**Correlations between Motivations to Learn and Student Expectations of the Instructor’s Role in an Online Course**

In recent decades, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of students enrolled in online courses. Many studies have investigated the learning processes that characterize online learning, the traits of learners, the role of instructors in online courses, and the interactions between them.

The role of the instructor differs in online courses and in frontal lectures delivered in person. In online courses, the learners carry much of the responsibility for gathering information, evaluating sources, formulating ideas, and presenting them (Huang, 2017). The instructor is not perceived as a conveyer of information, but as a mentor who guides learners (Cheok & Wong, 2015). Studies have identified various roles of instructors in online courses. Lee (2011) identifies five components of the instructor’s role: pedagogical, managerial, technical, affective, and differentiating. The instructor is expected to deliver the content in an optimal manner, excel in information management processes, integrate the technologies used, be sensitive to learners’ needs, and facilitate independent and varied learning.

In addition, in order to succeed in an online course, the learner must have a high level of motivation for learning. Motivation can be characterized by six components: self-efficacy, intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, task value, control of learning beliefs, and test anxiety (Duncan & McKeachie, 2005).

The present study examines the relationship between motivational factors that characterize students and how they perceive the role of the instructor in an online course.

**Methodology**

The study was conducted using a quantitative approach: 520 undergraduate students enrolled in asynchronous online courses as part of their studies responded to closed questionnaires. The subjects were 52.6% male and 46.8% female.

The research tool consists of two parts. The first is a questionnaire developed by Lee (2011) on the role of instructors in online courses, which includes the five roles: pedagogical, managerial, technical, affective, and differentiating. The second is the motivational sub-scale from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) developed by Duncan & McKeachie (2005). This questionnaire covers the six motivational components: self-efficacy, intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, task value, control of learning beliefs, and test anxiety.

The questionnaire was sent via Google Docs to all 1000 students enrolled in an online course as part of their studies. It was emphasized that the questionnaire was anonymous.

**Results**

Table 1 presents the correlations between the components in the “motivation for learning” variable and the components in the “expectations of the role of the instructor in an online course” variable.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1: Pearson Correlations between Motivational Components and Instructors’ Role** |
|  | Self- efficacy | Task Value | Test Anxiety | Intrinsic Goal Orientation | Extrinsic Goal Orientation | Control of Learning Beliefs |
| Pedagogical role | Pearson Correlation | .128\*\* | .154\*\* | .048 | .108\* | .226\*\* | .213\*\* |
| Technical role | Pearson Correlation | -.017 | .148\*\* | .257\*\* | .191\*\* | .177\*\* | .008 |
| Affective role | Pearson Correlation | -.055 | .152\*\* | .272\*\* | .114\* | .204\*\* | -.027 |
| Differentiating role | Pearson Correlation | .300\*\* | .332\*\* | .028 | .393\*\* | .133\*\* | .331\*\* |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |

1. Positive relationships were found between five of the components of motivation for learning (self-efficacy, intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, task value, and control of learning beliefs) and the pedagogical role of the instructor. Correlations range from rp = .10\* to rp = .23\*\*.
2. Positive relationships were found between four of the components of motivation for learning (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, task value, and test anxiety) and the technological role of the instructor. Correlations range from rp = .15\*\* to rp = .25\*\*.
3. Positive correlations were found between four of the components of motivation for learning (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, task value, and text anxiety) and the affective role of the instructor. Correlations range from rp = .12\* to rp = .27\*\*.
4. Positive correlations were found between five of the components of motivation for learning (self-efficacy, intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, task value, and control of learning beliefs) and the differentiating role of the instructor. Correlations range from rp = .13\*\* to rp = .33\*\*.

**Discussion**

This study explored the relationship between various components of students’ motivation for learning their expectations of the role of the instructor in an online course. The results of the study indicate a breakdown into three types of motivation: 1. **expectancy** (self-efficacy, control of learning beliefs), 2. **value beliefs** (intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, and task value), and 3. **affect** (test anxiety) as characterized by Duncan and Wilbert (2005). Each of these types of motivation is correlated in a different way to the various expectations of the role of instructor in an online course.

Learners whose motivation is based on “value beliefs” believe in the importance of the task and this is a barrier to their success. Therefore, they expect that the course instructor will fulfil four roles: pedagogical, technical, affective, and differentiating. In contrast, learners whose motivation is based on “expectancy” feel confident in their ability to perform the task. They expect that the instructor will fulfil only the pedagogical and differentiating roles, and do not need the instructor to fulfil the emotional and technical aspects. Learners motivated by “affect” expect the instructor to fill the affective and technical roles in order to reduce their stress and anxiety, which are impacted by the technological challenges of the online course.

The results of this study shed light on the need for precisely planning courses and online lessons in a way that is suitable for a variety of types of students.