Asian Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences
e-ISSN: 2682-8502 | Vol. 7, No. 3, 275-284, 2025
https://asianscholarsnetwork.com/asnet-journals

The Economics of Academic Motivation: Understanding the Role of Incentives and Cognitive Factors in Students' Achievement

Idayat A. Oderinde[1*], Maziahtusima Ishak[1], Sakinah Ahmad[1]

[1] Faculty of Major Language Studies, Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia, Malaysia

*Corresponding Author: oderindeia@gmail.com

Received: 13 February 2025 | Accepted: 19 March 2025 | Published: 1 April 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55057/ajress.2025.7.3.23

Abstract: *The study of academic motivation from an economic perspective investigates the relationship between various incentives, cognitive elements, and student performance, providing valuable understanding of how these factors influence educational outcome. Both intrinsic and extrinsic incentives serve as crucial motivators, affecting students' levels of engagement, effort, and perseverance. Extrinsic incentives, which may include grades, scholarships, or financial rewards, typically encourage short-term academic objectives, whereas intrinsic incentives, such as a desire for knowledge and the pleasure derived from learning, promote sustained long-term success. Cognitive aspects, including self-efficacy, goal-setting, and metacognitive abilities, play a mediating role in how these incentives affect students by influencing their perceptions of challenges and their effort allocation. This paper hence, investigates the economic theories that inform motivation. Additionally, it explores the psychological theories that support these choices, such as expectancy-value theory and self-determination theory.*

Keywords: Economics, Academic Motivation, Incentives, Cognitive, Academic Achievement

1. Introduction

Understanding the factors that drive students to achieve academic excellence is a pivotal inquiry at the crossroads of economics, education, and psychology. Academic motivation not only influences individual achievement but also has significant implications for broader societal outcomes, such as workforce efficiency and economic development (Akiki, 2024; Hanushek & Woessmann, 2012; Howard et al., 2021). Despite its importance, disparities in student performance persist, even among those with comparable socio-economic statuses and access to educational resources (Vadivel et al., 2023). This situation prompts an essential inquiry: what factors contribute to these variations in academic success, and how can this knowledge be leveraged by policymakers and educators to enhance educational outcomes?

The economic viewpoint on academic motivation emphasizes the significance of incentives in influencing behavior. Rooted in rational choice theory, this perspective asserts that individuals react to external rewards and penalties, modifying their effort and involvement according to perceived costs and benefits (Becker, 1964). For instance, financial incentives such as scholarships and performance-based rewards have been adopted worldwide to encourage student motivation, yielding varying levels of effectiveness (Byantoro et al., 2024.; Fryer, 2011). Nevertheless, research indicates that extrinsic rewards alone may not be sufficient to

maintain long-term motivation and, in certain instances, could even diminish intrinsic motivation (Pandya, 2024).

In addition to the economic perspective, psychological theories of motivation highlight the significance of internal cognitive elements, including self-efficacy, growth mindset, and goal orientation. These elements play a crucial role in shaping students' perceptions of challenges, their goal-setting processes, and their ability to maintain persistence when confronted with obstacles (Dwerk, 2006; Urhahne & Wijnia, 2023). The field of behavioral economics has further contributed to this discourse by uncovering cognitive biases such as present bias and loss aversion that can affect students' decision-making, often resulting in less than optimal outcomes(O'Donoghue & Rabin, 1999).

Although significant progress has been made in elucidating the distinct functions of incentives and cognitive elements, there remains a limited understanding of the interplay between these mechanisms in shaping academic motivation. Do monetary rewards complement or undermine intrinsic motivations? In what ways can interventions harmonize financial incentives with approaches that enhance cognitive resilience? Exploring these inquiries is essential for the formulation of effective educational policies aimed at not only enhancing immediate academic outcomes but also promoting enduring learning habits.

This review synthesizes existing literature to explore the interplay between economic incentives and cognitive factors in shaping academic motivation. By integrating insights from economics, psychology, and education, the paper aims to provide a comprehensive framework for understanding how these elements converge to drive student achievement. The review also identifies key gaps in the literature and offers practical recommendations for policymakers and educators.

2. Economic Theories of Motivation

Economic theories of motivation offer critical perspectives on the influence of external incentives on students' academic behaviors and outcomes. These theories posit that individuals engage in actions that optimize their utility by assessing the associated costs and benefits. Within the context of education, this suggests that students determine the level of effort they are willing to exert based on the anticipated rewards, whether financial, social, or related to future opportunities, that they expect to gain from their academic efforts.

A. The Rational Choice Theory

The Rational choice theory serves as a fundamental principle in economic decision-making, asserting that individuals evaluate potential benefits against the corresponding costs to select the option that optimizes their utility or satisfaction (Daniel, 2020; Yasmin & Iskandar, 2023). Within the realm of academic motivation, this theory implies that students function as rational agents who react to various incentives, such as grades, scholarships, or prospects for future employment, by modifying their behaviors to enhance their personal outcomes.

B. Cost Benefit Analysis

Cost-benefit analysis serves as a fundamental aspect of rational choice theory, significantly influencing the decision-making processes of students regarding their academic endeavors. This concept posits that students assess the "costs" (such as time, effort, and stress) in relation to the "benefits" (including grades, recognition, and potential future earnings) when deciding the level of effort to dedicate to their studies (Cellini, 2012; Mishan & Quah, 2020). In essence,

students partake in a cognitive evaluation, estimating the anticipated rewards associated with academic achievement and juxtaposing these against the perceived costs of engaging in educational activities. When students believe that the potential rewards whether financial or related to academic advancement exceed the associated costs, such as the time invested in studying or exam preparation, they are more inclined to prioritize their academic responsibilities (Gilead, 2014; Walcott et al., 2018).

C. Human Capital Theory

Human capital theory serves as a fundamental principle in understanding the economic motivations behind educational pursuits. This theory asserts that education functions as an investment in acquiring knowledge and skills, which subsequently enhances future productivity and earning capacity. (Becker, 1964) argues that individuals opt to invest in their education with the expectation of receiving returns in the form of increased lifetime earnings. This theoretical framework implies that academic motivation is largely influenced by the anticipated advantages associated with future economic benefits. A range of empirical research supports this notion, demonstrating that expectations of higher wages/returns and improved job opportunities motivate students to engage more deeply and persist in their academic endeavors (Ehrmantraut, et al. 2020, 2020; Fényes & Mohácsi, 2020; Poteliene & Tamasauskiene, 2013; Psacharopoulos & Patrinos, 2004).

3. The Role of Incentives in Academic Motivation

Incentives are crucial in influencing student behavior and enhancing motivation. As noted by (Grove & Hadsell, 2012), learning incentives can be understood as inducements or additional rewards that function as motivational tools for desired educational outcomes. These incentives are generally divided into two categories: monetary and non-monetary. Monetary incentives encompass financial rewards such as scholarships, stipends, or cash bonuses awarded for reaching academic goals (Fryer, 2011). Conversely, non-monetary incentives include forms of recognition, praise, certificates, and access to exclusive opportunities, which serve as social or symbolic rewards. Such incentives cater to students' intrinsic and social motivations by affirming their efforts and bolstering their sense of accomplishment (Bird & Frug, 2019; Levitt et al., 2016). The effectiveness of these incentives is primarily influenced by their impact on students' perceptions regarding the costs and benefits associated with academic effort.

A. Incentives and Goal Setting

Incentives play a crucial role in providing students with defined objectives and performance benchmarks, which act as catalysts for ongoing effort and academic achievement (Campos et al., 2022; Herranz-Zarzoso & Sabater-Grande, 2018). According to Locke and Latham's Goal-Setting Theory (1990), the establishment of specific, challenging, and achievable goals significantly enhances motivation. For instance, the provision of a scholarship that requires students to maintain a high GPA serves to motivate them to identify and strive for particular academic targets (Locke & Latham, 2013).

B. Time and Efforts Allocation

By linking rewards to academic success, incentives shape the manner in which students allocate their time and effort. This realignment of priorities is particularly impactful for students from low-income backgrounds, who may otherwise face financial pressures that distract from their studies (Duisenova & Zhorabekova, 2024; Hussain et al., 2023).

C. Behaviour Control

Additionally, incentives function as behavioral nudges, promoting student engagement in constructive activities such as attending classes, completing assignments, and preparing for examinations(Bowra et al., 2021) .

D. Building Positive Habits

Ultimately, well-designed incentives can foster the development of positive academic habits that extend beyond the immediate reward phase. For example, rewarding regular attendance and active participation can create routines that contribute to sustained academic involvement(Levitt et al., 2016).

4. Cognitive Factors in Academic Motivation

Cognitive factors significantly influence student behavior and their persistence in academic pursuits (Chiesi & Primi, 2010). These elements affect students' perceptions of their educational environment, their decision-making processes, and their ability to maintain effort when confronted with difficulties (Idris et al., 2023). Three fundamental cognitive constructs which include self-efficacy, intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation, and mindset theory (Keller et al., 2020; Teramoto Pedrotti & Edwards, 2014) are essential for comprehending how cognitive mechanisms influence academic motivation and decision-making.

A. Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy, a concept first introduced by (Bandura, 1977), denotes an individual's conviction in their capacity to achieve success in particular tasks or circumstances. Within the academic realm, self-efficacy plays a crucial role in shaping students' motivation to engage with educational activities, their perseverance in the face of difficulties, and their ability to rebound from failures (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012; Wu et al., 2020). This belief system significantly impacts decision-making by influencing students' expectations regarding success and their interpretation of the challenges they encounter. For instance, a student who possesses a strong sense of self-efficacy is likely to tackle a challenging academic problem with assurance, convinced that diligence and determination will yield positive results. Conversely, a student with diminished self-efficacy may shy away from such tasks, apprehensive about potential failure and viewing the effort as pointless. Empirical studies have demonstrated that self-efficacy is a critical determinant of academic achievement, as it directly affects both motivation levels and the amount of effort dedicated to learning endeavors (Adeeba Khan, 2023; Talsma et al., 2021; Zysberg & Schwabsky, 2021).

B. Motivation (Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic)

Intrinsic motivation is characterized by participation in an activity for the inherent pleasure or fulfillment it provides, whereas extrinsic motivation pertains to engaging in an activity to attain an external reward or to evade negative outcomes (Fishbach & Woolley, 2022). The Self-Determination Theory (SDT), developed by (Ryan & Deci, 2017), delineates these two motivational types, asserting that intrinsic motivation is more conducive to enduring engagement and overall well-being. Within an academic framework, intrinsic motivation is linked to a passion for learning, curiosity, and a quest for mastery.

Students driven by intrinsic motivation tend to immerse themselves in academic material and demonstrate resilience in the face of difficulties (Agustina et al., 2021; Sunu & Baidoo-Anu, 2024). They perceive learning as a personal objective and derive enjoyment from activities such as problem-solving, critical thinking, and exploration. For instance, a student who delights

in reading literature or tackling intricate mathematical problems is intrinsically motivated to pursue these endeavors, independent of any external incentives. Conversely, extrinsic motivation may stem from elements such as grades, rewards, or the approval of others.

Although extrinsic motivation can effectively initiate engagement, it may not foster long-term academic commitment if students become disengaged from the external incentives or if those incentives are deemed inadequate. (Ryan & Deci, 2000) note that an overemphasis on extrinsic rewards can diminish intrinsic motivation, a phenomenon referred to as the "crowding-out effect." For example, students who are predominantly motivated by grades or financial rewards may ultimately lose interest in the learning process itself, resulting in a decline in sustained academic engagement.

The balance between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is essential for promoting enduring academic persistence. Intrinsic motivation fosters a more profound and lasting engagement, whereas extrinsic motivation can serve as a catalyst for initiating efforts, particularly in the absence of intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

C. Mindset Theory by Carol Dweck

Carol Dweck's Mindset Theory, introduced in 2006, has emerged as a fundamental framework in the study of motivation and achievement. Dweck posits that individuals can adopt either a fixed mindset or a growth mindset, each of which significantly influences their academic behaviors and levels of persistence. Those with a fixed mindset hold the belief that their abilities and intelligence are immutable, leading them to view effort as pointless. Consequently, they often shy away from challenges due to a fear of failure and negative judgment (Dwerk, 2006). Conversely, individuals with a growth mindset maintain that abilities and intelligence can be cultivated through dedication, learning, and resilience (Dwerk, 2006).

Empirical studies have shown that students who embrace a growth mindset demonstrate enhanced academic resilience and persistence, as they are more inclined to regard effort as essential to achieving success. These students typically welcome challenging tasks, endure through difficulties, and ultimately attain higher academic performance (Limer et al., 2020; Miller & Srougi, 2021). In contrast, students with a fixed mindset may be prone to giving up when confronted with academic obstacles, as they perceive their capabilities as predetermined and unalterable (Ortiz Alvarado et al., 2019) . Initial attempts, particularly in the absence of intrinsic motivation, can also influence their engagement (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

5. Interactions between Incentives and Cognitive Factors

The interplay between incentives and cognitive factors is fundamental in influencing academic motivation. Cognitive interpretations by students, including their levels of self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation, and their mindset play a significant role in determining their reactions to external rewards (Schunk, 1984). For example, students who possess high self-efficacy may interpret incentives as validations of their capabilities, thereby motivating them to establish more ambitious academic objectives. Conversely, students with low self-efficacy may regard the same incentives as beyond their reach, leading to a sense of disengagement (Bandura, 1997).

Additionally, intrinsic motivation serves as a moderating factor in this dynamic; excessive reliance on extrinsic rewards can diminish the intrinsic pleasure associated with learning for those who are already intrinsically motivated, a phenomenon referred to as the "over

justification effect" (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In contrast, for students lacking intrinsic motivation, incentives can serve as essential motivators to foster engagement, especially when faced with challenging or seemingly irrelevant tasks.

The efficacy of incentives is significantly shaped by mindset theory, as articulated by (Dwerk, 2006). Students who adopt a growth mindset view intelligence and abilities as adaptable, making them more inclined to regard incentives as mechanisms for personal advancement. For these individuals, rewards associated with effort and progress bolsters their conviction that challenges present opportunities for development. In contrast, students with a fixed mindset may perceive incentives as assessments of their innate capabilities, which can lead them to shy away from challenging tasks in order to safeguard their self-esteem. Implementing interventions that foster a growth mindset in conjunction with incentive programs can alleviate these detrimental perceptions, motivating students to confront challenges and maintain their efforts (Blackwell et al., 2007; Morales-Navarro et al., 2024).

Furthermore, behavioral economics introduces a nuanced perspective on the interplay between incentives and cognitive elements, emphasizing the role of cognitive biases such as present bias and loss aversion (Kao & Velupillai, 2015). Present bias refers to the tendency of individuals to favor immediate gratification over future rewards, indicating that smaller, more frequent incentives may be more effective than larger, delayed ones in fostering sustained academic involvement(O'Donoghue & Rabin, 1999). In a similar vein, the concept of loss aversion where incentives are framed as potential losses rather than gains can significantly boost motivation, as students are motivated to avoid losing rewards they believe they have already secured (Fryer et al., 2012). When these approaches are combined with constructive feedback that enhances self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation, they form a comprehensive framework in which incentives and cognitive factors work together to promote academic persistence and achievement.

6. Policy and Practical Implications

The integration of economic and cognitive theories within educational policy and practice establishes a comprehensive framework aimed at improving academic motivation and performance. It is imperative for policymakers to create incentive systems that cater to both short-term and long-term engagement, utilizing principles from behavioral economics such as present bias and loss aversion. For instance, providing small, frequent rewards for incremental successes can promote sustained effort, while presenting rewards as potential losses (such as conditional scholarships) can heighten motivation to achieve.

Furthermore, incorporating cognitive development initiatives that enhance self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and a growth mindset into educational policies ensures that students not only react to external incentives but also develop internal resilience and enduring learning strategies. Practically, educators should implement personalized methods that combine incentives with cognitive and emotional support. Customizing rewards and feedback to meet individual needs enhances engagement, particularly for students who exhibit low self-efficacy or intrinsic motivation. Constructive feedback that highlights effort and progress serves to reinforce students' confidence in their capabilities. These integrative strategies empower students to thrive academically while also cultivating skills vital for lifelong learning and contributions to society.

7. Research Gaps and Future Directions

Significant advancements have been made in understanding the relationship between economic and cognitive factors influencing academic motivation; however, notable deficiencies persist. It is clear that existing research has not yet integrated economic incentives with psychological cognitive factors as this study proposes. Investigating the convergence of behavioral economics and cognitive science within actual educational environments could yield practical insights. Furthermore, there is a pressing need for longitudinal studies to evaluate the lasting effects of interventions on students' lifelong learning and career trajectories. The long-term implications of incentive-based strategies on intrinsic motivation and academic persistence also warrant further examination. Future inquiries should explore the impact of emerging technologies; particularly AI-driven personalized learning systems, in the context of cognitive-based methodologies. Such investigations will enhance our understanding of motivation, facilitating the development of more effective and equitable educational policies and practices.

8. Conclusion

The exploration of incentives and cognitive factors in academic motivation offers a robust framework for improving student performance. Economic theories, including rational choice, human capital theory, and cost-benefit analysis, elucidate the ways in which incentives influence student behavior. Concurrently, cognitive elements such as self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and growth mindset illuminate the internal processes that underpin persistence and decision-making. The synthesis of these viewpoints highlights the necessity of developing educational strategies that harmonize external incentives with the nurturing of intrinsic motivation and cognitive resilience. By catering to the varied needs of students through equitable policies, tailored interventions, and cutting-edge technologies, educators and policymakers can promote not only short-term academic achievements but also long-term development and adaptability. This comprehensive approach to academic motivation holds the promise of transforming educational systems, equipping students to excel in a dynamic world.

References

Adeeba Khan, N. (2023). Examining the role of instructional leaders and their effects on teacher performance and, organization citizenship behavior in educational sector of Pakistan: Teacher's self-efficacy as a mediating factor. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.8048191

Agustina, E. T., Wahyudin, A. Y., & Pratiwi, A. A. (2021). The students' motivation and academic achievement at tertiary level: A correlational study. *Journal of arts and education, 1(1).* https://doi.org/10.33365/jae.v1i1.33

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change.

Becker. (1964). Human capital.

Bird, D., & Frug, A. (2019). Dynamic non-monetary incentives. *American economic journal: Microeconomics, 11(4),* 111–150. https://doi.org/10.1257/mic.20170025

Blackwell, L. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal Study and an Intervention. *Child development, 78(1),* 246–263. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.00995.x

Bowra, A., Mashford-Pringle, A., & Poland, B. (2021). Indigenous learning on Turtle Island: A review of the literature on land-based learning. *Canadian geographies / géographies Canadiennes, 65(2),* 132–140. https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12659

Byantoro, G. A., Wardoyoe, D. T. W., Khamidi, A., & Nursalim, M. (n.d.). The impact of scholarships on student achievement: A mix methods study.

Campos, J. A. D. B., Campos, L. A., Martins, B. G., De Oliveira, A. P., Navarro, F. M., Dos Santos, S. C., Da Costa, J., Prado, O. Z., & Marôco, J. (2022). COVID-19 pandemic: Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and stress symptoms among Brazilian psychologists. *Frontiers in psychology, 13,* 1012543. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1012543

Cellini, S. R. (2012). For-profit higher education: An assessment of costs and benefits. *National tax journal, 65(1),* 153–179. https://doi.org/10.17310/ntj.2012.1.06

Chiesi, F., & Primi, C. (2010). Cognitive and non-cognitive factors related to students' statistics achievement. *Statistics education research journal, 9(1),* 6–26. https://doi.org/10.52041/serj.v9i1.385

Daniel, S. J. (2020). Education and the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prospects, 49(1–2),* 91–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09464-3

Duisenova, M. M., & Zhorabekova, A. N. (2024). Effects of rewards on motivation and student achievement in digital game-based learning in teaching English as a foreign language for primary school pupils in Kazakhstan. *Arab world English journal, 15(3),* 125–141. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no3.8

Dwerk. (2006). The new psychology of success.

Ehrmantraut, et al. (2020). The expected (Signaling) value of higher education.

Fényes, H., & Mohácsi, M. (2020). Do students take the predictions of human capital theory into account? An analysis of motives behind further studies in higher education. Hungarian *Educational research journal, 10(1),* 74–84. https://doi.org/10.1556/063.2020.00006

Fishbach, A., & Woolley, K. (2022). The structure of intrinsic motivation.

Fryer, R. G. (2011). Financial incentives and student achievement: Evidence from randomized trials. *The quarterly journal of economics, 126(4),* 1755–1798. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjr045

Fryer, R. G., Levitt, S. D., List, J., & Sadoff, S. (2012). Nber working paper series.

Gilead, T. (2014). Education and the rationale of cost–benefit analysis. *British journal of educational studies, 62(4),* 373–391. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2014.969190

Grove, W. A., & Hadsell, L. (2012). Incentives and Student Learning. In N. M. Seel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning. *Springer US.* 1511–1517.https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_156

Herranz-Zarzoso, N., & Sabater-Grande, G. (2018). Monetary incentives and self-chosen goals in academic performance: An experimental study. *International review of economics education,* 27, 34–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iree.2018.02.002

Hussain, M. A., Rafaqat, A., & Hussain, S. (2023). Impact of reward system on students' motivation and academic performance: A study of secondary schools. 3(1).

Idris, R., Govindasamy, P., Nachiappan, S., & Bacotang, J. (2023). Exploring the impact of cognitive factors on learning, motivation and career in Malaysia's STEM education. *International journal of academic research in business and social sciences,* 13(6), Pages 1669-1684. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v13-i6/17227

Kao, Y.-F., & Velupillai, K. V. (2015). Behavioural economics: Classical and modern. *The European journal of the history of economic thought, 22(2),* 236–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/09672567.2013.792366

Keller, L., Gollwitzer, P. M., & Sheeran, P. (2020). Changing behavior using the model of action PHASES. In M. S. Hagger, L. D. Cameron, K. Hamilton, N. Hankonen, & T.

Lintunen (Eds.), The handbook of behavior change (1st ed., 77–88). *Cambridge University Press.* https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108677318.006

Levitt, S., List, J., & Sadoff, S. (2016). The effect of performance-based incentives on educational achievement: Evidence from a randomized experiment (No. w22107; p. w22107). *National bureau of economic research.* https://doi.org/10.3386/w22107

Limer, B. D., Bloomberg, J., & Holstein, D. M. (2020). The influence of eddies on coral larval retention in the flower garden banks. *Frontiers in marine science, 7,* 372. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00372

Locke, E. A. (2013). New developments in goal setting and task performance (1st ed.). *Routledge.* https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203082744

Miller, H. B., & Srougi, M. C. (2021). Growth mindset interventions improve academic performance but not mindset in biochemistry. *Biochemistry and molecular biology education, 49(5),* 748–757. https://doi.org/10.1002/bmb.21556

Mishan, E. J., & Quah, E. (2020). Cost-benefit analysis (6th ed.). *Routledge.* https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351029780

Mojavezi, A., & Tamiz, M. P. (2012). The Impact of teacher self-efficacy on the students' motivation and achievement. *Theory and practice in language studies, 2(3),* 483–491. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.3.483-491

Morales-Navarro, L., Fields, D. A., & Kafai, Y. B. (2024). Understanding growth mindset practices in an introductory physical computing classroom: High school students' engagement with debugging by design activities. *Computer science education,* 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/08993408.2024.2317080

O'Donoghue, T., & Rabin, M. (1999). Doing it now or later.

Ortiz Alvarado, N. B., Rodríguez Ontiveros, M., & Ayala Gaytán, E. A. (2019). Do mindsets shape students' well-being and performance? *The journal of psychology, 153(8),* 843–859. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2019.1631141

Pandya, S. P. (2024). College students with high abilities in liberal arts disciplines: Examining the effect of spirituality in bolstering self-regulated learning, affect balance, peer relationships, and well-being. *High ability studies, 35(1),* 45–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2023.2278811

Poteliene, S., & Tamasauskiene, Z. (2013). Human capital investment: Measuring returns to education.

Psacharopoulos, G., & Patrinos, H. (2004). Returns to investment in education.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary educational psychology, 25(1),* 54–67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (Eds.). (2017). Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness. *Guilford press.* https://doi.org/10.1521/978.14625/28806

Schunk, D. H. (1984). Self-efficacy perspective on achievement behavior. *Educational psychologist, 19(1),* 48–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461528409529281

Sunu, S., & Baidoo-Anu, D. (2024). Relationship between students' academic self-concept, intrinsic motivation, and academic performance. *International journal of school & educational psychology, 12(1),* 41–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2023.2292033

Talsma, K., Robertson, K., Thomas, C., & Norris, K. (2021). COVID-19 beliefs, self-efficacy and academic performance in first-year University students: Cohort comparison and mediation analysis. *Frontiers in psychology, 12,* 643408. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.643408

Teramoto Pedrotti, J., & Edwards, L. M. (Eds.). (2014). Perspectives on the Intersection of multiculturalism and positive psychology. *Springer Netherlands, 7.*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8654-6

Urhahne, D., & Wijnia, L. (2023). Theories of motivation in education: An Integrative framework. *Educational psychology review, 35(2),* 45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09767-9

Vadivel, B., Alam, S., Nikpoo, I., & Ajanil, B. (2023). The impact of low socioeconomic background on a child's educational achievements. *Education research international*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/6565088

Walcott, R. L., Corso, P. S., Rodenbusch, S. E., & Dolan, E. L. (2018). Benefit–cost Analysis of undergraduate education programs: An example analysis of the Freshman research Initiative. *CBE—life sciences education*, 17(1), rm1. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.17-06-0114

Wu, H., Li, S., Zheng, J., & Guo, J. (2020). Medical students' motivation and academic performance: The mediating roles of self-efficacy and learning engagement. *Medical education online, 2*5(1), 1742964. https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2020.1742964

Yasmin, S., & Iskandar, K. (2023). Rational choice theory and taste of Japanese popular culture in motivation of PMI to enter Japan's global labor market. Al Qalam: *Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan Dan Kemasyarakatan, 17(2),* 571. https://doi.org/10.35931/aq.v17i2.2012

Zysberg, L., & Schwabsky, N. (2021). School climate, academic self-efficacy and student achievement. *Educational psychology, 41(4),* 467–482. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2020.1813690