e-international journal of educational research
Volume: 2 Issue: 2- Spring-2011 pp: 77-93

EFFECTIVE FACTORS ON SHAPING AND NON-SHAPING OF LEARNING IN MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS

Assist. Prof. Dr. Vali MEHDİNEZHAD
University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Iran
mehdinezhad@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine middle school students' perception about effective factors on shaping and non-shaping of students' learning. The methodology of this study was a quantitative research. The instrument used in this research was Bru et al. (2002) questionnaire in nine components: six dimensions of helpful factors on shaping of learning: teachers' emotional support; teachers' academic support; teachers' monitoring; parental monitoring; parental care; student influence; and three dimensions of effective barriers on shaping of learning: off-task orientation; opposition toward teachers; and bullying of other students. Findings showed that the students marked relatively high scores on effective factors on the shaping of students' learning. However, regarding students' perception, students influence and parental monitoring had more effects on shaping of learning. The measures of median and rank order also showed that these factors had outrank in comparison with the other components. The barriers of shaping of students' learning, respondents marked high score to bullying of other students and opposition toward teachers and over the average to off-task orientation. The results also indicated that there was relatively high positive correlation between effective factors on shaping and non-shaping students' learning

Key words: Effective Factor, Shaping of Learning, Non-Shaping of Learning, Middle School Students

INTRODUCTION

According to Bransford et al. (2000) teaching is complex and demanding work that requires highly specialized skills and knowledge to impact student learning significantly. Furthermore, teaching is a dynamic profession and, as new knowledge about teaching and learning emerges; new types of expertise are required by educators. Teachers must keep abreast of this knowledge base and use it to continually refine their conceptual and pedagogical skills. The field of inquiry that has had most significance for teachers and teaching is that of how students learn. The growing evidence base about student learning forms a compelling case for engaging teachers in highly effective professional learning and has profound implications for what is taught, how it is taught, and how learning is assessed. Doyle (1983:161) believed that learners need specific skills to cope with the complexity of classrooms, and to become competent in conducting learning in such an environment. Doyle has also shown us that in this context pupils and teachers may act to reduce ambiguity and risk, and therefore limit creative academic work. Many, or most, classrooms are associated with a profile of tasks which does not cover the full range listed in the section on 'Teaching-learning processes'.

There are many factors that influence shaping and non-shaping of students' learning. Some factors are helpful on shaping learning such as, teachers' emotional support; teachers' academic support; teachers' monitoring; parental monitoring; parental care; student influence; and there are some barriers on shaping students' learning such as, off-task orientation; opposition toward teachers; and bullying of other students. These factors explain in the following separately.

Teachers' emotional support refers to approval and an explicitly caring manner. This kind of support is likely to foster connection or attachment between teachers and students. Teachers who provide emotional support are also likely to enhance students' own beliefs in themselves to do well at school, thereby improving motivation. Findings from several studies indicate that students who feel emotionally supported by their teachers are more likely to experience enjoyment of learning and motivation for academic success and to display on-task behaviors (Fraser & Fisher, 1982; Merrett & Wheldall, 1987). Teachers' emotional support directly provides students with experiences that foster motivational and learning-related processes important to academic functioning (Crosnoe et al., 2004; Greenberg et al., 2003; Gregory & Weinstein, 2004; Pianta et al., 2002; Rimm-Kaufman et al., (2005); Roeser et al., 2000; Zins et al., 2004). The findings of Malecki and Demaray (2003) showed that teachers' emotional support, which consists of feelings of trust and love, rather than instrumental, informational, and appraisal support, was the most unique and strongest contributor to students' social skills and academic competence. As evidenced by the work on affective qualities of teacher-student relationships, emotionally supportive interactions have the potential to provide strong incentives for students to engage in valued classroom activities. An additional aspect of teachers' emotional support is reflected in their efforts to protect students' physical well-being. Most frequently, issues of student safety are discussed with regard to peer interactions.

Some researcher (e.g., Blankemeyer et al., 2002; Chang, 2003; Crosnoe et al., 2004; Hughes et al., 1999; Isakson & Jarvis, 1999; Murdock et al., 2004; Wentzel, 1994, 1997) believed that perceived emotional support from teachers has been related significantly to students' academic performance and social functioning throughout the school-aged years. According to some researchers (Goodenow, 1993; Ibanez et al., 2004; Midgley et al., 1989; Mitchell-Copeland et al., 1997; Murdock & Miller, 2003; Roeser et al., 1996; Ryan et al., 2005; Valeski & Stipek, 2001; Wentzel, 1997, 1998, 2003) students' perceived support from teachers has been related to mastery and performance goal orientations, academic values, interest, and self-efficacy.

Middle school students' perceptions of teacher emotional support have been related positively to students' perceived academic competence, and values and interest in academics, over and above the influence of perceived parental support (Marchant et al., 2001). In a study of perceived emotional support from teachers, parents, and peers, perceived support from teachers was unique in its relation to students' interest in class and pursuit of goals to adhere to classroom rules and norms; in contrast, perceived support from parents was related to students' motivational orientations toward achievement, and support from peers was related to students' pursuit of goals to be helpful and cooperative (Wentzel, 1998). Others have

identified perceived teacher support as a mediator between adolescents' attachment relationships with their parents and their perceived academic efficacy (Duchesne & Larose, 2007).

Teachers' academic support can be viewed as an affective component of academic involvement and refers to the extent to which parents/teachers provide encouragement, help, and support concerning the child/student's academic behaviors and outcomes for example, helping with homework; supporting them in the choices they make at school; supporting them when they have academic difficulties (Chouinard et al., 2007; Midgley et al., 1989; Patrick et al., 2007). About teachers' academic support among students in sixth through eighth grades, perceived teacher support was consistently the strongest predictor of motivation as measured by intrinsic interest, perceived value and expectancies for success. Wentzel (1998) reported positive associations between teachers' communicated social and academic support and several indicators of positive school values: intrinsic interest, pursuit of prosocial goals (e.g., help others in the class): and pursuit of social responsibility goals (e.g., pays attentions to the teacher's requests).

Researchers sometimes also have investigated perceptions of teachers' academic support; these include beliefs that the teacher cares about students' learning, wants to help them learn, and wants them to do their best. These two types of teacher support are distinct, as indicated by factor analyses (Johnson et al., 1983) and classroom observational studies (Patrick et al., 2001). However, because measures also tend to be correlated highly, they are sometimes summed to form a single measure of teacher support (Wentzel, 1997). Consistent with the other research, combined emotional and academic teacher support is related to student effort for academics (Wentzel, 1997). Thus, we expect that perceived support will facilitate students' willingness to engage cognitively and behaviorally in academic tasks, so that both teacher emotional support and teacher academic support will be related positively to both students' use of self-regulation strategies and their task-related interaction.

Teacher monitoring is viewed as an important instructional behavior that influences student learning. Many effective teaching models with the monitoring component have emerged from a plethora of research studies on effective teaching. These research studies have found that monitoring seatwork and homework assignments positively influence student achievement scores (Goldberg, 1989; Stalling, 1985). As a result of the teacher monitoring findings, many states have developed and implemented instructional models with a monitoring component. To be an effective teacher, all teachers are expected to demonstrate monitoring behaviors. For example, the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM) views monitoring as an element of instruction. Therefore, teachers are expected to allocate some classroom time by walking around to supervise students' on-tasks behaviors and to facilitate their practice learning opportunities.

Parental monitoring is defined as the extent to which parents structure their child's home, school and community environment and track their child's behaviors within those environments (Annunziata et al., 2006). Studies of students' perceptions of their parents have indicated that parental involvement that is, parents devoting time, attention, and resources to their children's learning-related activities contributed to the children's school achievement

and psychological adjustment, but largely only when it was accompanied by autonomy-support (e.g., Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; Ratelle et al., 2005; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2005). High school students participated in a series of studies reported by Niemiec et al. (2006). Results showed that when students perceived their parents as more autonomy supportive, the students were more autonomously motivated for pursuing their learning that is, they had more fully internalized the regulation of learning activities which, in turn, was associated with greater psychological well-being.

Interestingly, research indicates that broader indices of parental support and monitoring show higher correlations with school outcomes than more specific types of behaviors such as helping with homework at home or participating at school. In both of Jeynes' meta-analyses, measures assessing involvement as parents' supportive overall style had the strongest effects on achievement. In second through fifth graders observed interacting with their parents, a supportive style (warmth, clarity of communication, and positivity) was a stronger predictor of achievement than parent involvement at the school (Zellman & Waterman, 1998). These results support the idea that parents' positive and supportive involvement helps children to feel connected and valued, a conclusion that is reinforced by work reviewed later showing that involvement has its effect largely by helping to build motivational resources that children then bring to their school experiences (Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994).

Research has also shown that an authoritative parenting style characterized by parental warmth and consistent parental monitoring provide the optimal environment for school success in adolescents (Annunziata et al., 2006; Attaway & Bry, 2004; Marchant et al., 2001; Spera, 2006). When parental monitoring is high, or even moderate, adolescents are more engaged in school. A supportive home environment can function as a protective factor for at-risk adolescents. Annunziata et al. (2006) also found that a supportive family environment is identified as one of the attributes of resilient children. Educational resilience is defined as students who are engaged in school and perform well despite facing risk conditions associated with inadequate home and school factors (Annunziata et al., 2006). These family variables have predicted student achievement, perceived competence, sense of relatedness to peers, and academic effort (Annunziata et al., 2006). The effects of parental involvement on student achievement can influence adolescents' social, cognitive, and emotional development.

The literature on student influence has been somewhat eclipsed. Recently, however, more attention has been given to how increased student autonomy in the shaping of learning tasks can affect motivation and behavior. Research suggests that students who perceive that the classroom climate allows them a degree of autonomy are more committed and intrinsically motivated than students who regard the climate as more controlling (Boggiano et al., 1992; Firestone & Rosenblum, 1988; Grolnick & Ryan, 1987).

This study also focuses on three different types of student misbehavior. These types are: off-task orientation, opposition toward teachers and bullying. Bru et al. (2002) found that students' perception of class management (i.e., teacher support, teacher monitoring) accounted for more variance in off-task orientation (i.e., not concentrating on school tasks)

and opposition toward teachers (i.e., quarrel with teacher) than for bullying. A possible explanation for this finding is that off-task and oppositional behavior is triggered by goal frustration (i.e., their need for academic support is thwarted). Bullying would not be a logic response to that frustration, because this behavior seems unrelated to the cause of their goal frustration at that moment. Bullying behavior might be used by students to protect their sense of self-esteem or popularity, or a reaction on experienced frustration with respect to their social goals. To be able to distinguish these different processes, instruments are needed that can assess specific behaviors, personal and school goals, and specific context perceptions.

According to Shapiro (2004) off-task behaviors included talking about anything other than the assigned reading, leaving the seat for non relevant reasons, aimless movement of the reading passages, gazing away from the reading passages, reading something other than the assigned passages, and focusing attention to the activities of others. Research indicates that student off-task behavior is lower when a teacher is in close proximity (Van Der Mars & Cusimano, 1988). However, Ryan and Yerg (2001) found that when physical education teachers were not able to use teacher proximity, the use of distal feedback or ‘‘cross group feedback’’ was shown to reduce student off-task behavior. Distal or cross group feedback is defined as teacher feedback given to students furthest away from the teacher.

Jimerson et al. (2010:641) defined bullying as a negative action when somebody hits, pushes, pinches or restrains another by physical contact. Bullying can also be carried out by words (verbally): by threatening, taunting, teasing and calling names. Indirect bullying is defined as making dirty gestures, intentionally excluding someone from a group or spreading false rumors. The reasons for the bullying of other students have been examined, and while 40% of students surveyed have indicated that “people who are picked on rarely or never deserve it”, (Glover, 2000) there are several reasons students feel justified as bullies. Students often feel pushed into bullying by their peers who bully, because the disapproval of the social group could lead to being bullied in the future. The majority of bullies surveyed in the Keele University study in 2002 indicated that students who work hard in school are targeted more than any other group in the early secondary years. Because the bully often does not value academic success or is not capable of the same success as the victim, the bully chooses to harass the victim when the victim is successful at school. Because the bully does not value education, or does not value cultural difference, the bully exerts authority to show that she is superior over the person she is teasing (Boulton, 2002).

This study focuses on six dimensions of helpful factors on shaping learning (teachers’ emotional support; teachers’ academic support, teachers’ monitoring, parental monitoring, parental care, and student influence) and three dimensions of effective barriers on shaping learning (off-task orientation, opposition toward teachers, and bullying of other students). In fact this research tries to clear the rate of positive/negative influence of these factors and also to analysis the relationship between these factors.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this study was that of a quantitative research. The population of this study was all middle schools students in 6th to 8th grades in Zahedan, Iran. Out of 29935 students (16735 boys and 13200 girls) Using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample size table, 380 students (212 boys and 168 girls were selected as two sample groups and were introduced to the questionnaire used in this study. (Table 1)

Table 1. Population and Sample

Variables			Population	Sample
Middle Schools Students	Gender	Boy	16735	212
		Girl	13200	168
	Grade	6	11186	142
		7	9926	126
		8	8823	112
Total			**29935**	**380**

The instrument of this research was the Bru et al. (2002) questionnaire. This questionnaire has 38 items *by a five point Likert*-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly *agree* in nine components: six dimensions of helpful factors on shaping of learning: teachers' emotional support; teachers' academic support; teachers' monitoring; parental monitoring; parental care; student influence; and three dimensions of barriers on shaping of learning: off-task orientation; opposition toward teachers; and bullying of other students. First, the instrument translated to Persian, and then by using test-retest (after three weeks): internal consistency reliability of the questionnaire was calculated by Cronbach's alphas. Table 2 reports summary measures of test-retest to construct validity and reliability for each of the nine components. SPSS 15 was used to produce mean; standard deviations; Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r); exploratory factor analysis; confirmatory factor analysis and multi-level modeling; KMO value and the Bartlett's test; T-test; Bonferroni Post Hoc test; and Analysis of Variance.

Table 2. Summary measures of reliability

Variables	N. of Items	α (test)	α (retest)
teachers' emotional support	6	.82	.79
teachers' academic support	4	.69	.66
teachers' monitoring	5	.73	.70
parental monitoring	6	.79	.77
parental care	4	.65	.64
student influence	2	.68	.65
off-task orientation	4	.65	.63
opposition toward teachers	3	.84	.80
bullying of other students	4	.65	.62
Total	**38**	**.81**	**.79**

RESULTS

The instrument of this research included items intended to tap the effective factors on shaping and non-shaping of students' learning. The figures at table 3 show that the students marked relatively high scores on effective factors on the shaping of students' learning. However, students perception, students influence (M=7.53, SD=2.07) and parental monitoring (M=24.41, SD=4.21) were most effective on shaping of learning in comparison with other factors. The compute of median and rank order also showed that these factors outranked other components. About the barriers of shaping of students' learning, respondents marked high score to bullying other students (M=15.08, SD=2.66) and opposition toward teachers (M=9.83, SD=2.21) and over the average to off-task orientation (M=11.72, SD=2.45).

Table 3. Rate of influence of following factors on shaping of learning (N=380)

	Variables	N. item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Effect on shaping learning	teachers' emotional support	6	18.6263	5.74501
	teachers' academic support	4	12.9789	3.08876
	teachers' monitoring	5	15.6579	4.00578
	parental monitoring	6	24.4105	4.20954
	parental care	4	11.1789	2.91291
	student influence	2	7.5316	2.06914
Effect on non-shaping learning	off-task orientation	4	11.7263	2.44601
	opposition toward teachers	3	9.8263	2.21207
	bullying of other students	4	15.0838	2.66079

The selected statistical tools were Pearson Product Moment Correlations, exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis and multi-level modeling. KMO value was .852, and the Bartlett's test is significant (p<.000), therefore factor analysis was appropriate. Table 4 shows factor loading, Eigenvalues, variance and correlation between factors. In fact, there was relatively high positive correlation between factors. The highest correlation is related to teachers' emotional support with teachers' monitoring (r=.608); student influence (r=.537); and teachers' academic support (r=.518). There was also high positive correlation between other factors. Total variance for the factors was 57.3%.

Table 4. Factor Loadings, Eigenvalues, Variance Explained, and Correlation between the Effective Factors on the Shaping of Learning (N=380)

	F.1	F.2	F.3	F.4	F.5	F.6
Teachers' emotional support						
I feel the teachers care about me	.688					
I feel the teachers believe in me	.674					
The teachers will help me if I have problems	.651					
The teachers are like my good friends	.639					
The teachers know what interests I have	.503					
The teachers often praise me	.472					
Teachers' academic support						
Teachers provide good support during school work		.683				
When we work on our own, teachers explain well		.629				
The teachers are good at instructing the whole class		.625				
When we do group work, teacher explain well		.617				
Teachers' monitoring						
When students are disruptive, the teachers are able to handle this			.645			
The teachers check to see that we do our homework properly			.644			
The teachers make sure we do our best in class			.586			
The teachers make sure we behave well in class			.569			
The teachers make sure we behave well during recess			.523			
parental monitoring						
My parents know my friends				.711		
My parents know where I am and what I do on weekdays				.697		
My parents know where I am and what I do on weekends				.648		
My parents think it is important to know where I am and what I do				.620		
My parents know fairly well those with whom I usually go around				.505		
My parents like my friends				.446		
parental care						
Did not seem to understand what I needed or wanted					.709	
Appeared to understand my problems and worries					.707	
Did not help me as much as I needed					.682	
Did not talk with me very much					.506	
Student influence						
I participate in decisions regarding choice of my learning tasks						.595
I participate in decisions regarding working methods I shall use						.595
Eigenvalues	7.85	2.28	1.59	1.44	1.19	1.10
Variance explained Total: 57.3% (%)	29.1%	8.4%	5.9%	5.3%	4.4%	4.%
Correlation	TMS	TAS	TM	PM	PC	SI
teachers' emotional support						
teachers' academic support	.518(**)					
teachers' monitoring	.608(**)	.492(**)				
parental monitoring	.412(**)	.333(**)	.378(**)			
parental care	.279(**)	.112(*)	.384(**)	.232(**)		
student influence	.537(**)	.478(**)	.470(**)	.407(**)	.352(**)	

**P < .01 *P < .05

About effective factors on the non-shaping of learning used same method, KMO value was .872, and the Bartlett's test is significant (p<.000), therefore factor analysis was appropriate. Table 5 shows factor loading, Eigenvalues, variance and correlation between factors. Analysis of data about correlation between effective factors on the non-shaping of learning showed that, there was relatively high positive correlation between bullying of other students with off-task orientation (r=.308); and opposition toward teachers with off-task orientation (r=.292). There was no significance correlation between bullying of other students factor and opposition toward teachers. Total variance for the factors was 67.7%.

Table 5. Factor Loadings, Eigenvalues, Variance Explained, and Correlation between the Effective Factors on the Non-Shaping of Learning (N=380)

	F.1	F.2	F.3
off-task orientation			
When we do projects, I concentrate on the task	.683		
When we do group work, I concentrate on the task	.662		
When teachers instruct the whole class, I pay attention	.580		
When we work individually, I concentrate on the task	.538		
opposition toward teachers			
Sent out of class due to disruptive behavior		.789	
Swearing at teachers		.746	
Serious quarrelling with teachers		.522	
bullying of other students			
Bullying other students at school			.672
Serious teasing of other students			.641
Ostracizing other students			.563
Hitting, kicking or pushing other students			.529
The teachers make sure we behave well during recess			
Eigenvalues	4.44	1.59	.74
Variance explained	44.4%	15.9%	7.4
Total: 67.7%			
Correlation	OTO	OTT	BOS
off-task orientation			
opposition toward teachers	.292(**)		
bullying of other students	.308(**)	.071	

**P < .01 P > .05

In order to compare boy and girl students' beliefs about effective factors on shaping of learning, independent samples t-tests were performed. These analyses revealed a significant difference between the two groups in some effective factors on shaping of learning. There was significant difference in scores for boys (M=19.56, SD=5.81) and girls [M=17.45, SD=5.45; t(378)=3.60, P < .001] in the factor of teachers' emotional support; significant difference in scores for boys (M=23.56, SD=4.51) and girls [M=25.48, SD=3.53; t(378)=-4.50, P < .001] in parental monitoring factor; and there was also significant difference in scores for boys (M=10.86, SD=2.95) and girls [M=11.58, SD=2.82; t(378)=-2.425, P < .05] in parental care factor. There was no significant difference between the two groups in other factors (Table 6). In other word, the boy students described the factor of teachers' emotional

support more effective on their shaping of learning than girl students and the girls marked high score to parental monitoring and care factors.

Table 6. The comparison of boy and girl students' perception about effective factors on the shaping of learning (N=380)

Variables	Sex	N	Mean	Std. D.	t	df
teachers' emotional support	boy	212	19.5566	5.81399	3.602 (**)	378
	girl	168	17.4524	5.45071		
teachers' academic support	boy	212	12.8113	2.85880	-1.189	378
	girl	168	13.1905	3.35335		
teachers' monitoring	boy	212	15.9811	4.09596	1.772	378
	girl	168	15.2500	3.86253		
parental monitoring	boy	212	23.5660	4.51017	-4.503(**)	378
	girl	168	25.4762	3.53079		
parental care	boy	212	10.8585	2.95444	-2.425(*)	378
	girl	168	11.5833	2.81658		
student influence	boy	212	7.5094	2.14297	-.234	378
	girl	168	7.5595	1.97803		

P > .05 *P < .05 **P < .001

In order to compare boy and girl students' perception about effective factors on non-shaping of learning, independent samples t-tests were performed. These analyses revealed a significant difference between the two groups in some effective factors on non-shaping of learning. There was significant difference in scores for boys (M=9.32, SD=2.15) and girls [M=10.07, SD=2.17; t(378)=-1.930, P < .05] in factor of opposition toward teachers; and significant difference in scores for boys (M=15.44, SD=2.47) and girls [M=14.67, SD=2.82; t(378)=2.729, P < .01] in opposition toward teachers factor. There was no significant difference between the two groups in off-task orientation factor (Table 7). In fact the boys have given high score to opposition toward teachers and the girls marked high score to bullying other students.

Table 7. The comparison of boy and girl students' perception about effective factors on the non-shaping of learning (N=380)

Variables	Sex	N	Mean	Std. D.	t	df
off-task orientation	boy	212	11.6509	2.39685	-.674	378
	girl	168	11.8214	2.51063		
opposition toward teachers	boy	212	9.6321	2.14774	-1.930(*)	378
	girl	168	10.0714	2.27344		
bullying of other students	boy	192	15.4375	2.46998	2.729(**)	378
	girl	166	14.6747	2.81816		

P > .05 *P < .05 **P < .01

The comparison of students' perception about effective factors on shaping of learning by grade with use of Analysis of Variance showed that there was a significant difference between the groups. The six grade students described factors of teachers' emotional support,

teachers' monitoring, parental monitoring, parental care, and student influence on shaping of learning more effective than students in grades seven and eight. Bonferroni Post Hoc test certified the mean score differences between six grade students with the students in grades of seven and eight (Table 8).

Table 8. The comparison of students' perception about effective factors on the shaping of learning by grade (N=380)

Variables		Sum Sq.	df	Mean Sq.	F	Grade	Mean	Std. D.
teachers'	B. G.	853.693	2	426.847	13.807(**)	Six G.	20.535	5.052
emotional support	W. G.	11655.2	377	30.916		Seven G.	17.166	5.630
	T.	12508.9	379			Eight G.	17.848	6.071
teachers'	B. G.	44.608	2	22.304	2.355	Six G.	13.281	2.952
academic	W. G.	3571.22	377	9.473		Seven G.	12.500	3.179
support	T.	3615.83	379			Eight G.	13.133	3.117
teachers'	B. G.	276.111	2	138.056	8.965(**)	Six G.	16.676	3.876
monitoring	W. G.	5805.41	377	15.399		Seven G.	14.658	3.487
	T.	6081.52	379			Eight G.	15.491	4.417
parental	B. G.	276.544	2	138.272	8.095(**)	Six G.	25.507	3.552
monitoring	W. G.	6439.41	377	17.081		Seven G.	23.634	4.744
	T.	6715.95	379			Eight G.	23.892	4.078
parental care	B. G.	140.857	2	70.429	8.635(**)	Six G.	11.929	3.028
	W. G.	3074.97	377	8.156		Seven G.	10.952	2.465
	T.	3215.83	379			Eight G.	10.482	3.034
student influence	B. G.	127.898	2	63.949	16.129(**)	Six G.	8.281	1.719
	W. G.	1494.72	377	3.965		Seven G.	7.119	2.141
	T.	1622.62	379			Eight G.	7.044	2.132

P > .05 **P < .001

In table 9, the compute of Analysis of Variance on students' perception about effective factors on non-shaping of learning by grade showed that there was significant difference between groups in factor of opposition toward teachers and the six grade students marked high score to this factor on non-shaping of learning in comparison with other grads. Bonferroni Post Hoc test certified this difference. In the other factors there was no significant difference between groups.

Table 9. The comparison of students' perception about effective factors on the non-shaping of learning by grade (N=380)

Variables		Sum Sq.	df	Mean Sq.	F	Grade	Mean	Std. D.
off-task	B. G.	6.838	2	3.419	.570	Six G.	11.746	1.933
orientation	W. G.	2260.69	377	5.997		Seven G.	11.555	2.587
	T.	2267.53	379			Eight G.	11.892	2.842
opposition	B. G.	60.283	2	30.141	6.333(**)	Six G.	10.309	1.795
toward teachers	W. G.	1794.25	377	4.759		Seven G.	9.373	2.065
	T.	1854.53	379			Eight G.	9.723	2.697
bullying of other	B. G.	21.532	2	10.766	1.525	Six G.	14.876	2.681
students	W. G.	2505.95	355	7.059		Seven G.	14.991	2.808
	T.	2527.48	357			Eight G.	15.457	2.445

P > .05 **P < .00

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study set out to explore the middle school students' perception about effective factors on shaping and non-shaping of learning. Today education plays a critical role in personal development of children. Research studies indicate that teachers, parents and students themselves can exert optimal influence on learning process, leading to higher test scores, overall better performance and academic success at school. In other words, to promote effective learning in children, several factors come into play e.g. teachers and parent's beliefs, attitude and perceptions on education can positively affect their child's learning abilities.

In the first step, analysis of data showed that the students marked relatively high scores on effective factors on shaping of students' learning. However, factors of students' perception, students influence and parental monitoring were most effective on shaping of learning. The compute of median and rank order also showed that these factors outranked other components. The barriers of shaping of students' learning, respondents marked high score to bullying other students and opposition toward teachers and over the average to off-task orientation.

The results also indicated there was relatively high positive correlation between effective factors on shaping and non-shaping of learning (tables 4 and 5). However, there was significant difference in scores for boys and girls in factor of teachers' emotional support; significant difference in scores for boys and girls in parental monitoring factor; significant difference in scores for boys in parental care factor; and also there was significant difference in scores for boys and girls in factor of opposition toward teachers; and significant difference in scores for boys and girls in the factor of opposition toward teachers (tables 6 and 7). These differences observed in some factors in comparison of students' perception by education grade. In fact, the six grade students described factors of teachers' emotional support, teachers' monitoring, parental monitoring, parental care, and student influence on shaping of learning more effective than students in grades of seven and eight (table 8): and about effective factors on non-shaping of learning by grade results showed the six grade students marked high score to this factor on non-shaping of learning in comparison with other grads (Table 9).

The results of this study have supported by results of previous studies such, in dimension of teachers' emotional support (Crosnoe et al., 2004; Greenberg et al., 2003; Gregory & Weinstein, 2004; Pianta et al., 2002; Rimm-Kaufman et al., in press; Roeser et al.., 2000; Zins et al., 2004; Bru et al, 2002; Malecki and Demaray, 2003; Murdock et al., 2004; Ibanez et al., 2004; Ryan et al., 2005; Marchant et al., 2001; Duchesne & Larose, 2007); teachers' academic support (Chouinard et al., 2007; Midgley et al., 1989; Patrick et al., 2007; Wentzel, 1998; Cheryl, 2009; Plunkett et al., 2008); teacher monitoring (Cotton, 1988; Goldberg, 1989; Stalling, 1985); parental monitoring and care (Ratelle et al., 2005; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2005; Niemiec et al., 2006; Annunziata et al., 2006; Attaway & Bry, 2004; Marchant et al., 2001; Spera, 2006); student influence(Boggiano et al., 1992; Firestone & Rosenblum, 1988; Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Bru et al., 2002); Off-task behaviors (Shapiro, 2004; Ryan and Yerg, 2001); bullying of other students (Jimerson et al., 2010; Glover, 2000; Boulton, 2002); and opposition toward teachers (Bru et al., 2002).

Results can suggest that teachers need to reach a sufficient level of pedagogical knowledge to do appropriate educational and management activities in their classrooms. These skills can have a strong and positive impact on students. Continuous communication between teachers and parents is recommended strongly. The findings suggest that tailoring management strategies to individual students and avoiding individual favoritism might provide the best opportunity to improve student behavior. However, it needs further research in future. Previous research might suggest that teacher behavior has a greater impact on behavior and learning of younger students (Pianta, 1999). Moreover, research with other methods of data collection is needed to validate findings from the present study, which is based on self-report. More experimental or longitudinal-design studies with sufficient variances in class management are required to identify causal effects and directions. Finally, future studies should address how students' perceptions of effective factors on shaping and non-shaping of learning might interact with individual student characteristics and what would be teachers, parents and students' responsibility to reinforce positive effective factors and remove negative factors in students' learning.

References

Annunziata, D., Hogue, A., Faw, L., & Liddle, H.A. (2006). Family functioning and school success in at-risk, inner-city adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *35(1)*: 105- 113.

Attaway, N. M. & Bry, B. H. (2004). Parenting style and Black adolescents' achievement. *Journal of Black Psychology, 30(2):* 229-247.

Blankemeyer, M., Flannery, D. J., & Vazsonyi, A. T. (2002). The role of aggression and social competence in children's perceptions of the child-teacher relationship. *Psychology in the Schools, 39(3):* 293–304.

Boggiano, A. K., Shields, A., Barrett, M., Kellam, T., Thompson, E., Simons, J., & Katz, P. (1992). Helplessness deficits in students: the role of motivational orientation. *Motivation and Emotion 16(3):* 271–296.

Boulton, M., Trueman, M., & Flemington, I. (2002). Associations between Secondary School Pupils. Definitions of Bullying, Attitudes Towards Bullying, and Tendencies to Engage in Bullying: Age and Sex Differences. *Educational Studies*, *28*(4): 353-370

Bransford, JD, Brown, AL & Cocking, R. (2000). How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School, Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning, National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington DC.

Bru, E., Stephens, P., and Torsheim, T. (2002). Students' Perceptions of Class Management and Reports of Their Own Misbehavior. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40(4): 287–307.

Chang, L. (2003). Variable effects of children's aggression, social withdrawal, and prosocial leadership as functions of teacher beliefs and behaviors. *Child Development, 74(2):* 535–548.

Cheryl, T. Jeffries (2009.) Academic Support and Academic Identity of African American Males Labeled Emotionally Handicapped (EH):http://www.docstoc.com/docs/15407462/Academic-Support-and-Academic-Identity-of-African-American-Males

Chouinard, R., Karsenti, T., & Roy, N. (2007). Relations among competence beliefs, utility value, achievement goals, and effort in mathematics. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77(3):* 501-517.

Cotton, K. (1988). Monitoring Student Learning in the Classroom, School Improvement Research Series, http://educationnorthwest.org/webfm_send/541

Crosnoe, R., Johnson, M. K., & Elder, G. H. (2004). Intergenerational bonding in school: The behavioral and contextual correlates of student – teacher relationships. *Sociology of Education, 77(1):* 60 – 81.

Doyle, W. (1983). 'Academic work', *Review of Educational Research, 53(2):* 159–199

Duchesne, S., & Larose, S. (2007). Adolescent parental attachment and academic motivation and performance in early adolescence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37(7):* 1501–1521.

Firestone, W., & Rosenblum, S. (1988). The alienation and commitment of students and teachers in urban high schools. Washington, DC: Rutgers University and Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (1982). Predicting students' outcomes from their perceptions of classroom psychosocial environment. *American Educational Research Journal 19(4):* 498–518.

Glover, D., Gough, G., Johnson, M., and Cartwright, N. (2000). Bullying in 25 Secondary Schools: Incidence, Impact, and Intervention. *Educational Research*, *42*(2): 141-156.

Goldberg, L. (1989). *Implementing cooperative learning within six elementary school learning disability classrooms to improve math achievement and social skills.* Practicum, Nova University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262915)

Goodenow, C. (1993). The psychological sense of school membership among adolescents–Scale development and educational correlates. *Psychology in the Schools, 30(1):* 79–90.

Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'Brien, M. U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., et al. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. American Psychologist. Special Issue: *Prevention that Works for Children and Youth, 58(6/7):* 466 – 474.

Gregory, A., & Weinstein, R. S. (2004). Connection and regulation at home and in school: Predicting growth in achievement for adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19(4):* 405 – 427.

Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Parent styles associated with children's self-regulation and competence in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81(2):* 143–154.

Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in children's learning: an experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 52(5):* 890–898.

Grolnick, W. S., & Slowiaczek, M. (1994). Parents' involvement in their children's schooling: A multidimensional conceptualization and motivational model. *Child Development, 65(1):* 237–252.

Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Jackson, T. (1999). Influence of the teacher-student relationship on childhood conduct problems: A prospective study**.** *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 28(2):* 173–184.

Ibanez, G. E., Kuperminc, G. P., Jurkovic, G., & Perilla, J. (2004). Cultural attributes and adaptations linked to achievement motivation among Latino adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 33(6):* 559–568.

Jimerson et al., 2010 In: S.R. Jimerson, S.M. Swearer and D.L. Espelage, Editors, *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective*, Rutledge, New York (2010).

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Anderson, D. (1983). Social interdependence and classroom climate. *Journal of Psychology(1): 114,* 135–142.

Malecki C.K. and M.K. Demaray. (2003). what type of support do they need? Investigating student adjustment as related to emotional, informational, appraisal, and instrumental support, *School Psychology Quarterly*, 18(3): 231–252.

Marchant, G. J., Paulson, S. E., & Rothlisberg, B. A. (2001). Relations of middle school students' perceptions of family and school contexts with academic achievement**.** *Psychology in the Schools, 38(6):* 505–519.

Merrett, F., & Wheldall,K. (1987). Natural rates of teacher approval and disapproval in British primary and middle school classrooms. *British Journal of Educational Psychology 57(1):* 95–103.

Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Eccles, J. (1989). Student/teacher relations and attitudes toward mathematics before and after the transition to junior high school. *Child Development, 60(4):* 981–992.

Mitchell-Copeland, J., Denham, S. A., & DeMulder, E. K. (1997). Q-sort assessment of child-teacher attachment relationships and social competence in the preschool. *Early Education and Development, 8(1):* 27–39.

Murdock, T. B., & Miller, A. (2003). Teachers as sources of middle school students' motivational identity: Variable-centered and person-centered analytic approaches. *Elementary School Journal, 103(4):* 383–399.

Murdock, T. B., Miller, A., & Kohlhardt, J. (2004). Effects of classroom context variables on high school students' judgments of the acceptability and likelihood of cheating. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96(4):* 765–777.

Niemiec, C. P., Lynch, M. F., Vansteenkiste, M., Bernstein, J., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2006). The antecedents and consequences of autonomous self-regulation for college: A self-determination theory perspective on socialization. *Journal of Adolescence, 29(5):* 761–775.

Patrick H., Ryan, A. M., & Kaplan, A. (2007). Early adolescents' perceptions of the classroom social environment, motivational beliefs, and engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99(1):* 83–98.

Patrick, H., Anderman, L. H., Ryan, A. M., Edelin, K., & Midgley, C. (2001). Teachers' communication of goal orientations in four fifth-grade classrooms. *Elementary School Journal, 102(1):* 35–58.

Pianta, R. C. (1999). Enhancing relationships between children and teachers. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Plunkett, Scott W.; Henry, Carolyn S.; Houltberg, Benjamin J.; Sands, Tovah; Abarca-Mortensen, Sandra. (2008). Academic Support by Significant Others and Educational Resilience in Mexican-Origin Ninth Grade Students from Intact Families. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 28(3): p333-355

Ratelle, C. F., Larose, S., Guay, F., & Senecal, C. (2005). Perceptions of Parental Involvement and Support as Predictors of College Students' Persistence in a Science Curriculum. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19(2):* 286–293.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., LaParo, K. M., Downer, J. T., & Pianta, R. C. (2005). The contribution of classroom setting and quality of instruction to children's behavior in the kindergarten classroom. *Elementary School Journal, 105(5):* 377 – 394.

Roeser, R. W., Eccles, J. S., & Sameroff, A. J. (2000). School as a context of early adolescents' academic and social emotional development: A summary of research findings. *Elementary School Journal, 100(5):* 443 – 471.

Roeser, R. W., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. C. (1996). Perceptions of the school psychological environment and early adolescents' psychological and behavioral functioning in school: The mediating role of goals and belonging. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88(3):* 408–422.

Ryan, A.M., Patrick, H., & Shim, S.O. (2005). Differential profiles of students identified by their teacher as having avoidant, appropriate or dependent help-seeking tendencies in math class. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97(2):* 275-285.

Ryan, S., & Yerg, B. (2001). The effects of cross group feedback on off-task behavior in a physical education setting. *Journal of Teaching Physical Education, 20(2):* 172–188.

Sanchez, B., Colon, Y., & Esparza, P. (2005). The role of sense of school belonging and gender in the academic adjustment of Latino adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 34(6):* 619–628.

Shapiro, E. S. (2004). Academic skills problems: Direct assessment and intervention (3rd. Ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2005). Antecedents and outcomes of self-determination in three life domains: The role of parents' and teachers' autonomy support. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 34(6):* 589–604.

Spera, C. (2006). Adolescents' perceptions of parental goals, practices, and styles in relation to their motivation and achievement. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 26(4):* 456-490.

Stallings, J. (1985). *How effective is an analytic approach to staff development on teacher and student behavior?* George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 267019)

Valeski, T. N ., & Stipek, D. J. (2001). Young children's feelings about school. *Child Development, 72(4):* 1198–1213.

Van Der Mars, H., & Cusimano, B. (1988, May). *The effects of differential proximity on student off-task behavior in physical education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Behavior Analysis, Philadelphia.

Zellman, G. L., & Waterman, J. M. (1998). Understanding the impact of parent school involvement on children's educational outcomes. *The Journal of Educational Research, 91(3):* 370–381.

Zins, J. E., Bloodworth, M. R., Weissberg, R. P., & Walberg, H. (2004). The scientific base linking social and emotional learning to school success. In J. E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg, M. C. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.): Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say? New York: Teachers College Press.

e-international journal of educational research
Volume: 2 Issue: 2- Spring-2011 pp: 77-93

ORTAOKUL ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN ÖĞRENMELERİNİN ŞEKİLLENDİRİLMESİNDE VE ŞEKİLLENDİRİLMEMESİNDE ETKİLİ OLAN FAKTÖRLER

Assist. Prof. Dr. Vali MEHDİNEZHAD
University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Iran
mehdinezhad@gmail.com

Genişletilmiş Özet

Problem (amaç): Bu çalışmanın amacı ortaokul öğrencilerinin öğrenmeyi şekillendirmelerinde ve şekillendirmemelerinde etkili olan faktörlerle ilgili algılarını araştırmaktır. Daha önce yapılmış araştırmaların sonuçları, çocukların öğrenmesi üzerinde çeşitli faktörler etkili olduğunu göstermektedir. Örneğin öğretmenlerin ve ebeveynlerin eğitimle ilgili inançları, tutumları ve algıları çocuklarının öğrenme yeteneklerini olumlu yönde etkileyebilmektedir.

Yöntem: Bu çalışmada nicel araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın evrenini İran'ın Zahedan şehrindeki ortaokullarda öğrenim gören 6, 7 ve 8. sınıf öğrencileri oluşturmaktadır. Toplam 29935 öğrencinin 16735'i erkek ve 13200'ü kızdır. Krejcie ve Morgan'ın (1970) örneklem büyüklüğü tablosu kullanılarak 380 öğrenci örnekleme seçilmiştir (212 erkek ve 168 kız öğrenci 2 örneklem grubu olarak seçilmiştir). Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak Bru ve ark. (2002) tarafından geliştirilen anket formu kullanılmıştır. Ankette yer alan 38 madde (1) "Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum" dan (5) "Kesinlikle Katılıyorum" a kadar beş aşamalı Likert tipi ölçekle değerlendirilmiştir. Ankette yer alan maddeler, 6 boyutu öğrenmeyi şekillendirmede yardımcı faktörler (öğretmenlerin duygusal desteği, öğretmenlerin akademik desteği, öğretmenlerin gözetimi, ebeveyn gözetimi, ebeveyn ilgisi, öğrenci etkisi) ve 3 boyutu öğrenmeyi şekillendirmede engel olan faktörler (konu dışına yönelme, öğretmenlere karşı muhalefet, diğer öğrencilerin uyguladığı şiddet) olmak üzere 9 bileşenden oluşmaktadır.

Bulgular: Bulgular öğrencilerin öğrenmenin şekillendirilmesinde etkili olan faktörlere diğerlerine göre daha yüksek değerleri işaretlediklerini göstermiştir. Bununla birlikte öğrencilerin algılaması, öğrenci etkisi ve ebeveyn gözetiminin öğrenmenin şekillendirilmesi üzerinde daha fazla etkiye sahip olduğu görülmüştür. Ayrıca medyan ve sıralama ölçüm sonuçları bu faktörlerin diğer bileşenlere göre daha önemli olduğunu göstermiştir. Öğrencilerin öğrenmelerini şekillendirmede engel olan faktörlerden diğer öğrencilerin uyguladığı şiddet ve öğretmenlere karşı muhalefete yüksek değerler verdikleri, konu dışına yönelmeye de ortalamanın üzerinde değerler verdikleri tespit edilmiştir. Sonuçlar ayrıca öğrenmenin şekillendirilmesinde ve şekillendirilmemesinde etkili olan faktörler arasında göreceli olarak yüksek pozitif korelasyon olduğunu göstermektedir.

e-uluslararası eğitim araştırmaları dergisi
Cilt: 2 Sayı: 2- İlkbahar 2011 ss. 77-92

Öneriler: Öğretmenlerin sınıflarında gerekli eğitim ve yönetim faaliyetlerini yerine getirebilmeleri için yeterli seviyede pedagojik bilgiye sahip olmaları gerekmektedir. Bu becerilerin öğrenciler üzerinde olumlu etkisinin olacağı düşünülmektedir. Öğretmenler ve ebeveynler arasında sürekli bir iletişimin olması kuvvetle önerilir. Her bir öğrenciye uygun yönetim stratejileri geliştirmek ve öğrenciler arasında ayrımcılıktan kaçınmak öğrenci davranışlarını geliştirmede yardımcı olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Etkili Faktör, Öğrenmenin Şekillendirilmesi, Öğrenmenin Şekillendirilmemesi, Orta Okul Öğrencileri