

On Self Regulation in College-Level Mathematics Classes

Jenny Lee

Dagan Karp, Advisor

Luis A. Leyva, Reader



Department of Mathematics

May, 2018

Copyright © 2018 Jenny Lee.

The author grants Harvey Mudd College and the Claremont Colleges Library the nonexclusive right to make this work available for noncommercial, educational purposes, provided that this copyright statement appears on the reproduced materials and notice is given that the copying is by permission of the author. To disseminate otherwise or to republish requires written permission from the author.

Abstract

This paper looks into need for improvement in mathematics education at the college level in the US regarding equitable practices in instruction. In particular, this paper focuses on understanding the role self-regulation can play in the classroom dynamics, and how self-paced assessment can be a way to empower students. Also included is a case study in an introductory linear algebra class at a liberal arts college and is meant to provide a investigation into self-regulation in this context. The appendix includes an annotated bibliography comprised of the most relevant studies in self-regulation conducted in the last two decades or so. An index of keywords and pertinent quotes are highlighted for the ease of the reader.

Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	vii
1 Outline	1
2 Motivation	3
2.1 The need for change	3
2.2 Mathematics is not fair	4
3 Self-Regulation	7
3.1 Definition	7
3.2 Self-Assessment and Evaluation	9
3.3 An example of self-assessment: self-paced assessment.	11
4 The case study	13
4.1 Introduction	13
4.2 A (not so) brief note on Mudd	13
4.3 Method	14
Bibliography	17

Acknowledgments

Chapter 1

Outline

1. Introduction

(a) Background and motivation

Personal anecdote explaining the motivations behind why mathematics education needs reform, viewed and related in the perspective of a student

2. Mathematics is not fair

(a) Societal norms and impact of socio-economical differences in US

(b) Whiteness in mathematics, western mathematics (Kumashiro, Bishop)

(c) Implicit and/or systemic biases in action

i. Microaggressions

ii. Model minority myth

(d) Outdated practices

i. Description of student demographics and historical changes/trends

ii. Correlation between student performances and student demographics

* need substantial evidence

3. Self-regulation in mathematics learning

(a) Different types of learning

i. Mastery, IBL, group-based, etc

- (b) Finding a commonality that can suggest a shift in the paradigm of learning
- (c) Suggesting how self-regulation can reduce unfairness in mathematics learning

4. A case study in self-regulation

- (a) Introduction and description of self-paced assessments
- (b) Qualitative description of setting and details of where and how the study took place
 - i. Honor code, establishment of trust
 - ii. Nature of course in study, number and demographics of students
 - iii. Structural differences
- (c) Data Analysis
 - i. Tables and graphs of student backgrounds, performances
 - ii. need to talk to Prof Williams
 - iii. Qualitative student reports of differences in experience
- (d) Discussion
 - i. Necessary adaptations and customizations that were
 - ii. Caveats and fallbacks of the case study
 - iii. What this suggests for us: a question to consider

Chapter 2

Motivation

2.1 The need for change

I politely ask you to consider: a typical child grows up being told over and over again to “be quiet” and to learn the materials presented in front of them; there are no stupid questions as long as they are relevant to the material at hand. As they progress into higher education (if they do), they find themselves often sitting in a large lecture hall, questions left unanswered “in the interest of time,” and wondering whether the lecturer knows their name, or even cares if they show up at all.

A Google search for “changing higher education” returns a plethora of articles responding to recent student strikes advocating for change in policies regarding finances and other economic concerns. In contrast, a search for “changing K-12 education” returns a 20-page ERIC (Education Resources Information Center) document on curriculum reform and effect on entering post-secondary institutions. Despite advances in research in education, classroom instruction has not changed significantly in a typical college in the last five to ten decades, if not more. Students are still attending large lecture-style classes assessed via exams accompanied by weekly, graded assignments. With an increasing number of individuals pursuing a higher education, it seems naive to think that the current systems of education are still suitable or equitable to all students. With the diversifying population of students, it is just as crucial to bring sensible change to promote an equitable learning setting.

2.2 Mathematics is not fair

The current nature of mathematics education in the US provides an extremely different experience for a student who is Asian American versus African American versus white. Starting from achievement gaps between African American and Latino/a students and white students to the extremely stereotypical belief that “Asians are good at math,” there is abundant evidence for the unfair nature of mathematics education (Flores (2007)).

Specifically, there exists a large socioeconomic difference between ethnicities. The 2007-2011 census provides enough quantitative evidence of the unequal distribution of poverty among different races. American Indians and African Americans came in the highest at about 26% of the population being in poverty, more than a double in comparison to the 11.6% of whites (Suzanne Macartney and Fontenot (2013)). A 2018 New York Times article showcasing a megastudy conducted on white and black men showed that of the 5,000 white and 5,000 black boys who grew up in poverty, 48% of black boys grew up to remain in poverty and only 2% grew to be rich, while 31% of white boys remaining in poverty and 10% became rich (Badger et al. (2018)).

With income gaps this big, opportunity gaps are not so different. In 2013, enrollment percentages in postsecondary education showed about a near 10% difference between white (42%) and black (34%) students (Musu-Gillette). Graduation rates were similar, lowest for black students at around 41%. These numbers dip down further for STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) degrees, about 11% apart.

Exactly what perpetuates these depressing statistics rests deeply rooted in racism that has lined all of US history. To be more specific, it is absolute ignorance to think that any part of education is void of racism, whether outwardly intentional or not. From the 2005 study conducted by the American Mathematics Society, 80% of full time mathematics professors with PhDs are white, compared to 1% black and 2% Hispanic.

Yet, mathematics is historically not a unique subject to white Europeans; rather, prominent advancements were made by individuals from all over world. Yet, if we ask ourselves the names of famous mathematicians, what we hear are not Srinivasa Ramanujan, Hypatia, or Dorothy Vaughn but rather Euler, Pythagoras and Fermat. The problem in question lies exactly here—whiteness is rarely questioned in this context of mathematics. Without having stood in the shadow of an individual that society pictures to be the “model mathematician,” it is extremely difficult to understand the place of inequality in the education of our students. It is the not the white teacher

but the student of color who has the sole responsibility to succeed through societal oppression. It is no different than asking an ugly duckling to be something other than what he sees in the reflection.

This lack of having a proper role model impacts the belief a student has that they can succeed, otherwise known as self-efficacy (Thevenin (2007)). With lowered self-efficacy comes lowered achievement, unsurprisingly (Motlagh et al. (2011)). Once again, we see how the question of how these unfair societal norms factor into reducing the quality of education or effectiveness of education a student receives is rarely raised.

The solution is not clear either. There are many variables and factors in any classroom environment that either cannot be controlled or are unknown. There is no magic wand that turns poverty-stricken neighborhoods into more privileged ones, nor is there one that removes racial inequality within a school, never-mind school districts across a nation. One important example of an unexpected factor that aggravates the situation is microaggression, which describes any seemingly small behavior, including unvoiced assumptions, that relays hostility or prejudiced views towards a marginalized group, unintentional or not. When unnoticed or ignored, microaggressions towards ethnic minority groups feed racism, fueling a mindset that only continues to be confirmed as a correct one. As a result, impacted students fall further into the mindset of feeling less capable in the classroom.

In particular, this happens in subjects like mathematics, widely believed to be a neutral subject. First, neutrality on its own deserves to be revisited. Statements such as “all lives matter” made as a counter to the Black Lives Matter movement, describe a harmful form of using neutrality to deny racism exists. In a similar vein, stating that “mathematics has no color” contains as many subliminal messages. As Rochelle Gutierrez, notable for her advocacy in equitable education, writes:

[In] many mathematics classrooms, students are expected to leave their emotions, their bodies, their cultures, and their values outside the classroom walls, stripping them of a sense of wholeness (Gutierrez (2012)).

It is not to say that finding a derivative is promoting white supremacy. Rather, the way in which we teach a mathematical concept and the myriad of assumptions we make in the process shape the role mathematics takes in our society. In this light, remodeling education to eliminate inequitable practices in mathematics seems a daunting task for any one nation, let alone an institution, to tackle.

Thus, I propose to look into establishing self-efficacy in students. The status quo continues to marginalize students, undermining their abilities and discouraging them from the simple thought that they can succeed in mathematics. By letting students believe that they are capable and entrusting them with their own capabilities, classrooms will no longer be a place for oppression but a place for opportunity for everyone. Building self-efficacy will hence build supportive environments that can empower students with independence and trust in themselves.

While I believe such an ambition can be achieved in various ways, not excluding political and administrative actions, I think fostering self-regulation is a promising first step. In the next chapter, self-regulation is defined and detailed, showing how it can build an equitable classroom.

Chapter 3

Self-Regulation

3.1 Definition

This is the definition of self-regulation provided by Zeider, Pintrich and Boekaerts' *Handbook of Self-Regulation*:

Self-regulation refers to self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals (Zeider and Boekaerts).

This can be broken into two parts. First, it focuses on self-generation, indicating the necessity for an individual's own efforts and thus emphasizing power in the self. That way, the generated thoughts and actions can be structured to their own goals and needs, not those of the society or instructor. The word "cyclically" should be underlined here, as it points out how the process can be a self-sustained one, reinforced by practice and initial support.

Adopting a focus on self-generation of thoughts and actions which lead to attaining personal goals is a statement describing the achievement of power. In a typical classroom setting composed of a single instructor and a group of tens to hundreds of individuals, there exists a power dynamic. The instructor is given an unchallenged amount of control over the students' actions and knowledge.

Thus, promotion of self-regulation will accomplish two parts for students: one in which the process of self-generating their own thoughts and actions will shift the locus of power away from being centralized at the instructor, and two in which the learning experience can be shaped to fit personal needs and goals, instead of generalized versions often presented in traditional classes.

To begin looking into how the core ideas of self-regulation came about, mastery-based learning is a fit place to start. Simply put, mastery learning seeks to incorporate individualized pacing of progression through the course material. Developed by Benjamin Bloom, mastery-based learning expects students to have complete or near-complete mastery of concepts before proceeding further into the material (Bloom, 1968). Over the years mastery learning has taken on many variations, some more successful than others, but all focus on individual pacing and developing autonomy in a student's ability to learn. The biggest takeaway from studies done in mastery learning is the positive impact it has on students despite how much it differs from traditional methods of teaching (Zollinger (2017), Bradley (2017)).

As shown with the many studies done of the impact of mastery learning, self-regulation is a foreign concept in traditional instruction. Thus, how or why self-regulation should be a part of school does not come easily to most educators, nevertheless students, today. For a large part, if not all, of a young student's life in academics, the classroom is where they are instructed to do one thing or another. Report cards and other assessments and evaluations are the only sources of feedback.

For college and postsecondary education where classroom sizes go upwards to hundreds and even thousands of students, the feedback received is rarely refutable, with chances to improve given once or twice a semester when a midterm is returned.

In particular, mathematics education is rarely in the form different from the lecture-recitation style classes. Seminar or discussion-heavy classes are generally unheard of, let alone calling on students for participation in any shape or form. With bigger classes, asking questions in itself becomes a challenge, often perceived as being a waste of lecture time; practically impossible if the lecturer spares zero opportunities for questions. Truly, the conversation is one-sided, with little or no reception from the students' in their understanding.

In this status quo, it is unthinkable to "personalize" a course to meet a particular student's needs. More so, students have few chances to champion for themselves what they were lacking in the education they received. It is hardly reasonable to claim that one form of learning is the best way for every student to achieve success, as will be discussed in further detail later in this paper.

Looking only in terms of providing individual attention for academic achievement, attempts so far include remedial classes. Unfortunately, these often further reduce self-efficacy in underachieving students, as the students

are singled out and required to take these extra classes under the description that they are struggling or behind, increasing both physical and mental stress factors (Martin et al. (2017)).

Nevertheless, self-regulation takes many different forms and can be adapted to any type of classroom. In both methodology and focus, self-regulation can be incorporated at small or large scales. Detailed below are some (but certainly not all) ways in which self-regulation can take place in instruction (Montague (2007)). In addition, self-regulative strategies will often encompass a mix or overlap of the listed forms, thus none are mutually exclusive of another.

3.2 Self-Assessment and Evaluation

Self-assessment and evaluation can be pertinent to either qualitative evaluations of cognitive skills related to work ethic and habits or quantitative assessment of knowledge on concepts. The goal of most self-assessment and evaluation methods circles around helping students practice independent realization of their own necessities and strengths in learning, and hence increase self-efficacy as well as a feeling of empowerment.

Evaluating work practices in mathematics can be achieved through a variety of ways, including worksheets that ask students to outline how they did certain problems, reflection assignments that encourage students to evaluate their own weaknesses and strengths, and checkboxes to ensure certain practices were done (Montague (2007)). Such metacognitive processes can help students find and understand for themselves where they can improve in a way that doesn't explicitly expose particular weaknesses to their peers or instructors.

In recent years, self-assessment of course material and knowledge recollection is sometimes found in form of online-based classrooms, which reduces the work load of instructors to grade and follow through with each individual's assessments, as well as prevent academic dishonesty. However, the nature of online based learning is that a computer and a reliable internet connection is a luxury that students should not be expected to have, especially when equitable practices are in concern, as mentioned before.

A section below outlines more specifically the kinds of self-assessments that can accurately aid student learning and provide ways the reduce unequal power dynamics. Moreover, the case study found in this paper describes one specific example of self-assessment that seeks to implement a fair way to

provide student autonomy and improve self-efficacy in college mathematics. Once again, the goal of any method should be to increase empowerment of students and reduce inequitable practices, thus it is key to think about the benefits and fallbacks of everything discussed below.

3.2.1 Self-Instruction

Self-instruction looks into empowering students to learn the material on their own, thereby also instilling the belief that they are capable. Naturally, there is some risk associated to self-instruction, and therefore is often paired with supplementary activities or practices that solidify or clarify learning.

Examples of self-instruction cross an entire spectrum of student independence in the classroom, from full-autonomy where students decide what should be covered and how, to partial-autonomy that expects students to learn the material provided by an instructor (Burris and Schroeder (1972)).

Recently, self-instruction in mathematics has taken form via flipped classrooms, in which the learning of material is done outside of the scheduled class time through slides and recorded lectures (Lage et al. (2000)). This type of instruction reserves space and time for students to spend class time on group activities and more in-depth discussions of mathematics beyond the surface level of concepts, but also increases responsibility on the students to learn the material correctly on their own.

3.2.2 Self-Monitoring

Self-monitoring is similar in nature to the other self-regulation forms, but focuses more on providing immediate feedback. In mathematics, a checklist of commonly found errors are provided for students to check intermediate steps while solving problems (L K Dunlap (a)). The checklist is subsequently personalized for each student as mistakes are made, and eventually they were removed as a form of assistance. Results from some studies showed an increase in achievement (L K Dunlap (b)).

There are obvious challenges with this form of self-regulation, as it poses massive workloads realistically impossible for teachers or instructors. Furthermore, such a checklist is often difficult to formulate for mathematics classes above introductory, more computational courses. It is important, still, to see the benefits of introducing students to metacognitive methods such as creating a checklist on their own to aid their learning.

3.3 An example of self-assessment: self-paced assessment.

While all of the various ways self-regulation that takes place in the classroom has benefits, self-assessment of course material has tangible and scalable opportunities that touch upon self-instruction and self-monitoring as well. More specifically, self-paced assessment allows for the students to take control of the pace they are expected to learn the material.

The idea behind self-paced assessment is as simple as its name sounds. All assessments are conducted by the students on their own time and in their own choice of setting. Of the many stressful factors students are exposed to in college, examinations are one of the most prominent sources of stress. Students are expected to cover a hefty chunk of the course material and regurgitate it coherently within a set amount of time. In a traditional setting, all students in the course are asked to have the material digested by the time the exam is given to a level where basic concepts can be extended to applications. There is no chance or way to show that improvements can be made after exams are taken—in other words, a one-time assessment is the determining factor of a student's understanding of the material.

Described in this way, it is rather ridiculous as to how traditional methods of assessment and instruction are considered fair and accurate ways to judge the complex and multidimensional understanding of material students can have. In particular, examinations rarely ask for furthering of knowledge; in mathematics, the demand for using the creative process is simply left out in most exams despite how critical, creative thinking is necessary for mathematical research and exploration.

Self-paced assessment seeks to remedy a solution to some of many issues with traditional methods of teaching. For one, instead of one large assessment that covers weeks to months of material, multiple smaller assessments will ultimately achieve the same goal of checking the state of students' understanding while entirely removing the stressful factor of having to review and cram large amounts of material at once.

Second, students are relieved of the burden of having understood everything on a strict schedule. Individual styles and paces of learning is entirely ignored in the status quo, despite just how vastly spread out these can be (Busato et al. (2000)). The only expectation is that students are to complete the set of assessments by the end of the course. It is expected that the assessments would be handed out on a timely manner when the material

being assessed is covered, but it is not expected that the student would be prepared at that moment to be tested on it. Having the independence to be able to take the assessments at their own pace is essentially how self-regulation takes a role here.

Third, students will have a chance to retake these assessments if they feel as though they were not sufficiently prepared or think that they did not fully comprehend the material upon taking the assessment. Penalizing students who simply made an algebra mistake or could not finish an assignment that covered an important concept are simply unfortunate events that should not be deterministic of a student's achievement in the course. Rather, it should be encouraged for students to self-evaluate and test where they are in the course and use the retake opportunity to their advantage to figure out where they are lacking and where they are strong. This not only removes the unnecessary time spent on reviewing material a student may be already strong on, but also creates efficient study habits that builds metacognition.

Self-paced assessment as described here relies heavily on trust between students and teachers. Often in pop culture students are compared to prisoners, both groups of individuals under complete control, following a rulebook of a system set in stone. Though it sounds extreme, students from a young age are praised for following directions and punished for acting out. Eventually those who "succeed" in school are those students who were most obedient and studied what was given to them, without question. The snowball effect goes the other way as well, in which incriminating or humiliating students for some actions and grades lead to building further negative associations to school, reducing their desire to learn or participate.

Thus, giving students control over their own learning is essentially an action of giving students trust. If a snowball can form in one direction, the other direction is no different. Construction of trust in each other can work to flatten the strict hierarchy that exists today. Particularly for higher level postsecondary institutions, students are impending members of academia and society at a level of maturity that deserves trust, and subsequently, equity in power in the classroom. Trusting that students can be responsible for their own learning leaves greater individual impact that in turn affects how society views education.

As a more explicit example of how self-paced assessment can be implemented is explored in the case study.

Chapter 4

The case study

4.1 Introduction

Enter the US College Education: projector screens, chalkboards, individual desks, and syllabi stating exact dates to assignments and exams. Despite the 200 or so liberal arts colleges in the US, the variety of student experience is almost nonexistent. In any of these colleges, large lecture halls are ready to be filled with hundreds of students for them to watch a single professor or instructor. Whether a thousand-person introductory course or a ten-person advanced class, a student is expected to consume the material and spit it out, correctly. This is not to ridicule the efforts of certain colleges that are trying to actively reform education, but still the vast majority has remained stagnant.

The case study was designed as an attempt to show direct effects of making a small change and adding an element of self regulation in a mathematics course. To do so, self-regulated, self-paced assessments were put in place of midterm and final examinations.

4.2 A (not so) brief note on Mudd

To understand how self-paced assessment fit into the classroom in this case study, it is critical to note the nature of the college in study as well. Harvey Mudd College is a small liberal arts college with about 800 undergraduate students, located an hour from Los Angeles. The College focuses primarily on 6 departments in STEM, where all students are required to complete at least two semesters of coursework in each department, referred to as

the Common Core. Particular traits of this school make the self-paced assessment ideal in achieving desired results in self-regulation.

The Honor Code

Mudd, short for Harvey Mudd College, places great importance on its Honor Code, which is maintained by students for students to be responsible for integrity in actions for all academic and non-academic affairs on campus. The Honor Code is not decided by faculty nor administration but created by the students and respected by all parties of the College. In many ways, it is a bridge to securing trust between one another that allows for more freedom and power for students as an active member of the College community.

As humans, students are not perfect abiders to the Honor Code. Violations are dealt with by students as well, determining consequences and punitive measures under student government. To further reinforce trust that may be lost with such violations, the practice of self-reporting is put in place such that students are able to admit their own fault, instead of being the accused.

This explanation is necessary to understand what ways trust can be placed in students. Of the various privileges that come from securing the Honor Code are take-home assessments, which are, as the name states, regular examinations that are typically handed out for students to take at their own leisure, “at home.” Students are expected to take no more time than given, as well as not refer to any external materials if the exam is closed-book. This is all expected under no other supervision than the student’s own consciousness.

The math department is no exception, either. Take-home exams are a part of nearly all courses, most professors see the value in not letting time or location be a factor in assessments. With the culture at Mudd, students who were asked to take take-home assessments, multiple times, were trusted to do the right thing.

4.3 Method

This study focused on a mandatory introductory linear algebra course, all 24 students being first year students. There were 8 total sections of the course across 4 different instructors, each who taught 2 of these sections. As a method of control, one of the sections from one instructor underwent the study, while the other section from the same instructor remained unchanged.

For ease in distinguishing the two, the changed section will be dubbed the “quiz section” and the unchanged section will be the “control section.”

The 24 students of the quiz section did not have any midterm or final examinations. Instead, students were required to finish a total of 10 small assessments, or quizzes, by the end of the course. All 6 closed-book, closed-notes assessments consisted of one or two questions that pertained to the knowledge of the material, and students were expected to finish each within 15 minutes. All quizzes were self-paced and take-home, meaning students had autonomy over when, where, and how they wished to take these assessments.

Homework assignments remained identical to the other 7 sections, and instruction was similar for the two sections under the same instructor. Students were not given the choice to opt out, other than to switch into a different section. No students in other sections were allowed to switch into the section in study.

Students in both sections were asked to fill out a pre-survey during the first week of the course asking for information like demographics and high school math backgrounds. After the course ended, the students were asked to fill out a second survey and participate in focus groups for qualitative feedback.

Bibliography

Badger, Emily, Claire Cain Miller, Adam Pearce, and Kevin Quealy. 2018. Extensive Data Shows Punishing Reach of Racism for Black Boys. *The New York Times* URL <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/03/19/upshot/race-class-white-and-black-men.html>, <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/03/19/upshot/race-class-white-and-black-men.html>.

Bradley, Kirk. 2017. *Evaluating the effects of mastery learning in postsecondary developmental mathematics*. Ph.D. thesis, ProQuest Information & Learning, US.

Burris, Joanna S., and Lee Schroeder. 1972. Developmental Mathematics: Self-Instruction with Mathematics Laboratory. *The Two-Year College Mathematics Journal* 3(1):16–22. doi:10.2307/3026792. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3026792>.

Busato, Vittorio V, Frans J Prins, Jan J Elshout, and Christiaan Hamaker. 2000. Intellectual ability, learning style, personality, achievement motivation and academic success of psychology students in higher education. *Personality and Individual Differences* 29(6):1057–1068. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00253-6. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886999002536>.

Flores, Alfinio. 2007. Examining Disparities in Mathematics Education: Achievement Gap or Opportunity Gap? *The High School Journal* 91(1):29–42. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40367921>.

Gutierrez, Rochelle. 2012. Embracing Nepantla: Rethinking "Knowledge" and its Use in Mathematics Teaching. *Journal of Research in Mathematics Education* 1(1):29–56. doi:10.4471/redimat.2012.02. URL <http://hipatiapress.com/hpjournals/index.php/redimat/article/view/191>.

L K Dunlap, G Dunlap. ???a. Self-Monitoring: Customized Math Self-Correction Checklists | Intervention Central. URL

<http://www.interventioncentral.org/academic-interventions/math/self-monitoring-customized-math-self-correction-checklists>.

———. ???b. A self-monitoring package for teaching subtraction with regrouping to students with learning disabilities. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1286182/>.

Lage, Maureen J., Glenn J. Platt, and Michael Treglia. 2000. Inverting the Classroom: A Gateway to Creating an Inclusive Learning Environment. *The Journal of Economic Education* 31(1):30–43. doi:10.2307/1183338. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1183338>.

Martin, Kimberly, Molly Goldwasser, and Eugenia Harris. 2017. Developmental Education's Impact on Students's Academic Self-Concept and Self-Efficacy. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice* 18(4):401–414. doi:10.1177/1521025115604850. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025115604850>.

Montague, Marjorie. 2007. Self-Regulation and Mathematics Instruction. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* 22(1):75–83. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5826.2007.00232.x. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2007.00232.x>.

Motlagh, Shahrzad Elahi, Kourosh Amrai, Mohammad Javad Yazdani, Haitham altaib Abderahim, and Hossein Sour. 2011. The relationship between self-efficacy and academic achievement in high school students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15:765–768. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.180. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811003594>.

Musu-Gillette, L. ??? Status and Trends in the Education of Racial and Ethnic Groups 2016 188.

Suzanne Macartney, Alemayehu Bishaw, and Kayla Fontenot. 2013. Poverty Rates for Selected Detailed Race and Hispanic Groups by State and Place: 2007–2011 20.

Thevenin, Melissa K. 2007. *Mentors, role models, and differences in self-efficacy and motivation among construction management students*. Thesis, Colorado State University. Libraries. URL <https://dspace.library.colostate.edu/handle/10217/88608>.

Zeider, Pintrich, and Boekaerts. ????. Self-Regulation: A Characteristic and a Goal of Mathematics Education - Handbook of Self-Regulation - Chapter 21. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780121098902500500>.

Zollinger, Steven. 2017. The Impact of an Online, Mastery, and Project-Based Developmental Math Curriculum on Student Achievement and Attitude. *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies* URL <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/4120>.