

Andragogy and Pedagogy as Foundational Theory for Student Motivation in Higher Education

Stephen Pew, PhD
Associate Professor of Healthcare Leadership
Park University

*"I never teach my pupils. I only attempt to provide
the conditions in which they can learn." -Albert Einstein*

How educators approach the issue of student motivation, be it intrinsic or extrinsic, is determined, in part, by the andragogical or pedagogical philosophical underpinnings of professors' teaching practices. Difficulty arises when pedagogical methods and practices are applied in whole or in part to situations that require andragogical dynamics. A misunderstanding or misapplication of these critical issues may result in situational, temporary, or unsustainable models of motivation that guide lifelong learners and perhaps undermine the entire process of student motivation. This discussion explores the root causes of the misapplication of pedagogical models and its impact on adult learners.

The intention of this article is to promote critical thinking about pedagogy, andragogy, and their relationships to student motivation. The objective is to assist the reader in experiencing what Ken Bain (2004) has described as an "expectation failure," which creates a situation where old mental models do not work and where, in this context, the reader/student is prompted to reconstruct their concepts about motivation and teaching philosophy and practices. This article does not offer answers or solutions to the paradoxes or real-world challenges presented; to do so would defeat its purpose. The author instead strives to provide clarity on the dimensions of the issues. In the end it is anticipated that the reader may experience frustration and cognitive dissonance regarding their own teaching beliefs and practices, whereupon the opportunity to rethink the issues and one's own beliefs may arise.

Difficulty arises when pedagogical methods and practices are applied in whole or in part to situations that require andragogical dynamics. A misunderstanding or misapplication of these critical issues may result in situational, temporary, or unsustainable models of motivation that guide lifelong learners and perhaps undermine the entire process of student motivation.

Motivation

"Motivation has been defined as the level of effort an individual is willing to expend toward the achievement of a certain goal" (Brennen, 2006, ¶ 4). "Motivation energizes, directs and sustains behavior and can be either intrinsic or extrinsic" (McDevitt, 2006, ¶ 1). In psychology, motivation refers to the initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of behavior (Geen, 1995). The study of student motivation spans both philosophical and practical disciplines, and offers multiple findings and recommendations for a best practice. Theories of motivation include behavioral, cognitive, humanistic, and biological viewpoints.

Based on the work of B.F. Skinner's operant learning theories, behavioral theories describe the processes of increasing the desired behavior by using either positive consequences or avoidance of negative stimuli as extrinsic forms of motivation.

The cognitive view "emphasizes the arousal of cognitive disequilibrium as a means to motivate students to learn something new" (Teaching Concepts, 2007, p. 399). This state of cognitive dissonance drives students to behave in ways that

reestablish equilibrium. Cognitive theory emphasizes intrinsic motivation and creates situations where students are stimulated to see answers.

The humanistic view is based on Abraham Maslow's work on "Motivation and Personality" (Teaching Concepts, 2007) describing how students seek to attain five different levels of hierarchical needs. The theory holds that if students have their basic physical and safety needs met, their needs for belongingness, self esteem, and self-actualization will intrinsically motivate them to achieve. Achievement motivation theory holds that most people want to achieve and have goals they want to reach. "Low achievers tend to attribute failure to lack of ability and success to luck. High achievers... tend to attribute failure to a lack of effort and success to effort and ability" (Weiner, 1990, pp. 616-622).

The biological or neural basis of motivation holds that "neural activity in the brain guides us towards or away from particular results and it is these synaptic events that influence behavioral outcomes" (Sullivan, 2003, ¶ 5).

Instructor Philosophies of Motivation

With the demographic actively changing from that of high school seniors to one of non-traditional students, faculty in higher education must adjust their teaching methods and philosophies. Higher education must now construct an environment in which these non-traditional students can expand their learning.

Engaging in an environment where the dynamics between learner and educator are carefully considered and implemented may require a significant readjustment of expectations and relationships for both learners and teachers.

The underlying philosophies of the architects of higher education, whether at the graduate or undergraduate levels, determine the types of experiences that students will encounter in the classroom. These experiences may mean the difference between students who will be temporally motivated by point-in-time external events, and those who develop and/or expand dynamic internal systems of self-sufficiency. Internal motivation systems can propel students through their lives and careers. Who is responsible for motivation is a key issue; the source of that motivation is also key. To that end, a further discussion of intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation, as they relate to pedagogy and andragogy, is essential.

The underlying philosophies of the architects of higher education, whether at the graduate or undergraduate levels, determine the types of experiences that students will encounter in the classroom. These experiences may mean the difference between students who will be temporally motivated by point-in-time external events, and those who develop and/or expand dynamic internal systems of self-sufficiency.

Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation

There are basic differences in sources of motivation. According to the Center for Educational Research and Innovation (2000):

Intrinsically-motivated students are said to employ strategies that demand more effort and that enable them to process information more deeply. Extrinsically-motivated students, by contrast, are inclined to make the minimum effort to achieve an award. Older behaviourist perspectives on motivation assumed that teachers could manipulate children's engagement with schoolwork through the introduction of controls and rewards. However, research has tended to show that children usually revert to their original behaviour when the rewards stop. Furthermore, at least two dozen studies have shown that people expecting to receive a reward for completing a task—or for doing it successfully—do not perform as well as

those who expect nothing. This appears to be true for children and adults, for males and females, for rewards of all kinds and for tasks ranging from memorising facts to designing collages. (p. 27)

In traditional settings of higher education, students are motivated by a variety of internal and external stimuli. Motivating external stimuli can include, but are not limited to, a quest for a college degree or knowledge, opportunity for career enhancement or entrance into a career, grades, fear of failure or avoidance of shame (grading), personal recognition, money, externally set goals, pleasing the instructor, pleasing one's parents, friends, or colleagues, etc; the list of external motivators goes on. External motivators are often culturally driven and observable.

A Web search of the single word *motivation* yields 54,600,000 hits. It seems that motivation has become a commodity to be sold or traded, much like religion, beans, or other publicly traded services promising to enhance your life. The most current and popular product is *The Secret* (Heriot, 2007), a film sharing a professedly new technique that motivates you to

It seems that motivation has become a commodity to be sold or traded, much like religion, beans, or other publicly traded services promising to enhance your life.

get anything you want just by imagining you will get it. Magical thinking? Hoax? Discovery? Or, as described by its detractors, "same hot air, new balloon" (Bell, 2007)? For the unmotivated with money, the sources of motivational assistance are nearly endless. Students who view education as an investment toward some gain later on are externally driven consumers, for whom the buyer beware caveat is critical. Investment education can be purchased based on price, location, convenience, ease of courses, and many other features and benefits. Students who are intrinsically driven may pursue education for other reasons, which will be discussed later.

Some companies (such as Motivation123.com) have patented methods of motivation guaranteed to change your life. Others are motivational speakers who, for a hefty fee, will come to your area. Alternatively, you can travel to attend their seminar and engage in an experience that is promised to motivate you and your comrades. Of course, these sellers of motivation base their product or services on the philosophy that motivation comes from outside the student (extrinsic), not from within (intrinsic). If you do not have it within yourself, you can get it from them. This would seem to answer the Zen koan, "*If you do not get from yourself, where will you go for it*" (Watts, 2006). With respect to higher education, the external sources of motivation are evident and accessible, but often thrust upon students, even if unsolicited.

What about intrinsic motivation? Piaget, a prominent figure in child development research and theory, contends that the desire to interact and work toward equilibrium results in a natural motivation to learn. If that tendency exists naturally, then what is the purpose of an external motivator?

Intrinsic motivation has been the focus of study by educational psychologists and has its roots in self-determination theory:

In Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985) we distinguish between different types of motivation based on the different reasons or goals that gives rise to an action. The most basic distinction is between *intrinsic motivation*, which refers to doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable, and *extrinsic motivation*, which refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcome. Over three decades of research has shown that the quality of experience and performance can be very different when one is behaving for intrinsic versus extrinsic reasons. (Reeve, Deci, & Ryan, 2004, pp. 31-60)

Additionally, Bandura's work (1993) on self-efficacy in cognitive development has made significant contributions to the understanding of intrinsic motivation. Students

who are intrinsically motivated are more likely to credit their successes to internal factors such as the amount of effort they invest. They also believe that they can take credit for the results of their efforts rather than attribute them to luck. Intrinsically motivated students strive for a deep understanding and mastery of the material rather than simply memorization of facts.

The benefit of intrinsic motivation is its availability and portability. If what drives one to succeed is based on factors that derive from one's own beliefs, morals, desires, and goals, then access to those motivators is instant and not dependent on the availability or cooperation of external sources such as money or motivational speakers. The reward of acquiring knowledge or critical thinking skills comes from a personal sense of accomplishment that one has somehow grown as an individual; achievement of personal goals outweighs any external reward. External gratification, while desirable and not to be discounted, is secondary to an internal sense of accomplishment.

At what point do human beings develop a preference for an intrinsic rather than an extrinsic source of motivation? Knowles (1984) points out that growing older, the mature adult becomes more independent, and wholly self-directing. "When a person becomes older, his motivation to learn comes more from his own self" (p 12). Colleges and universities are experiencing a changing demographic, from one of college freshmen who enroll directly from high school to one of adult learners with significant life experiences. The methods of education and the dynamics of the classroom or online class must change to accommodate the adult or mature learner.

Andragogy, Pedagogy, and Responsibility

While motivation can be intrinsic or extrinsic, the definitions and origins themselves do not connote a clear locus of responsibility. The responsibility for one's motivation, regardless of source, depends on who is being motivated. For students in higher education, the underlying philosophy and course dynamics driven by the instructor can dictate that responsibility, albeit inconsistently if not carefully planned, managed, and executed. To offer clarity, a focus on the "who" part of the equation might be useful. "Who" pertains to this question: Is the student a child or an adult? A discussion of pedagogy and andragogy in relation to educational approach and technique follows.

The responsibility for one's motivation, regardless of source, depends on who is being motivated.

Pedagogue is defined as "a schoolteacher. One who instructs in a pedantic or dogmatic manner" ("Pedagogue", 2007). In the pedagogic model, teachers assume responsibility for making decisions about what is learned, and how and when something will be learned. It is teacher-directed or teacher-centered. Teacher-directed learning has its roots in Calvinism, and the belief that wisdom is evil, and that adults should direct, control, and ultimately limit children's learning to keep them innocent (Conner, 1997-2004, ¶ 4).

Andragogy, by contrast, is

the art and science of helping adults learn. In the andragogical model there are five assertions: 1) Letting learners know why something is important to learn, 2) showing learners how to direct themselves through information, 3) relating the topic to the learner's experiences. In addition, 4) people will not learn until they are ready and motivated to learn. 5) This requires helping overcome inhibitions, behaviors, and beliefs about learning" (Conner, 1997-2004, ¶ 12).

In Pedagogy, the educational focus is on transmitting, in a very teacher-controlled environment, the content subject matter. In Andragogy, the educational focus is on facilitating the acquisition of and critical thinking about the content and

its application in real-life practical settings (<http://www.sergeclaes.be/Essays/Andragogy.html>).

Rachal (2002) examined andragogy as a means of educating adults:

Andragogy also calls for learner control, measures of knowledge acquisition based upon performance standards, and the voluntary involvement of students in the learning activity. Most of these conditions do not exist in the university. One of the primary tenets of andragogy is that learning is pursued for its intrinsic value. Finally, andragogy calls for the measurement of satisfaction and for learner determined outcome measures. Neither of these conditions is readily found in higher education where faculty set the learning objectives and where satisfaction is not the primary determinant of future course offerings (pp. 210-227).

When it comes to adults, the foundation of higher education must assume that the adult learner has primary responsibility for their own motivation. This is not to suggest that the external environment cannot be facilitative, only that it does not encourage responsibility.

Extrinsic factors such as teachers may be an important part of the education of children. When it comes to adults, the foundation of higher education must assume that the adult learner has primary responsibility for their own motivation. This is not to suggest that the external environment cannot be facilitative, only that it does not encourage responsibility. Knowing the difference can mean the success or failure of higher educators in conveying to students learning skills that are permanent and student owned.

When learning and its motivations are self-derived, then the responsibility is clearer. Connor (1997) notes:

How can we expect to analyze and synthesize so much information if we turn to others to determine what should be learned, how it will be learned, and when it will be learned? Though our grandchildren or great-grandchildren may be free of pedagogic bias, most adults today are not offered that luxury. To succeed, we must unlearn our teacher-reliance (¶ 17).

Changing the environment of higher education will be an arduous and complicated task. Those who champion that transition will likely find it a thankless job fraught with Philistine defiance.

Implications for Constructing Educational Settings That Facilitate Motivation

What are the implications for the architects of an environment of higher learning? The first implication is that those who teach must have a clear understanding of who is responsible for motivation. If we assume that we are focusing on adult learners, not on children, then the model must be that of andragogy, not pedagogy. Subsequently the responsibility for student motivation lies primarily within the student, with support from faculty, but it is not the responsibility of faculty to be the motivator. Faculty as a primary source of motivation may result in the educator's complicity in creating a student culture of childish self-indulgence in which the responsibility for student success lies with someone else. If students' preferences are extrinsic, then the Web's 54 million resources await them; if their motivation is intrinsic, then the responsibility issue is axiomatic.

The student who does not complete assignments; listens to music through headphones during lectures; and doesn't master the material or take an active,

engaged leadership role in their education, might be assumed to be insufficiently motivated to engage in a discourse of higher education. The solution is not for the teacher to immediately assume the task of instilling motivation in the student, beyond conveying the expectation that “if you don’t do the work and master the material, you will fail the course.” Instead, teachers might consider directing externally motivated students to counseling resources (or the Internet), where their needs can be professionally addressed.

Students entering the realm of higher education bring with them a lifetime of experiences and baggage. Some who have acquired a propensity for the richness of adult-to-adult relationships and learning will thrive in an environment of andragogy. Students who still look to others to be responsible for their learning will find a pedagogical environment more comfortable. Professors rooted in andragogy will seek to devote the majority of their time to teaching, not motivating. Those who practice the pedagogical model in a setting of higher education with adult students may find their teaching efforts diluted as time and energy are devoted more to encouraging and motivating recalcitrant learners than to teaching the knowledge, skills, and concepts of the area of study.

Internal motivators such as a quest for knowledge sustain the student’s engagement in the acquisition of learning/knowledge, whether or not external stimuli exist. Behavior is also sustained by a complex array of internal experiences and drivers that are invisible to the outside observer. For any one person to know what motivates another is a complex process and constitutes a profession (psychology) in and of itself. Mastery of this professional knowledge is rare for employment supervisors, university instructors, or others who find themselves assuming (or having thrust upon them) the responsibility for the motivation of others. Indeed educators often erroneously assume that they are knowledgeable about what motivates their students. In reality, their perceptions are often shaped by their own experiences and preferences in motivating rewards and punishments. Following the proverbial “golden rule,” they apply motivating structures to others based on what might motivate them. This is another critical thinking error in the motivation paradigm.

Educators in higher education might be more successful if they were to apply the “platinum rule,” which states that we might motivate others as *they* want to be motivated, not as we might want to motivate them. This would require two changes in the approach of educators: They would have to realize, first, that knowledge of internal student motivators is unavailable to them directly, and second, that what motivates them as educators may or may not motivate students. This involves a complex relationship analysis that is seldom part of the preparation of instructors in higher education. As a result, the skill sets are poorly developed, or not developed at all.

However, like religion, astrology, or other theoretical or practical concepts of motivation, lack of mastery of the knowledge, skills, and principles of the craft (in this case the motivation of others), does not seem to inhibit most from engaging in such practices. Indeed some derive great pleasure from being the motivator of the moment, the sage on the stage. Subsequently, the realm of student motivation is often narrowly understood and is instructor- rather than student-centric because of the complexity of incorporating the unknown (student internal motivation) into the equation. Instructors fall back on a pedagogical teacher-centered orientation to comprehend and manage student motivation, rather than let natural tendencies evolve.

Internal motivators such as a quest for knowledge sustain the student’s engagement in the acquisition of learning/knowledge, whether or not external stimuli exist.

Aligning Motivations: Possible Approaches to a Better System

How does this affect the practices, traditions, and applications of theory to practice in student motivation? Management and use of external motivators might be prevalent because they are more easily accessed and controlled; how, then, might we approach student motivation in higher education, assuming that student motivation comes from the students themselves? Simply, we must create learning environments that let students draw on the internal resources that brought them to college in the first place. As instructors, we must focus our attention on creating an environment where students can gain knowledge and skills in critical thinking and problem solving in their chosen areas of learning.

We must create learning environments that let students draw on the internal resources that brought them to college in the first place. As instructors, we must focus our attention on creating an environment where students can gain knowledge and skills in critical thinking and problem solving in their chosen areas of learning.

However, to say that higher education should dismiss the pedagogy model and adopt one of andragogy may be an oversimplification. If it were that easy, one might ask why it has not been done already, and why university professors cling to a model of education designed for children, not for adults. Exploring the potential root causes may yield some insight into what might be done to remove potential obstacles and change the system from a pedagogical to an andragogical one.

Scenario 1: We've always done it this way; the downside of tradition.

Scientists place five monkeys in a cage; suspended from the roof of the cage is a large bunch of ripe bananas. Inside the cage are many boxes. After several minutes of staring at the bananas, the monkeys begin to stack the boxes in order to reach them. Each time any of the monkeys tries to stack the boxes, the researchers spray all of the monkeys with a high-pressure hose. This continues until all monkeys stop trying to reach the bananas. Once all five monkeys have been thoroughly conditioned, Phase Two begins: The scientists replace one original monkey with a newcomer. Upon seeing the bananas, the sixth monkey begins to stack boxes and is immediately attacked by the remaining "trained" monkeys. No water is sprayed, but the remaining monkeys still won't let the newcomer try for the bananas. Once the newcomer is trained, the scientists replace another monkey. Again, the newcomer is attacked each time it tries to reach the bananas. Even the sixth monkey takes part in the attack, even though it has never been sprayed. This continues until all five original monkeys have been replaced. No replacement monkeys have ever been sprayed to keep them away from the bananas. Yet, even with five monkeys who have never been punished for stacking boxes now in the cage, none of them will try for the bananas. Why?

Because that's the way it's always been done around here (Baldwin, 2003, ¶ 2-6). Perhaps higher education faculty have become stalwart defenders of the status quo of pedagogy because that's the way we've always done it (i.e., according to tradition). To break this pattern, the art and science of change and its management, as well as incorporating andragogy, might be useful.

Scenario 2: The Delicious Futility of Fame; The Catnip of Motivator Educators

Instructors/professors who assume responsibility for the motivational rehabilitation of seemingly unmotivated students may be outside their accountability and perhaps beyond their professional skill sets. Why would faculty choose to do this? Motivating others can be a complex and time-intensive endeavor. What is the instructor's motivation or reward for taking on the difficult task of being responsible for motivating students and perhaps even making them dependent? To identify ways that instructors might avoid the dependency trap, we might examine possible motives of educators ensconced in a pedagogical model with adult learners. Two concepts that may explain this difficult dilemma are "enabling" and "codependency".

Instructors/professors who assume responsibility for the motivational rehabilitation of seemingly unmotivated students may be outside their accountability and perhaps beyond their professional skill sets.

Codependency is a condition that results in a dysfunctional relationship between the codependent and other people. A codependent is addicted to helping someone and needs to be needed. This addiction is sometimes so strong, the codependent will cause the other person to continue to be needy; this behavior is called enabling. A codependent often suffers from the 'Messiah Complex' of seeing problems with everyone and him- or herself as the only person who can help. "Here is where I need to work...trying to be 'Mr. Fixit' for everyone...even those who don't feel they need anything fixed" (Williams 2006, ¶ 1).

Understanding this concept might help university faculty avoid enabling learning structures derived from an educational codependency. Faculty and students might be better served if the motives of the faculty did not include a need to be needed by students, but an intrinsic desire to successfully convey the content, critical thinking, and dynamics of their expertise to others who could apply this knowledge and skill to reach their own personal and career goals, i.e. to teach and to learn respectively.

Scenario 3: A Mutual Pact of Low Expectations; The Result of a Systems Problem

To further explore the root causes of non-effective educational systems, Thomas H. Benton (2006) in his *Tough-Love Manifesto for Professors* discusses the dynamics that professors fall into when they become unwitting (or volunteer) participants in a student culture of permissiveness. The professor who says, "Please, please hire me! I'll do anything! I'll keep the students entertained and give them all high grades because everyone's special and who am I to judge anyway?" (¶ 3), and beyond this assumes teachers are primarily responsible for a student's motivation. Faculty motivation for this approach may be the result of institutional demands for enrollment, retention and graduation rates, and wanting to be liked, rather than for delivering an education to the students. The faculty's motivation, to cater to students, is self-serving rather than student centered. The student's motivation is to get a degree with the least amount of time and effort. The point is not to motivate the students but to deliver an education consistent with their own intrinsic motivations for seeking higher education.

Benton (2006) speaks candidly about the 7 Deadly Sins of Students and the 7 Deadly Sins of Professors. He summarizes by saying "My argument is that a student culture of self-indulgence is enabled by the failure of professors to maintain expectations in the classroom" (¶ 4). In his manifesto he contends that "students and professors have entered into a mutual pact of low expectations" (¶ 4). One explanation of low expectations may be that instructors are clinging to a teacher-child-centered model of education (e.g., pedagogy), when an adult-adult, non-

traditional student-centered model may be more effective (e.g., andragogy). Taking responsibility for a student's motivation implicitly usurps credit for motivation and achievement from the student and may undermine the dynamic development of self-determination and self-sufficiency. It also creates a dependency on extrinsic motivational sources that will not serve the student, as they will pursue the next extrinsic source of motivation rather than their own goals.

Motivational Development or Another Welfare System for the Motivationally Impoverished?

Whatever its root causes, motivation for students in higher education must be sufficient to sustain engagement and performance in a course of study, including those courses that may be boring, poorly developed and poorly taught. If a student selects course instructors carefully by examining professor performance databases, the likelihood of finding an educational experience that supports the student's own motivation goes up. Variety is a fact of life. The university should prepare students for experiences that vary in their external motivational properties, not shield or protect them, nor assume responsibility for motivation which may sustain dependence on external stimuli. The student's motivation to achieve the end product of a higher education must be strongly ingrained and developed internally, and of sufficient strength to sustain goal-oriented progress in the best and the worst of motivational times.

Life is as much about determination as it is about motivation. Faculty who attempt to rescue students from the realities of a dysfunctional or limiting motivational life might consider the extent to which they are in codependent relationships with their students. In the same way, students who find they rely on others as external motivators might examine ways to expand their relationships with their instructors to encompass more adult-to-adult interactions and wean themselves of the dependencies of parent-child dynamics.

Some instructors may serve as a temporary motivational bridge as historically externally motivated students become more self-sufficient. At the same time, instructors will devote primary teaching resources to those self-motivated students who came to learn and expand their knowledge and critical thinking skills. The self-motivated students often complain that a course that reduces itself to the lowest common denominator (in this case, the externally motivated student) disenfranchises the prepared, self-motivated student. If a majority of the instructor's resources are devoted to encouraging, managing, and motivating the externally motivated students, less instructional time is invested in the self-motivated students. After all, isn't the main instructional goal to educate, not motivate?

Some instructors may serve as a temporary motivational bridge as historically externally motivated students become more self-sufficient. At the same time, instructors will devote primary teaching resources to those self-motivated students who came to learn and expand their knowledge and critical thinking skills.

Maintaining this dichotomy of educational existence and balancing the competing demands for teacher attention is often a challenge for university educators, but one worth pursuing. Understanding the andragogical or pedagogical foundations of adult-to-adult learning in an environment of higher education can help meet this challenge, in that adult-to-adult interactions are more facilitative of adult learning than are parent-to-child interactions (Tyrell & Johnston, 1983).

Whether an instructor adopts a personal responsibility for a student's motivation, a shared responsibility with the student, or a position that a student is primarily responsible, approaching the teaching tasks from an informed, deliberate, strategic and tactical perspective can improve the educational setting for both educators and learners. This is opposed to previously stated motives which may be habitual, familiar, self serving, or seeking the path of least resistance. Instructors

should clearly explain to their students the philosophical basis of higher education and behave consistently with that philosophy. Then students can prepare to adapt to the instructor's style or, if possible, avoid classes that do not fit with their motivational needs. Alternatively, instructors can try to be all things to all students, in which case none will be adequately served. As a character in Caldwell and Thomason's book, *The Rule of Four*, says, "the delicious futility of impossible tasks is the catnip of overachievers" (Caldwell, 2004).

Those familiar with the Pygmalion and Hawthorne effects may conclude that when adults are treated like adults, they often behave like responsible adults; when treated like children, they often behave as such (Draper, 2006). Adopting andragogical methodologies; letting students know clearly what they can expect from higher education and what instructors expect from them as adult learners (including responsibility for their own motives and leadership in their learning process), develops in lifelong learners intrinsic behavioral drivers that are portable, dynamic, and student owned and controlled. They are less likely to be temporary and fleeting, borrowed from the motivational speaker of the moment.

The challenges to faculty to balance the demands of teaching and of meeting the multiple and varied motivational needs of students with their philosophical leanings are ever-present. The decision to offer little if any direction as to how each professor can or should solve the problem is rooted in the author's andragogical preferences. If the work presented here has resulted in an expectation failure for the reader, then its objective has been achieved. How, or if, the reader begins to reconstruct their mental models of how to teach or motivate adult learners then becomes an individual problem to be solved.

Not addressed in this article is a multitude of other factors, such as the issue of cultural differences and practices, that influence the task of student motivation. The impulse to address these factors here has been resisted, in that the topic is complex and worthy of further and more detailed investigation and consideration.

As T.S. Eliot reminds us in *Four Quartets*, "...the ends of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started....and know the place for the first time" (Eliot, n.d.). Let us return to the root of this exploration, student motivation. The responsibility for and source of student motivation are best summed up by the following story told by Kathy Kalina, RN, a hospice nurse and professional storyteller.

In the 1980s, her story goes, she was caring for a dying west Texas rancher. He had little more than a 4th grade education, but had attained a practical wisdom of life. As she was leaving the hospice one evening, she could see that his breathing was labored, pulse slowed, and extremities cooling. He would most likely die before she returned the next morning. Having grown fond of him, she leaned over his bed, kissed him on the forehead, and whispered in his ear, "When you see Jesus, put in a good word for me." Unexpectedly he opened his eyes, looked at her and with a calm and soft voice whispered back, "Paddle your own canoe."

When it comes to motivating students, teachers might take a lesson from this and advise students in a similar fashion.

In the end, self-reliance is probably the most enduring source of motivation and, if you have it, you do not have to go anywhere to get it. Expecting and promoting intrinsic motivation in students, weaning them from external dependencies and providing an environment and experiences that support their own motivational structures: These become an integral part of the task of teaching. It is no longer just about content.

The challenges to faculty to balance the demands of teaching and of meeting the multiple and varied motivational needs of students with their philosophical leanings are ever-present.

"We're all in this together...by ourselves." -Lily Tomlin

References

- Baldwin, L. (2003, December). *Don't be afraid of change – Part Two*. Retrieved March 12, 2007 from <http://www.lanebaldwin.com/v0318.html>.
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28 (2), 117-148.
- Barker, S. (2004). *Psychology* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Bell, J. (Executive Producer). (2007, February 28). *The today show* [Television broadcast]. New York: NBC News.
- Benton, T.H., (2006, April 14). The 7 deadly sins of students [Electronic Version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, v52 (32).
- Benton, T.H. (2006, May 12). The 7 deadly sins of professors [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, v52 (36).
- Benton, T.H. (2006, June 9). A tough love manifesto for professors [Electronic version]. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, v52 (40).
- Biehler, R.F., & Snowman, J. (1993). *Psychology applied to teaching*. Retrieved March 28, 2007, from <http://college.hmco.com/education/pbl/tc/motivate.html>
- Brennen, A.M. (2006). *Enhancing students' motivation*. Retrieved March 1, 2007, from <http://www.soencouragement.org/enhancing-students-motivation.htm>
- Caldwell, I., & Thomason, D. (2004). *The rule of four*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Connor, M.L. *Andragogy and pedagogy*. Retrieved March 1, 2007, from <http://agelesslearner.com/intros/andragogy.html>
- Cooper, H.M. (1979). Pygmalion grows up: A model for teacher expectation communication and performance influence. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(3), 389-410. Retrieved March 28, 2007 from JSTOR Journal Archive database (10.2307/1170137).
- Draper, S.W. (2006). *The hawthorne, pygmalion, placebo and other effects of expectation*. Retrieved February 11, 2007, from <http://www.psy.gla.ac.uk/~steve/hawth.html>
- Eliot, T.S., (n.d.). *The Four Quartets*. Retrieved March 11, 2007, from <http://www.tristan.icom43.net/quartets/>
- Geen, R.G. (1995). *Human motivation: A social psychological approach*. Retrieved March 28, 2007, from <http://www.kent.ac.uk/psychology/studying/ug/part2/sp608/index.htm>
- Heriot, D. (Director). (2006). *The Secret* [Motion Picture]. USA: Prime Time Productions.
- Knowles, M. et al. (1984). *Moving from pedagogy to andragogy*. Retrieved March 16, 2007, from <http://www-distance.syr.edu/andraggy.html>
- Motivation for your happiness and success*. Retrieved March 2, 2007, from www.motivation123.com
- McDevitt, T.M., & Ormrod, J.E. (2006). *Child development, educating and working with children and adolescents* (2nd ed.). Boston: Prentice Hall.

OECD. (2000). Motivating students for lifelong learning. *Center for Educational Research and Innovation*. Retrieved on March 3, 2007 from ERIC Academic Database (ED449566).

"Pedagogue." (2007). *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Retrieved March 22, 2007, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com>.

Rachal J. R. (2002). Andragogy's detectives: A critique of the present and proposal for the future. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 52(3), 210-27.

Reeve, J., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Self-determination theory: A dialectical framework for understanding socio-cultural influences on student motivation. In S. Van Etten & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Big Theories Revisited* (pp. 31-60). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Press.

Sullivan, A.E. (Ed.). (2003, July 7). *ScienceStrength: Essential Expertise for Learning & Performance Specialists*. Retrieved March 27, 2007, from <http://www.leaderstrength.com/files/ScienceStrength1.pdf>

Tyrrell, P., & Johnston, B. (1983). Challenge versus judgment in responding to students' writing. *English in Australia*, 66(1), 37-43. Retrieved March 4, 2007, from ERIC Academic database (EJ296735).

Tomlin, L. (2007). *Zen Calendar*. New York: Workman Publishing.

Watts, A.. (2006). *Zen Calendar*. New York: Workman Publishing.

Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivation research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 82, pp. 616-622.

Williams, G. (2006). *Codependency test and definition*. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from <http://www.way2hope.org/codependency-test-definition.htm>

Pew is an Associate Professor in the Park University Graduate School and Executive Director of the Master of Healthcare Leadership Program. He has over 30 years of healthcare experience, including executive management in health care provider organizations, hospitals, mental health organizations, physician groups, managed care companies and medical device manufacturers. He has worked with public and private, not for profit and for profit organizations and businesses in the areas of database marketing, clinical outcomes analysis, physician services, media and public relations, community health, continuous quality improvement, patient safety, Appreciative Inquiry, and performance management. Pew holds a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology and Measurements from the University of Nebraska. He has been a licensed Nursing Home Administrator in Indiana/Kansas/Kentucky and holds certificate in Civil and Family Mediation and Conflict Resolution from Texas Woman's University. He is a published author, public speaker and holds copyrights on Diversity Measurement Tools for large organizations. His most recent co-authored book is Don't Go There Alone: A Guide to Hospitals for Patients and Their Advocates. Steve is the founder of Health Advocacy Leadership and Learning Organization (HALO) www.halo1.org. HALO is an organization dedicated to educating and training professionals and volunteers in health and patient advocacy in order to improve the quality of healthcare they get by being more informed consumers.