Exploring Learning Motivation Across Education Levels

Syahrina 'Adliana Abdul Halim[1], Siti Hajjar Mohd Amin[2], Sharifah Faatihah Syed Mohd Fuzi[3], Julizaerma Mohamad Khudzari[4], Nor Ezrine Yusoff[5] and Noor Hanim Rahmat[6]

[1,2,3,4,5]Faculty of Administrative Science & Policy Studies, UiTM Campus Seremban 3, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia, [6]Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Johor, Kampus Pasir Gudang
Corresponding Author Email: hajjar@uitm.edu.my

Abstract
This research explores motivation for learning as an intrinsic condition that compels individuals to participate in learning activities, including a range of internal and external elements. It has become an important determinant of success for students at all education levels. This study aims to investigate motivation for learning among undergraduate university students in Malaysia. This research integrates three components: value, expectancy, and affective to measure the motivation for learning among the undergraduate students across educational levels. This study employs a quantitative method called purposive sampling. We distributed 310 Likert scale questionnaires, dividing them into four sections: Section A covers the demographic profile, Section B covers expectancy (7 items), and Section D covers all three components: value (12 items), expectancy (7 items), and affective (5 items). SPSS was used to analyse the data. The findings revealed that students at the bachelor's degree level have a higher score for all components of value, expectancy, and affective, making them more motivated to learn compared to the students at the diploma level. Despite the extensive research on students' motivation, this study offers fresh perspectives by examining the motivation of tertiary students at various educational levels. Thus, the research findings can be used to foster an educational environment that will encourage students to thrive.
Keywords: Motivation, Motivation for Learning, Value, Expectancy, Affective

Introduction
Background of Study

The investigation of learning motivation across diverse educational levels is a complex subject that includes numerous psychological theories and pedagogical techniques. Motivation is crucial in shaping students' involvement and success, affecting their educational

experiences from basic to higher education. Comprehending the dynamics of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is crucial for educators seeking to cultivate an effective learning environment. The sources and effects of motivation might change markedly across various educational levels. In higher education, the intricacy of motivation escalates as students are required to assume greater responsibility for their learning. The shift from secondary to tertiary education frequently necessitates that students cultivate metacognitive methods and self-regulation abilities, which are essential for academic achievement (Tuckman, 2003). Research has demonstrated that instructing students in efficient learning strategies can markedly improve their motivation and academic achievement (Tuckman, 2003). The incorporation of motivational climate elements, including the provision of autonomy and the promotion of mastery-oriented objectives, can enhance educational outcomes across many fields (Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2011; Barkoukis et al., 2008). Learning motivation is a vital psychological factor that affects students' engagement, perseverance, and overall achievement in educational environments. This motivation may originate from diverse sources, including internal variables like personal interest and delight in the subject matter, as well as extrinsic motivations such as rewards, recognition, or the aspiration to fulfil external expectations (Kusumaningtyas et al., 2023) Vroom's perspective on motivation is summarised in his Expectancy Theory, which asserts that motivation is determined by three essential elements: expectancy, instrumentality, and valence (Vroom, 1964). Expectancy denotes a belief that an individual's work will result in the attainment of the targeted performance standard (Sanchez et al., 2000; Zboja et al., 2020). Meanwhile, instrumentality is the belief that attaining a particular degree of performance will result in designated outcomes or rewards (Matthews et al., 2020; Davidescu et al., 2017). On the other hand, valence refers to the value an individual places on the expected outcomes (Fagbohungbe, 2012; Lokman et al., 2022). Learning motivation holds particular significance in the Malaysian context due to the distinctive problems and opportunities inherent in its educational framework. The Malaysian educational system has experienced substantial adjustments to enhance student results and conform to international standards. The Malaysian Education Blueprint (2013-2025) underscores the significance of cultivating student desire to attain educational excellence (Subramaniam, 2022). Within the realm of tertiary education in Malaysia, various difficulties concerning learning motivation have been identified that substantially affect students' academic experiences and outcomes. These challenges can be classified into several areas, including curriculum relevance (Zamberi Ahmad, 2013; Wigfield & Eccles (2000); Terpstra-Tong & Ahmad (2018)., pedagogical efficacy (Jamil et al., 2020; Soh & Sharif, 2021; Isa & Kamin, 2019 ; Al-Saggaf & Rusli, 2021), financial limitations (Jebaraj Benjamin et al., 2011; Zakaria et al., 2020), language proficiency (Maarof et al., 2015), technological impact (Salim et al., 2019; Sanusi et al., 2022; Ramis & Loh, 2023) and mental health and well-being (Aziz et al., 2023).

Statement of Problem

Motivation is one of the most discussed topics across many fields and disciplines. It is a multifaceted problem that requires analysis from many perspectives to offer a comprehensive understanding. Studying motivation is crucial because every theory in the domains of personality, intellect, success, and learning necessitates motivation in every action and process. A common challenge faced by university students is identifying and achieving motivation.

Students' motivation for learning appears to be an important determinant of success in education, including tertiary education. Motivation is considered a causal factor that triggers a particular behaviour, and a high level of motivation corresponds to an increased inclination to engage in learning (Sogunro, 2015). It is also one of the best predictor to students' academic grade (Kuh et al., 2006). This is aligned with the posited conclusion by Muhammad et al. (2021) in which academic achievement of students is positively correlated with their motivation in learning.

Since the COVID-19 pandemic has changed the landscape of education and learning, it is crucial to comprehend students' motivation for learning. The emergence of online and blended learning at the university has required students to adjust and suit themselves to the new learning environment. To enhance learning motivation, examining students' value is vital, as students' interests and values serve as powerful drivers for teaching and learning in education, directing them toward more effective knowledge acquisition (Pandey, 2024). Moreover, Steinmayr et al. (2019) consider the inclusion of the expectancy component as one of the key predictors of motivation. Although there may be other factors that can better predict motivation. Although there might be other factors that may become greater predictor to motivation (Nieto Carracedo et al., 2024), the affective component is still worth considering in understanding motivation among learners (Fitria et al., 2024).

Therefore, students' motivation shapes their learning, and it is a multifaceted matter. This complex condition must be analysed from various angles to gain a multidimensional point of view. Therefore, this research serves to explore the learning motivation among students across educational levels by incorporating these three components: value, expectancy, and affective.

Objective of the Study and Research Questions
This study is done to explore perception of learners on their use of learning strategies. Specifically, this study is done to answer the following questions;
- Is there a significant difference for value components across education level?
- Is there a significant difference for expectancy components across education level?
- Is there a significant difference for affective components across education level?
- How does the mean differ across education level for value components?
- How does the mean differ across education level for expectancy components?
- How does the mean differ across education level for affective components?

Literature Review
Motivation for Learning
Learning motivation is a complex issue that can significantly impact academic performance and other outcomes, as highlighted in several studies. Tan (2021) defines learning motivation as the behaviour that drives students to engage in learning activities and complete their tasks to achieve academic goals. Generally, motivation can be categorized into intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation is being influenced by personal interest, enjoyment, students' needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Tan, 2021; Wang et al., 2024). In contrast, extrinsic motivation is influenced by external factors such as the learning environment and societal expectations (Tan, 2021). Other factors influencing students' learning motivation are their socioeconomic status, immigrant background and

gender (Brandmiller et al., 2020). Various studies have testified that learning motivation can bring several challenges and benefits to students and learning institutions.

Past Studies on Motivation for Learning

Learning motivation is vital in enhancing educational performance and other aspects of individual life. The main benefit of learning motivation is to enhance academic performance. It was argued that motivated students tend to achieve higher academic success because motivation can enhance students' engagement and cognitive presence in the learning environment (Tan, 2021). Besides, individual personal interest and enjoyment also can improve sustainability learning outcomes (Wang et al., 2024). Besides, behavioural, emotional and agentic engagement can contribute to students' active participation and investment in learning activities (Raza et al., 2020).

While learning motivation is important for effective learning achievement, several challenges and issues have been identified by prior studies. For instance, Zainuddin et al. (2019) highlighted that in a flipped classroom model, the students often lack motivation to engage with pre-class materials like video lectures. As a result, the students participated less in-class activities. However, in the context of employee training, the lack of motivation is attributed to the employees' lack of perceived relevance or career advancement opportunities, which can affect their motivation to learn (Sharif et al., 2023). Meanwhile, individual characteristics like higher socioeconomic status are perceived as more motivated and better behaved than lower socioeconomic status, which tends to give a biased perception of students' achievement (Brandmiller et al., 2020). Further, the lack of supportive conditions can hinder thriving motivation for learning (Wang et al., 2024)

Two important factors can contribute significantly to learning effectiveness: intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation is particularly important, which is derived from students' needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Wang et al., 2024), which can encourage students to be more active and encourage more autonomous learning. Additionally, task-avoidance behaviours, such as procrastination, are early indicators of motivational issues that can negatively affect learning outcomes and require immediate intervention (Andres, 2020). Moreover, high intrinsic motivation is when the individual is more likely to apply newly acquired skills and knowledge in their work (Sharif et al., 2023).

Although internal factors are more dominant in learning motivation, external factors (extrinsic motivation, such as learning environment and social interactions) (Tan, 2021) shall not be left behind. Tan (2021) found a significant difference in learning motivation, community of inquiring and learning performance among students in Malaysian higher education institutions before and during the Movement Control Order (MCO). The result showed a decline in students' motivation and learning performance during the MCO due to challenges like lack of infrastructure and social support. Zainuddin et al. (2019) also found that insufficient instructional support and the novelty of the flipped classroom approach can deter students' motivation and learning.

In conclusion, learning motivation is essential to enhance academic performance and equips individuals to enhance their learning capacity. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors can drive students to achieve higher academic performance, encourage more active learning,

and lead to more constructive learning environments. Figure 1 shows the conceptual framework of the study, that shows the linkages between motivation to learn, educational level and motivation components (value, expectancy and affective).

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework of the Study – Motivation across education levels

Methodology

This quantitative study is done to explore motivation factors for learning among undergraduates. A purposive sample of 310 participants responded to the survey. The instrument used is a 5 Likert-scale survey and is rooted in Pintrich & De Groot (1990) to reveal the variables in table 1 below. The survey has 4 sections. Section A has items on demographic profile. Section B has 14 items on reading difficulties. Section C has 17 items on global strategies. Section D has 8 items on problem-solving strategies and section E has 9 items on support strategies.

Table 1
Distribution of Items in the Survey

Sect	Construct		Variable	Items	Total Items
A	Value Components	(a)	Intrinsic Goal Orientation	4	12
		(b)	Extrinsic Goal Orientation	3	
		(c)	Task Value Beliefs	5	
B	Expectancy Component	(a)	Students' Perception of Self- Efficacy	5	7
		(b)	Control Beliefs for Learning	2	
C	Affective Components				5
			Total No of Items		24

Table 2
Reliability of Survey

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.874	24

Table 2 shows the reliability of the survey. The analysis shows a Cronbach alpha of .874, thus, revealing a good reliability of the instrument chosen/used. Further analysis using SPSS is done to present findings to answer the research questions for this study.

Findings
Findings for Demographic Profile
Q1. Gender
Table 3
Percentage for Gender

1	Male	23%
2	Female	77%

Table 3 shows the percentage of genders in this study. The result shows that 77 percent of the respondents are female. Only 23 percent of the respondents were male.

Q2 Age Group
Table 4
Percentage for Age Group

1	18-20 years old	25%
2	21-23 years old	57%
3	24-26 years old	17%
4	27 years old and above	1%

Based on Table 4, we categorise the total percentage of male and female respondents based on their age group. The majority of the respondents (57 percent) are in the age range of 21 to 23 years old. 25 percent of them are at the age of 18 to 20 years old. Students aged 24 to 26 also made up 17 percent of the respondents. Only one percent of the total respondents fell within the age range of 27 and above.

Q3 Discipline
Table 5
Percentage for Discipline

1	Science & Technology	10%
2	Social Sciences	80%
3	Business	10%

Table 5 shows that the study has grouped the respondents based on their discipline of study. Most of the respondents are social science students, which represents 80 percent of the total respondents. Only 10 percent of the respondents were from the science and technology field, while the remaining 10 percent were from the business discipline.

Q4 Educational Level
Table 6
Percentage for Education Level

1	Diploma	61%
2	Degree	39%

The study also identified the education level of the respondents. According to Table 6, the majority of the respondents were diploma level students, which represents 61 percent of the total sample. The remaining, which is 39 percent, were degree level students.

Findings for Significant Difference for Value across Education Level

This section presents data to answer research question 1- Is there a significant difference for value components across education level?

Table 7
T-Test- Group Statistics

	Q4EDU	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total Value	Diploma	121	3.8258	.47992	.04363
	Degree	189	3.9775	.49057	.03568

Table 8
T-Test- Independent Samples Test

		Leven's Test for Equality of Variances		t-Test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig (2 tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Total Value	Equal variances assumed	.582	.446	-2.679	308	.008	-.15176	.05664	-.26320	-.04031
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.692	259.986	.008	-.15176	.05636	-.26274	-.04077

A two-sample t-test was performed to compare value components across education levels. There was a significant difference for value components between those with Diploma (M=3.83, SD=.479) and those who with Degree (M= 3.97, SD= .490); t (308) =-2.679, p=.008.

Findings for Significant Difference for Expectancy across Education level

This section presents data to answer research question 2- Is there a significant difference for expectancy components across education level?

Table 9
T-Test

	Q4EDU	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total Value	Diploma	121	3.5289	.67704	.06155
	Degree	189	3.7793	.55101	.04008

Table 10
T-Test- Independent Samples Test

		Leven's Test for Equality of Variances		t-Test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	**Sig.**	**t**	**df**	**Sig (2 tailed)**	**Mean Difference**	**Std. Error Difference**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Total Value	Equal variances assumed	3.186	.075	-3.565	308	.000	-.25036	.07024	-.38857	-.112316
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.409	218.294	.001	-.25036	.07345	-.39512	-.10560

A two-sample t-test was performed to compare expectancy components across education levels. There was a significant difference for value components between those with Diploma (M=3.528, SD=. 677) and those who with Degree (M= 3.77, SD= .551); t (308) =-3.565, p=.000.

Findings for Significant Difference for Affective Components across Education Level

This section presents data to answer research question 3- Is there a significant difference for affective components across education level?

Affective
Table 11
T-Test- Group Statistics

	Q4EDU	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total Value	Diploma	121	3.7174	.81799	.07436
	Degree	189	3.7873	.81021	.05893

Table 12
T-Test- Independent Samples Test

		Leven's Test for Equality of Variances		t-Test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	**Sig.**	**t**	**df**	**Sig (2 tailed)**	**Mean Difference**	**Std. Error Difference**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Total Value	Equal variances assumed	.039	.844	-.739	308	.461	-.06995	.09468	-.25626	.11636
	Equal variances not assumed			-.737	254.096	.462	-.06995	.09488	-.25681	.11691

A two-sample t-test was performed to compare affective components across education levels. There was no significant difference for value components between those with diploma and those who with Degree.

Findings for Value Components across Education Level
This section presents data to answer research question 4- How does the mean differ across education level for value components?

Table 13
Mean for Intrinsic Goal Orientation

	DIP	DEG
MSVCQ1 In this program, I prefer class work that is challenging so I can learn new things.	3.4	3.6
MSVCQ2 In the courses of a program like this, I prefer course materials that arouse my curiosity, even if they are difficult to learn.	3.4	3.7
MSVCQ 3 The most satisfying thing for me in this program is trying to understand the content of the courses	3.8	4
MSVCQ 4 When I have the opportunity in this class, I choose course assignments that I can learn from even if they don't guarantee a good grade.	3.4	3.6

The results on the inherent goal orientation of diploma and degree holders at Malaysian public and private universities are shown in Table 13. With mean scores of 3.8 and 4.0, both degree and diploma candidates report that they are more satisfied when comprehending the course material. Furthermore, diploma students' means for demanding coursework, piqued interest in the subject matter, and emphasised knowledge over grades are comparable at 3.4. Regarding degree students, the average score is comparable, coming in at 3.6 for demanding coursework and emphasising knowledge over grades. Finally, with a mean score of 3.7, the degree of students' intrinsic goal orientation was demonstrated by the course contents that piqued their interest. Consequently, the findings imply that students with diplomas and degrees have a medium level of intrinsic goal orientation when learning.

Table 14
Mean for Extrinsic Goal Orientation

	DIP	DEG
MSEGQ1 Getting a good grade in the classes is the most satisfying thing for me right now.	4.4	4.4
MSEGQ 2 The most important thing for me right now is improving my overall grade point average, so my main concern in this program is getting a good grade.	4.3	4.3
MSEGQ 3 I want to do well in the classes because it is important to show my ability to my family, friends, or others.	4.3	4.3

The findings for the extrinsic goal orientation mean value of diploma and degree students at Malaysia's public and private universities are demonstrated in Table 14. Students pursuing degrees and diplomas had comparable outcomes. With a mean score of 4.4, diploma and degree students concurred that having a strong grade was one of the things that contributed to their satisfaction. Furthermore, with an average score of 4.3, diploma and

degree students concurred that increasing their grades and obtaining good grades were their top priorities. With an average score of 4.3, the results also demonstrate that diploma and degree holders did well enough in the classes to showcase their accomplishments to friends, family, and other stakeholders. These findings imply that learners' motivation to study can be influenced by outside variables, such as receiving high marks from instructors and how other people see them. As a result, the findings suggest that students pursuing degrees and diplomas have higher levels of motivation to learn because they are more focused on external than internal goals.

Table 15
Mean for Task Value Beliefs

	DIP	DEG
MSTVQ1 I think I will be able to transfer what I learn from one course to other courses in this program.	3.4	3.7
MSTVQ2 It is important for me to learn the course materials in the courses.	4	4.1
MSTVQ3 I think the course material in the courses of this program is useful for me to learn	3.9	4.1
MSTVQ4 I like the subject matter of the courses.	3.5	3.9
MSTVQ5 Understanding the subject matter of the courses is very important to me.	4	4.2

Table 15 shows the findings of task value belief among diploma and degree students. Overall, degree students show higher task value beliefs than diploma students on all five items. For the first item, the mean value for diploma students is 3.4, while for degree students, it is 3.7. It indicates that degree students can transfer knowledge between courses more than diploma students. Next, a higher mean score for diploma and degree students obtained for the second item indicates that both learners view the course materials in the course as significant to them. For the third item, degree students perceive the course material in the courses as useful compared to diploma students, with a mean value of 3.9 and 4.1 for diploma and degree students, respectively. Regarding the subject matter, degree students show a higher mean score of 3.9 than diploma students, with a 3.5 mean value. Lastly, for the fifth item, both learners consider understanding the subject matter very important, with a mean value of 4 and 4.2 for both groups.

Findings for Expectancy Components across Education Level
This section presents data to answer research question 5- How does the mean differ across education level for expectancy components?

In the context of this study, expectancy is measured by (i) students' perception of self-efficacy, and (ii)control beliefs for learning.

Table 16
Mean for Students' Perception of Self-Efficacy

	DIP	DEG
ECSEQ1 I believe I will receive excellent grades in the classes.	3.5	3.7
ECSEQ2 I'm confident I can understand the most complex materials presented by the instructors in the courses.	3.2	3.5
ECSEQ3 I'm confident I can do an excellent job on the assignments and tests in this program.	3.4	3.7
ECSEQ4 I'm certain I can master the skills being taught in the classes.	3.3	3.6
ECSEQ5 Considering the difficulty of the courses, the teachers, and my skills, I think I will do well in the classes.	3.4	3.7

Table 16 above shows the findings of expectancy components: perception of self-efficacy. For all five items, degree students consistently reported higher self-efficacy perceptions than diploma students. This indicates that degree students have a stronger belief in their ability to succeed academically and handle complex course material than diploma students. The mean value for the first item is 3.5 for diploma students and 3.7 for degree students, indicating that degree students have a higher belief in their ability to achieve excellent grades than their counterparts. For the second item, degree students show a higher mean value of 3.5, indicating that they are more confident in their understanding of complex material presented by instructors in the courses than diploma students with a 3.2 mean value. Next, the mean value for the third item for diploma students is 3.3, while for degree students, it is 3.7. The value shows that degree students are more confident performing well on assignments and tests than diploma students. Meanwhile, the fourth item indicates that degree students have a higher level of certainty about mastering the skills taught in the class than diploma students, with a mean value of 3.3 and 3.6 for diploma and degree students, respectively. Finally, the last items show a mean value of 3.4 for diplomas and 3.7 for degree students. It shows that degree students are more confident about performing in a class when factors like the difficulty of the course, teachers, and skills are considered.

Table 17
Mean for Control Beliefs for Learning

	DIP	DEG
ECCBQ1 If I study in appropriate ways, then I will be able to learn the material in the courses of this program	3.9	4.1
ECCBQ2 If I try hard enough, then I will understand the course materials.	4	4.2

Table 17 shows the findings of expectancy components: control beliefs for learning. For first question, both groups demonstrate a comparatively high level of agreement with this assertion, suggesting that they are confident in their ability to acquire the material through diligent study. The mean value of 3.9 indicates that diploma students generally agree however, they may exhibit slightly lower levels of confidence than their degree-holding counterparts. Degree students demonstrate a slightly higher level of confidence in their capacity to learn when they study appropriately, with a mean of 4.1. This implies that degree students may possess a slightly larger degree of academic learning than diploma students, as evidenced by their slightly stronger belief in the efficacy of their studies. For second item,

diploma students rate a 4.0 mean value which suggests a relatively strong sense of self-efficacy and determination. The mean value of 4.2 for degree students indicates that they are slightly more confident in their ability to comprehend the material if they exert themselves sufficiently in comparison to diploma students. This may indicate a greater sense of academic self-assurance or a belief that success is contingent upon hard effort. Diploma and degree students alike demonstrate assurance that their academic success will be achieved through the implementation of effective study strategies and diligent effort. Nevertheless, degree students possess slightly higher means in both questions, indicating that they are generally more confident in their capacity to comprehend and absorb course content than diploma students.

Findings for Affective Components across Education Level
This section presents data to answer research question 6- How does the mean differ across education level for affective components?
In the context of this study, valence is measured by affective components.

Table 18
Mean for Affective Components

	DIP	DEG
ACQ1 When I take a test I think about how poorly I am doing compared with other students.	3.7	3.8
ACQ2 When I take a test, I think about items on other parts of the test I can't answer	3.8	3.8
ACQ3 When I take tests I think of the consequences of failing.	3.8	3.9
ACQ4 I have an uneasy, upset feeling when I take an exam.	3.5	3.7
ACQ5 I feel my heart beating fast when I take an exam.	3.8	3.8

Table 18 indicate the result of valence: affective component. The first item shows relatively high mean values of both diploma and degree students. Degree students appear to be slightly more inclined to compare themselves to others, a difference that is minor but could indicate a slightly more intense sense of competitiveness or anxiety associated with peer comparison. For second item, the mean value of 3.8 for both groups indicates that diploma and degree students are frequently apprehensive about questions on other sections of the test that they are unable to answer. The two groups exhibit no discernible distinctions, suggesting that they experience comparable levels of anxiety or distraction during examinations. Third item indicates that degree students exhibit a slightly higher mean (3.9) than the other two categories, as they frequently contemplate the repercussions of failing tests. However, degree students may experience a slightly greater sense of strain, possibly as a result of the perceived higher level of expectations or stakes associated with their programme. Next item, degree students (mean of 3.7) report slightly stronger feelings of unease than diploma students (mean of 3.5), despite both groups reporting feeling uneasy or upset during examinations. This implies that degree students may be experiencing a minor increase in emotional distress or anxiety during exams. Lastly, the mean value of 3.8 for both groups indicates that both diploma and degree students experience comparable levels of physiological symptoms of anxiety during examinations, including an elevated heart rate. This

implies that the two groups experience a similar level of physiological arousal during exams, which suggests that they share a common experience of exam stress.

Conclusion

This research explores students' motivation for learning at two academic levels in tertiary education. The research revealed a significant difference in the value and expectancy components across pre-graduate educational levels. However, the affective component did not show a significant difference between the degree and diploma levels. Moreover, the overall findings of this research revealed that the bachelor students' mean values for every component, including value, expectancy, and affective, were slightly higher than those of the diploma students.

According to the findings, students at higher academic levels have better motivation to learn. This conclusion can be justified by the higher maturity level among bachelor's degree students, along with the level of academics that the students were in. Although research by Ulusoy and Önen (2014) was conducted in the school setting, their argument is that the level of academic motivation and achievement is significantly determined by the maturity level. This is consistent with Lake and Boyd (2015), in which their study provide evidence that mature learners exhibit deep approaches to learning compared to younger students. This study observed two different academic levels in tertiary education and developed the assumptions related to the maturity of the students. Given that one academic qualification is higher than the other, future research may consider studying in depth the aspect of maturity and motivation among students in tertiary education.

This study provides several theoretical and practical contributions. This study highlights the importance of educational level, which reflects the maturity level of the students in the Expectancy Theory of motivation. Students with a higher maturity level have a higher value of motivation, which in turn can improve their academic performance. Thus, the motivational components such as value, expectancy, and affective depend upon students' educational level (bachelor's versus diploma). This study also contributes practically to the context of higher education. This study provides insight that educators or lecturers should use different teaching methodologies and approaches for different educational levels. Bachelor's students could be more independent and able to intrinsically motivate themselves, as compared to diploma level. Further, the educational policy should also embed motivational factor components like value and affective components when designing and delivering the curriculum to the students as to satisfy the stakeholders' need.

References

Al-Saggaf, M., and Rusli, Z. (2021). Investigating the types of motivation of TESL students in a higher education institute in Malaysia. *TESOL and Technology Studies, 1*(1), 55-69. https://doi.org/10.48185/tts.v1i1.105

Andres, H. (2020). The role of active teaching, academic self-efficacy, and learning behaviors in student performance. *Journal of International Education in Business, 13*(2), 221-238. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB-02-2020-0017

Aziz, M. F., Yusoff, Y. M., Leng, A. C. W. H., Subramaniam, S. S., Yusof, S. A. A., & Arham, A. F. Religious Teaching and Student Mental Health in Klang Valley Tertiary Education: A Preliminary Study. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 13(12), 2214-2224*. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i12/19231

Barkoukis, V., Tsorbatzoudis, H., & Grouios, G. (2008). Manipulation of motivational climate in physical education: effects of a seven-month intervention. *European Physical Education Review, 14*(3), 367-387. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336x08095671

Brandmiller, C., Dumont, H., & Becker, M. (2020). Teacher perceptions of learning motivation and classroom behavior: The role of student characteristics. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 63*, 101893. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101893

Davidescu, A. A., Eid, M. T. I., AnaMaria Davidescu, A., & Tania Issa Eid, M. (2017). Jordanian health employees' job satisfaction. A Vroom theory investigation. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences, 27*, 122-133. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2017.07.03.18

Fagbohungbe, B. O. (2012). Students' performance in core and service courses: a test of valence-instrumentality expectancy theory. *Journal of Management and Sustainability, 2*(2), 236. https://doi.org/10.5539/jms.v2n2p236

Fitria, M. F., Usadiati, W., & Rusfandi, R. (2024). Exploring the multifaceted influence of affective factors on English reading comprehension among senior high school students. *Psychology, Evaluation, and Technology in Educational Research, 6*(2), 190-202.

Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2012). Transferring motivation from educational to extramural contexts: A review of the trans-contextual model. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 27*(2), 195-212. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-011-0082-5

Isa, M., & Kamin, Y. (2019). Effective strategies for integrating project-based learning into woodwork technology education and understanding at tertiary institutes in Nigeria. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET), 14*(20), 120-136. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i20.11468v

Jackson, S. L. (2015). *Research methods and statistics: A critical thinking approach* (5th ed.). Boston, Cengage Learning

Jamil, H., Wahab, A. Y. A., Razak, A. R. A., & Al-Saari, N. (2020). Exploring the internationalization strategy of higher education institutions and halal food ecosystem in Malaysia. *Food Research, 4*(1), 145-150. https://doi.org/10.26656/fr.2017.4(s1).s23

Jebaraj Benjamin, S., Srikamaladevi Marathamuthu, M., Muthaiyah, S., & Raman, M. (2011). Affordability of private tertiary education: a Malaysian study. *International Journal of Social Economics, 3*8(4), 382-406. https://doi.org/10.1108/03068291111112068

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J. L., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of the literature* (Vol. 8). Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

Kusumaningtyas, P. S., Parmiti, D. P., & Setemen, K. (2023). The Contribution of Learning Motivation and Parents' Socio-Economy towards Students' Learning Outcomes through

Learning Independence. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran, 56*(2), 381-392. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpp.v56i2.64758

Lokman, A., Hassan, F., Ustadi, Y. A., Rahman, F. A. A., Zain, Z. M., & Rahmat, N. H. (2022). Investigating motivation for learning via Vroom's theory. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 12*(1). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v12-i1/11749

Maarof, N., & Munusamy, I. M. A. (2015). Learner's Learning Experiences & Difficulties towards (ESL) among UKM Undergraduates. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6*(3), 83-87. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.6n.3p.83

Matthews, B. L., Daigle, J., & Cooper, J. (2020). Causative effects of motivation to transfer learning among relational dyads: the test of a model. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics, 29*(3), 297-314. https://doi.org/10.1108/ejmbe-07-2019-0120

Muhammad, A. S., Bakar, N. A., Mijinyawa, S. I., & Halabi, K. A. (2021). Impact of motivation on students' academic performance: A case study of University Sultan Zainal Abidin students. *The American Journal of Innovative Research and Applied Sciences, 1*(6), 221-226.

Nieto Carracedo, A., Gómez-Iñiguez, C., Tamayo, L. A., & Igartua Perosanz, J. J. (2024). Emotional intelligence and academic achievement relationship: Emotional well-being, motivation, and learning strategies as mediating factors. *Psicología educativa, 30*(2), 67-74.

Pandey, L. (2024). Values and interests: Predictors of motivation to learn. *Jamshedpur Research Review, 3*(65), 8-11.

Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 33.

Raza, S. A., Qazi, W., & Umer, B. (2020). Examining the impact of case-based learning on student engagement, learning motivation and learning performance among university students. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 12*(3), 517-533. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-05-2019-0105

Ramis, T., & Loh, S. C. (2023). Mediating effect of psychological needs satisfaction on the relationship between gratitude and academic motivation during online learning. *Journal of Pedagogical Research, 7*(4), 131-143. https://doi.org/10.33902/jpr.202322757

Salim, M. H. M., Ali, N. M., & Ijab, M. T. (2019). Understanding students' motivation and learning strategies to redesign massive open online courses based on persuasive system development. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 10*(12), 234-241. https://doi.org/10.14569/ijacsa.2019.0101233

Sanchez, R. J., Truxillo, D. M., & Bauer, T. N. (2000). Development and examination of an expectancy-based measure of test-taking motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 739-750. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.739

Sanusi, S., Abdullah, N. H. N., Rozzani, N., & Muslichah, I. (2022). Factors influencing the level of satisfaction on online learning among tertiary students during Covid-19 pandemic era–A Malaysian study. *Geografia, 18*(2), 248-263. https://doi.org/10.17576/geo-2022-1802-19

Sharif, S., Braimah, M., & Dogbey, A. E. (2023). Academic supports, motivation to learn, motivation to transfer and transfer of training: A comparative analysis of public and private universities. *European Journal of Training and Development, 47*(5/6), 507-532. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-05-2021-0068

Sogunro, O. A. (2015). Motivating factors for adult learners in higher education. *International Journal of Higher Education, 4*(1), 22-37. https://doi.org/doi:10.5430/ijhe.v4n1p22

Soh, O. K., & Sharif, N. S. A. B. M. (2021). The attitude and motivation of Islamic studies students towards learning the English Learning. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 10*(2), 625-647. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v10-i2/10147

Steinmayr, R., Weidinger, A. F., Schwinger, M., & Spinath, B. (2019). The importance of students' motivation for their academic achievement–replicating and extending previous findings. *Frontiers in psychology, 10*, 464340. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01730

Subramaniam, M. A. (2022). Application of STEM in the mastery of mathematics learning in primary school. *Journal of Electronics, Computer Networking and Applied Mathematics, 23*, 38-47. https://doi.org/10.55529/jecnam.23.38.47

Tan, C. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on student motivation, community of inquiry and learning performance. *Asian Education and Development Studies, 10*(2), 308-321. https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-05-2020-0084

Terpstra-Tong, J. L. Y., & Ahmad, A. (2018). High school-university disconnect: A complex issue in Malaysia. *International Journal of Educational Management, 32*(5), 851-865. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-10-2016-0214

Tuckman, B. W. (2003). The effect of learning and motivation strategies training on college studentsi achievement. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(3), 430-437. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2003.0034

Ulusoy, F. M., & Önen, A. S. (2014). The effects of the professional maturity levels of secondary school students on their academic motivations. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 143, 1153-1157. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.5

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. *John Wiley & Sons.*

Wang, H., Jiang, X., Wu, W., & Tang, Y. (2024). The effect of social innovation education on sustainability learning outcomes: The roles of intrinsic learning motivation and prosocial motivation. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 25*(4), 689-707. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-07-2021-0285

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy–value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 68-81. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1015

Zakaria, N. B., Rasyid, M., Mohamed, N., Daud, D., & Ismail, A. M. (2020). Study loan defaults among tertiary graduates. *International Journal of Financial Research, 11*(3), 125-130. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijfr.v11n3p125

Zainuddin, Z., Zhang, Y., Li, X., Chu, S. K. W., Idris, S., & Keumala, C. M. (2019). Research trends in flipped classroom empirical evidence from 2017 to 2018: A content analysis. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education, 16*(3), 255-277. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-10-2018-0082

Zamberi Ahmad, S. (2013). The need for inclusion of entrepreneurship education in Malaysia lower and higher learning institutions. *Education+ Training, 55*(2), 191-203. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911311304823

Zboja, J. J., Jackson, R., & Grimes-Rose, M. (2020). An expectancy theory perspective of volunteerism: The roles of powerlessness, attitude toward charitable organisations, and attitude toward helping others. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing, 17*(4), 493-507. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-020-00260-5