


An Investigation of Students’ Motivation to Pursue Higher Education at the Czech University

Jitka Vaculíková

Research Centre, Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Czech Republic
E-mail address: vaculikova@utb.cz · Phone No. +420 576 038 007



Ninth SELF Biennial International Conference
SELF – DRIVING POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY AND WELL-BEING
25 – 28 SEPTEMBER 2017 · MELBOURNE · AUSTRALIA



Aims. The aim of this paper was to **investigate the type of motivation** leading students to pursue higher education, and to **describe the adaptation** of the modified version of the **Academic Motivation Scale** (Vallerand et al., 1989). This seven-point 28-items Likert-scale was designed to assess self-determination continuum and the types of motivation with their regulatory styles.

Participants. The research pool consisted of **467 university students** in regular classroom settings enrolled at the Czech university. The mean age of the sample reached 22.25 (*SD* = 1.7) and ranged from 19 to 29 years (Table 1).

Procedure. (1) An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to explore the latent factor structure. The principal component analyses with the Varimax rotation was used with items loading over .30. The internal consistency was checked using Cronbach's alpha and item-total correlations.

(2) Correlations among the motivation subscales (Figure 1) assessing the self-determined continuum and correlations with GPA to test the predictive validity of the scales were examined.

(3) The overall average motivation and influence of the selected variables, i.e., gender, age, year and field of study.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample (n = 467)

Gender		Age		Year of study						Field of study			
Frequency													
	Male	Female	19-21 years	22-29 years	1 st year Bc	2 nd year Bc	3 rd year Bc	1 st year Mgr	2 nd year Mgr	Social Education	Healthcare	Philology	Preschool Teachers
n	29	438	184	278	149	150	86	39	43	177	109	55	126
%	6.2	93.8	39.4	59.5	31.9	32.1	18.4	8.4	9.2	37.9	23.3	11.8	27.0

Results.

In EFA a **4-factor model** was generated explaining 61% of the total variance. In this version the survey consisted of 16-items with Cronbach's α ranging from .82 to .60 and items falling into the appropriate factor. Only exception was item 5 (“Because I want to learn something new”) from the intrinsic motivation – to know, falling into the identified regulation. The data proved a student’s (F1) **IDR**, (F2) **ER**, (F3) **AM**, and (F4) **IM** to be strong predictors of students’ motivation to pursue higher education. Czech students reported being **primary motivated by IM**, representing self-determined regulation meaning studying for own purposes and the pleasure derived from it.

Table 2. Intercorrelations between the motivation scales and GPA

Subscale	Mean (SD)	IDR	ER	AM	IM
Identified regulation (IDR)	4.45 (1.44)	(5 items) .82			
External regulation (ER)	3.51 (1.32)	-.143**	(4 items) .67		
Amotivation (AM)	3.05 (1.39)	-.523**	.394**	(4 items) .74	
Intrinsic motivation (IM)	4.81 (1.18)	.530**	-.139**	-.343**	(3 items) .60
Grade point average (GPA)	1.95 (.606)	-.399**	.173**	.278**	-.242**

Note: Cronbach’s alphas are placed on diagonal.




Figure 2. Intercorrelations on the Self-Determination continuum

Type of motivation	Amotivation	Extrinsic Motivation				Intrinsic Motivation
Type of regulatory styles	Non-regulation	External Regulation	Introjected Regulation	Identified Regulation	Integrated Regulation	Intrinsic Regulation
Causality	Impersonal	External	Somewhat external	Somewhat external	Internal	Internal
Associated processes	Lack of the intention to pursue an activity	Motivation to obtain rewards or avoid punishments	Internalization Ego-involvement	Personally valuable, important Self-endorsement of goals	Congruence but not for enjoyment or inherent interest	Interest Enjoyment Inherent satisfaction
Quality of behavior	Non-self-determined regulation → Fully self-determined regulation					

Figure 1. Self-Determination continuum of motivation with researched types of motivation highlighted (Modified from Deci & Ryan, 2002)

Two **deviations** from the expected correlations outcomes were found and should be highlighted (see Table 2). (1) Amotivation showed a stronger negative correlation with identified regulation (-.523) than with intrinsic motivation (-.343), which is between these two subscales on the self-determined continuum (see Figure 2). (2) Identified regulation showed stronger positive correlation with intrinsic motivation (.530) than with external regulation falling into the same external motivation (-.143). Identified regulation itself was perceived by the Czech students as a part of intrinsic motivation rather than extrinsic motivation.

Table 3. Means differences for groups of students by selected variables

Subscales	Gender			Age			Year of study						Field of study										
	Male	Female	p-value	Effect Size (<i>r</i>)	19-21 years	22-29 years	p-value	Effect Size (<i>r</i>)	1 st year Bc	2 nd year Bc	3 rd year Bc	1 st year Mgr	2 nd year Mgr	F-test	p-value	Effect Size (η^2)	Social Education	Healthcare	Philology	Preschool Teacher	F-test	p-value	Effect Size (η^2)
IDR	3.7	4.5	< .001	.15	4.5	4.5	.947	.00	4.8	4.0	4.5	4.7	4.6	21.3	< .001	.049	4.8	4.2	2.9	4.8	66.1	< .001	.178
ER	3.9	3.5	.081	.08	3.5	3.5	.385	.04	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.0	3.2	17.6	< .001	.030	3.3	3.9	4.2	3.2	41.5	< .001	.078
AM	3.9	2.9	< .001	.15	2.9	3.2	< .05	.10	2.6	3.3	3.3	2.9	3.4	21.3	< .001	.044	3.0	3.3	3.9	2.5	50.9	< .001	.099
IM	4.2	4.9	< .001	.12	4.9	4.8	.509	.03	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.7	3.5	.477	.006	4.9	4.8	4.4	4.9	6.29	.098	.020

Note: Bc = Bachelor's degree. Mgr = Master's degree. Means on 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (does not correspond at all) to 7 (corresponds exactly) are displayed.