

---

## **THE IMPACT OF TEACHING TECHNIQUES ON LEARNERS' LEARNING MOTIVATIONS**

**Nguyen Thi Dan Tam, PhD.**

Ho Chi Minh City University of Economics and Finance, Vietnam.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61646/IJCRAS.vol.3.issue2.73>

### **ABSTRACT**

This paper presents a comparative analysis of two distinct teaching techniques, namely assigning group presentations and assigning free projects, with a focus on their efficacy in enhancing learner motivation. Motivation is a critical factor influencing student engagement and academic performance, thus warranting a thorough investigation into instructional methodologies that foster motivation. Through a comprehensive review and synthesis of existing literature, this research examines the theoretical underpinnings and empirical evidence surrounding both group presentations and free projects in educational settings. Various dimensions of learner motivation, including intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and autonomy, are explored within the context of these teaching strategies. Additionally, factors such as student preferences, learning outcomes, and perceived challenges associated with each approach are scrutinized. By synthesizing findings from diverse studies, this paper aims to provide educators with valuable insights into the comparative effectiveness of these two teaching techniques in promoting learner motivation. The implications of this research may inform instructional practices aimed at optimizing student engagement and academic achievement in diverse educational environments.

**Keywords:** comparative analysis, teaching techniques, group presentations, free projects, learner motivation, self-efficacy, autonomy

---

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Motivation plays a pivotal role in the learning process, influencing students' engagement, persistence, and

ultimately, their academic achievement (Wu, Li, Zheng, J & Guo, 2020; Turgunova & Abdurahimovna, 2023; Leenknecht, Wijnia, Köhlen, Fryer, Rikers & Loyens, 2021). As educators seek to cultivate an environment conducive to enhanced motivation, the selection of appropriate teaching techniques becomes paramount. Among the myriad of instructional strategies, assigning group presentations and free projects have emerged as popular approaches to promote student engagement and motivation. However, understanding the comparative effectiveness of these techniques in enhancing learner motivation remains a subject of scholarly inquiry.

Group presentations involve collaborative efforts among students to research, prepare, and deliver content to their peers, fostering not only content mastery but also interpersonal skills and teamwork (Sirisrimangkorn, 2021). On the other hand, free projects grant students autonomy to explore topics of personal interest, encouraging creativity, self-directed learning, and a sense of ownership over their academic pursuits (Valls-Ratés, Niebuhr & Prieto, 2022). Both approaches are rooted in theoretical frameworks such as Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which emphasizes the importance of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in fostering intrinsic motivation (Ryan, & Vansteenkiste, 2023).

While the benefits of these teaching techniques are well-documented individually, a comparative analysis is necessary to discern their differential impacts on learner motivation. This research aims to fill this gap by synthesizing existing literature to examine the efficacy of group presentations and free projects in enhancing motivation within educational contexts. By elucidating the strengths, limitations, and nuances of each approach, educators can make informed decisions to optimize student engagement and learning outcomes.

This paper begins with a review of relevant literature on motivation in education, followed by an exploration of the theoretical underpinnings of group presentations and free projects within the context of learner motivation. Subsequently, a comparative analysis will be conducted to assess the differential impacts of these teaching techniques on various dimensions of motivation, including intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and autonomy. The findings of this research have implications for instructional practices aimed at fostering motivation and promoting academic success in diverse educational settings.

## **2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Project-Based Learning (PBL) is a pedagogical approach wherein students engage in multifaceted tasks that integrate theoretical knowledge with practical application (Pham & Tran, 2021; Sarwar, 2020). In PBL, students collaborate to fulfill project requirements, necessitating a high degree of autonomy. To cultivate autonomy, learners must be motivated. The concept of "motivation" lacks a universally agreed-upon definition among scholars (Ek Styvén & Mariani, 2020; Omar & Dequan, 2020; Li, 2020). Generally, motivation refers to internal drives that propel behavior (Fishbach & Woolley, 2022). Luong (2022) identifies three primary motivation theories: Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Mindset Theory, and Expectancy-Value Theory.

This article focuses on Self-Determination Theory (SDT) proposed by Deci and Ryan in 1991 and updated by Ryan and Vansteenkiste (2023). SDT posits two core tenets: first, humans possess an inherent inclination for growth and are influenced by external factors; second, humans harbor three fundamental psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness, the fulfillment of which influences motivation. When these needs are met, individuals are more inclined to engage proactively. SDT categorizes motivation into three levels of autonomy: amotivation, external regulation, and intrinsic motivation. Amotivation signifies a lack of drive or intention to act, whereas intrinsic motivation stems from interest in the activity itself. External regulation encompasses behavior driven by rewards or avoidance of punishment, while introjected regulation is internally pressured behavior. Identified regulation involves voluntary participation due to perceived importance, and integrated regulation involves behavior aligned with personal values.

### 3. RESEARCH METHODS

This study assesses student autonomy through two distinct activities: group presentations assigned by the instructor and self-directed projects. In group presentation activities (GROUP), instructors assign topics to groups and allocate members based on class lists. Groups deliver presentations according to a schedule set by the instructor, with students lacking the autonomy to select topics. Evaluation of presentation outcomes is conducted collectively, with no differentiation among group members. Subsequently, students receive a survey to provide feedback on the activity. This study involved 79 GEP students from 5 Ho Chi Minh City University of Economics and Finance.

**Table 1. Gender**

		GENDER			Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Male	40	50.6	50.6	50.6
	Female	39	49.4	49.4	100.0
	Total	79	100.0	100.0	

According to table 1, among the 79 participating students, there were 40 males (50.6%) and 39 females (49.4%). Based on the SDT theory, the scale of student autonomy designed by the author includes 6 criteria from low to high: unmotivated - Amotivation; External influence - External Regulation; Introjected Regulation; Identified Regulation; Integrated Regulation; Intrinsic Motivation. The scale was converted into a survey and distributed directly to students after 2 tasks. The questions in the survey are designed on a Likert scale from 1-5, in which 1 is strongly disagree to 5 is strongly agree. After collected data will be analyzed through SPSS software.

### 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Compare student autonomy before and after applying the project-based teaching method. Through the

results showing students' autonomy in the two tasks of presentation and project work, the data on the chart shows that there is a difference before and after applying PBL. To have additional basis to confirm that difference, T-Test in SPSS is applied to 3 pairs of criteria clearly shown in the chart above: lack of motivation, adjustment due to goals, and content. motivation.

#### 4.1 AMO test

When comparing the lack of motivation before and after applying the project, two hypotheses are made: i) H0: The lack of motivation before and after applying is the same. ; H1: Lack of motivation before and after adoption is different. If Sig (2 tailed) > 0.5, H0 will be accepted; otherwise, H1 will be recognized.

**Table 2. AMO TESTS**

		Paired Samples Test					Significance			
		Paired Differences					t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	GROUP AMO 1 PROJECT AMO 1	2.544	1.048	.118	2.310	2.779	21.588	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 2	GROUP AMO 2 PROJECT AMO 2	2.519	1.084	.122	2.276	2.762	20.647	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 3	GROUP AMO 3 PROJECT AMO 3	2.443	1.248	.140	2.163	2.723	17.399	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 4	GROUP AMO 4 PROJECT AMO 4	2.114	1.271	.143	1.829	2.399	14.785	78	<.001	<.001

Based on the results of table 2, all variables have sig (2 tailed) < 0.5, thus, H1 is confirmed: The lack of motivation before and after applying the project is different.

#### 4.2 IR Tests

Similar to above, there are two hypotheses that need to be tested. H0: Self-regulation due to goals before and after teaching according to the project is the same. H1: Self-regulation due to goals before and after teaching according to the project is different. The following results:

**Table 3. IR Tests**

		Paired Samples Test					t	df	Significance	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	GROUP IR 1 PROJECT IR 1	-1.430	1.533	.173	-1.774	-1.087	-8.292	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 2	GROUP IR 2 PROJECT IR 2	-2.013	1.605	.181	-2.372	-1.653	-11.144	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 3	GROUP IR 3 PROJECT IR 3	-1.873	1.471	.165	-2.203	-1.544	-11.321	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 4	GROUP IR 4 PROJECT IR 4	-2.316	1.524	.171	-2.658	-1.975	-13.513	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 5	GROUP IR 5 PROJECT IR 5	-3.076	1.289	.145	-3.365	-2.787	-21.214	78	<.001	<.001

Based on the results of table 3, all variables have sig (2 tailed) < 0.5, thus, H1 is confirmed: The adjustment due to goals before and after applying the project is different.

### 4.3 T-tests

In the comparison of internal dynamics, there are two hypotheses that need to be tested. H0: Internal motivation before and after teaching according to the project is the same. H1: Internal motivation before and after teaching according to the project is different. The following results:

**Table 4. T-tests**

		Paired Samples Test					Significance			
		Paired Differences					t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference						
				Lower	Upper					
Pair 1	GROUP IM 1 PROJECT IM 1	-3.228	1.229	.138	-3.503	-2.952	-23.336	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 2	GROUP IM 2 PROJECT IM 2	-2.481	1.084	.122	-2.724	-2.238	-20.335	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 3	GROUP IM 3 PROJECT IM 3	-2.013	1.031	.116	-2.244	-1.782	-17.343	78	<.001	<.001
Pair 4	GROUP IM 4 PROJECT IM 4	-2.392	1.067	.120	-2.631	-2.153	-19.925	78	<.001	<.001

Based on the results of table 4, all variables have sig (2 tailed) < 0.5, thus, H1 is confirmed: Internal motivation before and after project teaching is different.

In summary, the above results show that students' initiative is different between presentation and project tasks. Proactivity in the project is better demonstrated in the presentation. This is consistent with two hypotheses in SDT: i) when learners find the appropriateness of the assigned task with their personal goals, internal motivation will be generated and; ii) internal motivation has a positive impact on learner autonomy.

#### 4.4 Discussions and conclusion

The findings of this study suggest that free projects serve as a more motivating educational approach compared to group presentations. This conclusion aligns with existing literature emphasizing the importance of autonomy in fostering student engagement and intrinsic motivation (Bureau, Howard, Chong & Guay, 2022; Guay, 2022; Salazar-Ayala, Gastélum-Cuadras, Hernández & Moreno-Murcia, 2021). By allowing students greater freedom in project selection and execution, educators can tap into individuals' intrinsic drives and interests, enhancing their overall learning experience. The autonomy-supportive nature of free projects empowers students to take ownership of their learning journey (Meece, 2023; Teng, 2024). When students have the freedom to choose project topics and design their approach, they are more likely to feel a sense of control and responsibility, leading to increased motivation (Pelikan, Lüftenegger, Holzer, Korlat, Spiel & Schober, 2021; Wu, Li, Zheng & Guo, 2020). This autonomy

facilitates deeper engagement with the material and promotes a sense of personal investment in the project outcomes (Alamri, Lowell, Watson & Watson, 2020; Theobald, 2021). In contrast, group presentations, while valuable for developing collaboration and communication skills, may impose constraints on student autonomy. The assigned topics and rigid structure of group presentations limit students' opportunities for creative expression and self-directed learning (Campillo-Ferrer & Miralles-Martínez, 2021). Moreover, the reliance on collective evaluation may diminish individual accountability and intrinsic motivation, as students may perceive their contributions as less impactful on the overall outcome (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2021).

These findings underscore the significance of incorporating autonomy-supportive practices into educational settings. Educators should strive to provide students with opportunities for self-directed learning and choice, as this can enhance motivation and overall learning outcomes (Alam, Fahim, Gupta, Dev & Malhotra, 2020; Vermote, Aelterman, Beyers, Aper, Buyschaert & Vansteenkiste, 2020; Müller, Thomas, Carmignola, Dittrich, Eckes, Großmann & Bieg, 2021). By embracing approaches that prioritize autonomy, such as free projects, educators can cultivate an environment conducive to student engagement, creativity, and intrinsic motivation.

In conclusion, this study highlights the importance of autonomy in promoting student motivation within educational contexts. Free projects emerge as a particularly effective means of fostering intrinsic motivation, as they afford students greater autonomy and opportunities for self-expression. By recognizing the pivotal role of autonomy in student motivation, educators can design learning experiences that inspire and empower learners to achieve their full potential.

## REFERENCE

- Alam, A., Fahim, A., Gupta, T., Dev, R., & Malhotra, A. (2020). NEED-BASED PERSPECTIVE STUDY OF TEACHERS' WORK MOTIVATION AS EXAMINED FROM SELF-DETERMINATION THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(6), 8063-8086.
- Alamri, H., Lowell, V., Watson, W., & Watson, S. L. (2020). Using personalized learning as an instructional approach to motivate learners in online higher education: Learner self-determination and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 52(3), 322-352.
- Bureau, J. S., Howard, J. L., Chong, J. X., & Guay, F. (2022). Pathways to student motivation: A meta-analysis of antecedents of autonomous and controlled motivations. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(1), 46-72.
- Campillo-Ferrer, J. M., & Miralles-Martínez, P. (2021). Effectiveness of the flipped classroom model on students' self-reported motivation and learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8(1), 1-9.
- Ek Styvén, M., & Mariani, M. M. (2020). Understanding the intention to buy secondhand clothing on sharing economy platforms: The influence of sustainability, distance from the consumption system, and economic motivations. *Psychology & Marketing*, 37(5), 724-739.



- Fishbach, A., & Woolley, K. (2022). The structure of intrinsic motivation. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 9, 339-363.
- Guay, F. (2022). Applying self-determination theory to education: Regulations types, psychological needs, and autonomy supporting behaviors. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 37(1), 75-92.
- Leenknecht, M., Wijnia, L., Köhler, M., Fryer, L., Rikers, R., & Loyens, S. (2021). Formative assessment as practice: The role of students' motivation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(2), 236-255.
- Li, F. S. (2020). Understanding Chinese tourists' motivations of sharing travel photos in WeChat. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 33, 100584.
- Meece, J. L. (2023). The role of motivation in self-regulated learning. In *Self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 25-44). Routledge.
- Müller, F. H., Thomas, A. E., Carmignola, M., Dittrich, A. K., Eckes, A., Großmann, N., ... & Bieg, S. (2021). University students' basic psychological needs, motivation, and vitality before and during COVID-19: a self-determination theory approach. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 775804.
- Omar, B., & Dequan, W. (2020). Watch, share or create: The influence of personality traits and user motivation on TikTok mobile video usage.  
<https://www.learntechlib.org/p/216454/>
- Phạm, T. B. T., & Trần, T. H. (2021). Đổi mới phương pháp dạy đại học tại trường đại học Công nghiệp TPHCM- Thực trạng và giải pháp. *Tạp chí Khoa học và Công nghệ, Số 53A. Research*, 28(2), 366-388.
- Pelikan, E. R., Lüftenegger, M., Holzer, J., Korlat, S., Spiel, C., & Schober, B. (2021). Learning during COVID-19: the role of self-regulated learning, motivation, and procrastination for perceived competence. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 24(2), 393-418.
- Ryan, R. M., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2023). Self-determination theory. In *The Oxford Handbook of Self-Determination Theory*(pp. 3-30). Oxford University Press.
- Salazar-Ayala, C. M., Gastélum-Cuadras, G., Hernández, E. H., & Moreno-Murcia, J. A. (2021). Autonomy support in student's resilience through a cognitive-social model of motivation. *European Journal of Education and Psychology*, 14(1), 1-16.
- Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2021). Self-efficacy and human motivation. In *Advances in motivation science* (Vol. 8, pp. 153-179). Elsevier.
- Sirisrimangkorn, L. (2021). Improving EFL Undergraduate Learners' Speaking Skills through Project-Based Learning Using Presentation. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 12(3), 65-72.
- Teng, L. S. (2024). Individual differences in self-regulated learning: Exploring the nexus of motivational beliefs, self-efficacy, and SRL strategies in EFL writing. *Language Teaching* (2).
- Theobald, M. (2021). Self-regulated learning training programs enhance university students' academic performance, self-regulated learning strategies, and motivation: A meta-analysis. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 66, 101976.
- Turgunova, F., & Abdurahimovna, R. S. (2023). WAYS TO INCREASE STUDENTS'MOTIVATION



IN

ENGLISH CLASSES. *Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики*, 5(5).

Valls-Ratés, Ì., Niebuhr, O., & Prieto, P. (2022). Unguided virtual-reality training can enhance the oral presentation skills of high-school students. *Frontiers in Communication*, 7, 910952.

Vermote, B., Aelterman, N., Beyers, W., Aper, L., Buysschaert, F., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2020). The role of teachers' motivation and mindsets in predicting a (de) motivating teaching style in higher education: A circumplex approach. *Motivation and emotion*, 44, 270-294.

Wu, H., Li, S., Zheng, J., & Guo, J. (2020). Medical students' motivation and academic performance: the mediating roles of self-efficacy and learning engagement. *Medical education online*, 25(1), 1742964.