning the current study, other contemporary motivational theories are drawn upon where relevant, including self-efficacy theory (Bandura 1997) and interest theory (Hidi and Renninger 2006).

2.3.3.1 Motivation from a Learning Design Perspective

The first perspective used when examining motivation in online learning settings has been to concentrate on the design of the environment to elicit student motivation. Several instructional design models have been put forward, some of which consider learner motivation as a component of a broader design approach, and others which focus exclusively on motivation (see for example Chan and Ahern 1999). By far the most frequently used instructional design framework for the development of motivating online learning environments is Keller's ARCS model (Keller 1987). The framework was developed as a means of influencing learner motivation by using a systematic approach to instructional design. The attention, relevance, confidence and satisfaction (ARCS) categories serve as guidelines for systematically developing instructional strategies that capture learner attention,

establish relevance of what is being taught, encourage learner confidence, and provide a sense of satisfaction via intrinsic and extrinsic rewards (Keller 2010). Though not originally developed for online education, the ARCS model has been used as a design approach for instruction in online learning contexts (Keller 2008; Keller and Deimann 2012) and has underpinned a variety of other studies (ChanLin 2009; Hodges and Kim 2013; Paas et al. 2005).

Such instructional design approaches have been very important in developing our understanding of motivation in online learning environments. However, they are not sufficient on their own to explain the complex processes that occur as they often do not take into account learner differences. Even though the full application of the ARCS design process incorporates an analysis of the motivation of learners (Keller 2010), the model itself is often applied in a more prescriptive way (ChanLin 2009; Hodges and Kim 2013). Such approaches concentrate on the view that it is the designer and developer who make the material motivating and frequently reflect earlier behaviourist theories of motivation that assume that behaviour is caused by events or stimuli external to the person (Hickey and Granade 2004). Contemporary motivation literature suggests that it is a complex mix of these as well as other factors that contribute to a learner's motivation in any given situation (Brophy 2010).

2.3.3.2 Motivation from a Learner Trait Perspective

The second and predominant method for investigating motivation has been to conceptualise various motivation constructs as learner characteristics or traits. The impetus for conducting much of this research has been in an attempt to identify and address factors that contribute to higher attrition rates (Lee et al. 2013). Conversely, other studies have attempted to identify characteristics that predict learner success (Yukselturk and Bulut 2007).

Moos and Marroquin (2010) contend that research investigating motivation in technology-rich environments should be guided by fundamental and well-established theories of motivation. These include, self-efficacy theory (Bandura 1997); goal orientation theory (Murayama et al. 2012); interest theory (Hidi et al. 2004); and intrinsic–extrinsic motivation theory, in particular self-determination theory (Ryan and Deci 2000a). Of these, self-efficacy theory has been used most frequently.

Self-efficacy: Social cognitive theory proposes that motivation influences both learning and performance (Schunk and Usher 2012) and focuses on how people acquire knowledge, skills, beliefs and strategies through their interactions with and observations of others. Bandura (1986) social cognitive theory is central to this area of motivational research. It is based on the premise that there is a reciprocal, triadic, interactive relationship among personal factors, behaviours and environmental influences. A focal point of this theory is the notion of self-efficacy, defined as the belief that one is capable of learning or performing at a certain level in order to

attain particular goals. Self-efficacy, unlike similar constructs such as self-concept or self-esteem, is focused on an individual's beliefs about their performance capabilities for a particular task within a particular context that has yet to be undertaken.

Bandura (1997) proposed that individuals use information from a number of sources in order to judge self-efficacy. These include actual experiences (successes, failures), vicarious experiences (model observation), attributions, verbal persuasion, and physiological/affective states. Actual experience plays a major role in assessing self-efficacy for a task, with success generally raising self-efficacy and failure lowering it. Ability and effort attributions affect self-efficacy with positive ability attributions enhancing self-efficacy more than effort attributions (Schunk et al. 2014).

Observing similar peers successfully completing a task can convey to the observer that they too have the capabilities for success where model similarity is an important factor. Having a trusted person tell you that you have the ability to succeed is a further important source of information. Physiological symptoms such as increased heart rate or sweating can act as a signal of anxiety, indicating a lack of skills or ability. Alternatively, it may be interpreted as positive anticipation suggesting confidence in the ability to succeed.

Self-efficacy has been linked to factors influencing goal setting and goal performance (Schunk and Usher 2012) and has been shown to be a major motivational factor that affects students' task choices, effort, persistence and achievement (see Brophy 2010). Research has consistently shown that self-efficacy is a strong predictor of performance and student motivation (Schunk et al. 2014). Criticism of self-efficacy theory centre around, what some consider, an ambiguity of definition (i.e. outcome expectations and efficacy expectations are not conceptually distinct) and the lack of clarity of the self-efficacy measurement scale (Eastman and Marzillier 1984).

Self-efficacy has also been highlighted as an important predictor of successful outcomes and satisfaction in online learning environments (Kuo et al. 2013). Academic self-efficacy (Artino 2008; Lynch and Dembo 2004) and efficacy to learn online (Shen et al. 2013) have both been found to be significantly related to a number of factors. These include: use of high level learning strategies (Moos and Azevedo 2009; Wang and Wu 2008); critical thinking and metacognitive learning strategies (Artino and Stephens 2006); persistence (Hart 2012); satisfaction (Artino 2007, 2008); participation (Kuo et al. 2013); and academic performance (Hodges 2008). However, several studies exploring self-efficacy to learn online did not predict student achievement outcomes (Bell 2007; Xie et al. 2006). Prior successful experience with online learning has also been found to be important for learners to feel efficacious about future learning in similar contexts (Bates and Khasawneh 2007). Furthermore, learner self-efficacy may fluctuate as they come to understand the challenging nature of learning in technology-rich environments (see Moos and Marroquin 2010).

Goal orientation: A second conceptual framework used to support studies investigating *motivation to learn* in online contexts, is goal orientation theory. Goal orientation theory explores learners' reasons for engaging in achievement behaviour, in particular the beliefs that result in different approaches to and engagement in achievement situations (Murayama et al. 2012).

Although there are numerous types of goal orientations, the two that have been studied most extensively are learning (mastery or task-involved) goal and performance (ego-involved) goal orientations (Schunk et al. 2014). Learners who adopt a learning goal orientation tend to focus on learning for understanding, developing new skills, and improving or developing competence where the standard for judging the achievement or otherwise is internal to the learner. In contrast, a performance goal orientation tends to focus on demonstrating competence or ability where the standard for measurement is in comparison to others (Murayama et al. 2012).

While earlier research focused on the differences between learning and performance goals, more recent work recognises that performance goal orientation can be further categorised into performance-approach (wanting to demonstrate competence in relation to others) and performance-avoid (wanting to avoid looking incompetent) orientations. This research also suggests that performance-approach goals can be potentially positive for learning and, when combined with learning goals, can lead to optimal motivation (Harackiewicz et al. 2002). What is also clear from the research is that a performance-avoidance orientation is negatively related to various learning outcomes (Brophy 2010).

Studies in online learning environments have found that students who adopt a performance orientation are more likely to contribute to assessed activities (Bures et al. 2000) and focus on administrative tasks (Dawson et al. 2009) in comparison to learners who adopted a learning goal orientation. Furthermore, research has shown positive relationships between learning goal orientation and increased participation in discussions related to learning and sharing (Dawson et al. 2009), metacognitive strategy use and performance (Chen and Wu 2012), and learners' overall satisfaction (Kickul and Kickul 2006). A smaller body of research has investigated approach and avoid goal orientations, for example, a learning-approach orientation has been shown to be a predictor of achievement (Crippen et al. 2009). Moos and Marroquin (2010) highlight the fact that the type of strategies learners use differ depending on their goal orientation, while Ng (2012) found that the positive effects of both learning and performance goal approach orientations are supported by learners' control beliefs. Apart from a few exceptions (Ng 2008, 2009), studies that have considered the adoption of multiple simultaneous goal orientations by learners in online contexts are rare.

Interest, a concept closely related to intrinsic motivation, is a distinct motivational construct evident in some online motivational research. Research in traditional educational contexts has consistently shown that the level of an individual's interest has a significant influence on their learning (Hidi and Renninger 2006). Interest has been characterised in a number of ways, but is most often viewed as a psychological

state that “involves focused attention, increased cognitive functioning, persistence, and affective involvement” (Hidi 2000, p. 311). Interest is always content specific (Krapp 2002) and two types of interest have frequently been associated with this psychological state, namely individual and situational interest (Hidi and Harackiewicz 2000). Individual interest is seen as a relatively stable disposition or motivational orientation towards certain activities. Situational interest is engendered in response to particular conditions within the environment and tends to be less enduring (Hidi and Ainley 2008).

Rather than being seen as opposites, situational and individual interest are considered distinct constructs that can interact and influence each other. While researchers have highlighted the importance of individual interest on learning and motivation (Hidi and Renninger 2006), research has also focused on situational interest as a way for educators to foster student involvement and motivation in specific activities (Hidi and Harackiewicz 2000). In their four-phase model of interest, Hidi and Renninger (2006) describe two different types of situational interest, triggered and maintained. Triggered situational interest tends to be short-lived. Maintained situational interest follows on from the triggered state and is usually sustained over longer periods of time.

Triggered situational interest has been linked to learning environments that include group work and use of computers (Hidi and Renninger 2006; Lepper and Malone 1987). Maintained situational interest has been linked to a variety of conditions such as personal relevance and utility value (Hidi and Renninger 2006), collaborative work as well as authentic and meaningful activities (Blumenfeld et al. 2006; Boekaerts and Minnaert 2006).

Online learning studies have shown that higher engagement occurs when learners are personally interested in the topic (Schallert and Reed 2003) and have a pre-existing individual interest in computers (Sansone et al. 2011). Additionally, personal interest is enhanced in autonomy-supportive online environments (Moos and Marroquin 2010); a learner’s level of topic interest has been linked to learning in online environments (Akbulut 2008; Renninger et al. 2011); and situational interest has been shown to increase with the inclusion of conceptual scaffolding in online contexts (Moos and Azevedo 2008). However, researchers have highlighted the need to account for novelty effects frequently seen in technology-rich contexts where learner interest diminishes over time (see Moos and Marroquin 2010).

Intrinsic–extrinsic motivation: is another motivational construct that has been used to investigate learner motivation in online environments. “Intrinsic motivation is defined as the doing of an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable consequence” (Ryan and Deci 2000a, p. 56). Intrinsic motivation often results from the challenge, interest or fun an individual derives from an activity. In contrast, “extrinsic motivation is a construct that pertains whenever an activity is done in order to attain some separable outcome” (Ryan and Deci 2000a, p. 60). In other words, intrinsic motivation is associated with undertaking an activity for the enjoyment or interest inherent in it. Extrinsic motivation is associated with a source outside the activity itself, such as undertaking a course of study

to improve future career prospects. Research suggests that individuals who are intrinsically motivated are more likely to undertake challenging activities; be actively engaged and enjoy learning; adopt a deep approach to learning; and exhibit enhanced performance, persistence, and creativity (Amabile 1985; Brophy 2010; Ryan and Deci 2000b).

Several studies have explored students' reasons for engagement in online environments from an intrinsic-extrinsic motivation perspective (e.g., Rentroia-Bonito et al. 2006; Shroff and Vogel 2009; Xie et al. 2006). Huang and Liaw (2007) found that learners' perceptions of autonomy were predictive of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. A study by Martens et al. (2004) examined the intrinsic motivation of psychology and technology undergraduates undertaking authentic computer tasks. They found that high levels of intrinsic motivation were not necessarily indicative of higher levels of achievement. Instead, intrinsic motivation was associated with greater exploration of the learning environment. Results of research by Rienties et al. (2009) revealed that differences in learner motivation influenced the type of discourse contributions with intrinsically motivated learners being central and prominent contributors. While this body of research adds to our understanding of motivation, it is important to note that there has been the tendency to focus predominantly on intrinsic motivation (Martens et al. 2004; Rovai et al. 2007; Shroff and Vogel 2009). In doing so, current views that individuals can be simultaneously intrinsically and extrinsically motivated to a greater or lesser degree over time in any given context, are neglected (Paris and Turner 1994).

2.3.3.3 Motivation from a Situational Perspective

Although fewer in number, studies have been conducted that do acknowledge a more contemporary situated 'person in context' perspective (Turner and Patrick 2008). For example, studies have shown that receiving elaborated and timely feedback significantly enhances student self-efficacy (Artino 2007, 2008; Bates and Khasawneh 2007; Wang and Wu 2008). Collective efficacy, "people's shared beliefs in their collective power to produce the desired results" (Bandura 2000, p. 75), is a related construct that has been shown to have positive effects on discussion behaviour and group performance in computer supported collaborative learning environments (Wang and Lin 2007a, b).

Furthermore, Matuga (2009) found that goal orientation changed from a performance to learning orientation over time, within the context of an online science course. In a related study, Whipp and Chiarelli (2004) found that instructor support, peer support and course design all influenced learner interest within a web-based course. While Xie et al. (2006) identified contextual factors that increased student intrinsic motivation (e.g., clearly stated guidelines, well-designed discussion topics and instructor involvement) and those that decreased it (e.g., lack of instructor and peer feedback).

2.4 Self-determination Theory as a Framework for Studying Online Motivation

Arguably one of the more well-known theories of motivation is intrinsic–extrinsic motivation. An influential theory that explains this motivation concept is self-determination theory (SDT) (Deci and Ryan 1985). Self-determination theory is a contemporary theory of situated motivation that is built on the fundamental premise of learner autonomy. SDT argues that all humans have an intrinsic need to be self-determining or autonomous, as well as competent and connected, in relation to their environment.

Connell (1990) defines *autonomy* as “the experience of choice in the initiation, maintenance and regulation of activity and the experience of connectedness between one’s actions and personal goals and values” (pp. 62–63). When autonomous, students attribute their actions to an internal locus of causality and experience a sense of freedom and choice over their actions. *Competence* is defined as “the need to experience oneself as capable of producing desired outcomes and avoiding negative outcomes” (Connell and Wellborn 1991, p. 51). *Relatedness* “encompasses the need to feel securely connected to the social surround and the need to experience oneself as worthy and capable of ... respect” (Connell and Wellborn 1991, pp. 51–52).

SDT states that if the environmental conditions are such that they support an individual’s autonomy, competence and relatedness needs, then a learner’s inherent intrinsic motivation will be promoted (Ryan and Deci 2000a). When intrinsically motivated, outside incentives are unnecessary as the reward lies in the doing of the activity (Ryan and Deci 2000b). In contrast, students who are extrinsically motivated undertake activities for reasons separate from the activity itself (Ryan and Deci 2000a); for example gaining good grades, avoiding negative consequences, or because the task has utility value such as passing a course in order to earn a degree.

Ryan and Deci (2000a) recognised that learners will not be intrinsically motivated at all times and in all situations. SDT explains extrinsic motivation processes in terms of external regulation, as the reasons for undertaking the task lie outside the individual. However, the degree to which an activity is perceived as externally regulated can vary and therefore *different types of extrinsic motivation exist*. The taxonomy of human motivation details a continuum of regulation that incorporates amotivation (lack of motivation) at one end through to intrinsic motivation at the other, with different types of extrinsic motivation sitting between the extremes. The various forms of extrinsic motivation highlight a shift in the degree to which externally motivated behaviour is autonomously determined. They range from externally controlled with little or no self-determination, to more internal control and self-regulation where a learner engages in an activity because of its significance to their sense of self.

Research has shown that intrinsic and extrinsic types of motivation can and do co-exist (Lepper et al. 2005). It is the degree to which a student is intrinsically or

extrinsically motivated that is important, with more self-determined students experiencing positive learning outcomes even when extrinsically motivated (Reeve et al. 2002, 2004). Furthermore, autonomous forms of motivation have also been shown to have a potential buffering effect on less self-determined types of motivation (Ratelle et al. 2007; Sheldon and Krieger 2007).

According to this taxonomy, an *amotivated* individual lacks intention because he/she feels incompetent or has low self-efficacy. They feel that whatever they do it will not affect the outcome, or they place low value on the task being undertaken. Within the four patterns of extrinsic motivation, *external regulation* refers to individuals who are responsive to threats of punishment or the offer of rewards. This is the type of extrinsic motivation most often contrasted with intrinsic motivation, especially in earlier research. *Introjection* refers to students who engage in a task because they feel they should due to the expectations of others and feel guilty if they do not participate. Even though the feelings are internal, the individual is not self-determining as they are being controlled by their feelings (Ryan and Deci 2002). The third level of extrinsic motivation, called *identification*, is associated with individuals who engage in the task because it has personal value to them. The locus of causality is internal in the sense that the individual has chosen the goal or identifies with it and is aware of its importance. But the motivational pattern is still considered extrinsic in the sense that it is the utility value (a means to an end), personal importance and/or relevance of the task rather than the task itself that determines the behaviour.

The final level within the extrinsic motivation types is *integration*, where learners engage in the activity because of its significance to their sense of self. Both identified and integrated types of motivation share some of the qualities of intrinsic motivation (Ryan and Deci 2000a) and have similar consequences for learning and motivation. This has important implications as it highlights how educators can assist learners to appreciate the importance and value of learning activities even when they are not intrinsically interesting. More recently, Deci and Ryan (2012) have described the continuum of human motivation in terms of two meta-theoretical concepts, namely controlled and autonomous motivation to differentiate between externalised and internalised types of extrinsic motivation. External and introjected regulations are viewed as types of controlled extrinsic motivation while identified and integrated regulations are considered types of autonomous motivation in conjunction with intrinsic motivation. For a diagrammatic representation of the continuum see Ryan and Deci (2000a).

Research in traditional learning situations shows that autonomy support within the learning context leads to more self-determined forms of motivation among learners (Deci and Ryan 2008; Guay et al. 2008; Reeve 2009; Reeve et al. 2008; Van Etten et al. 2008). Examples of autonomy support include: providing rationales for tasks, the use of non-controlling language, and the provision of relevant and meaningful instructional activities that align with students' personal interests.

Conversely, external regulation such as deadlines, directives and compliance requests serve to undermine self-determined types of motivation (Deci and Ryan 2008; Guay et al. 2008; Ryan and Deci 2000a; Vallerand et al. 2008; Van Etten et al. 2008). Rewards can have a similar effect if used in order to control behaviour such as task engagement, completion or performance (Deci et al. 1999). Choice has also been shown to be supportive of learners' autonomy needs (Katz and Assor 2007; Patall et al. 2008). However, it is the perception of choice, or lack of it, rather than the actual choices offered that is critical in terms of self-determination (Reeve et al. 2003).

Support for the competence needs of learners is also necessary to facilitate motivation (Schunk and Zimmerman 2006). The provision of structure (Connell and Wellborn 1991) has been shown to be important in supporting competence needs and facilitating autonomous types of motivation (i.e. identification, integration and intrinsic motivation). Structure includes explicit, detailed information that clarifies expectations without seeking to control behaviour; provision of informational feedback given in a timely manner; and responsiveness to student questions, comments and suggestions (Deci and Moller 2005; Reeve et al. 2004, 2008).

The fact that high structure within the learning activity can co-exist and be seen as mutually supportive, rather than conflicting with the autonomy needs of learners, is something that has been previously noted in the general motivation literature (Jang et al. 2010; Reeve 2009). In addition to structure supporting learner competence, learning activities designed to be optimally challenging, that is where the challenge of the task is high and reasonably well-matched to learners' skill levels (Csikszentmihalyi 1985), encourage feelings of capability and more self-determined motivation.

The more an individual experiences having their autonomy and competence needs met within a supportive relationship, the more connected and trusting they feel towards that person (Ryan et al. 2005). In line with this, teacher involvement in terms of the amount of time invested, care taken, and attention given, have also been shown to be powerful motivators (Brophy 2010). Inclusion, which encompasses respect and connectedness, has also been identified as one of the basic conditions necessary for encouraging and supporting motivation across diverse groups of learners (Ginsberg and Wlodkowski 2000). Conversely, difficulties in relationships with teachers and other learners have been associated with a corresponding undermining of autonomy needs (Martens and Kirschner 2004).

Criticism of self-determination theory centre around the argument that the fundamental assumptions on which it is based adopt a distinctly Western perspective and may not be universal (McInerney and Van Etten 2004). In particular, the assumption that autonomy is a universal human need is questioned within collectivist cultures (Markus and Kitayama 1991). However, research in non-Western cultures supports SDT, although with slightly differing emphasis on autonomy and relatedness (for a summary see Reeve et al. 2004). Several researchers (Reeve et al. 2004; Ryan and Deci 2006) point out that this criticism often stems from the misunderstanding of the concept of autonomy where it is frequently equated with individualism and separateness. Research has shown that autonomy and relatedness

are compatible constructs (Ryan and Deci 2006). Further criticism originates from proponents of operant theory who argue that, contrary to SDT, contingent based rewards are the best motivators (Pierce et al. 2003).

Several online studies have utilised self-determination theory as a theoretical basis (Giesbers et al. 2013; Hartnett et al. 2011; Rienties et al. 2012). For example, Chen et al. (2010) showed that addressing the autonomy, competence and relatedness needs of learners is likely to enhance online engagement, achievement and course satisfaction. Collectively, other studies have demonstrated that feedback, the instructor's role in online discussions, choice, competence, challenge, interest, relevance and collaboration all influenced student intrinsic *motivation to learn* in the various online learning contexts. Few studies, however, draw on multiple perspectives (i.e., of both instructors and students) or examined more self-determined (i.e. autonomous) forms of extrinsic motivation. This has resulted in a tendency by some researchers to characterise online learners as intrinsically motivated (Rovai et al. 2007). The study by Hartnett et al. (2011) makes an important contribution by highlighting the complex, multifaceted, situation-dependent nature of motivation in online contexts by using the SDT continuum in addition to *all three* underlying concepts of autonomy, competence and relatedness as analytic tools.

2.5 Summary

With advances in technology that have enabled greater connectivity among learners contemporary learning theories, in particular social constructivism, have increasingly informed teaching and learning practices in online learning contexts. Constructivist principles that encompass concepts of collaboration, interaction and dialogue, where the context and situated nature of learning are integral considerations, have been shown to be important underpinnings in the development of successful online learning communities. Motivation has been identified as a key factor in developing and sustaining a sense of community as well as learning and achievement in online contexts.

This chapter has reviewed the existing research on *motivation to learn* in online settings while highlighting the limited number and scope of studies to-date. Moreover, it was argued that the majority of existing studies have either adopted a behaviourist approach, focusing on the environment or a cognitive perspective concentrating on the characteristics of the learner. Both overlook the dynamic and responsive nature of *motivation to learn*. Contemporary theories of motivation have been used to underpin some research. However, they have generally been applied in limited ways. Studies that have used a situated approach (where both the learner and the learning environment are considered) do exist, but are also limited in terms of the breadth of social and contextual motivational influences explored and their use of narrow conceptualisations of motivation. An example of this has been the tendency to focus exclusively on intrinsic motivation in studies using self-

determination theory as a conceptual framework. Taken together, these issues highlight the need for research that explores motivation from a contemporary situated perspective, in ‘real-life’ online settings that includes consideration of a broad range of social and contextual influences.

References

- Akbulut, Y. (2008). Predictors of foreign language reading comprehension in a hypermedia reading environment. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 39(1), 37–50. doi:[10.2190/EC.39.1.c](https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.39.1.c).
- Ally, M. (2008). Foundations of educational theory for online learning. In T. Anderson (Ed.), *Theory and practice of online learning* (2nd ed., pp. 3–31). Retrieved from <http://www.aupress.ca/index.php/books/120146>.
- Amabile, T. M. (1985). Motivation and creativity: Effects of motivational orientation on creative writers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(2), 393–399. doi:[10.1037/0022-3514.48.2.393](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.48.2.393).
- Anderson, B., & Simpson, M. (2004). Group and class contexts for learning and support online: Learning and affective support in small group and class contexts. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 5(3), Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/index>.
- Anderson, B. (2006a). Writing power into online discussion. *Computers and Composition*, 23(1), 108–124. doi:[10.1016/j.compcom.2005.12.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2005.12.007).
- Anderson, T. (2006b). Interaction in learning and teaching on the educational semantic web. In C. Juwah (Ed.), *Interactions in online education: Implications for theory and practice* (pp. 141–155). London: Routledge.
- Anderson, T. (2008). Teaching in an online context. In T. Anderson (Ed.), *Theory and practice of online learning* (2nd ed., pp. 343–366). Retrieved from <http://www.aupress.ca/index.php/books/120146>.
- Anderson, T., & Dron, J. (2011). Three generations of distance education pedagogy. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 12(3), 80–97. Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/890/1826>.
- Artino, A. R. (2007). Online military training: Using a social cognitive view of motivation and self-regulation to understand students’ satisfaction, perceived learning, and choice. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 8(3), 191–202.
- Artino, A. R. (2008). Motivational beliefs and perceptions of instructional quality: Predicting satisfaction with online training. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 24(3), 260–270. doi:[10.1111/j.1365-2729.2007.00258.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2007.00258.x).
- Artino, A. R., & Stephens, J. M. (2006). Learning online: Motivated to self-regulate? *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 10(4), 176–182.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(3), 75–78. doi:[10.1111/1467-8721.00064](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00064).
- Bates, A. W. (2005). *Technology, e-learning and distance education* (2nd ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bates, R., & Khasawneh, S. (2007). Self-efficacy and college students’ perceptions and use of online learning systems. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23, 175–191. doi:[10.1016/j.chb.2004.04.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.04.004).

- Baynton, M. (1992). Dimensions of “control” in distance education: A factor analysis. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 6(2), 17–31. doi:[10.1080/08923649209526783](https://doi.org/10.1080/08923649209526783).
- Bekele, T. A. (2010). Motivation and satisfaction in internet-supported learning environments: A review. *Educational Technology & Society*, 13(2), 116–127.
- Bell, P. D. (2007). Predictors of college student achievement in undergraduate asynchronous web-based courses. *Education*, 127(4), 523–533.
- Blumenfeld, P. C., Kempler, T. M., & Krajcik, J. S. (2006). Motivation and cognitive engagement in learning environments. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (pp. 475–488). Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Boekaerts, M., & Minnaert, A. (2006). Affective and motivational outcomes of working in collaborative groups. *Educational Psychology*, 26(2), 187–208. doi:[10.1080/01443410500344217](https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410500344217).
- Bonk, C. J., & Khoo, E. (2014). *Adding some TEC-VARIETY: 100 + activities for motivating and retaining learners online*. Bloomington, IN: Open World Books.
- Brophy, J. (2010). *Motivating students to learn* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bullen, M., & Janes, D. P. (Eds.). (2007). *Making the transition to e-learning: Strategies and issues*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.
- Bures, E. M., Abrami, P. C., & Amundsen, C. C. (2000). Student motivation to learn via computer conferencing. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(5), 593–621. doi:[10.1023/A:1007071415363](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007071415363).
- Candy, P. C. (1991). *Self-direction for lifelong learning: A comprehensive guide to theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Chan, T. S., & Ahern, T. C. (1999). Targeting motivation—Adapting flow theory to instructional design. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 21(2), 151–163.
- ChanLin, L.-J. (2009). Applying motivational analysis in a web-based course. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, 46(1), 91–103. doi:[10.1080/14703290802646123](https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290802646123).
- Chen, C.-H., & Wu, I. C. (2012). The interplay between cognitive and motivational variables in a supportive online learning system for secondary physical education. *Computers & Education*, 58(1), 542–550. doi:[10.1016/j.compedu.2011.09.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.09.012).
- Chen, K.-C., Jang, S.-J., & Branch, R. M. (2010). Autonomy, affiliation, and ability: Relative salience of factors that influence online learner motivation and learning outcomes. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning: An International Journal* 2(1), 30–50.
- Connell, J. P. (1990). Context, self, and action: A motivational analysis of self-system processes across the life-span. In D. Cicchetti & M. Beeghly (Eds.), *The self in transition: Infancy to childhood* (pp. 61–98). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes. In M. R. Gunnar & L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Self processes and development: The Minnesota symposia on child development* (Vol. 23, pp. 43–77). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Conole, G. (2010). Personalisation through technology-enhanced learning In J. O’Donoghue (Ed.), *Technology-supported environments for personalized learning: Methods and case studies* (pp. 1–15). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Crippen, K. J., Biesinger, K. D., Muis, K. R., & Orgill, M. K. (2009). The role of goal orientation and self-efficacy in learning from Web-based worked examples. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 20(4), 385–403.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1985). Emergent motivation and the evolution of the self. In D. A. Kleiber & M. L. Maehr (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 4, pp. 93–119). Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Cutler, R. (1995). Distributed presence and community in cyberspace. *Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An Electronic Journal for the 21st Century*, 3(2), 12–32.
- Dalgarno, B. (2001). Interpretations of constructivism and consequences for computer assisted learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 32(2), 183–194. doi:[10.1111/1467-8535.00189](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8535.00189).

- Dawson, S., Macfadyen, L., & Lockyer, L. (2009). Learning or performance: Predicting drivers of student motivation. *Proceedings of the Ascilite Conference in Auckland, New Zealand* (pp. 184–193). Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland09/procs/all-abstracts.html>.
- De Wever, B., Schellens, T., Valcke, M., & Van Keer, H. (2006). Content analysis schemes to analyze transcripts of online asynchronous discussion groups: A review. *Computers & Education*, 46(1), 6–28. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2005.04.005.
- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125 (6), 627–668. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.627.
- Deci, E. L., & Moller, A. C. (2005). The concept of competence: A starting place for understanding intrinsic motivation and self-determined extrinsic motivation. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 579–597). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development and health. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 182–185. doi:10.1037/a0012801.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Motivation, personality, and development within embedded social contexts: An overview of self-determination theory. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (pp. 85–107). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Mcmillan.
- Dron, J. (2007). *Control and constraint in e-learning: Choosing when to choose*. Hershey, PA: Information Science.
- Dyke, M., Conole, G., Ravenscroft, A., & de Freitas, S. (2007). Learning theory and its application to e-learning. In G. Conole & M. Oliver (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives in e-learning research: Themes, methods and impact on practice* (pp. 82–97). London: Routledge.
- Eastman, C., & Marzillier, J. S. (1984). Theoretical and methodological difficulties in Bandura's self efficacy theory. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 8(3), 213–229. doi:10.1007/bf01172994.
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 109–132. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153.
- Garrison, D. R. (2000). Theoretical challenges for distance education in the 21st century: A shift from structural to transactional issues. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/2/22>.
- Garrison, D. R. (2003). Self-directed learning and distance education. In M. G. Moore & W. G. Anderson (Eds.), *Handbook of distance education* (pp. 161–168). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Garrison, D. R. (2011). *E-learning in the 21st century: A framework for research and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2), 87–105. doi:10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6.
- Garrison, D. R., & Baynton, M. (1987). Beyond independence in distance education: The concept of control. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 1(3), 3–15. doi:10.1080/08923648709526593.
- Giesbers, B., Rienties, B., Tempelaar, D., & Gijssels, W. (2013). Investigating the relations between motivation, tool use, participation, and performance in an e-learning course using web-videoconferencing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(1), 285–292. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.09.005.
- Ginsberg, M. B., & Wlodkowski, R. J. (2000). *Creating highly motivated classrooms for all students: A schoolwide approach to powerful teaching with diverse learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Guay, F., Ratelle, C. F., & Chanal, J. (2008). Optimal learning in optimal contexts: The role of self-determination in education. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 233–240. doi:10.1037/a0012758.
- Hara, N., & Kling, R. (2003). Students' distress with a web-based distance education course: An ethnographic study of participants' experiences. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 4(2). Retrieved from <http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/tojde10/articles/hara.htm>.
- Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Pintrich, P. R., Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Revision of achievement goal theory: Necessary and illuminating. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(3), 638–645. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.94.3.638.
- Harasim, L. (2012). *Learning theory and online technologies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hart, C. (2012). Factors associated with student persistence in an online program of study: A review of the literature. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 11(1), 19–42.
- Hartnett, M., St. George, A., & Dron, J. (2011). Examining motivation in online distance learning environments: Complex, multifaceted and situation-dependent. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 12(6), 20–38. Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1030>.
- Haythornthwaite, C., & Andrews, R. (2011). *E-learning theory and practice*. London: Sage.
- Herrington, J., & Oliver, R. (2000). An instructional design framework for authentic learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 48(3), 23–48. doi:10.1007/BF02319856.
- Hickey, D. T., & Granade, J. B. (2004). The influence of sociocultural theory on our theories of engagement and motivation. In D. M. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Eds.), *Research on sociocultural influences on motivation and learning: Big theories revisited* (Vol. 4, pp. 223–247). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Hidi, S. (2000). An interest researcher's perspective: The effects of extrinsic and intrinsic factors on motivation. In C. Sansone & J. M. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp. 309–339). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hidi, S., & Ainley, M. (2008). Interest and self-regulation: Relationships between two variables that influence learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 77–109). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hidi, S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2000). Motivating the academically unmotivated: A critical issue for the 21st century. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(2), 151–179.
- Hidi, S., & Renninger, K. A. (2006). The four-phase model of interest development. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 111–127. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep4102_4.
- Hidi, S., Renninger, K. A., & Krapp, A. (2004). Interest, a motivational variable that combines affective and cognitive functioning. In D. Y. Dai & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Motivation, emotion, and cognition: Integrative perspectives on intellectual functioning and development* (pp. 89–115). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hillman, D. C., Willis, D. J., & Gunawardena, C. N. (1994). Learner-interface interaction in distance education: An extension of contemporary models and strategies for practitioners. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 8(2), 31–42. doi:10.1080/08923649409526853.
- Hirumi, A. (2006). Analysing and designing e-learning interactions. In C. Juwah (Ed.), *Interactions in online education* (pp. 46–71). London: Routledge.
- Hodges, C. B. (2008). Self-efficacy in the context of online learning environments: A review of the literature and directions for research. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 20(3–4), 7–25.
- Hodges, C. B., & Kim, C. (2013). Improving college students' attitudes toward mathematics. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, 57(4), 59–66. doi:10.1007/s11528-013-0679-4.
- Howland, J. L., Jonassen, D., & Marra, R. M. (2012). *Meaningful learning with technology* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Huang, H.-M., & Liaw, S.-S. (2007). Exploring learners' self-efficacy, autonomy, and motivation toward e-learning. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 105(2), 581–586. doi:10.2466/PMS.105.6.581-586.

- Huett, J. B., Kalinowski, K. E., Moller, L., & Huett, K. C. (2008). Improving the motivation and retention of online students through the use of ARCS-based e-mails. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 22(3), 159–176. doi:[10.1080/08923640802224451](https://doi.org/10.1080/08923640802224451).
- Jang, H., Reeve, J., & Deci, E. L. (2010). Engaging students in learning activities: It's not autonomy support or structure, but autonomy support and structure. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 588–600. doi:[10.1037/a0019682](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019682).
- Jones, A., & Issroff, K. (2007). Learning technologies: Affective and social issues. In G. Conole & M. Oliver (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives in e-learning research: Themes, methods and impact on practice* (pp. 190–202). London: Routledge.
- Juwah, C. (2006). Interactions in online peer learning. In C. Juwah (Ed.), *Interactions in online education* (pp. 171–190). London: Routledge.
- Katz, I., & Assor, A. (2007). When choice motivates and when it does not. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19(4), 429–442. doi:[10.1007/s10648-006-9027-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9027-y).
- Keller, J. M. (1987). Development and use of the ARCS model of instructional design. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 11(4), 2–10. doi:[10.1007/BF02905780](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02905780).
- Keller, J. M. (1999). Using the ARCS motivational process in computer-based instruction and distance education. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, Summer (78), 39–47.
- Keller, J. M. (2008). First principles of motivation to learn and e³-learning. *Distance Education*, 29(2), 175–185. doi:[10.1080/01587910802154970](https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910802154970).
- Keller, J. M. (2010). *Motivational design for learning and performance: The ARCS model approach*. New York: Springer.
- Keller, J. M., & Deimann, M. (2012). Motivation, volition, and performance. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed., pp. 84–95). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Keller, J. M., & Suzuki, K. (2004). Learner motivation and e-learning design: A multinationally validated process. *Journal of Educational Media*, 29(3), 229–239.
- Kickul, G., & Kickul, J. (2006). Closing the gap: Impact of student proactivity and learning goal orientation on e-learning outcomes. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 5(3), 361.
- Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 75–86. doi:[10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1).
- Krapp, A. (2002). An educational-psychological theory of interest and its relation to SDT. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-determination research* (pp. 405–427). Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester Press.
- Kuo, Y. C., Walker, A. E., Belland, B. R., & Schroder, K. E. E. (2013). A predictive study of student satisfaction in online education programs. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 14(1), 16–39.
- Lee, Y., Choi, J., & Kim, T. (2013). Discriminating factors between completers of and dropouts from online learning courses. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(2), 328–337. doi:[10.1111/j.1467-8535.2012.01306.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2012.01306.x).
- Lepper, M. R., Henderlong Corpus, J., & Iyengar, S. S. (2005). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations in the classroom: Age differences and academic correlates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 184–196. doi:[10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.184](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.184).
- Lepper, M. R., & Malone, T. W. (1987). Intrinsic motivation and instructional effectiveness in computer-based education. In R. E. Snow & M. J. Farr (Eds.), *Aptitude, learning and instruction* (Vol. 3: Cognitive and affective process analyses, pp. 255–286). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lin, Y.-M., Lin, G.-Y., & Laffey, J. M. (2008). Building a social and motivational framework for understanding satisfaction in online learning. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 38(1), 1–27. doi:[10.2190/EC.38.1.a](https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.38.1.a).
- Lindgren, R., & McDaniel, R. (2012). Transforming online learning through narrative and student agency. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 15(4), 344–355.

- Liyanagunawardena, T. R., Adams, A. A., & Williams, S. A. (2013). MOOCs: A systematic study of the published literature 2008–2012. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning*, 14(3), 202–227. Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1455/2531>.
- Lynch, R., & Dembo, M. (2004). The relationship between self-regulation and online learning in a blended learning context. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 5(2). Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/189/799>.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224.
- Martens, R. L., Gulikers, J., & Bastiaens, T. (2004). The impact of intrinsic motivation on e-learning in authentic computer tasks. *Journal of Computer Assisted learning*, 20(5), 368–376. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2004.00096.x.
- Martens, R. L., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). Predicting intrinsic motivation. *Association for educational communications and technology* (pp. 621–630). Washington, DC: Association for Educational Communications and Technology.
- Matuga, J. M. (2009). Self-regulation, goal orientation, and academic achievement of secondary students in online university courses. *Educational Technology and Society*, 12(3), 4–11. Retrieved from <http://www.ifets.info/>.
- McInerney, D. M., & Van Etten, S. (2004). Big theories revisited: The challenge. In D. M. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Eds.), *Research on sociocultural influences on motivation and learning: Big theories revisited* (Vol. 4, pp. 1–11). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- McLoughlin, C., & Lee, M. J. W. (2008). The three P's of pedagogy for the networked society: Personalization, participation, and productivity. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(1), 10–27.
- Mishra, S., & Juwah, C. (2006). Interactions in online discussions. In C. Juwah (Ed.), *Interactions in online education* (pp. 156–170). London: Routledge.
- Moore, M. G. (1989). Three types of interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 3(2), 1–6. doi:10.1080/08923648909526659.
- Moore, M. G. (1990). Recent contributions to the theory of distance education. *Open Learning*, 5(3), 10–15. doi:10.1080/0268051900050303.
- Moore, M. G. (1993). Theory of transactional distance. In D. Keegan (Ed.), *Theoretical principles of distance education* (pp. 23–38). London: Routledge.
- Moore, M. G. (2007). The theory of transactional distance. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (2nd ed., pp. 89–108). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Moore, M. G., & Kearsley, G. (2005). *Distance education: A systems view* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Moos, D. C., & Azevedo, R. (2008). Exploring the fluctuation of motivation and use of self-regulatory processes during learning with hypermedia. *Instructional Science*, 36(3), 203–231. doi:10.1007/s11251-007-9028-3.
- Moos, D. C., & Azevedo, R. (2009). Learning with computer-based learning environments: A literature review of computer self-efficacy. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 576–600. doi:10.3102/0034654308326083.
- Moos, D. C., & Marroquin, E. (2010). Review: Multimedia, hypermedia, and hypertext: Motivation considered and reconsidered. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 265–276. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.11.004.
- Murayama, K., Elliot, A. J., & Friedman, R. (2012). Achievement goals and approach-avoidance motivation. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (pp. 191–207). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ng, C. (2008). Multiple-goal learners and their differential patterns of learning. *Educational Psychology*, 28(4), 439–456. doi:10.1080/01443410701739470.
- Ng, C. (2009). Profiling learners' achievement goals when completing academic essays. *Educational Psychology*, 29(3), 279–295. doi:10.1080/01443410902797988.

- Ng, C. (2012). The role of self-efficacy, control beliefs and achievement goals on learning among distance learners. In J. L. Moore & A. D. Benson (Eds.), *International perspectives of distance learning in higher education* (pp. 233–252). Shanghai: InTech.
- Nichols, M. (2008). E-learning in context - #1. *ePrimer series*. Retrieved from Ako Aotearoa website <http://ako.aotearoa.ac.nz/project/eprimer-series/resources/files/e-learning-context-1-eprimer-series>.
- Paas, F., Tuovinen, J. E., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Darabi, A. A. (2005). A motivational perspective on the relation between mental effort and performance: Optimizing learner involvement in instruction. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53(3), 25–34. doi:10.1007/BF02504795.
- Paris, S. G., & Turner, J. C. (1994). Situated motivation. In P. R. Pintrich, D. R. Brown & C. E. Weinstein (Eds.), *Student motivation, cognition, and learning: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie* (pp. 213–237). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Park, J.-H., & Choi, H. J. (2009). Factors influencing adult learners' decision to drop out or persist in online learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 12(4), 207–217. Retrieved from <http://www.ifets.info/>.
- Patal, E. A., Cooper, H., & Robinson, J. C. (2008). The effects of choice on intrinsic motivation and related outcomes: A meta-analysis of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(2), 270–300. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.270.
- Paulus, T., & Scherff, L. (2008). "Can anyone offer any words of encouragement?" Online dialogue as a support mechanism for preservice teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 16(1), 113–136.
- Piaget, J. (1977). *The origin of intelligence in the child*. (M. Cook, Trans.). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Pierce, W., Cameron, J., Banko, K. M., & So, S. (2003). Positive effects of rewards and performance standards on intrinsic motivation. *The Psychological Record*, 53(4), 561–579.
- Ratelle, C. F., Guay, F., Vallerand, R. J., Larose, S., & Senécal, C. (2007). Autonomous, controlled, and amotivated types of academic motivation: A person-oriented analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(4), 734–746. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.4.734.
- Reeve, J. (2009). Why teachers adopt a controlling motivating style toward students and how they can become more autonomy supportive. *Educational Psychologist*, 44(3), 159–175. doi:10.1080/00461520903028990.
- Reeve, J., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Self-determination theory: A dialectical framework for understanding sociocultural influences on student motivation. In D. M. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Eds.), *Research on sociocultural influences on motivation and learning: Big theories revisited* (Vol. 4, pp. 31–60). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Reeve, J., Jang, H., Hardre, P., & Omura, M. (2002). Providing a rationale in an autonomy-supportive way as a strategy to motivate others during an uninteresting activity. *Motivation and Emotion*, 26(3), 183–207. doi:10.1023/A:1021711629417.
- Reeve, J., Nix, G., & Hamm, D. (2003). Testing models of the experience of self-determination in intrinsic motivation and the conundrum of choice. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(2), 375–392. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.95.2.375.
- Reeve, J., Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L., & Jang, H. (2008). Understanding and promoting autonomous self-regulation: A self-determination theory perspective. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 223–244). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Renninger, K. A., Cai, M., Lewis, M., Adams, M., & Ernst, K. (2011). Motivation and learning in an online, unmoderated, mathematics workshop for teachers. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 59(2), 229–247. doi:10.1007/s11423-011-9195-4.
- Rentiroa-Bonito, M. A., Jorge, J., & Ghaoui, C. (2006). Motivation to e-learn within organizational settings: An exploratory factor structure. *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies*, 4(3), 24–35.

- Rienties, B., Giesbers, B., Tempelaar, D., Lygo-Baker, S., Segers, M., & Gijssels, W. (2012). The role of scaffolding and motivation in CSCL. *Computers & Education*, 59(3), 893–906. doi:[10.1016/j.compedu.2012.04.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.04.010).
- Rienties, B., Tempelaar, D., Van den Bossche, P., Gijssels, W., & Segers, M. (2009). The role of academic motivation in computer-supported collaborative learning. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25(6), 1195–1206. doi:[10.1016/j.chb.2009.05.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.05.012).
- Rovai, A. P. (2000). Building and sustaining community in asynchronous learning networks. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 3(4), 285–297. doi:[10.1016/S1096-7516\(01\)00037-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(01)00037-9).
- Rovai, A. P. (2002). Sense of community, perceived cognitive learning, and persistence in asynchronous learning networks. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 5(4), 319–332. doi:[10.1016/S1096-7516\(02\)00130-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(02)00130-6).
- Rovai, A. P. (2007). Facilitating online discussions effectively. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 10(1), 77–88. doi:[10.1016/j.iheduc.2006.10.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2006.10.001).
- Rovai, A. P., & Lucking, R. (2003). Sense of community in a higher education television-based distance education program. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 51(2), 5–16. doi:[10.1007/BF02504523](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504523).
- Rovai, A. P., Ponton, M., Wighting, M. J., & Baker, J. (2007). A comparative analysis of student motivation in traditional classroom and e-learning courses. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 6(3), 413–432.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54–67. doi:[10.1006/ceps.1999.1020](https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020).
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. doi:[10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68).
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Determination research* (pp. 3–33). Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester Press.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Self-regulation and the problem of human autonomy: Does psychology need choice, self-determination, and will? *Journal of Personality*, 74(6), 1557–1585. doi:[10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00420.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00420.x).
- Ryan, R. M., La Guardia, J. G., Solky-Butzel, J., Chirkov, V., & Kim, Y. (2005). On the interpersonal regulation of emotions: Emotional reliance across gender, relationships, and cultures. *Personal Relationships*, 12(1), 145–163. doi:[10.1111/j.1350-4126.2005.00106.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-4126.2005.00106.x).
- Sansone, C., Fraughton, T., Zachary, J., Butner, J., & Heiner, C. (2011). Self-regulation of motivation when learning online: The importance of who, why and how. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 59(2), 199–212. doi:[10.1007/s11423-011-9193-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-011-9193-6).
- Schallert, D. L., & Reed, J. H. (2003). Intellectual, motivational, textual, and cultural considerations in teaching and learning with computer-mediated discussion. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 36(2), 103–118.
- Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (2014). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Schunk, D. H., & Usher, E. L. (2012). Social cognitive theory and motivation. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (pp. 13–27). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2006). Competence and control beliefs: Distinguishing the means and ends. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 349–367). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Shea, P., Swan, K., & Pickett, A. (2005). Developing learning community in online asynchronous college courses: The role of teaching presence. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 19(4), 59–82.
- Sheldon, K. M., & Krieger, L. S. (2007). Understanding the negative effects of legal education on law students: A longitudinal test of self-determination theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(6), 883–897. doi:[10.1177/0146167207301014](https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207301014).

- Shen, D., Cho, M.-H., Tsai, C.-L., & Marra, R. (2013). Unpacking online learning experiences: Online learning self-efficacy and learning satisfaction. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 19, 10–17. doi:[10.1016/j.iheduc.2013.04.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2013.04.001).
- Shroff, R. H., Vogel, D., Coombes, J., & Lee, F. (2007). Student e-learning intrinsic motivation: A qualitative analysis. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 2007(19), 241–260.
- Shroff, R. H., & Vogel, D. R. (2009). Assessing the factors deemed to support individual student intrinsic motivation in technology supported online and face-to-face discussions. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 8, 59–85.
- Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *Instructional Technology and Distance Education*, 2(1), 3–10. Retrieved from <http://www.elearnspace.org/Articles/connectivism.htm>.
- Thach, E. C., & Murphy, K. L. (1995). Competencies for distance education professionals. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 43(1), 57–79. doi:[10.1007/BF02300482](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02300482).
- Turner, J. C., & Patrick, H. (2008). How does motivation develop and why does it change? *Reframing motivation research*. *Educational Psychologist*, 43(3), 119–131. doi:[10.1080/00461520802178441](https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520802178441).
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Koestner, R. (2008). Reflections on self-determination theory. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 257–262. doi:[10.1037/a0012804](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012804).
- Van Etten, S., Pressley, M., McInerney, D. M., & Liem, A. D. (2008). College seniors' theory of their academic motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(4), 812–828. doi:[10.1037/0022-0663.100.4.812](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.4.812).
- Vrasidas, C., & McIsaac, M. S. (1999). Factors influencing interaction in an online course. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 13(3), 22–35. doi:[10.1080/08923649909527033](https://doi.org/10.1080/08923649909527033).
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, S.-L., & Lin, S. S. J. (2007a). The application of social cognitive theory to web-based learning through NetPorts. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(4), 600–612. doi:[10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00645.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00645.x).
- Wang, S.-L., & Lin, S. S. J. (2007b). The effects of group composition of self-efficacy and collective efficacy on computer-supported collaborative learning. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(5), 2256–2268. doi:[10.1016/j.chb.2006.03.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2006.03.005).
- Wang, S.-L., & Wu, P.-Y. (2008). The role of feedback and self-efficacy on web-based learning: The social cognitive perspective. *Computers & Education*, 51(4), 1589–1598. doi:[10.1016/j.compedu.2008.03.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.03.004).
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- Whipp, J. L., & Chiarelli, S. (2004). Self-regulation in a web-based course: A case study. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 52(4), 5–22. doi:[10.1007/BF02504714](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504714).
- Wighting, M. J., Liu, J., & Rovai, A. P. (2008). Distinguishing sense of community and motivation characteristics between online and traditional college students. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 9(3), 285–295.
- Xie, K., DeBacker, T. K., & Ferguson, C. (2006). Extending the traditional classroom through online discussion: The role of student motivation. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 34(1), 67–89. doi:[10.2190/7BAK-EGAH-3MH1-K7C6](https://doi.org/10.2190/7BAK-EGAH-3MH1-K7C6).
- Yukselturk, E., & Bulut, S. (2007). Predictors for student success in an online course. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(2), 71–83. Retrieved from <http://www.ifets.info/>.
- Zaharias, P., & Poylymenakou, A. (2009). Developing a usability evaluation method for e-learning applications: Beyond functional usability. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 25(1), 75–98. doi:[10.1080/10447310802546716](https://doi.org/10.1080/10447310802546716).



<http://www.springer.com/978-981-10-0698-2>

Motivation in Online Education

Hartnett, M.

2016, XXIII, 134 p. 5 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-981-10-0698-2