Journal of Teacher Education and Educators
Volume 9, Number 2, 2020, 221-239

Pre-service Teachers' Reflections on Personal Responsibility for Student Motivation: A Video Vignette Study

(Received on January 31, 2020 – Accepted on August 7, 2020)

Lia M. Daniels[1], Bryce S. Dueck[2] and Lauren D. Goegan[3]

Abstract
Teachers assume personal responsibility in four domains: student motivation, student achievement, relationships with students, and the quality of their own teaching. In all existing research, pre-service and practicing teachers score lowest in the motivation domain. This may be because some teachers view motivation as a shared responsibility or one that is contingent on external factors. Thus, the purpose of this research was to examine pre-service teachers' reflections on two different perspectives on personal responsibility for student motivation - one that reflected high internal unmitigated responsibility and one that reflected shared and contextualized responsibility. Pre-service teachers watched two video vignettes, and then reflected on the perspectives in an open-ended written format. The descriptive statistics confirmed that responsibility for motivation was the lowest of the four domains. Moreover, the percentage pre-service teacher felt responsible for student motivation predicted which video vignette they selected. Thematic analysis of pre-service teachers' reflection revealed four themes that give insight to how pre-service teachers make sense of responsibility for student motivation: people responsible, external factors, strategies to support motivation, and emotions. The results are discussed in light of methodological, theoretical, and practical implications.

Key Words: Pre-service teachers, personal responsibility, student motivation, vignette, thematic analysis, logistic regression

Introduction

In the current fast-paced, curriculum-dense, complex classroom of K-12 education, there is no doubt teachers have their work cut out for them. Faced with so many important outcomes, taking responsibility for student motivation may be a low priority for teachers. Indeed, both pre-service and in-service teachers regularly score lower on personal responsibility for student motivation than any other domain of responsibility including student achievement, relationships, or their own teaching quality (e.g., Daniels, Radil, & Wagner, 2016; Lauermann & Karabenick, 2013). Qualitative research further reveals that some teachers seem to consider themselves fully responsible for student motivation; whereas, other teachers seem to contextualize their personal responsibility relative to the external constraints they face (Daniels, Poth, & Goegan, 2018).

This internal-external distinction is foundational to many classic (Rotter, 1954;,

[1] Corresponding author, University of Alberta, Dept. of Educational Psychology, lia.daniels@ualberta.ca ORCID: 0000-0001-9202-2538
[2] University of Alberta, Dept. of Educational Psychology, bhoy@ualberta.ca
[3] University of Alberta, Dept. of Educational Psychology, goegan@ualberta.ca

Weiner, 1985) and contemporary approaches to motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2017). It also appears in constructs specific to teachers such as the classic literature on teaching efficacy (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) and contemporary literature on shared responsibility (Helker & Wosnitza, 2014). This difference in perspectives is critical to understand if researchers and teacher-educators want to help pre-service teachers assume responsibility for student motivation given the external constraints. Thus, the purpose of this research was to examine pre-service teachers' reflections on two different perspectives on personal responsibility for student motivation - one that reflected high internal unmitigated responsibility and one that reflected shared and contextualized responsibility. Pre-service teachers watched two video vignettes, and then reflected on the perspectives in an open-ended written format. The results of this study shed light on how pre-service teachers' view their personal responsibility for student motivation thereby identifying spaces of potential education related to motivation.

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Lauermann and Karabenick (2011) define personal responsibility "as a sense of internal obligation and commitment to produce or prevent designated outcomes" (p. 135). Personal responsibility is different than external accountability: In personal responsibility the locus of commitment originates within the teacher; whereas in an accountability system commitment is imposed by an external regulator (Lauermann & Karabenick, 2011; Rotter, 1954). Through their program of qualitative and quantitative research, Lauermann and Karabenick (2011) identified that teachers assume personal responsibility in four domains: student motivation, student achievement, relationships with students, and the quality of their own teaching. They went on to create the Teachers' Responsibility Scale (TRS) to measure personal responsibility in these four domains. Since then the TRS has been used in a number of empirical studies with pre-service and in-service teachers in Germany, the United States, Canada, Italy, and Turkey with evidence of adequate reliability and validity (e.g., Daniels et al., 2018; Eren, 2014, 2015, 2017; & Eren & Çetin, 2019; Lauermann & Karabenick, 2013).

Empirical studies have shown that personal responsibility tends to be associated with beneficial outcomes for teachers (Guskey, 1981; Pelletier et al., 2002; Lauermann & Karabenick, 2009; Ryan & Weinstein, 2009; Lauermann, 2014) and brought about by pleasant emotions, classroom climates, and optimism (Eren, 2014). In other words, the nomological net surrounding Lauermann and Karabenick's (2011) notion of personal responsibility is overwhelmingly positive. This is important because external accountability systems have been associated with a variety of negative teaching strategies (Deci et al., 1982; Flink et al., 1990) rendering personal responsibility a beneficial alternative perspective. Moreover, because personal responsibility can be encouraged in teacher education programs separate from the accountability policies unique to any given school, board, or country, focusing on personal responsibility in initial teacher

education programs has certain advantages over externally imposed accountability systems.

Amongst this good news, motivation researchers point out that in all the research studies reported above, pre-service teachers have noticeably lower mean scores on the subscales of personal responsibility for student motivation than any of the other three subscales. It should be noted that the TRS-motivation subscales focuses on intrinsic motivation, which originates in interest, choice, and value rather than extrinsic motivation, which is based on rewards and contingencies (Deci & Ryan, 2017). The items focus on feeling personally responsible for students' intrinsic motivation because intrinsic, rather than extrinsic, motivation is positively correlated with a range of beneficial outcomes such as creativity, persistence, and pleasant emotions such as enjoyment (see Sansone & Harackiewicz, 2000). We bring the constructs of sense of teaching efficacy (Woolfok & Hoy, 1990) and shared responsibility (Helker & Wosnitza, 2014) alongside personal responsibility (Lauermann & Karabenick, 2011) to offer possible explanations for pre-service and practicing teachers' consistently low scores on responsibility for student motivation.

Sense of teaching efficacy

In the early sense of teaching efficacy literature (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) theorists and researchers distinguished personal efficacy from teaching efficacy. Sense of efficacy was broadly defined as teachers' "belief in their ability to have a positive effect on student learning" (Ashton, 1985, p. 142). More specifically, in the Gibson and Dembo (1984) operationalization items that contained "I" statements were used to tap into teachers' personal teaching efficacy; whereas, general teaching efficacy items addressed the influence of teachers or teaching as a field generally, often along with other members of the learning community such as parents and students themselves. Woolfolk and Hoy describe the relationship between personal and teaching efficacy such that "individuals who believe that teaching is a potentially powerful factor in student's learning may believe either that they are effective or that they lack the ability to make a difference with their own students" (1990, p. 82). In a mixed-method study, Daniels and colleagues (2018) found that teachers who had low levels of personal responsibility for student motivation explained how their personal responsibility was mitigated by external factors beyond their control such as family influence, adequacy of school supports, differences in teaching style, and peer dynamics. In the same study, teachers with high TRS-motivation scores did not discuss ways their personal responsibility was limited. This distinction appears to resemble the personal vs. teaching efficacy nuance of the original literature.

Most contemporary syntheses and theorizing about teachers' sense of efficacy appear to have lost this dual perspective, focusing almost exclusively on teachers' personal efficacy beliefs about their own abilities to bring about change because of its

consistency with Bandura's conceptualization of efficacy (e.g., Klassen et al., 2011). Nonetheless, it seems that teachers continue to consider the contextual constraints within which they exert those beliefs and abilities, even if they do not fit neatly under the umbrella of efficacy. Lauermann and Karabenick (2013) showed that the TRS and personal teaching efficacy were conceptually and empirically distinct; however, for neither construct did they consider the reality of external constraints that teachers cannot ignore.

Shared responsibility

Another possibility is that even within the external constraints, some teachers view motivation as a shared responsibility. Frequently in the literature, student responsibility has been largely described as students being cooperative and compliant students (Bacon, 1993; Lewis, 2001). In the domain of shared responsibility, however, students are described as needing to take an active role in managing their own motivation. Perhaps not surprisingly from a motivation perspective, it seems that the more students assume responsibility themselves the better their motivation, psychological needs, and achievement outcomes (Helker & Wosnitza, 2016). This would be consistent with self-determination theory for example, which states that intrinsic motivation is rooted in autonomous behaviour (Ryan & Deci, 2017).

In addition to students, Helker and Wosnitza (2014) suggest that parents are also responsible in the schooling context. Indeed they identify three domains in which responsibility is shared: responsibility for the learning process, responsibility for learning outcomes, and responsibility for a supportive social network. Matteucci and Helker (2018) concluded that students ascribe higher responsibility to themselves than they do to parents or teachers or than parents and teachers do to them. Teachers tend to assign parents more responsibility than parents take on themselves while parents see teachers as most responsible for learning outcomes. And finally, parents and students tend to have fairly similar ascriptions of responsibility. A major limitation of this work is that although Helker and Wosnitza acknowledge Lauermann and Karabenick's (2013) conceptualizations of personal responsibility, they ultimately explored different factors than the TRS thereby making comparisons difficult. Indeed, items quite similar to those in the TRS responsibility for motivation subscale, for example, are dispersed between the three new factors. In other words, this research has obscured responsibility for motivation specifically.

The current study

Student motivation appears to be a phenomenon about which teachers have conflicting perspectives when it comes to their personal responsibility. Drawing on sense of teaching efficacy and shared responsibility, two beliefs patterns appear common when it comes to responsibility for student motivation. For some teachers, it seems

that they are able to accept full responsibility for student motivation regardless of external factors. For other teachers, it seems that student motivation is viewed as contingent on a wide range of external factors and thus becomes a shared responsibility. The purpose of this study was to explore how pre-service teachers reflect on their personal responsibility for student motivation when presented with both of these perspectives. Additionally, we had two sub-objectives. First, to determine if we were able to predict which video pre-service teachers agreed with based on their perceptions of responsibility for student motivation. We hypothesized that pre-service teachers who scored high on perceptions of responsibility for student motivation would agree with the teacher who described feeling completely responsible for student motivation. On the other hand, we hypothesized that pre-service teachers who scored low on perceptions of responsibility would be more likely to agree with the teacher who described responsibility for student motivation as shared. Second, we were interested in exploring how to incorporate the findings from our thematic analysis into teacher education programs and future research.

Methodology

We used a two-part descriptive research design with video vignettes to elicit pre-service teachers' reflections on personal responsibility for student motivation (Hazel, 1995). First, we used two logistic regressions to investigate if we could predict which video vignette teachers agreed with. Second, we utilized thematic analyses to their open-ended responses after watching the video vignettes to explore their perspectives on feeling responsible for student motivation. Additional information regarding the methodology is provided below. This study was approved by the University's Research Ethics Board.

Procedure

Prior to coming to the vignette session, we asked pre-service teachers to complete an online questionnaire containing items related to demographic information and personal responsibility for student motivation. Next, during a predetermined class, students watched two video vignettes of practicing teachers describing their different experiences and feelings of responsibility related to motivating students in the classroom. Immediately after watching the video vignettes, participants completed an open-ended written reflection in which they described which of the two perspectives they agreed with and why. This type of reflection process is familiar to pre-service teachers who are expected to become reflective practitioners (Larrivee, 2000).

Participants

A total of 543 students attended class the day the videos were presented. Of these students, 321 made a clear agreement with one of the two vignettes in their reflection,

and were therefore included in the current analyses. The participants who did not clearly identify with a vignette (n = 222), did not meaningfully differ on any of the variables in our study with participants who did have clear agreement with a vignette ($p>0.05$) and thus were not examined further. Of the remaining 321 participants, 238 had completed the questionnaire prior to class and therefore had demographic information and quantitative information on their personal responsibility, thus the sample size for the quantitative portion is smaller than the qualitative (n = 238 and 321 respectively).

Of the 238 participants that completed the demographic information, 71% of participants identified as female (n = 171), and the participants ranging in age from 20 to 50 (M = 23.97, SD = 5.53). The majority of participants identified as being Caucasian (80%, n = 190) while other participants identified with a variety of backgrounds including Aboriginal, Arab, Black, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and South Asian. Participants were asked to identify in which program in the Faculty of Education they were enrolled with 43% being in the elementary program, 34% in the secondary program, and 23% in the after-degree program.

Survey information

Participants indicated their gender, age, and education program, as well as answered questions regarding personal responsibility for student motivation. Because responsibility for motivation is usually considered in relation to other responsibilities, participants completed the full Teachers' Responsibility Scale (TRS; Lauermann & Karabenick, 2013), which includes 14-items in the following four domains of responsibility: student motivation (e.g., I would feel personally responsible if a student of mine was not interested in the subject I teach), student achievement (e.g., I would feel personally responsible if a student of mine had very low achievement), relationships with students (e.g., I would feel personally responsible if a student of mine did not believe that I truly cared for him/her), and for one's own teaching (e.g., I would feel personally responsible if a lesson I taught was not as effective for student learning as I could have possibly made it). To tap into the notion of shared responsibility, we asked participants to indicate the percentage that they felt personally responsible for student motivation. Participants were provided with a 10-point Likert scale from 10% to 100%, increasing by 10% at each interval. The assumption was that the remaining percent of responsibility is shared by some members of the learning community. See Table 1 for all descriptive information.

Vignette videos

The vignettes were written by two practicing teachers based on their own experiences and informed by the results of an earlier study on teachers' personal responsibility for student motivation (Daniels et al., 2018). In the first video "Teacher A" described how her sense of personal responsibility for student motivation is separate

from the influence of external factors. In the second video, "Teacher B" described how her sense of personal responsibility for student motivation is limited by external factors beyond her control. The videos were created for a larger intervention study (Daniels, Goegan, Radil, & Dueck, under review) in which they served the purpose of personal priming prior to the treatment messages. The videos are available at https://tinyurl.com/v6w99vx and https://tinyurl.com/wv6f9z7.

Open-ended reflection

After watching the video vignettes, participants responded to the question, "Write a brief description of how you relate to the perspectives presented by the teachers in the videos. What do you agree with? What do you disagree with?" Responses were typed on personal computers directly into an unlimited text box.

Plan for analyses

We conducted our analyses in three steps. First, we looked at the descriptive information for the items on the survey including reliability and correlations for the TRS and the percentage responsible item. Second, we conducted two logistic regressions to determine if we could predict which video participants would agree with based on a) their percentage of personal responsibility for student motivation and b) their endorsement of the TRS domain for student motivation . Third, we performed a content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) to examine the themes that emerged from the participants' reflections on the video vignettes. Two research assistants were responsible for coding the responses independently, and then compared and discussed any discrepancies in their codes. They completed the coding for Teacher B responses first, and then applied the codes to participants' responses to Teacher A. When new codes emerged based on Teacher A, the research assistants reviewed the responses for Teacher B and determined if the new codes were applicable. Initial inter-rater reliability was calculated at 77%. Any discrepancies in coding were discussed until consensus was achieved.

Findings

Survey results

As has been found in other studies using the TRS, participants had the lowest scores for personal responsibility for student motivation relative to the other three domains (Table 1). In terms of identifying an exact percentage responsible, on average participants felt they were 70% responsible for student motivation, implying the remaining on average 30% is the responsibility of the student or some other external factor. All 10% intervals (0-10% to 90-100%) were selected by participants, suggesting a wide variability. As some evidence of validity, the single percentage item correlated more strongly with the TRS responsibility for student motivation subscale than

the other three subscales. Moreover, all of the responsibility items are significantly and positively correlated with one another, ranging from .32 to .56. Correlations between all study variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.
Descriptive Information for All Survey Variables

	Descriptive Information			Pearson Correlations			
	M (SD)	Range	Alpha	1	2	3	4
1. Resp Achievement	5.13 (.92)	2.5-7	.81	--			
2. Resp Relationship	6.07 (.91)	1-7	.82	.39*	--		
3. Resp Own Teaching	6.18 (.75)	3.67-7	.71	.44*	.35*	--	
4. Resp Motivation	4.17 (1.15)	1-7	.89	.56*	.34*	.32*	--
5. % Responsible for motivation	70% (17%)	10-100%	--	.36*	.32*	.16	.43*

* $p < .001$

143 participants indicated that they most related to Teacher A's description of being responsible for student motivation; whereas, 95 participants indicated that they most related to Teacher B's description. Next, we ran a logistic regression where percentage of responsibility for motivation predicted pre-service teachers' agreement with Teacher A or Teacher B. The analysis was statistically significant $\chi2(1) = 17.01$, $p < .001$ and the model explained 9.3% (Nagelkerke R2) of the variance of the choice between Teacher A and Teacher B with 61.8% prediction success overall. The Exp(B) value indicates that when the average percentage response increased by 1 unit, which in this case was 10%, individuals were 7.01 times more likely to agree with Teacher A. We then ran a second logistic regression where participants' score on the TRS domain for student motivation was used to predict their agreement with either Teacher A or Teacher B. The analysis was statistically significant $\chi2(1) = 18.54$, $p < .001$ and the model explained 10.1% (Nagelkerke R2) of the variance of the choice between Teacher A and Teacher B with 66.4% prediction success overall. The Exp(B) value indicates that when the average percentage response on the TRS motivation subscale increased by 1 unit, participants were 5.55 times more likely to agree with Teacher A.

Qualitative analysis

In total, 321 responses were thematically coded from participants. Most participants wrote a short paragraph reflection. For Teacher A, responses ranged from 12 to

227 words (*M* = 74 words) and for Teacher B, responses ranged from 9 to 220 words (*M* = 77 words). The fact that responses to each video were approximately equal in length suggest that neither video prompted consistently "more" reflection than the other. From these written responses, we identified four major themes in students' reflections on personal responsibility for student motivation: People Responsible, External Factors, Strategies to Support Motivation, and Emotions (Figure 1).

Thematic Category	Definition	Codes	% From Teacher A Choice (*n* = 143)	% From Teacher B Choice (*n* = 95)
People Responsible	Who is responsible for student motivation	Teacher Duty Shared Responsibility	***32%*** (*n* = 46)	***48%*** (*n* = 45)
External Factors	External factors considered when assuming responsibility for students' motivation	Home Environment School Environment Little Control	***12%*** (*n* = 17)	***43%*** (*n* = 41)
Strategies to support motivation	Classroom management and dynamics that affect students' motivation	Student Choice Restricted Student Choice Building Relationships Safe Environment Class Content Multiple Strategies Never Giving Up	***51%*** (*n* = 73)	***5%*** (*n* = 5)
Emotions	Teacher's emotions pertaining to student motivation	Frustration Love	***5%*** (*n* = 7)	***4%*** (*n* = 4)
Total			***100%*** *(n = 143)*	***100%*** *(n =95)*

Figure 1. Qualitative Thematic Categories Related to Feeling Personally Responsibility for Student Motivation

People responsible

Participants regularly commented directly about the different people involved in being responsible for student motivation, with two specific sub-themes. Pre-service teachers who identified with Teacher A were most likely to describe ways in which student motivation was the *duty of teachers*. For example, one pre-service teacher commented that they thought, "it is the responsibility of the teacher to motivate students to the best of their abilities" and another commented that, "it is our job to motivate students," while another said that, "I agree that it is the role of me as the teacher to motivate my students." In comparison, a majority of pre-service teachers who identified with Teacher B described ways in which they as the teacher shared responsibility for student motivation with other people. For example, several pre-service teachers commented on the role of students in their own motivation commenting that the "student also has to partly motivate themselves, although the teacher should play a bigger role in this." Likewise, one pre-service teacher commented on the need for students to develop their own intrinsic motivation. However, responsibility for student motivation was not only shared with students, parents were often named in having a role. As an example, one pre-service teacher commented that student motivation "is a joint effort between teacher, student, and parents."

External factors

In addition to sharing responsibility with various people, participants named many external factors that influenced how responsible they personally felt about student motivation. There were three sub-themes. The majority of pre-service teachers who identified with Teacher B described that they felt that they had little control over student's motivation given the presence of unnamed external factors. In particular, several pre-service teachers commented on the difficulties of being responsible for student motivation given "... external forces that [they have] no control over." Other pre-service teachers named specific external factors rooted in the *home environment* (e.g., family dynamics) and the *school environment* (e.g., class size, relationships between peers) as negatively influencing their sense of responsibility. For pre-service teachers who identified with Teacher A, these external influences were described in a way that still protected their overall sense of personal responsibility. For example, one pre-service teacher commented that she agree[d] "that there are other factors than just the teacher that affect student motivation, but I feel that the teacher can override these other factors in a lot of ways." Likewise, these sentiments were expressed by another pre-service teacher who commented, "I think it's important to remember [that] you can't change those external factors but you can change how you adapt and respond to them." Taken together these responses suggest that pre-service teachers are mindful of external factors, however, some felt that they were able to compensate for external factors while others believed that the factors reduce their personal responsibility.

Instructional strategies

Participants enacted their personal responsibility for student motivation by naming seven sub-themes of instructional strategies they use to support student motivation. Perhaps because they look for ways to overcome external factors, most of these statements came from participants who identified with Teacher A. For example, several pre-service teachers commented on the role of *choice* in supporting student motivation. One pre-service teacher commented, "tr[ying] lots of strategies like offering choices" can support student motivation. Choice with limits was the main strategy offered by pre-service teachers who selected Teacher B and often their comments focused on the need to be strategic with choice saying things such as "some choice has to be restricted for students because especially for younger students they can be overwhelmed with choice." Another theme that was mentioned regularly with regard to supporting student motivation was the role of *building relationships*. To illustrate, one pre-service teacher commented, "building relationships is the first step in developing motivation in your students" while another commented, "I agree that relationship building is really important for developing motivation in the classroom." Like building relationships, pre-service teachers identified their role in "provid[ing] [students] with a *safe environment* in which they feel comfortable and motivated." Another strategy was to adapt *class content* to better support student motivation. To illustrate, one pre-service teacher commented "I think that connecting school work with what students might be interested in in their own lives is huge in terms of achieving motivation." Some pre-service teachers suggested using *multiple strategies* to support student motivation, without necessarily naming the strategy itself. For example, one pre-service teacher commented, "I agree that you need to try several things like Teacher A did - motivation is not a one size fits all." Others listed many specific strategies teachers can use such as "activities, rewards and incentives." Lastly, pre-service teachers expressed the importance of *never giving up* on supporting students' motivation, which was a direct statement in the Teacher A video. As an example, one pre-service commented, "[Teacher A] believes in never giving up on her students" while another commented, "I think that as teachers we should never give up on our students, regardless of their background and where they are in the present time."

Emotions

The last theme we identified describes the emotional toll of supporting student motivation. Although there were not very many instances of these expressions, the two sub-themes describe how being responsible for student motivation may be related to the emotional labour of teaching (Tsang, 2011). In particular, pre-service teachers regardless of whether they identified with Teacher A or B commented that they anticipated *frustration* when it came to supporting student motivation. To illustrate, one pre-service teacher commented "I feel as though motivation will be something that I

become frustrated with figuring out how to bring out about efficiently." Likewise, several pre service teachers related to the idea of being frustrated with regards to student motivation as shown in this comment, "I agree that it is frustrating but it is important to make sure that students are motivated to learn, and are engaged in the classroom." In comparison, only pre-service teachers who identified with Teacher A commented that they anticipated a need to *love and care* for their students when it came to supporting their motivation. For example, one pre-service teacher commented that, "when students feel loved and trust their teacher, they will be more willing to be open minded and troubleshoot to find ways that they can become motivated." The emotional nature of this statement distinguishes it from the idea of using relationships as a motivational strategy.

Discussion

The purpose of this research was to explore pre-service teachers reflections when given the opportunity to consider two differing perspectives on personal responsibility for student motivation. In the video vignette for Teacher A, pre-service teachers heard how motivation is a core responsibility of teachers, that they must try all sorts of strategies to catch students' attention, and that they should never give up. In the video vignette for Teacher B, pre-service teachers heard that even though motivation is the responsibility of the teacher, there are external factors, like what goes on at home or with peers, that teachers can't control and that make motivation something for which teachers share responsibility. We focus our discussion on three main points. First, we comment on the distribution of pre-service teachers in terms of their agreement with the two videos and the ability to predict such a choice based on the quantitative percentage of responsibility and scores on the TRS domain for student motivation. Second, pre-service teachers' reflections tended to comment on the main perspective forwarded by the videos - that is the extent to which the teacher is responsible for student motivation - and the amount and variety of instructional strategies they suggest related to assuming this perspective. Third, the anticipated emotional component of managing student motivation is novel and represents an area in which pre-service teachers' usual optimism may not apply.

Distribution of choice

Sixty percent of pre-service teachers identified with the perspective forwarded by Teacher A, while the remaining 40% identified with Teacher B. In research on motivation, such an equal distribution is somewhat rare. Self-report measures of motivation beliefs or strategies that use likert scales may suffer from a variety of measurement issues including responses that cluster near the "agree" end of the scale (Fulmer & Frijters, 2009). The self-report items are so overwhelmingly positive in tone that it is almost impossible for pre-service or practicing teachers to disagree with the state-

ment. Easy to agree with items, are particularly susceptible to social desirability bias, which is defined as "the tendency of individuals to present themselves in a manner that will be viewed favorably by others" (APA Dictionary, https://dictionary.apa.org/social-desirability). Thus, the fact that pre-service teachers felt able to agree with either perspective is an important methodological finding in terms of socially acceptable options. While force-choice options have long been recommended as one way to reduce social desirability biases (Nederhof, 1985), choosing between vignettes is an interesting modification because of the ability to craft a fulsome narrative in vignettes. It is possible that hearing Teacher B explain how external constraints reduced her personal responsibility, that the perspective became acceptably normalized and a valid option for pre-service teachers to select. As such, taking time to normalize less adaptive beliefs and practices related to motivation may help researchers gain true responses from participants.

Prediction of choice

The significant logistic regression shows that pre-service teachers selected the video vignette in a way that aligned with the amount of personal responsibility they reported. In other words, pre-service teachers who indicated a lower percentage of personal responsibility, or had lower scores on the TRS domain of student motivation, were more inclined to choose Teacher B and those with a higher percentage of personal responsibility, or had higher scores on the TRS domain of student motivation, were more inclined to choose Teacher A. This provides exciting evidence that if, with intervention or education, pre-service teachers can become even 10% more personally responsible for student motivation, then they are more likely to relate to Teacher A and her uncompromising commitment to student motivation. The use of a simple percentage indicator may be helpful for teacher-educators who do not want to use full measurement scales (Gogol et al., 2014) but can assess percentage easily and frequently. Future research may ask pre-service teachers to allocate the remaining percentage of responsibility, thereby leaning into the theoretical framework provided by shared responsibility (Helker & Wosnitza, 2014). Moreover, future research could ask pre-service teachers why they identify the percentage of responsibility to aid intervention efforts. This would allow researchers to have a good sense of with whom the teachers believe responsibility for motivation is shared. However, it will be important in this research that students are active in their personal responsibility for motivation and not just compliant to teachers' requests (Ames, 1992).

Responsibility for student motivation: Who and how

The reflections written by pre-service teachers were internally consistent with the messages presented by Teacher A or B respectively. This provides some validity evidence that they watched the videos and were indeed making their choice because of

the perspective it had forwarded. Participants who agreed with Teacher A saw student motivation as their duty; whereas, participants who agreed with Teacher B focused on ways in which responsibility was shared. This distinction, which was forwarded in the video vignettes and echoed in participant reflections, harkens back to the original internal/external dichotomies prevalent in motivation theories and research (Rotter, 1954; Weiner, 1985; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Perhaps extending from this perspective on who is responsible for student motivation, over half of participants who agreed with Teacher A went on to articulate a wide range of strategies to apply to support student motivation compared to just a handful of participants who agreed with Teacher B. Arguably, because we know participants who selected Teacher B view themselves as significantly less responsible for student motivation than those who selected Teacher A, a logical inference is that they did not name strategies because they do not "need" strategies.

Rather than listing strategies, participants that agreed with Teacher B went on to describe how home or school environments reduce their personal responsibility for student motivation. These descriptions map closely onto original sense of teaching efficacy items that distinguished between personal efficacy and teaching efficacy (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Indeed, the written reflections from participants who chose Teacher A appear to describe high personal and teaching efficacy; whereas, the reflections from participants who chose Teacher B express high personal efficacy paired with low teaching efficacy. We encourage researchers to consider how to fit external circumstances into the self-focused nature of efficacy beliefs and personal responsibility because pre-service and practicing teachers are clearly impacted by the external constraints associated with the profession. Overall, the differences between the reflections based on teacher choice reinforces the quantitative results of the logistic regression and shows clear differences in not only the percentage responsible for motivation, but how that belief plays out in terms of instructional practices.

Emotions in responsibility for motivation

Researchers have been increasing their focus on understanding the breadth and influence of teachers' emotions in the classroom (Frenzel, 2014). Our qualitative results remind us that pre-service teachers project emotions into their professional future. By anticipating frustration in regards to motivating students, pre-service teachers show a realism that is often obscured by the unrealistic optimism that is more commonly associated with this population (Weinstein, 1990). In contrast, pre-service teachers who spoke of loving students did so without acknowledging the emotional labour involved with that level of relationship. Thus, both the positive and negative emotions evoked by being responsible for student motivation have relevance for emotional labor of teaching and by extension burnout. Supporting the link between personal responsibility and emotions empirically, Eren (2014) found positive correlations between personal

responsibility for student motivation and teachers' self -reported academic optimism, hope, and enjoyment of teaching, and negative correlations with anger and anxiety. Future qualitative research may be a way to further explore the emotions associated with varying levels of responsibility for student motivation so that the emotional labor of the task can be addressed (Yin et al., 2019).

Limitations and directions for future research

In closing, we address three limitations of our study and make recommendations for future research. First, there are several concerns related to using video vignettes to trigger personal reflections. To begin, the teachers in the videos were young female elementary school teachers meaning their stories may not have resonated as strongly with high school teachers or possibly men. Likewise, the teachers scripted their own narratives based on personal experiences and to reflect the open-ended responses of teachers who had previously scored high or low on the TRS-motivation subscale. The extent to which participants felt the teachers' stories were authentic is unknown. However this could be assessed in future research with a manipulation-check item such as "To what extent do you think these perspectives represent the teachers' personal experiences?". Indeed, the work of Hauser, Ellsworth and Gonzalez (2019) highlights the importance of well-designed manipulation-checks in research. Additionally, future research using video vignettes may want to consider a less structured conversation amongst several teachers of varying ages, genders, and grade levels that could flow back and forth between perspectives to ensure that the authenticity is high.

Second, in their stories in the video vignettes both teachers acknowledged that they feel personally responsible for student motivation before they went on to further explain ways they stepped wholly into that responsibility or ways they found it mitigated. We did not offer pre-service teachers an option in which they heard a story from a teacher that simply did not think they were responsible for student motivation. Given that the full range of percentage options, including 0-10%, was utilized by pre-service teachers in the quantitative portion of the study, it may be important to further explore occasions when this responsibility is essentially disregarded and to create a representative vignette. Future research in general, should be mindful that a full range of possible perspectives are presented to ensure that all practitioners can connect with the messages presented.

Third, our sample was limited to pre-service teachers at one Canadian institution, so future research should consider reflections from pre-service teachers in other institutions, provinces, and even countries. Although it is not uncommon to focus on a single training site in education research, the fact that the videos are easily accessed online can facilitate sharing the videos and gathering reflections from pre-service teachers all around the world. We would encourage teacher-educators to consider using these video vignettes as case studies or to prompt discussion about personal responsibility

for motivation in their teacher education courses to support the development of these practitioners. It seems that pre-service teachers felt empowered to select either video vignette and explain their own perspective relative to the narrative. As such, the video vignettes could become a pedagogical tool as much as they served a research purpose in the current study. Indeed, video cases are becoming more popular recent years in teacher education programs to support learning with facilitated experiences for these developing practitioners (Piwowar et al., 2018).

Conclusion

In conclusion, our research provides important information on pre-service teachers' perspectives on personal responsibility for student motivation. The results shed light on how pre-service teachers' view personal responsibility for student motivation. Indeed, we were able to identify potential external constraints, strategies to support motivation, and emotional factors important for pre-service teachers' views. Moreover, the findings from our thematic analysis highlight a number of topics important for the instruction of pre-service teachers related to student motivation, responsibility, and efficacy as part of their teacher education programs. The use of vignettes to examine the perspectives of the participants is novel, and should be considered for future research in this area as well as serving as a useful pedagogical tool.

References

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of educational psychology, 84*(3), 261-271.

Ashton, P. (1985). Motivation and the teacher's sense of efficacy. In C. Ames and R. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education: Vol. 2. The classroom milieu (pp. 141-174). Academic Press.

Bacon, C. S. (1993). Student responsibility for learning. Adolescence, 28(109), 199-212.

Daniels, LM, Goegan, LD, Radil, AI, & Dueck, B. S. (under review). Targeting Both Motivation Beliefs and Practices in an Online Intervention for Pre-service Teachers. Manuscript under review.

Daniels, L. M., Poth, C. A. & Goegan, L. D. (2018). Enhancing our understanding of teachers' personal responsibility for student motivation: Mixed insights informing theory, measurement, and practice. *Frontiers: Educational Psychology, 3*, 91.

Daniels, L. M., Radil, A., & Wagner, A. (2016). Concordance between pre-service teachers' personal responsibilities and intended instructional practices. *Journal of Experimental Education, 84*, 529-553. doi:10.1080/00220973.2015.1054333.

Deci, E. L., Spiegel, N. H., Ryan, R. M., Koestner, R., & Kauffman, M. (1982). Effects of performance standards on teaching styles: behavior of controlling teachers. *J.*

Educ. Psychol., 74(852). https://doi.org/ 10.1037/0022-0663.74.6.852

Eren, A. (2014). Uncovering the links between prospective teachers' personal responsibility, academic optimism, hope, and emotions about teaching: a mediation analysis. *Soc. Psychol. Educ., 17*, 73-104. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s11218-013-9243-5

Eren, A. (2015). "Not only satisfied and responsible, but also hopeful": prospective teachers' career choice satisfaction, hope, and personal responsibility. *Camb. J. Educ., 45*, 149-166. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/0305764X.2014.930417

Eren, A. (2017). Investigating prospective teachers' teaching-specific hopes as predictors of their sense of personal responsibility. Asia-Pac. J. Teach. Educ., 45, 267-284. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/1359866X.2016.1169507

Eren, A., & Çetin, G. (2019). Pre-service teachers' beliefs about the teaching profession, curriculum orientations, and personal responsibility. Curriculum Perspectives, 39(1), 19-32.

Flink, C., Boggiano, A. K., & Barrett, M. (1990). Controlling teaching strategies: Undermining children's self-determination and performance. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol., 59*, 916-924. https://doi.org/ 10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.916

Frenzel, A. C. (2014). Teacher emotions. In R. Pekrun & L. Linnenbrink-Garcia (Eds.), Educational psychology handbook series. International handbook of emotions in education (p. 494-518). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group

Fulmer, S. M., & Frijters, J. C. (2009). A review of self-report and alternative approaches in the measurement of student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review, 21*(3), 219-246.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 569-582. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.76.4.569

Gogol, K., Brunner, M., Goetz, T., Martin, R., Ugen, S., Keller, U., Fischbach, A., & Preckel, F. (2014). "My questionnaire is too long!" The assessments of motivational-affective constructs with three-item and single-item measures. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 39*(3), 188-205.

Guskey, T. R. (1981). Measurement of the responsibility teachers assume for academic successes and failures in the classroom. *J. Teach. Educ., 32*, 44-51. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/002248718103200310

Hauser, D. J., Ellsworth, P. C., & Gonzalez, R. (2018). Are manipulation checks necessary?. *Front. Psychol., 9:998.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00998

Hazel, N. (1995). Elicitation Techniques with Young People, *Social Research Update*, Issue 12, Department of Sociology, University of Surrey, http://www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/sru/SRU12.html.

Helker, K., & Wosnitza, M. (2014). Responsibility in the school context - Development and validation of a heuristic framework. *Frontline Learning Research, 2*(2),

115-139.

Helker, K., & Wosnitza, M. (2016). The interplay of students' and parents' responsibility judgements in the school context and their associations with student motivation and achievement. *International Journal of Educational Research, 76*, 34-49. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.ijer.2016.01.001

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Klassen, R. M., Tze, V. M., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher efficacy research 1998-2009: Signs of progress or unfulfilled promise?. *Educational psychology review, 23*(1), 21-43.

Larrivee, B. (2000). Transforming teacher practice: Becoming the critically reflective teacher. *Reflective Practice, 1,* 293-307. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940020025561

Lauermann, F. (2014). Teacher responsibility from the teachers' perspective. *Int. J. Educ. Res., 65,* 75-89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2013.09.005

Lauermann, F., & Karabenick, S. A. (2009). "The many faces of teacher responsibility," in *Paper Presented at the 13th European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction Biennial Conference (EARLI)* (Amsterdam).

Lauermann, F., & Karabenick, S. A. (2011). Taking Teacher Responsibility Into Account(ability): Explicating its multiple components and theoretical status. *Educational Psychologist, 46*(2), 122-140.

Lauermann, F., & Karabenick, S. A. (2013). The meaning and measure of teachers' sense of responsibility for educational outcomes. *Teach. Teach. Educ., 30,* 13-26. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.001

Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: The students' view. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(3), 307-319. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00059-7

Matteucci, M. C., & Helker, K. (2018). Who is responsible for educational outcomes? Responsibility ascriptions for educational outcomes in a sample of Italian teachers, parents, and students. *Learning and Individual Differences, 61,* 239-249. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.lindif.2017.12.009

Nederhof, A. J. (1985). Methods of coping with social desirability bias: A review. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 15*(3), 263-280. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420150303

Pelletier, L., Seguin-Levesque, C., & Legault, L. (2002). Pressure from above and pressure from below as determinants of teachers' motivation and teaching behaviors. *J. Educ. Psychol., 94,* 186-196. https://doi.org/ 10.1037//0022-0663.94.1.186

Piwowar, V., Barth, V. L., Ophardt, D., & Thiel, F. (2018). Evidence-based scripted videos on handling student misbehavior: the development and evaluation of video cases for teacher education. *Professional development in education, 44*(3), 369-

384. 0.1080/19415257.2017.1316299

Rotter, J. B. (1954). Social learning and clinical psychology. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness. Guilford Press.

Ryan, R. M., & Weinstein, N. (2009). Undermining quality teaching and learning: A self-determination theory perspective on high-stakes testing. *Theory Res. Educ., 7*, 224-233. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1477878509104327

Sansone, C., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (Eds.). (2000). *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance.* Elsevier.

Tsang, K. K. (2011). Emotional labor of teaching. *Educational Research, 2*(8), 1312-1316.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review, 92*(4), 548-573.

Weinstein, C. S. (1990). Prospective elementary teachers' beliefs about teaching: Implications for teacher education. *Teaching and teacher education, 6*(3), 279-290.

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 81-91.

Yin, H., Huang, S., & Chen, G. (2019). The Relationships between Teachers' Emotional Labor and Their Burnout and Satisfaction: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Educational Research Review*, 28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.100283