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In my opinion, extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation is agree for me to the authors. Both of the motivations are useful for certain time, intrinsic motivation can let students to do the things that can fulfill their enjoyment without regarding any tangible reward but extrinsic motivation can let students to do something they did not really want to do but can motivate them to do and to learns new or complex things. The authors of this article mentions three different experiments conducted the " effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation" were explored. The three different experiments conclude either intrinsic motivation decrease, increase, or remain the same after extrinsic rewards have been experienced? (Coded by Deci’s Initial Studies). I agree with the author’s first experiment, which are participants do not receive any reward. Participants do not receive reward on the task but the participants able to do the task with their interest and this can improve their intrinsic motivation. However, I disagree with the second experiment, which are participants had been told that is giving out reward for each task solved. This can increase participants’ extrinsic motivation but participant’s intrinsic motivation will decrease. Unfortunately, the third experiment does not provided reward, same as the first experiment. I believe that third experiment will decrease participant’s intrinsic motivation due to the second experiment was given out extrinsic reward and third experiment does not have any reward. In the other view, if a child first time can behave well in an activity and the teacher do not give any tangible reward to the child; the child intrinsic motivation will increase. Yet, if the child does not behave well in the second time for the same activity, teacher can use verbal recognition to correct the child behavior. Teacher does not need provide tangible rewards to the children for any activities or behavioral, this will make children intrinsic motivation decrease. I consent to the author that external rewards can bring the negative effect intrinsic motivation and verbal praise was substituted for tangible rewards cited by Deci. In my opinion, I believe children have their own self-actualization. Teacher uses verbal praise is more effective than using tangible reward. Besides that, the authors also stated task-contingent rewards and quality-dependent rewards in two categories cited by Deci and Ryan (1985). I disagree with the authors differentiate to two categories (task-contingent rewards and quality-dependent reward) due to the authors stated that divide the task-completion rewards category into the subcategories. Which named as performance-independent rewards and completion-independent rewards coded by Eisenberger and Cameron (1996). The reason I disagree with the two categories (task-completion rewards and quality-dependent reward) because the teacher should not provide any tangible reward for no reason. In my opinion, I support the two categories combined together because task-contingent reward will increase extrinsic motivation and quality-dependent reward will decrease extrinsic motivation. This is because the child recognize that, if the child do a task wonderfully but the child did not share the color pencil with friend (color pencil provided by school), and the child get the tangible reward due to the work is wonderful but not the child’s performance, so this can increase the child’s extrinsic motivation. Yet, if the teacher did not give tangible reward to the child because of the child do a task wonderfully, the child know he/she does not behave well in the class so then the child knows he/she could not get the tangible reward. But then, sometimes it will be never clear because it might bring some confused due to the two categories (task-contingent rewards and quality-dependent rewards). However, I do agree with the authors for the subcategories because divided the categories from a bigger part to smaller part, the teacher can easily give out extrinsic reward according what the child does. Teacher should be very observant that did the children really participant on the activities or did the children really finish the task that teacher given. Besides that, I do agree with the authors that extrinsic reward can bring much negative effect on intrinsic motivation coded by Rummel and Feinberg (1988). This is because I believe that giving out tangible reward is controlling, informational or motivational. Children always want to get tangible reward and the children will act to be quiet, trying to behave good so then teacher will give out the tangible reward. But the teacher did not notice the children is acting or really behave naturally. Extrinsic reward is just controlling the children. To prevent this, teacher should not often provide extrinsic reward to children. In addition, the authors mention that participant divided to three group which are an expected-reward group, an unexpected-reward group and a no-reward group cited by Lepper et al., 1973. I support the second group and third group rather than the first group. This is because if the participants do the task nicely and the participants did not know either got reward or do not have extrinsic reward, the participants will do it well and did not ask for extrinsic reward for doing the task had given. But if the extrinsic reward is already told the participants, the participants will do it but with the feeling just wanted to finish the task fast and get the extrinsic reward. In the article, the authors mentions that verbal rewards tend to increase intrinsic motivation, whereas tangible rewards may decrease intrinsic motivation cited by Cameron & Pierce (1994). I tend to agree with this because verbal recognition is much better than tangible reward. For example, if the child can solve a mathematic problem, as a teacher can verbal recognition the child, " you solve the mathematic question". The teacher does not need give a tangible reward for the child due to solving mathematic problem. Tangible reward can decrease the child intrinsic motivation. Moreover, the authors stated that decrement in intrinsic motivation may occurs when participant find that activity is boring or uninteresting, reward are given for activities culturally praised as intrinsically motivated behavior cited by Dickinson (1989). I believe that, if the teacher often giving out tangible reward for behavior, children will feel boring because once children have well then the teacher give out the tangible reward, so then if children did not behave well, there are not any tangible rewards giving out from the teacher. Yet, if the teacher changes from giving out tangible reward to verbal recognition, the students might find out it is more interesting rather than just giving out the tangible reward. Furthermore, there is an argument about determining the definition of intrinsic motivation coded by Vasta and Stripe (1979). In the article, the authors mentions that intrinsic motivation was defined as the amount of time a child engages in a certain task cited by Lepper et al., (1973), the amount of behavior generated cited by Feingold & Mahoney (1975) and the quality of performance cited by Kruglanski, Friedman & Zeevi (1971). I disagree about this argument. This is because in my opinion, intrinsic motivation does not mean the amount of time a child engages in a certain task, the amount of behavior generated and the quality of performance. I believed that, intrinsic motivation is a child interest to do something without asking any tangible reward. The child is doing the thing he/she likes; it is not the amount of time for the child engages in the task. It is the enjoyment how does the child felt to do something he/she likes to fulfill he/she without regarding tangible reward. The authors of this articles mention that the more common type of praise in a classroom is the latter and utilized manipulative praise should be examined separately coded by Kohn. In my opinion, there should not to be separately between classroom’s latter and manipulative praise. Teacher can praises the child in verbal recognition once the child done something that improved. For example, a child does not try to wear his/her shoes before and now he/she trying to wear and he/she can wore it. So that, as teacher can verbal recognition the child " you wear your shoes by your ownself". Children tend to be like verbal recognition to make the children learn the new things. However, overall that extrinsic reward had detrimental effects on intrinsic motivation cited by Rummel and Feinberg’s (1988). I agree with this because once extrinsic reward been introduced to a child, the child tends to be more aggressive in the tangible reward and the intrinsic motivation will decrease. For example, a 3-year-old child able to count 1 to 3, teacher gives the child a tangible reward and the child felt it is easy to get tangible reward just counted for 1, 2 and 3, so almost all of the time the child like to counting for the number 1, 2 and 3 only. The purpose of the child is wanted to catch the teacher’s attention, the child wanted to get the teacher’s attention about he/she is counting, so that, the teacher will gives the child another tangible reward. But if the teacher does not introduce the tangible reward for counting 1 to 3, the child will slowly learns to count from 1 to 3, 1 to 6, and 1 to 9. If the tangible reward did not introduce to the child, the child intrinsic motivation will gain to learn counting to the bigger and bigger number, do not only stop at the 3 to catch the teacher’s attention. In the article, the authors stated that, the researchers specifically examined verbal rewards (termed " positive feedback") separately from tangible rewards. I support these researchers because verbal recognition is more effective than tangible reward. Some of the children like the praises by the teacher, but some children like the tangible rewards, it is depends on the child. But some how rather, verbal recognition is more powerful. As the above stated, tangible reward is controlling the child. For example, a defiant student sudden behaving well in the class, as a teacher uses verbal recognition is much effective than giving out tangible reward. The teacher can tell the defiant student " you behave well, continue it!" it sounds like positive than just giving out the tangible reward that is no reason. The authors also stated that rewards should not be presented for mere participation in a task without regard for completion or quality. I support with this because participants should know that, if he/she does not complete the work, he/she could not get any tangible reward. But, if the teacher gives out rewards to participants without regard for completion or quality, participants will feel that it is easy to get a tangible reward. It does not have challenges; this will definitely decrease the participant’s intrinsic motivation. Besides that, the authors also mention that techniques based upon the use of extrinsic rein forcers work in the classroom stated by Maag & Kotlash (1994). I agree with this because teacher can use verbal recognition to change the child’s behavior. For example, if behavior occurred suddenly, the teacher can talk with the child by using behavior narration. The authors also this article also stated that, intrinsic motivation has been defined as behaviors performed in the absence of observable external reinforcement. I agree with this because once extrinsic reward does not introduce to a child, the child will not ask for tangible reward for a task. Yet, once extrinsic reward introduce to a child, the child will ask for tangible reward for the continuous task. As a teacher, should not always provide tangible reward for the children, this will strongly make he children intrinsic motivation decrease. But if the teacher does not provide tangible reward to the children, the children intrinsic motivation will maintain the same or increase. Last but not the least, I agree with the authors giving out tangible reward or verbal recognition are suitable to children in some situation. Some children can do a task without reward and the children can do it well, but once reward provided, children’s intrinsic motivation will decrease. Yet, some students do a task with reward, which is extrinsic reward, and extrinsic reward can make children become more motivation to do a task because the children want to get the reward. But, in some situation the teacher have to give out tangible reward to control the class. For example, the class is very uncontrolled; the teacher can use the tangible reward to control the class, but not every time using tangible reward. As a teacher, should also use verbal recognition if one of child is compliant in the class, so that the defiant children will follow the compliant child. In my opinion, giving out tangible reward is not a suitable method to children but verbal recognition is much effective than tangible reward. According to Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development (ZPD) and scaffolding, at first the child does a task need teacher to teach but once the teacher teach about the task, the child’s ZPD is going up and the third time, the child can do it he/she own. But if the teacher does not teach the child and straight to give answer to the child, the child second and third time also depend on the teacher’s answer. It is the same with intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. For example, a child can does a task without regarding a reward, he/she can do it well but once extrinsic reward has been introduce, the child’s intrinsic motivation will decrease. Santrock, (2102). Figure 6. 11: Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development. Page. 191

## LOWER LIMIT

Level of problem solving reached on these task by child working alone

## ZONE OF PROXIMAL DEVELOPMENT (ZPD)

## UPPER LIMIT

Level of additional responsibility child can accept with assistance of an able instructor