

Primary School Students' Performance Orientation - The Czech Republic Research

*Helena Vomáčková - Vlastimil Chytrý**

Received: November 12, 2020; received in revised form: February 17, 2021;
accepted: February 18, 2021

Abstract:

Introduction: The current school is strongly focused on student performance. Each student faces a large number of learning tasks, which place considerable demands on them, arouse in them a different degree of interest, evoke a different degree of commitment to work, are associated with different expectations or have a different degree of attractiveness. Performance situations are associated with pleasant experiences but also with experiences of failure, which in their essence affect the activity or passivity of the student, and thereby affect the prioritization of the necessity to excel or the need to avoid failure. These needs are the basis of performance orientation, which is analysed in the paper. The aim is to verify whether the motivational orientation of students is related to their beneficial outcomes.

Methods: The quantitative nature of the paper made it possible to use both indicators of descriptive statistics (mean, median, mode, standard deviation) and inductive statistics (Mann-Whitney U test, Pearson's Chi-square test, Shapiro-Wilk normality test). The surveyed sample of 363 respondents consisted of an available selection of students from 14 primary schools in five regions of the Czech Republic in 2019. The data were collected physically at schools using a standardized questionnaire. Students were acquainted with its purpose and content. Statistical analysis of the data was carried out electronically, both in terms of methodology in accordance with the research design of Hrabal and Pavelková (2011).

Results: The analysis of the data of the sample of respondents revealed that the performance orientation of problem students differs statistically significantly from that of the performance motivation of non-problem students in two cases: 1) the need for successful performance, where differences were verified using hypothesis H1 and 2) in the ratio of performance needs, where the differences were verified using hypothesis

* Helena Vomáčková, J. E. Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, Faculty of Education, Department of Special and Social Pedagogy, Ústí nad Labem, Czech Republic; helena.vomackova@ujep.cz

Vlastimil Chytrý, J. E. Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, Faculty of Education, Department of Pre-Primary and Primary Education, Ústí nad Labem, Czech Republic; vlastimil.chytry@ujep.cz

H4. In other cases, no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups.

Discussion: The presented findings correspond to current domestic (Kryrkorková & Váňová, 2010) and foreign research (Weiner, 2000). They draw attention to the importance of a positive motivation of the student in terms of his degree of involvement in the development of his own dispositions, which affects the benefit of the student. Positively motivated students achieve better results with a comparable intellect than non-motivated students (Man & Mareš, 2005). The role of the teacher and his knowledge of motivational types of students is of paramount importance in this respect.

Limitations: The sample under examination of respondents does not bring a representative sample in terms of the representation of students according to school years, regions of the Czech Republic or according to the representation of so-called problem or non-problem students. The outcomes of the survey can thus be applied only to a given sample of respondents.

Conclusion: The benefitting for students in the sample showed lower positive motivation than their intellectually comparable non-problem classmates. It is a question of reserves, the use of which is a challenge not only for themselves, but also for the school and parents. The largest differences between the two groups were recorded in the specific ratio of positive and negative motivation 4: 2 within the T1 type and in the ratio 1: 3 within the T6 type. The attempt to determine the causes of this fact, especially proposing a remedy, is a topic for further research in this area.

Key words: performance orientation, the need for successful performance, positive tendencies, the need to avoid failure, negative tendencies, problem and non-problem students in terms of results.

Introduction

The development of a healthy self-esteem for each individual is related to performance motivation, which determines his aspiration level. Self-confidence and self-esteem are conditioned by personality characteristics, but they are also related to performance behaviour, which is generally reflected in the preference for goals and in the personal attitude to success and failure. Knowledge of performance needs is of paramount importance in the school environment, and teachers should be able to diagnose and measure the apparent performance needs of their students. Students' performance motivation is usually divided according to the inclination into one of two polarities: the positive include students who need to be successful and the negative those who need to avoid failure (Hrabal & Pavelková, 2010). Such positively or negatively oriented students show different behaviour in school situations and show different effectiveness in learning. They then place completely different demands on teachers, as these students react

differently and show a different level of aspiration. The task of the teacher is to create such conditions that strengthen the positive tendency of the students and minimize the negative tendency. However, teachers tend to have difficulty recognizing performance motivation and often attribute to students either increased intensity with both the tendencies, and none at all (Pavelková, 2009). Both motivational tendencies form the basis of the student's performance orientation, which depends on the predominance of one or the other tendency. The degree of attractiveness of performance activity for the student and the subjective probability of the expected result play a decisive role (Atkinson & Raynor, 1974). In accordance with the approach of Covington and Müeller (2001), the paper examines the performance orientation of a selected sample of students and their classification into motivational types according to the ratio of motivational tendencies. At the same time, it monitors differences in performance orientation according to achievement as an indicator of students' school success.

1 Research methods and sampling

The aim of the research was to analyse the performance orientation of lower secondary school students in the Czech Republic and to verify whether there are differences between them in connection with the required school level. These were students of ordinary primary schools with a comparable intellect, where no students with mild mental disabilities were apparent. The students were divided into two groups. The first group included those marked as problem students by teachers (P); the second group included those marked as non-problem students by teachers (N). The boundary between grouping was given by a classification rating better than "good" (inclusive) and a rating worse than "sufficient" (inclusive) in at least two educational areas. The research sample consisted of a total of 363 lower secondary school students from five regions of the Czech Republic. Of this, group P was represented by 248 students, i.e. 68%, group N by 115 students, i.e. 32%.

The motivational focus was determined and subsequently evaluated on the basis of data obtained in the school year 2019/2020 using the standardized School Performance Motivation of Students questionnaire (Hrabal & Pavelková, 2011), which contained 12 items. The structure of the answers to each of them was given by a five-point scale with a score of 1-5. The sum of points for items 1-6 expressed the level of the student's need for successful performance (NSP), the sum of points for items 7-12 expressed the level of the student's need to avoid failure (NAF). Each student could obtain a minimum of 6 and a maximum of 30 points in each section, which were then transferred to five zones - see Tables 1 and 2 (Hrabal & Pavelková, 2011).

Table 1

<i>The NSP conversion standard</i>	
<u>Sum of points</u>	<u>NSP bands</u>
28 to 30 points	5 Very high need
25 to 27 points	4 High need
21 to 24 points	3 Average need
18 to 20 points	2 Low need
Up to 17 points	1 Very low need

Table 2

<i>The NAF conversion standard</i>	
<u>Sum of points</u>	<u>NAF bands</u>
25 to 30 points	5 Very high concern
25 to 27 points	4 High concern
21 to 24 points	3 Average concern
18 to 20 points	2 Low concern
Up to 17 points	1 Very low concern

Based on the ratio of NSP: NAF bands, students were assigned to individual motivational types T1-T6, see Table 3. Their knowledge by the teacher is a prerequisite for optimizing the pedagogical effect on various motivationally selected students.

Table 3

<i>Types of students according to the ratio of the need for successful performance (NSP) and the need to avoid failure (NAF)</i>											
<u>Type 1</u>		<u>Type 2</u>		<u>Type 3</u>		<u>Type 4</u>		<u>Type 5</u>		<u>Type 6</u>	
NSP:NAF		NSP:NAF		NSP:NAF		NSP:NAF		NSP:NAF		NSP:NAF	
5	1	1	5	5	5	1	1	3	3	3	5
5	2	1	4	5	4	1	2	3	4	5	3
4	1	2	5	4	5	2	1	4	3	1	3
4	2	2	4	4	4	2	2	3	2	3	1
								2	3		

The basic characteristics of individual motivational types of students from Table 3 are as follows:

T1: High NSP and at the same time low NAF

These are students who are not hindered in their actions by the fear that they will fail. They see more difficult tasks as a challenge, as opposed to easy tasks, and accomplishing them gives them a strong sense of satisfaction. They are characterized by commitment and an adequate aspiration level, they trust each other. They like to compete and strive for success and recognition. They usually know how to learn from their mistakes. They happily analyse their successes and failures (Helus, 2015).

T2: Low NSP and at the same time high NAF

These are students who are motivated by fear and apprehension that they will not be able to do something, they will fail; they will make mistakes. They tend to avoid performance situations, do not trust each other and do not like competitions. Their aspirations are not adequate. They can also be excellent students with enormous ability but with a maximalist approach, which underlies the unpleasant experiences associated with performing tasks. For this reason, too, they tend to escape situations with a risk of failure (Göksoy, 2017). Unfortunately, they attribute this to the causes of their successes and failures.

T3: High NSP and at the same time high NAF

These are students who, on the one hand, want to "shine" and, on the other hand, suffer from the knowledge that they can completely "fail". Their great commitment is also associated with great anxiety and depends on their other personality characteristics (Heckhausen & Heckhausen, 2010) and the given task situation at hand, whether they will fulfil it anxiously or whether they will escape from it. They are quite unpredictable for teachers. They exhibit both inadequately high and inadequately low aspirations.

T4: Low NSP and at the same time low NAF

These are students who lack the absence of school performance motivation, who usually possess the ability potential, but school task situations usually do not appeal to them. They represent the most difficult group of students to motivate for teachers. It is necessary to find out whether the student shows a normal performance tendency at least outside the school, or whether he is so to speak non-performance oriented. It is impossible to do this without cooperation from the family, which may emphasize non-performance behaviour, as is the case with Roma students (Roth, Pop, & Raiu, 2013).

T5: Bilaterally ambivalent, i.e. both from the point of view of NSP and NAF.

These are students stemming from the non-winning type, whose ratios of performance needs (NSP: NAF) are around the average (3-3), or with whom weaker tendencies may appear than for the types of more distinct and stronger types, but in the same ratio (3-4, 4-3, 3-2, 2-3). For these students, performance motivation is usually not the most important source of school performance. As with type 4, the family's cooperation with the school is required.

T6: Unilaterally ambivalent, i.e. either from the point of view of NSP or NAF.

These are students who could not be included in any of the previous types. Their ratios of performance needs (NSP: NAF) always show an average (3) in one

value and a low (1) or high (5) need in the other value. In terms of capturing these students, the same applies as for the previous type.

The data obtained from the research survey was structured and analysed using indicators of descriptive and inductive statistics. Four basic hypotheses were tested, each with its own zero variant H_0 , based on the agreement of the medians of both groups of students:

H1: Non-problem students have a higher NSP than problem students,

H2: Non-problem students have less NAF than problem students,

H3: Motivational type is statistically significantly different for problem and non-problem students,

H4: Problem students differ statistically significantly from non-problem students in terms of the ratio of performance needs NSP:NAF.

2 Findings

Descriptive statistics indicators revealed that students in both groups differed more in terms of the need for successful performance - see Table 4 than in terms of the need to avoid failure - see Table 5.

Table 4

Basic descriptive characteristics of respondents in terms of NSP

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Group of students</i>	<i>NSP</i>					
		<i>Question 1</i>	<i>Question 2</i>	<i>Question 3</i>	<i>Question 4</i>	<i>Question 5</i>	<i>Question 6</i>
Mean	Non-problem	4.05	3.61	3.47	3.50	3.86	4.23
	Problem	3.69	3.13	3.25	3.23	3.43	3.83
Median	Non-problem	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
	Problem	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
Mode	Non-problem	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	5.00
	Problem	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.00
Standard deviation	Non-problem	0.86	0.83	0.95	1.10	0.96	0.84
	Problem	1.12	0.99	1.17	1.35	1.08	1.03

Table 4 indicates that the need for successful performance is always lower on average than for non-problem students. Also, the standard deviation here reached higher values in all cases for problem students and thus indicates that the students in this group show greater differences than in the group of non-problem students. From the above it can be deduced that problem students in the sample are a more motivating group for teachers than their non-problem classmates. The median and mode differ only slightly between the two groups.

Table 5

<i>Basic descriptive characteristics of respondents in terms of NAF</i>							
		<u>NAF</u>					
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Group of students</i>	<i>Question 7</i>	<i>Question 8</i>	<i>Question 9</i>	<i>Question 10</i>	<i>Question 11</i>	<i>Question 12</i>
Mean	Non-problem	3.24	2.04	2.45	2.98	2.93	2.96
	Problem	3.19	2.12	2.64	2.95	3.16	2.85
Median	Non-problem	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
	Problem	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode	Non-problem	3.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
	Problem	3.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Standard deviation	Non-problem	1.25	1.02	1.06	1.26	1.17	1.13
	Problem	1.27	1.12	1.15	1.27	1.22	1.10

The indicators shown in Table 5 no longer demonstrate such convincing differences between the two groups of students. In the presented research survey, non-problem students acknowledged the effort to avoid school failure on average, in a similar fashion to their problem peers: in three of the six questions asked, they reached higher average values (questions 7, 10, 12), in the remaining three questions (questions 8, 9, 11), on the other hand, recorded lower average values than problem students. Standard deviation, with the exception of Question No. 12, pointed out, as in the previous case, to greater mutual differences in the group of problem students. The values of mode and median were exactly the same.

The results of inductive statistics in half of the tested hypotheses, confirmed the difference between the two groups of students. They supported the results of previous research, pointing to the need for a different approach of teachers in creating a motivational environment for differently oriented students (Asanova & Gagova, 2019). In the case of verification of hypotheses H1 and H2, it was a comparison between two ordinal values on a scale of 1-5. For this reason, we used the Mann-Whitney U test to compare the two groups. The one for H1: Non-problem students have a higher NSP than problem students showed $p=0.000523$ at $p<0.054$ ($U=11033$, $Z=-3.467$). In this case, it was possible to reject the zero hypothesis of identical medians at the 5% level of significance and state that there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups of students in terms of positive performance trend. This is also confirmed by the distribution of relative frequencies in Table 6.

Table 6

Representation of groups of students according to NSP bands

<i>Standard score</i>	<u>NSP</u>		<i>Difference P-N</i>
	<i>Problem students</i> (%)	<i>Non-problem students</i> (%)	
1 Very low need	26.6%	10.4%	6.2% P
2 Low need	22.6%	19.1%	3.5% P
3 Average need	25.0%	34.8%	9.8% N
4 Higher need	18.5%	24.3%	5.8% N
5 Very high need	7.3%	11.3%	4.0% N

In the case of H2 verification: Non-problem students have less NAF than problem students, on the other hand, the p-level values found were higher than 0.05 ($p=0.474$. $U=13594$. $Z=0.715$). Thus, it was not possible to reject the null hypothesis about the difference between groups of students and it was maintained that there is no statistically significant difference between the examined groups in terms of negative performance trend. This also corresponds to a very similar distribution of relative frequencies in Table 7.

Table 7

Representation of groups of students according to NAF bands

<i>Standard score</i>	<u>NAF</u>		<i>Difference P-N</i>
	<i>Problem students</i> (%)	<i>Non-problem students</i> (%)	
1 Very low concern	24.2%	28.7%	6.5% N
2 Low concern	22.2%	20.0%	2.2% P
3 Average concern	37.9%	37.4%	0.5% P
4 High concern	9.3%	9.6%	0.3% N
5 Very high concern	6.5%	4.3%	2.2% P

When verifying H3: Motivational type is statistically significantly different in problem and non-problem students, the data was not ordinal, and therefore the comparison $T_n < T_{n+1}$ did not apply. For this reason, Pearson's Chi-square test was used. The p-level value in this case reached $p=0.138$, i.e. it exceeded the 5% level of significance and it was not possible to reject the null hypothesis that the motivational types of students from different groups do not differ significantly. Table 8 also supports the above.

Table 8

<i>Distribution of students according to motivational types</i>			
<u>Type of students according to the needs ratio NSP:NAF</u>	<u>Problem students (%)</u>	<u>Non-problem students (%)</u>	<u>Difference P-N (%)</u>
T1 (high : low)	18.1%	24.6%	6.5% N
T2 (low : high)	7.7%	3.5%	4.2% P
T3 (high : high)	3.6%	4.4%	0.8% N
T4 (low : low)	19.4%	17.5%	1.9% P
T5 (ambivalent on both sides)	33.1%	37.7%	4.6% N
T6 (unilaterally ambivalent)	18.1%	12.3%	5.8% P

When we focused (within the motivational types T) on the specific ratios of motivational needs (NSP:NAF) in the students of both groups, the conclusions were different, see Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9

Percentage of Problem students according to the ratios of NSP:NAF

<u>Problem students</u>																	
<u>Type 1</u>		<u>Type 2</u>		<u>Type 3</u>		<u>Type 4</u>		<u>Type 5</u>		<u>Type 6</u>							
NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%
5	1	4.4	1	5	0.4	5	5	1.2	1	1	6.0	3	3	11.7	3	5	2.4
5	2	1.2	1	4	1.6	5	4	0.4	1	2	6.0	3	4	2.0	5	3	0.0
4	1	7.7	2	5	2.0	4	5	0.8	2	1	2.4	4	3	4.0	1	3	12.1
4	2	4.8	2	4	3.6	4	4	1.2	2	2	4.8	3	2	5.2	3	1	3.6
												2	3	10.1			

Table 10

Percentage of Non-problem students according to the ratios of NSP:NAF

<u>Non-problem students</u>																	
<u>Type 1</u>		<u>Type 2</u>		<u>Type 3</u>		<u>Type 4</u>		<u>Type 5</u>		<u>Type 6</u>							
NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%	NSP:NAF	%
5	1	2.6	1	5	0.9	5	5	1.8	1	1	0.9	3	3	11.4	3	5	2.4
5	2	4.4	1	4	0.0	5	4	0.9	1	2	5.3	3	4	3.5	5	3	0.0
4	1	6.1	2	5	1.8	4	5	0.0	2	1	4.4	4	3	5.3	1	3	12.1
4	2	11.4	2	4	0.9	4	4	1.8	2	2	7.0	3	2	10.5	3	1	3.6
												2	3	7.0			

While verifying H4: Problem students differ statistically significantly from non-problem students in terms of the ratio of performance needs NSP: NAF, we worked with a ratio variable, and thereupon we at first verified the normality of the data. The testing of data normality was performed using the Shapiro-Wilk normality test (we tested against the null hypothesis that the assessed data has a normal distribution). Based on the normality test, the appropriate parametric and non-parametric methods of statistical analysis were then selected. The revealed values of p-values in these cases were $p < 0.001$ (problem students) and $p < 0.001$ (non-problem students). The non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was again used to compare the two groups. Based on the values found $p = 0.0007$ ($U = 11092$, $Z = -3.405$), it was possible to state that there is a statistically significant difference between the specific ratios of students' performance needs NSP: NAF. Thereby, it was possible to reject H_0 on identical medians at the one percent level of significance.

3 Discussion

Our expectation that the two groups of students will differ significantly in all four points of the formulated hypotheses H1 - H4 was confirmed in only two cases.

The first discrepancy is signalled by Table 6 - the NSP - where the biggest difference was in Band 1- very low need for successful performance. This difference was reflected in the verification of H1 in the demonstration of a statistically significant difference in the positive motivation of students' P and N. What could be the causes of the low need of P students to be successful? According to Hoeksem et al. (2014), the following causes must be taken into account: emotions (feeling embarrassed, experiencing feelings of shame, disgrace, humiliation, etc.), high probability of negative expectations (bad result, unpleasant activity, uncertainty emanating from a task situation, etc.) and thus low attractiveness of performance activity (lack of interest, reluctance, passivity). Of course, the student's personality characteristics (anxiety, self-confidence, self-doubt, etc.) and his or her social and cultural background determined by the family also play a role. On the part of the teacher and the school, it is especially the reasonable difficulty of learning requirements (Mitchell & Carbone, 2011) in relation to different groups of students, which is generally understood on the part of an individual's approach to education. However, it is related to the teacher's knowledge of what students he/she has in front of him/her, especially in terms of the motivational type of student and in terms of his current level of development of dispositions (Machů & Lukeš, 2019). With this knowledge, it seems to be a strategic task for the teacher to strengthen the need for successful performance in students, i.e. to help positively change their motivation (Skinner, Edge, Altman et al., 2003).

In our case, the intervention of teachers should be reflected in a reduction in the number of students in zones 1 and 2 of the NSP, which concerns not only group

P but also that of N students (their representation was close to 30%). Another task, this time more of a school than that of a teacher, should be a change in evaluation associated with the introduction of the so-called individual relational norm (Ryška, 2009). Its favourable motivational effect is demonstrated especially for students with fear of failure, but also for weaker students. In general, they also have a weaker performance orientation (Kubíková, 2012), as our research has also confirmed. Interestingly, the need to avoid failure was not significantly different between the two groups of students. The sample we monitored showed practically identical results in terms of fears of failure. Concerns were most strongly represented in zone 3 of the NAF (more than a third in both groups). The total in bands 1 and 2 was just below 50% and the classically undesirable high and very high fear of failure in bands 4 and 5 oscillated around 15% for both N and P students. Our assumption that problem-free students do not suffer from great fear of failure has not been conclusively demonstrated. Indirectly, this confirmed the independence of the NSP and the NAF, i.e. the high need to be successful does not automatically mean that the student will not have the need to avoid failure (Atkinson & Raynor, 1974).

The second difference was confirmed during the H4 verification, which followed the differences within the motivational types T1-T6. A statistically significant difference between the group of P and N students was demonstrated in the specific ratios of students' performance needs NSP: NAF. This fact was mostly due to the discrepancy of representation in the ratio 4:2 (difference by 6.6% in favour of N students) in the motivational type T1 and in the ratio 1: 3 (difference by 10.3% in favour of P students) in the motivational type T6. It turned out that the specific ratios of positive motivational tendency to negative motivational tendency for each student, but also for the school class or school, have a greater informative value than the isolated observed need for successful performance or the need to avoid failure. It is also a figure specifying the classification into six motivational types of T1-T6 students.

For the motivational types themselves, no statistically significant difference was found between non-problem and problem students. However, certain differences need to be commented. Problem and non-problem students showed the most numerous representations in the T5 type, i.e. not gained on both sides in terms of their motivational tendencies. In this type, a higher proportion of N students (37.7%) than of P students (33.1%) appears to be a challenge for schools. It can be assumed that school education is uninteresting and uninspiring for these students (Čejková, 2014) and provides a considerable reserve in terms of their interest and involvement in the active process of self-development. For teachers, it places increased demands on the cultivation of performance motivation in these students. In the first place, it is the nature of the assigned learning tasks and the nature of the created school situations (Mareš, 2013). Methodologically, in this situation, it is recommended to prioritize cooperative teaching over competitive teaching (Kasíková, 2016).

Representation in other motivational types was interesting not only in terms of the frequency of representation, but also in terms of the difference between the group of P and N students. The largest difference was reported in the motivational type T1 (predominantly N students) and in the type T6 (predominantly P students). Type T1 represents a motivationally ideal student for teachers, who responds positively to success and failure. So it was no surprise that higher representation was achieved by non-problem students. The question remains as to their representation of about a quarter can be considered sufficient. Related to this is the question of who has the greatest reserves in this regard: whether the student, teacher, parents, and the system of education and assessment of students in the Czech Republic. Focusing on the use of these reserves opens up other topics for research, see e.g. Vodanovich (2003), Eren and Coskun (2015). Type T6 represents a one-sided non-achievement of a student: either the average need to be successful combined with low or high fear of failure, or the average need to avoid failure combined with low or high need to be successful. It was no wonder that problem students predominated in this type. As the subsequent analysis showed, this was due to the high frequency of representation in a ratio of 1: 3, i.e. low need for success and average fear of failure. Even in this case, the key problem is the activation of the student, his involvement in the development of his own dispositions and minimizing the feeling of disinterest and boredom (Nett, Goetz, & Daniels, 2010; Pavelková, 2010).

The proportion of students in type T4, with a small deviation in non-problem students, was close to one-fifth of the research sample. This is a high frequency of this motivationally problem type, which is basically a type of "indifferent" who does not care whether he will be successful or unsuccessful. Methodologically, it represents an even more problematic group for teachers than in the case of type T5 and T6. If teachers fail to find a platform for their positive motivation in cooperation with family or peers, e.g. outside school, the teacher usually resigns over time and devotes himself to students who show at least some interest and participation in school. The potential for development of students of this type of T4 in school practice in the Czech Republic usually remains internally ambivalent (hesitant or uncertain in his views). The area of initiation and activation of this group of students is a challenge for the future. It is also worth mentioning the difference in the representation of students in type T2, which was more frequent among P students. Compared to the previous type, it is more of an anxious and internally fluctuating type. Helping such a student build confidence in his or her own school skills (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006) is a long and uncertain process for teachers, often without parental support. Weakening negative motivation means breaking down individual students' fears and apprehension of failure, which cannot be done without an accompanying positive climate on the part of the entire class (Mareš & Ježek, 2006). One of the most difficult tasks of a teacher in the strengthening of positive motivation is to

estimate the adequate form and content of the student's school workload and not to reduce the demands on him in the long run or in turn to increase the demands above the acceptable limit (Daučianskaitė & Žydžiūnaitė, 2020).

Conclusion

The research probe pre-supposed the requirement of the teachers' individual approach to students at the lower secondary school in terms of their prevailing motivational tendency. The research sample of 363 respondents showed a difference between students with a predominant need for successful performance and students with a predominant need to avoid failure in connection with their school achievement. There was a statistically significant difference in the need for successful performance for non-problem students compared to their problematic counterparts. At the same time, there was a statistically significant difference between the group of problem-problem and non-problem-based students in terms of the positive need to achieve success and the negative need to avoid failure (NSP:NAF). Although both groups achieved the highest identical frequencies of representation in the T5 type (especially in the ratios 3: 3, 3: 2, 2: 3), problem students in the T6 type (ratio 1: 3) and non-problem students in the T1 type (ratio 4: 2) dominated.

Acknowledgement

The contribution was created by means of a research survey supported by the SGS 2019-43-009-3 grant at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem.

References

- Asanova, B., & Gagova, P. (2019). Motivation in the educational process. *Knowledge International Journal*, 34(2), 435-438. Retrieved from <https://ikm.mk/ojs/index.php/KIJ/article/view/2136>
- Atkinson, J. W., & Raynor, J. O. (1974). *Motivation and achievement*. Washington: Winston.
- Covington, M. V., & Müeller, K. J. (2001). Intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation: An approach/avoidance reformulation. *Education Psychology Review*, 13(2), 157-176.
- Čejková, I. (2014). Nuda ve škole. *Studia Paedagogica*, 19(3), 154-170.
- Daučianskaitė, A., & Žydžiūnaitė, V. (2020). Differences and similarities between coaching, instructional and educational leadership styles. *Acta Educationis Generalis*. 10(3), 95-108. <https://doi.org/10.2478/atd-2020-0022>
- Eren, A., & Coskun, H. (2015). Time perspectives and boredom coping strategies of undergraduate students from Turkey. *Educational Research for Policy and Practise*, 14(1), 53-75.

- Göksoy, S. (2017). Situations that make students happy and unhappy in schools. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 5(12A), 77-83.
- Heckhausen, J., & Heckhausen, H. (2010). *Motivation and action*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Helus, Z. (2015). *Sociální psychologie pro pedagogy*. Praha: Grada.
- Hoeksema, N. S. at al. (2014). *Atkinson and Hilgard's introduction to psychology* (16th Edition). United Kingdom.
- Hrabal, V., & Pavelková, I. (2010). *Jaký jsem učitel*. Praha: Portál.
- Hrabal, V., & Pavelková, I. (2011). *Školní výkonová motivace*. Praha: Portál.
- Kasíková, H. (2016). *Kooperativní učení, kooperativní škola*. Praha: Portál.
- Krykorková, H., & Váňová, R. (2010). *Učitel v současné škole*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Kubíková, K. (2012). *Vztahové normy učitelů a výkonová motivace žáků* (Dissertation thesis). Praha: Karlova Univerzita.
- Machů, E., & Lukeš, P. (2019). Teachers' work with taxonomy of educational objectives as one of the forms of the gifted preschoolers' development. *Acta Educationis Generalis*. 9(3), 9-23. <https://doi.org/10.2478/atd-2019-0011>
- Man, F., & Mareš, J. (2005). Výkonová motivace a prožitek typu flow. *Pedagogika*, 2, 151-171.
- Mareš, J. (2013). *Pedagogická psychologie*. Praha: Portál.
- Mareš, J., & Ježek, S. (2006). Kvalitativní metody pro diagnostiku psychosociálního klimatu škol. *Pedagogická revue*, 58(1), 30-45.
- Mitchell, I., & Carbone, A. A. (2011). Typology of task characteristics and their effects on student engagement. *International Journal of Educational Research*, vol.50, pp.257-270.
- Nett, U. E., Goetz, T., & Daniels, L. M. (2010). What to do when feeling bored? Students' strategies for coping with boredom. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20(6), 626-638.
- Pavelková, I. (2009). Výkonová motivace žáků v českých školách. In *Psychologie ve vzdělávání učitelů a v jejich profesní činnosti* (pp. 32-49). Plzeň: Západočeská univerzita v Plzni.
- Pavelková, I. (2010). Nuda ve škole. In H. Krykorková, & R. Váňová (Eds.), *Učitel v současné škole* (pp. 219-233). Praha: Karolinum.
- Roth, M., Pop, F., & Raiu, S. (2013). Vulnerabilities built in the identities and future orientation of Roma children and youth. *Philobiblon: Transylvanian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Humanities*, 18(2), 374-388. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=92976076&lang=cs&site=eds-live>
- Ryška, R. (2009). *Evaluce a přidaná hodnota ve vzdělávání*. Praha: Karlova Univerzita.
- Skinner, E. A., Edge, K., & Altman, J. et al. (2003). Searching for the structure of coping: A review and critique of category systems for classifying ways of coping. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(2), 216-269.

- Vodanovich, S. J. (2003). Psychometric measures of boredom: A review of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, 137(6), 569-595.
- Weiner, B. (2000). Intrapersonal and interpersonal theories of motivation from an attributional perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, 12(1), 1-14.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Cleary, T. J. (2006). Adolescents' development of personal agency. The Role of self-efficacy beliefs and self-regulatory skill. In R. Pajares, & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents* (pp. 45-70). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.