

This is the accepted version of the following article: Barkoukis, V. and Taylor, I. and Chanal, J. and Ntoumanis, N. 2014. The relation between student motivation and student grades in physical education: A 3-year investigation. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*. 24: pp. e406-e414, which has been published in final form at <http://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12174>

1 The Relation Between Student Motivation and Student Grades in Physical Education:

2 A Three-year Investigation

3

4 Barkoukis, V. and Taylor, I. and Chanal, J. and Ntoumanis, N. 2014. The relation between
5 student motivation and student grades in physical education: A 3-year investigation.
6 Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports. 24: pp. e406-e414.

7

8

9 Running head: Motivation and grades in PE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Abstract

Enhancing students' academic engagement is the key element of the educational process; hence, research in this area has focused on understanding the mechanisms that can lead to increased academic engagement. The present study investigated the relation between motivation and grades in physical education (PE) employing a three-year longitudinal design. Three hundred and fifty four Greek high school students participated in the study. Students completed measures of motivation to participate in PE on six occasions; namely, at the start and the end of the school year in the first, second and third year of junior high school. Students' PE grades were also recorded at these time points. The results of the multilevel growth models indicated that students' PE grades increased over the three years and students had better PE grades at the end of each year than at the beginning of the subsequent year. In general, students and classes with higher levels of controlling motivation achieved lower PE grades, whereas higher levels of autonomous motivation were associated with higher PE grades. These findings provide new insight on the associations between class- and individual-level motivation with objectively assessed achievement in physical education.

Key words: motivational regulations, achievement, grades, physical education, longitudinal, multilevel modeling

1 The Relation Between Student Motivation and Student Grades in Physical Education:
2 A Three-year Investigation

3

4 The prediction of school students' academic engagement and achievement is a
5 focal issue in educational psychology. Most of the research in this area aims to
6 understand the variety of mechanisms (e.g., motivational climate, motivational
7 regulations, learning strategies) that can lead to increased academic engagement and
8 achievement (e.g., Boiché et al., 2008; Liem et al., 2008; Vansteenkiste et al., 2009).
9 Tucker et al. (2002) argued that motivation is one of the most important factors that
10 can affect academic achievement. Yet, longitudinal research evidence exploring the
11 effects of different types of motivation on indices of academic achievement is limited.
12 The present study attempted to examine longitudinally the effects of different
13 motivational regulations, as conceptualized by self-determination theory (SDT; Deci
14 & Ryan, 2000), on students' grades in school physical education (PE) lessons.

15 According to SDT, motivation should be viewed from a multi-dimensional
16 perspective. Specifically, SDT differentiates among intrinsic motivation, extrinsic
17 motivation and amotivation. Intrinsic motivation reflects engagement in an activity
18 due to inherent interest and for the pleasure and satisfaction of performing it. When
19 intrinsically motivated, students act out of choice, for the pleasure derived during
20 class participation, and the sense of satisfaction in completing the taught tasks (Deci
21 & Ryan, 2000). For instance, an intrinsically motivated student participates in the PE
22 lesson for the fun and the pleasure of performing different sporting activities.

23 Extrinsic motivation refers to engagement in an activity in order to obtain
24 outcomes separate from the activity itself. Extrinsic motivation comprises three types of
25 behavioral regulation¹ that represent different levels of self-determination, namely

1 external, introjected and identified regulations (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Identified regulation
2 is a self-determined type of extrinsic motivation and refers to involvement in an activity
3 because the specific activity is valued and considered important for the individual. An
4 example of this type of motivational regulation would be of a student who participates in
5 PE lessons to improve his/her health, because this is important to him. Introjected
6 regulation refers to involvement in an activity in order to avoid negative feelings, such as
7 guilt, or to attain self-worth. For instance, some students may participate in PE in order to
8 avoid the feeling that they have let their parents down. External regulation is the least
9 self-determined type of extrinsic motivation as it refers to engagement in an activity in
10 order to gain rewards or social approval, or to avoid punishment or to comply with
11 external norms. For example, a student who participates in PE purely because it is a
12 compulsory subject is motivated by external regulation. Finally, amotivation represents
13 the absence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. When amotivated, students do not have
14 any motivation to engage in PE, feel incompetent, without control, and are unwilling to
15 exert effort (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

16 Intrinsic motivation and identification are considered autonomous types of
17 motivation, whereas introjected and external regulations are considered as controlling
18 types of motivation. Importantly, motivational regulations explain the 'why' of
19 involvement and not just the decision to engage in an activity. For instance, although
20 school attendance is compulsory, there are students who enjoy participation (intrinsic
21 motivation), whereas others participate due to obligation (extrinsic motivation).

22 Motivational regulations have different cognitive, affective and behavioral
23 consequences. In a review of the application of SDT in PE, Ntoumanis and Standage
24 (2009) showed that autonomous motivation is related to more adaptive responses
25 during PE lessons, compared to controlling motivation. For example, autonomous

1 motivation positively correlates with positive affective responses during PE, such as
2 enjoyment, vitality and positive affect (Mouratidis et al., 2008; Standage et al., 2005;
3 Ullrich-French & Cox, 2009). On the contrary, controlled motivation is positively
4 associated with lower enjoyment, and higher boredom and unhappiness (Mouratidis et
5 al., 2008; Ntoumanis, 2001; Standage et al., 2005, Ullrich-French & Cox, 2009). In
6 addition, autonomous motivation is positively associated with cognitive outcomes
7 such as valuing of physical activity and concentration during lessons (Ntoumanis,
8 2005; Ullrich-French & Cox, 2009). Furthermore, in contrast to controlling
9 motivation, autonomous motivation is a more positive predictor of behavioral indices
10 such as effort and persistence (Ntoumanis, 2001; Ullrich-French & Cox, 2009).
11 Finally, autonomous motivation has positive relations with health-related constructs
12 such as leisure time physical activity intentions and health-related quality of life
13 (Standage, Duda & Ntoumanis, 2003; Standage & Gillison, 2007).

14 In addition to the aforementioned outcomes, it is important to also examine
15 student achievement and grades. Research evidence with university students has
16 indicated that autonomous motivational regulations correlate with higher grades in
17 law and economics (Ahmed & Bruinsma, 2006), and organic chemistry (Black &
18 Deci, 2000). Similarly in secondary education, autonomous motivational regulations
19 have been associated with higher academic achievement (Fortier et al., 1995; Ratelle
20 et al., 2007; Vansteenkiste et al., 2009). On the contrary, controlling motivation and
21 amotivation have been found to negatively predict academic achievement (Legault et
22 al., 2006; Lepper et al., 2005).

23 A drawback of research examining the relations among motivational
24 regulations and academic achievement is the lack of assessment of the dynamic
25 relation between the two constructs. Researchers have usually assessed these

1 constructs at one point in time. For example, Boiche et al. (2008) measured high
2 school students' motivation at the beginning and their performance at the end of a ten
3 weeks gymnastics cycle. They provided evidence that highly autonomously regulated
4 PE students applied more effort, performed better and had higher grades in
5 gymnastics compared to moderately autonomously regulated and controlling
6 regulated students. Importantly, moderately autonomously regulated students showed
7 higher effort, performance and grades than controlling regulated students.

8 However, longitudinal studies in this area are important because the relation
9 between motivation and PE grades may fluctuate. Past evidence revealed a decrease in
10 autonomous motivation and an increase in amotivation in physical education lessons
11 from the beginning to the end of junior high school (Ntoumanis et al., 2009).

12 However, to date, there is limited evidence on the trajectory of motivational
13 regulations across school years and their longitudinal association with school grades.
14 Outside PE, Makri-Botsari (1999) demonstrated that intrinsic motivation is positively
15 related to achievement in mathematics, science and language (ancient and modern
16 Greek) but this relation declines during the transition from elementary to high school.
17 In a three-year longitudinal study examining the transition from junior to senior high
18 school, Otis et al. (2005) revealed that students' intrinsic motivation and extrinsic
19 motivation decreased gradually and these declines were associated with less
20 educational adjustment.

21 The extent to which such longitudinal findings generalize to PE is unknown.
22 There is substantial research evidence (Bong, 2001, Gottfried et al., 2001; Guay et al.,
23 2010) indicating that motivation can vary across different school subjects. For
24 instance, Guay et al. (2010) investigated the differences in motivation in three school
25 subjects (reading, writing, and mathematics). The results of the study indicated that

1 several motivational regulations were more salient in some school subjects but not
2 others. Similarly, Bong (2001) suggested that motivational-related variables, such as
3 achievement goals, self-efficacy and task value show high subject specificity (i.e.,
4 Korean, English, mathematics and science) in middle and high school Korean
5 students. Thus, it is important to examine the relation between motivation and
6 achievement in specific school subjects. PE is an interesting subject to study because,
7 contrary to other school subjects, it requires physical competence from the students.
8 Usually there is a wide variation in students' physical competence levels due to out-
9 of-school participation in organized sport by some of the students. These differences
10 might impact both upon the motivation of the students and their achievement in the
11 subject. Understanding motivation in PE is also important from a public health
12 perspective as PE-related motivation can predict intentions for leisure time physical
13 activity (see Barkoukis & Hagger, 2009; Barkoukis et al., 2010).

14 In brief, this study extends past literature in two ways. First, it examines the
15 relation between motivation and achievement in a school subject in which there is
16 only scarce evidence so far regarding this relation (e.g., Boiche et al., 2008). Second,
17 it employs a three-year longitudinal design (i.e., from the beginning to the end of
18 Greek junior high school), which is significantly longer than designs used by many
19 other studies looking at the relation between motivation and school achievement (e.g.,
20 Boiche et al., 2008; 10 weeks). We did not explore the temporal patterns of students'
21 motivational regulations, as these have been reported elsewhere (Ntoumanis et al.,
22 2009). Thus, the purpose of the study is to examine changes in grades in PE and how
23 motivational regulations in PE predict these changes.

24 Based on the aforementioned research evidence, the following hypotheses
25 were made. In terms of PE grades, it was assumed that they will increase over time

1 (H1). This is because, according to the Greek physical education curriculum for junior
2 high school (see Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2008), an emphasis is placed on skill
3 development in the first year of junior high school. In subsequent years it is assumed
4 that motor skills have been developed and emphasis is placed on teaching game
5 tactics (for team sports). Students apply in competitive situations the tasks they have
6 already learned in previous years. Thus, it is assumed that grades will increase as
7 students perform the same tasks and tactics already taught in the previous years.

8 With respect to intrinsic motivation and identified regulation, they were
9 expected to be positive predictors of PE school grades (H2). With respect to
10 introjected regulation, research evidence has provided contradictory findings as to
11 how this regulation relates to achievement (Otis et al., 2005; Vansteenkiste et al.,
12 2004). Nevertheless, as it is a controlling type of motivation, it was expected in this
13 study to negatively predict PE grades (H3). External regulation and amotivation were
14 also hypothesized to be negative predictors of PE grades (H4), as these motivational
15 variables reflect little or no self-determination in behavior. These hypotheses were
16 made with respect to three different levels of analysis. Within-person relations, as
17 well as between-person and between-class differences in motivation were investigated
18 as predictors of PE grades because they represent statistically and conceptually
19 different types of association (Curran & Bauer, 2011; see Results section for more
20 details). We expected the relations between motivation and grade to be of the same
21 direction at all three levels (within-students, between-students and between-classes),
22 as the motivation variables proposed by SDT are purported to predict motivation-
23 related outcomes in the same way at all levels of a generality hierarchy (Vallerand,
24 1997). However, we did not make any hypothesis as to the strength of the predicted
25 relations at the three levels.

1 **Method**

2 **Sample**

3 Three hundred and fifty four Greek students (males = 185; females = 169) from 17
4 classes in five schools in a large city in the north of Greece took part in the study.

5 The PE curriculum was delivered by eight PE teachers with more than 15 years of
6 experience in teaching school PE. The curriculum was standard across all classes and
7 conformed to the curriculum provided by the Ministry of Education. To ensure a
8 consistent application of the curriculum and minimize inter-rater differences on

9 student grades, we selected schools in which the teachers taught the same students

10 throughout the three years of the study. All students were Caucasians and were

11 attending typical co-educational Greek schools. The students' grades and motivation

12 were recorded at the start and the end of the school year in the first year (i.e., age 12),

13 second year (i.e., age 13), and third year (i.e. age 14) of Greek junior high school.

14 Three hundred and thirty three students completed the questionnaires on the first

15 measurement occasion, 280 on the second and third occasions, 235 on the fourth

16 occasion, and 281 on the fifth and sixth occasions. Students' drop out across the

17 measurement occasions was due to absence of the students during the days of data

18 collection (e.g., because of illness or participation in other school activities) or

19 because they have moved to another school. The participants were drawn from

20 a large longitudinal study, findings from which (pertaining to different research

21 questions) have been published elsewhere (Authors).

22 **Measures**

23 *Motivational regulations.* A PE-adapted version of the Self-Regulation

24 Questionnaire and the amotivation subscale of the Academic Motivation Scale

25 (Vallerand et al., 1992) developed by Goudas, Biddle and Fox (1994) were used to

1 measure motivational regulations in PE. The questionnaire measures intrinsic
2 motivation (example item: “because it is fun”), identified (example item: “because I
3 want to improve in sport”), introjected (example item: “because I would feel bad
4 about myself if I didn’t”) and external regulations (example item: “so that the
5 teachers won’t yell at me”), and amotivation (example item: “but I can’t see what I
6 am getting out of PE”). The participants responded to the stem "I take part in this PE
7 class..." on scales ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Previous
8 research has supported the validity and reliability of the questionnaire with both
9 British (Goudas et al., 1994) and Greek high school students (Kiriakidis et al., 2005).

10 **PE grades.** According to the Greek curriculum, students’ grades are based on
11 a composite score which should reflect: a) psychomotor development (i.e., whether
12 the students have developed taught skills or improved their level of their fitness; 40%
13 of total grade), b) emotional involvement (i.e., positive attitudes, effort, perceptions
14 and values developed through the lesson; 40% of total grade), and c) knowledge
15 gained during the lesson (i.e., game rules, historical aspects of sport, benefits of
16 exercise; 20% of total grade) (see Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2008). PE grades theoretically
17 range from 0 to 20, but in practice they often range from 12-13 to 20. Ikonomopoulos
18 et al. (2004) stated that this is a common practice in grading students in physical
19 education classes in several educational systems (see also Klein & Hardman, 2008).
20 In this sense, the grades do not simply reflect psychomotor development, but rather
21 an index of achievement relevant to the aims of the national curriculum. Hence, it
22 seems that PE teachers place more emphasis on students’ effort and participation in
23 the lesson, rather than on physical performance only. In each trimester students are
24 graded on these three domains with respect to the content of the lesson. Students are
25 graded three times per year: December (i.e., grading period from September to

1 November), March (i.e., grading period from December to February), and June (i.e.,
2 grading period from March to May). The grades of the first and third trimesters were
3 used in this study to investigate the effect of motivation on students' grades in each
4 of the three years of high school.

5 **Procedure**

6 Informed consent to participate in the study was obtained from Head of School
7 and PE teachers in all schools involved in this study. Written information about the
8 purposes of the study and consent forms were also provided to parents and students.
9 Those students who returned both forms participated in the study (97% response
10 rate). The students completed the questionnaires in a quiet environment under the
11 supervision of experienced research assistants. Both verbal and written instructions
12 were given to the students regarding the content and the completion of the
13 questionnaires. The students were reassured about the confidentiality of the responses
14 and were informed that they could withdraw at any time during the completion of the
15 questionnaires. The completion of the questionnaire was performed twice a year; on
16 late October and mid May. At the end of each school year, the first author contacted
17 the schools and obtained the PE grades for all the students for that year. Students'
18 questionnaires and grades were matched up across the measurement occasions by
19 school personnel using demographic information regarding students' PE class,
20 gender, and date of birth.

21 **Results**

22 **Descriptive Statistics and Reliability**

23 Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations and Cronbach's alpha
24 coefficients of the motivational regulations and PE grades across all time points.
25 Internal consistency of all subscales was acceptable across all time points. In general,

1 students reported levels of intrinsic and identified regulation above the midpoint of
2 the scale, and levels of introjected regulation, external regulation and amotivation
3 below the midpoint of the scale. Students' mean PE grades reflected high achievement
4 scores across the course of the study.

5 **Changes in PE Grades over Time**

6 PE grades were modeled across the six measurement times (i.e., the beginning
7 and end of three consecutive school years) using MLWin 2.10 multilevel modelling
8 software (Rasbash et al., 2009), with repeated time points (Level 1) nested within
9 students (Level 2), which were nested within classes (Level 3). Prior to constructing
10 models exploring the research hypotheses, we constructed a model which included
11 age and gender (entered as a dummy variable; male = 0, female = 1) as predictors of
12 PE grades. This model showed no significant effects of age or gender, hence, we did
13 not include these variables in any further models.

14 To explore hypothesis 1, three unconditional growth models were constructed
15 (see Table 2). The first included four time variables modeled as fixed effects within
16 the level 1 equation, which aimed to test (a) a linear annual effect of time (i.e.,
17 changes in PE grades year on year; time was centered at the beginning of the study),
18 (b) a quadratic annual effect of time, (c) a within-year effect of time (i.e., changes in
19 PE grades from the beginning to the end of the year; coded as beginning = 0, end = 1),
20 and (d) an interaction between the linear between-year variable change and the
21 within-year variable change. This latter variable was included to test if the linear
22 annual effect was different at the beginning or at the end of the year. Results revealed
23 that grades generally increased linearly over time and grades were higher at the end of
24 year than at the beginning, however, this latter trend became weaker over the course
25 of the study (see Figure 1).

1 In the second and third models, random effects were considered to assess
2 inter-individual and inter-class variability in the rate of change of PE grades,
3 respectively. Results revealed significant inter-individual and inter-class variability in
4 the linear and quadratic effects of time, as well as the within-year effect of time.

5 **Motivational Regulation as predictors of PE Grades**

6 To examine the predictive effects of motivation on grades, a conditional
7 growth model was constructed for each motivational regulation (see Table 3, models 4
8 – 8). Building upon the unconditional growth model reported above (i.e., model 3),
9 the respective motivational regulation was centered on each student’s unique mean
10 score and entered into the level 1 equation. This predictor explored whether changes
11 in students’ motivation were associated with changes in PE grades. Additionally,
12 students’ mean score was centered on the respective class mean and entered into the
13 level 2 equation to examine the relation between students’ average motivation relative
14 to their class mates and PE grades. Finally, each class mean was entered into the level
15 3 equation to investigate whether class average motivation was associated with PE
16 grades².

17 **Intrinsic motivation.** Results for Model 4 showed no significant within-
18 person relation between intrinsic motivation and PE grades. However, students who
19 reported higher average levels of intrinsic motivation relative to their class mates
20 achieved higher grades, compared to students who reported lower average levels of
21 intrinsic motivation relative to their class mates. Moreover, classes with high average
22 levels of intrinsic motivation achieved higher grades, compared to classes with lower
23 average levels.

24 **Identified regulation:** Results for Model 5 showed that students who reported
25 higher average levels of identified regulation relative to their class mates (i.e., Level

1 2) achieved higher grades, compared to students who reported lower average levels of
2 identified regulation. No significant within-person or between-class relations between
3 identified regulation and PE grades were found.

4 **Introjected regulation.** Results for Model 6 showed that increases in
5 students' introjected regulation were associated with lower PE grades. No significant
6 between-person or between-class relations between introjected regulation and PE
7 grades were found.

8 **External regulation.** Results for Model 7 showed no significant within-
9 person relation between external regulation and PE grades. However, students who
10 reported higher average levels of external regulation relative to their classmates
11 achieved lower PE grades, compared to students who reported lower average levels of
12 external regulation. In addition, classes with higher average levels of external
13 regulation achieved lower grades, compared to classes who reported lower average
14 levels.

15 **Amotivation.** Results for Model 8 showed that increases in students'
16 amotivation were associated with lower PE grades. In addition, students who reported
17 higher average levels of amotivation relative to their classmates achieved lower PE
18 grades, compared to students who reported lower average levels of amotivation.
19 Finally, classes with higher average levels of amotivation achieved lower grades,
20 compared to classes who reported lower average levels.

21 **Discussion**

22 The present study investigated the longitudinal relations between motivational
23 regulations in PE and students' PE grades. A three-year framework was employed
24 spanning across Greek junior high school. With respect to the PE grades' trajectory,
25 the findings of the study support our hypothesis that students' grades would improve

1 each year, although the trajectory varied across individuals and classes. This finding
2 could be attributed to the change of the PE curriculum from teaching skills in 7th
3 grade to understanding game tactics in grades 8 and 9. Teachers may be grading skill
4 performance more strictly because it may be easier to spot mistakes when students are
5 practicing skills in a drill, compared to general game play. In addition, mistakes in
6 game play may be harder to spot, for example, in team games a tactical mistake (e.g.,
7 poor defensive positioning) might not be easily identifiable. Other possible reasons
8 for the yearly improvement in students' grades could be the familiarization of the
9 teacher with the students and the possibility that students simply improved over time.

10 In addition, students' grades improved within the same year, although this
11 pattern was variable across individuals and classes. According to the national
12 curriculum, in each trimester different teaching material is provided to the students
13 and they should be graded according to their performance on this material (see
14 Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2008). Hence, students should be graded independently from
15 their performance on the previous trimester. Yet, these results imply that teachers are
16 heavily influenced by their interactions with the students during the previous
17 trimester. Therefore, it seems that teacher-student familiarization influences the
18 grading process, albeit, this trend was weaker in the last year of junior high school.

19 However, it should be noted that at the beginning of each year the grades were
20 lower than those at the end of the previous year. This finding indicates that at the
21 beginning of the year PE teachers are more conservative when grading their students.
22 Taking into consideration that in practice PE teachers rarely grade a student below 16,
23 this grade becomes 17 or 18 at the end of the year, assuming the student improves
24 over the year. Hence, in the next year the PE teacher will not grade this student with

1 19 as there would be no sufficient grade range to reflect the improvement of the
2 student.

3 Regarding intrinsic motivation, the results of the analyses indicated a
4 significant and consistent effect on PE grades for students and classes but not at the
5 intra-person level. Students and classes with high average levels of intrinsic
6 motivation reported higher grades throughout the three years of high school. This
7 finding supports our hypothesis and SDT. It is plausible that intrinsically motivated
8 students try harder during the lesson, pay more attention and persist more in order to
9 learn the skills and game tactics taught compared to less intrinsically motivated
10 students. If this is the case, these students are graded higher in the emotional and
11 knowledge gained parts of the evaluation. In addition, as a result of enhanced
12 participation, they are more likely to perform better on the various criteria included in
13 the psychomotor part of their evaluation. At the class level, students in intrinsically
14 motivated classes obtain higher grades, compared to students in less intrinsically
15 motivated classes. This may signify that teachers' evaluations of achievement may be
16 influenced by the overall levels of motivation within the class, in addition to
17 individual factors. The lack of significant effect at the intra-person level implies that
18 relative changes in intrinsic motivation (or identified regulation, as discussed below)
19 may not be of sufficient magnitude to change student achievement from students' own
20 baseline scores, possibly due to ceiling effects with regard to the scores of these two
21 types of motivation.

22 The results for identified regulation also revealed a positive and significant
23 between-person effect of this type of motivation on PE grades. This finding is in
24 congruence to our hypothesis and theoretical predictions (Deci & Ryan, 2000). As an
25 autonomous type of regulation, identified regulation was expected to positively

1 influence students' grades. It is possible that students high in identified regulation
2 value the benefits from PE participation and put more attention and effort in the
3 lessons. If this is the case, the teachers may have positively graded these elements of
4 student participation. Also, similar to the intrinsic motivation, it is assumed that
5 students' effort and persistence, because they value PE, may have led to higher
6 performance in the taught activities resulting in higher grades in the evaluation. In
7 contrast to intrinsic motivation, however, no class-level associations between
8 identified regulation and achievement emerged. It is plausible that teachers can easily
9 notice behavioral indicators of intrinsic motivation (e.g., enthusiasm, happiness) and
10 their assessments are subsequently (implicitly or explicitly) influenced by such
11 manifestations in the class. In contrast, the behavioral expression of classes that place
12 value on the PE activities may not be so easy for teachers to discern and acknowledge.

13 The results pertaining to introjected regulation were consistent with our
14 hypotheses and theoretical predictions. Specifically, students who experienced higher
15 introjected regulation than normal levels obtained lower grades in PE. Introjected
16 regulation is an extrinsic motivation dimension and as such it is expected to have a
17 negative association with academic achievement. Although Guay et al. (2008) pointed
18 out that introjected regulation has often been related to higher levels of persistence in
19 school, it is likely that this persistence will be rigid and will not result in adaptive
20 cognitive and affective experiences that facilitate performance (Ryan et al., 1991).
21 The longitudinal design of the present study supported this argument. However, the
22 lack of significant effects at between-person and between-class indicates the need for
23 further research on this topic.

24 With respect to external regulation, the findings of the present study showed
25 a significant and negative effect on PE grades at the individual and class level. This is

1 in congruence to our hypothesis and previous research suggesting that external
2 regulation has a negative association with students' achievement (Vansteenkiste et al.,
3 2004; Ratelle et al., 2007). External regulation actually describes two types of
4 behaviors: an approach (try to obtain rewards) and an avoidance one (avoid
5 punishment). Students adopting the approach behavior put effort and try hard during
6 the lesson. However, it seems that for several reasons (e.g., small range of grades in
7 PE) they do not persist long in their pursuits and over time their grades decrease. For
8 students adopting an avoidance behavior their participation in the lesson ensures the
9 avoidance of punishment. Thus, no extra effort is required to achieve their main
10 objective. This, however, may result in low interest towards the lesson and low
11 performance, and consequently in low grades. Our findings suggest that in both cases
12 students participating in PE due to external regulation show a maladaptive association
13 with achievement in PE. Similar to intrinsic motivation and identified regulation, the
14 lack of effect at the within-person level could be ascribed to the small changes from
15 students' own baseline scores.

16 Findings pertaining to amotivation are consistent with our hypotheses and
17 previous research findings (Legault, et al., 2006; Lepper et al., 2005; Ratelle et al.,
18 2007). A negative relation between amotivation and PE grades was found at all three
19 levels of analysis. Highly amotivated students are characterized by helplessness, show
20 no interest and do not attend PE lessons (Ntoumanis et al., 2004). Amotivated
21 students in the Ntoumanis et al. study reported not exerting effort in the lessons
22 because they did not think they had the competence to do well in PE, or because they
23 did not consider it personally important. As a result, it is likely that these students
24 receive lower grades from their teachers. Further, Ntoumanis (2005) found that
25 amotivated students were more likely to opt out from non-compulsory PE.

1 Overall, the results of the present study indicated that all motivational
2 regulations contribute to the prediction of grades in PE. Autonomous motivational
3 regulations have positive effect whereas controlling ones a negative effect. These
4 findings are in accordance with self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), and
5 Koestner and Losier's (2002) suggestions about motivation in compulsory settings.
6 Intervention studies are available in the literature to indicate how to structure PE
7 lessons in ways that promote adaptive motivation. For example, providing students
8 with an autonomy supportive environment, in which they are given choices and
9 opportunities for decision making, may have positive effects on autonomous
10 motivation (e.g., Chatzisarantis & Hagger, 2009).

11 A limitation of this study was that the range of grades was rather small. This is
12 an inherent problem of the grading system in Greece seeking to cover simultaneously
13 different aspects of student performance. For instance, a highly skilled student might
14 find the activities of a lesson too boring/unchallenging and might not apply much
15 effort, yet he/she could obtain a high grade due to his/her competence levels. Another,
16 less skilled but intrinsically motivated student might try hard during the lesson and get
17 a high grade due to his/her effort. Although similar grading issues exist in many
18 countries' curricula (see Klein & Hardman, 2008 for an overview of physical
19 education curricula in Europe), in the future, research would benefit by decomposing
20 the grading criteria and investigating the separate effects that motivation-related
21 variables have on each criterion. Further, an interesting approach for future research
22 would be to investigate the association of students' performance with cognitive and
23 affective experiences during lessons. Finally, although the temporal ordering of our
24 hypotheses (i.e., motivation predicting grades) was based on a well-supported theory,
25 the direction of causality cannot be established with the longitudinal data used in the

1 study. Despite these limitations, the present study offers new insight into the temporal
2 relation between motivation and achievement. Specifically, the findings suggest that
3 encouraging students' intrinsic motivation to gain knowledge, while minimizing
4 internal pressures to participate may influence student achievement in PE classes.

5 **Perspective.** There is a well-established belief within self-determination theory that
6 autonomous forms of motivation have a positive influence on performance (Ratelle et
7 al., 2007). This belief was largely based on cross-sectional evidence with scarce
8 longitudinal evidence regarding the dynamic relation between motivation and
9 performance (Boiche et al., 2008; Vansteekiste et al., 2009). Past research has
10 indicated that motivation in junior high school years fluctuate (Ntoumanis et al.,
11 2009). Hence, it is important to investigate how changes in motivation influence
12 students' grades. This evidence will provide insightful information on the factors
13 predicting a decline of achievement and how to tackle this decline. The present study
14 fills this gap in the literature by providing information on the dynamic relation
15 between school motivation and achievement, with respect to the specific subject of
16 physical education. Autonomous forms of motivation were found to have positive
17 effect on students' achievement in physical education. This is in congruence with
18 prior research on the effect of autonomous motivation on cognitive and affective
19 aspects of the physical education lesson (Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2007). Thus, the
20 structure and teaching methods used in physical education lessons should foster
21 students' autonomous motivation.

22

References

- 1
2 Ahmed W. & Bruinsma M. A structural model of self-concept, autonomous
3 motivation and academic performance in cross-cultural perspective. *Electronic*
4 *Journal of Research in Educational Psychology* 2006: 4: 551-576.
- 5 Barkoukis V. & Hagger M. A test of the trans-contextual model of motivation in
6 Greek high school pupils. *Journal of Sport Behavior* 2009: 32: 152-174.
- 7 Barkoukis V. Hagger M. Lambropoulos G. & Tsorbatzoudis H. Extending the trans-
8 contextual model in physical education and leisure-time contexts: Examining the
9 role of basic psychological need satisfaction. *British Journal of Educational*
10 *Psychology* 2010: 80: 647–670.
- 11 Black A.E. & Deci E.L. The effects of instructors' autonomy support and students'
12 autonomous motivation on learning organic chemistry: A self-determination
13 theory perspective. *Science Education* 2000: 84 : 740-756.
- 14 Boiché J.C.S. Sarrazin P.G. Grouzet F.M.E. Pelletier L.G. & Chanal J. P. Students'
15 motivational profiles and achievement outcomes in physical education: A self-
16 determination perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 2008: 100: 688-
17 701.
- 18 Bong M. Between- and within-domain relations of academic motivation among
19 middle and high school students: Self-efficacy, task value, and achievement goals.
20 *Journal of Educational Psychology* 2001: 93: 23-34.
- 21 Chatzisarantis N.L. & Hagger M.S. Effects of an intervention based on self-
22 determination theory on self-reported leisure-time physical activity
23 participation. *Psychology and Health* 2009: 24: 29-48.

1 Curran P.J. & Bauer D.J. The disaggregation of within-person and between-person
2 effects in longitudinal models of change. *Annual Review of Psychology* 2011: 62:
3 583.

4 Deci E.L. & Ryan R.M. The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the
5 self-determination theory. *Psychological Inquiry* 2000:11: 227–268.

6 Fortier M.S. Vallerand R.J. & Guay F. Academic motivation and school performance:
7 Toward a structural model. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 1995: 20:
8 257-274.

9 Gottfried A.E. Fleming J.S. & Gottfried A.W. Continuity of academic intrinsic
10 motivation from childhood through late adolescence: A longitudinal
11 study. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 2001: 93: 3-13.

12 Goudas M. Biddle S. & Fox K. Perceived locus of causality, goal orientations, and
13 perceived competence in school physical education classes. *British Journal of*
14 *Educational Psychology* 1994: 64: 453-463.

15 Guay F. Ratelle C.F. & Chanal J.P. Optimal learning in optimal contexts: The role of
16 self-determination in education. *Canadian Psychology* 2008: 49: 233-240.

17 Guay F. Chanal J.P. Marsh H. Dowson M. Larose S. & Boivin M. Intrinsic, identified,
18 and controlled types of academic motivation among young elementary school
19 children: Factor structure and age effects. *British Journal of Educational*
20 *Psychology* 2010: 80: 711-735.

21 Hagger M.S. & Chatzisarantis N.L. *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in*
22 *exercise and sport*. 2007: Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

23 Ikonomopoulos G. Tzetzis G. Kioumourtzoglou E. & Tsorbatzoudis C. Evaluating
24 and Grading Practices of Physical Educators in Greece. *Journal of Human*
25 *Movement Studies* 2004: 46: 141-154.

- 1 Kiriakidis T. Barkoukis V. Ourda D. & Tsorbatzoudis H. Investigation of different
2 dimensions of motivational climate effects on motivational regulations in physical
3 education. *Hellenic Journal of Physical Education and Sport* 2007: 66: 6-19.
- 4 Klein G. Hardman K. *Physical education and sport education in European Union*
5 2008: Paris. Edition Revue EPS.
- 6 Koestner R. & Losier G.F. Distinguishing three ways of being highly motivated: A
7 closer look at introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation. In E. L. Deci &
8 R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* 2002: 101-121.
9 Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- 10 Legault L. Green-Demers I. & Pelletier L. Why do high school students lack
11 motivation in the classroom? Toward an understanding of academic amotivation
12 and the role of social support. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 2006: 98: 567-
13 582.
- 14 Lepper M.R. Corpus J.H. & Iyengar S.S. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivational
15 orientations in the classroom: Age differences and academic correlates. *Journal of*
16 *Educational Psychology* 2005: 97: 184-196.
- 17 Liem A.D. Lau S. & Nie Y. The role of self-efficacy, task value, and achievement
18 goals in predicting learning strategies, task disengagement, peer relationship, and
19 achievement outcome. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 2008: 33: 486-
20 512.

1 Makri-Botsari E. Academic intrinsic motivation: Developmental differences and
2 relations to perceived scholastic competence, locus of control and achievement.
3 *Evaluation and Research in Education 1999: 13: 157-171.*

4 Mouratidis A. Vansteenkiste M. Lens W. & Sideridis G. The motivating role of
5 positive feedback in sport and physical education: Evidence for a motivational
6 model. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology 2008: 30: 240-268.*

7 Ntoumanis, N. A self-determination approach to the understanding of motivation in
8 physical education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology 2001, 71: 225-242.*

9 Ntoumanis N. A prospective study of participation in optional school physical
10 education based on self-determination theory. *Journal of Educational Psychology*
11 *2005: 97: 444-453.*

12 Ntoumanis N. Barkoukis V. & Thogersen-Ntoumani C. Developmental trajectories of
13 motivation in physical education: Course, demographic differences, and
14 antecedents. *Journal of Educational Psychology 2009: 101: 717-728.*

15 Ntoumanis N. Pensgaard A.M. Martin C. & Pipe K. An ideographic analysis of
16 amotivation in compulsory school physical education. *Journal of Sport and*
17 *Exercise Psychology 2004: 26: 197-214.*

18 Ntoumanis N. & Standage M. Motivation in physical education classes A self-
19 determination theory perspective. *Theory and Research in Education 2009: 7:*
20 *194-202.*

21 Otis N. Grouzet F.M.E. & Pelletier L.G. The latent motivational change in academic
22 setting: A three-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology 2005:*
23 *97: 170–183.*

24 Rasbash J. Steele F. Browne W.J. & Goldstein H. A user's guide to MLwiN, v2. 10
25 2009. *Centre for Multilevel Modelling, University of Bristol.*

- 1 Ratelle C.F. Guay F. Vallerand R.J. Larose S. & Senécal C. (2007). Autonomous,
2 controlled, and amotivated types of academic motivation: A person-oriented
3 analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 2007: 99: 734-746.
- 4 Ryan R.M. Koestner R. & Deci E.L. Ego-involved persistence: When free-choice
5 behavior is not intrinsically motivated. *Motivation and Emotion* 1991: 3: 185-205.
- 6 Standage M. Duda J.L. & Ntoumanis N. A model of contextual motivation in physical
7 education: Using constructs from self-determination and achievement goal
8 theories to predict physical activity intentions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*
9 2003: 95: 97-110.
- 10 Standage M. Duda J.L. & Ntoumanis N. A test of self-determination theory in school
11 physical education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 2005: 75: 411-433.
- 12 Standage M. & Gillison F. Students' motivational responses toward school physical
13 education and their relationship to general self-esteem and health-related quality
14 of life. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 2007: 8: 704-721.
- 15 Tsorbatzoudis H. Grouios G. Barkoukis V. & Alexandris K. Physical education and
16 education through sport in Greece. In G. Klein & K. Hardman (Eds), *Physical*
17 *Education and Sport Education in the European Union* 2008: 162-171. Paris,
18 Editions Revue EP.S.
- 19 Tucker C.M., Zayco R.A. Herman K.C. Reinke W.M. Trujillo M. Carraway C.
20 Wallack C. & Ivery P.D. Teacher and child variables as predictors of academic
21 engagement among low-income African American children. *Psychology in the*
22 *Schools* 2002: 39: 477-488.
- 23 Ullrich-French S. & Cox A. Using cluster analysis to examine the combinations of
24 motivation regulations of physical education students. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*
25 *Psychology* 2009: 31: 358-379.

- 1 Vallerand R.J. Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In
2 M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* 1997: 271-360).
3 New York: Academic Press.
- 4 Vallerand R.J. Pelletier L.G. Blais M.R. Briere N.M. Senecal C. & Vallieres E.F. The
5 Academic Motivation Scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivation in
6 education. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 1992: 52: 1003-1017.
- 7 Vansteenkiste M. Sierens E. Soenens B. Luyckx K. & Lens W. Motivational profiles
8 from a self-determination perspective: The quality of motivation matters. *Journal*
9 *of Educational Psychology* 2009: 101: 671-688.
- 10 Vansteenkiste M. Simons J. Lens W. Sheldon K.M. & Deci E.L. Motivating learning,
11 performance, and persistence: The synergistic role of intrinsic goals and
12 autonomy-support. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2004: 87: 246–
13 260.
14
15

Footnotes

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

¹According to SDT, the most self-determined type of extrinsic motivation is integrated regulation, a regulation reflecting the integration of behavior within the self (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Integrated regulation was not measured in the present study as there is no established questionnaire that assesses this regulation in PE or education in general.

² Due to the centering strategy of the time variables, the coefficients for the motivational regulations in the conditional models refer to associations between these regulations and grades at the beginning of the study. However, we also explored growth models that included regulation \times time interaction terms to assess the variability of these relations over time. These models revealed that all the relations were stable across time with the exception of the within-person relation between external regulation and PE grades which became stronger over the course of the study.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of the Motivational Regulations and PE grades.

	Lowest α across time points	Mean (Standard Deviation)					
		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	Time 5	Time 6
Intrinsic	.86	5.45(1.41)	5.32(1.46)	5.02(1.43)	5.05(1.49)	4.88(1.46)	4.89(1.46)
Identified	.72	5.57(1.19)	5.33(1.32)	5.06(1.32)	5.04(1.43)	4.87(1.47)	4.83(1.46)
Introjected	.80	3.49(1.52)	3.30(1.52)	3.49(1.35)	3.24(1.38)	3.44(1.41)	3.40(1.38)
External	.79	2.99(1.56)	2.91(1.57)	3.15(1.58)	3.02(1.63)	3.20(1.60)	3.17(1.57)
Amotivation	.73	2.19(1.44)	2.13(1.44)	2.55(1.47)	2.28(1.41)	2.35(1.43)	2.48(1.48)
PE grades	-	18.18(1.10)	19.04(1.13)	18.32(1.28)	19.20(1.35)	18.78(1.15)	19.25(0.96)

Note. Times 1, 3, and 5 represent the beginning of the first, second, and third school year, respectively. Times 2, 4 and 6 represent the end of the school year.

1 Table 2

2 *Modeling Change in PE Grades Across Time*

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
<i>Fixed Effects</i>	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>b</i>	SE
Intercept	18.16*	.11	18.17*	.11	18.17*	.13
Linear time	.19*	.07	.20*	.08	.19	.16
Quadratic time	.04	.03	.04	.03	.05	.06
Within year	.92*	.05	.92*	.04	.94*	.07
Linear * Within	-.17*	.04	-.17*	.03	-.18*	.03
<i>Random Effects</i>						
Level: Classes						
<i>Variances</i>						
Intercept	.14*	.06	.14*	.06	.22*	.09
Linear time					.34*	.15
Quadratic time					.04*	.02
Within year					.06*	.03
Level: Student						
<i>Variances</i>						
Intercept	.59*	.05	.80*	.08	.74*	.07
Linear time			.92*	.16	.63*	.14
Quadratic time			.15*	.03	.12*	.03
Within year			.07*	.02	.01	.02
Level: Occasion						
Intercept	.45*	.02	.29*	.02	.29*	.02
-2 Log-likelihood	4706.16		4497.34		4377.10	

3

4 *Note:* Covariances between random effects are not shown to simplify the presentation
5 of the results. * $p < .05$.

6 Model 1 examined fixed effects only, Model 2 examined variability of slopes across
7 students, and Model 3 examined variability of slopes across classes.

8

1

2 Table 3

3 *Conditional Growth Models Exploring Motivational Regulations as Predictors of PE*

4 *Grades*

	Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7		Model 8	
	Intrinsic Motivation		Identified Motivation		Introjected Motivation		External Motivation		Amotivation	
	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>b</i>	SE
Intercept	16.57*	.07	16.51*	1.14	19.24*	.68	19.76*	.44	19.53*	.38
Linear time	.07	.17	.06	.17	.06	.17	.07	.17	.08	.17
Quadratic time	.11	.06	.11	.06	.11	.06	.11	.06	.10	.06
Within year	.97*	.08	.97*	.08	.97*	.08	.97*	.08	.97*	.08
Linear * Within	-.22*	.03	-.22*	.03	-.21*	.03	-.22*	.03	-.22*	.03
Regulation at level 1	.01	.02	-.01	.02	-.04*	.02	-.02	.02	-.04*	.02
Regulation at level 2	.11*	.04	.15*	.04	-.06	.04	-.17*	.04	-.20*	.04
Regulation at level 3	.32*	.15	.33	.22	-.31	.20	-.51*	.14	-.58*	.16
-2 Log-likelihood	3623.45		3617.09		3622.73		3601.18		3592.88	

5 *Note:* To simplify the presentation of the results only fixed effects are shown;

6 * $p < .05$.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13


1

2

3 Figure 1

4 *Change in PE Grades over Three Years of Junior High School*

5



6

7