The effects of learning behaviors in classroom goal orientation and control ideology: Using structural equation modeling
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Abstract - A structural equation modeling were used to explore the effect of teacher’s own learning behavior and teaching practices.300 in service teachers respond to a self-regulated learning questionnaire(Boufard,1995) as teacher’s learning behavior, their teaching practices as indicated in goal orientation questionnaire(Baton et al 1996), and The teacher’s approach toward control ideology as shown in PIC (Hoy,2000) . Findings demonstrated that teachers own self-regulated learning behavior influence goal orientation in a way that teachers take mastery goal orientation to teaching environment, which in turn leads to democratic control ideology.
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1 Introduction
One of the most popular theories of work motivation and task performance over the past three decades is goal-setting theory, proposed by Locke and Latham (1990). The main point of this theory is that, goals are important and immediate regulator of human behavior, guiding the direction, intensity and persistence of task related behavior. Goals are emphasized as essential aspects of the motivational quality of activities, namely through the role they play in the regulation of actions (Lemos, 1999).
Goal orientation refers to a set of behavioral intentions that determine one’s approach to engaging in learning activities (Ames, 1992). Research on achievement of goal orientation has proposed three types of achievement goal constructs to explain differences in students’ achievement behaviors. The first two sets of goals can be differentiated in terms of whether learning is perceived and valued as an end in itself or as a means to a goal external to the task (e.g. gaining social approval, demonstrating superiority, etc.). On the basis of this distinction, students may engage in tasks either for trying to outperform their peers or to impress theirs teachers (i.e., performance goals), or for developing competence by learning as much as they can about a subject; i.e., mastery goals. The third type of goal orientation is the work-avoidant goal (Meece, 1991). Unlike mastery and performance oriented goals, which represent different forms of approach motivation, the work avoidant goal is characterized by a form of avoidance motivation. Here, the main question one can raise is: What causes to pursue these different goals?
Previous studies suggested that students’ achievement goal orientations are related to their beliefs about the causes of success. (Meece, 1991). Children with learning mastery goals hold the belief that effort, interest and attempts to understand determine success, depends on impressing the teacher and performing better than others. In recent years, researchers of learning and motivation have become interested in students’ self- regulation of their academic learning and performance. Self- regulated learning has been defined diversely on the basis of different theoretical frameworks. Learning focused and performance goals are two main goal orientation described in achievement contexts. Learning focused goal is orientation is similar to intrinsic motivation under a learning goal, individuals strive to improve their competence, it involves the desire to learn for the sake of learning. Under a performance goal, individuals seek to demonstrate high ability, it is likely to compare their performance with that of others as being a source of motivation(Ames,1992).
According to Zimmerman (1989), self-regulated learners are individuals who are meta-cognitively, motivationally and behaviorally active participants.
in their own learning process. In terms of metacognitive processes, children who are self-regulated learners plan, set goals, organize, self-monitor and self-evaluate at various points during the process of acquisition. In terms of motivational process, self-regulated learners report high self-efficacy, self-attributions and intrinsic task interest. With regard to the behavioral processes, these learners, select, structure and create environments that optimize learning.

From a social-cognitive point of view, self-regulation comprises three sub processes: self-Observation, self-judgment and self-reaction (Bandura, 1986, Schunk, 1989, 1994; Zimmerman, 1989). The performance related to sub processes are not mutually exclusive, rather, they interact with one another in reciprocal fashion.

Self-observation refers to the learner’s deliberate attention to his or her own performance, which usually involves systematic monitoring. (Schunk, 1994; Zimmerman, 1989)

In the second process of self-regulation, or self-judgment, the learner compares present performance with his or her goal. A third process of the individual’s self-regulation involves self-reactions to one’s performance.

The relationship between control ideology and goal orientation explains why teachers develop different pupil control ideologies.

In sum, self-regulatory learning strategies lead to academic achievement (Zimmerman, 1989; Zimmerman and Martinez–Pons 1988). However students need a proper environment to develop self-regulatory skills.

Fig1. Proposed model (Gordon et al 2004)
2 Methodology

2.1 Participants

Participants consisted of a sample of 300 in-service teachers (200 males and 100 females) which were randomly selected to Participate in the project.

2.2 Measures

(1) Goal orientation: Goal orientation was assessed using a two dimensional instrument designed by Button, et.al, (1996), which consists of 16 items, eight LGO of learning goal orientation (e.g.: I prefer to work on tasks that force me to learn new things) and eight PGO or performance goal orientation (e.g.: I prefer to do things that I can do well rather than things that I do poorly). Responses were based on a 5-point Likert Type Scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Correlations between the LGO and PGO scales were near zero.

The reliability for both mastery oriented and performance oriented scale was high. They were 0.75 and 0.79, respectively (Gordon, et al, 2006).

(2) Learning self-regulation: this was assessed using a scale designed by Boufard, et.al (1995) which consists of 14 items. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert Type Scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The reliability for both cognitive and metacognitive scale were high. They were 0.70 and 0.68 respectively (Kadivar, 2002).

(3) A modified version of the PCI (Hoy, 2000) was used to measure the control ideology of the teachers. The 20 item, 5-point Likert scale, PCI places a highly teacher controlled classroom management (humanistic) classroom management on the other end. The reliability of the PCI is consistently above 0.80 (Hoy, 2000) and the construct validity of the scale has been supported in a number of studies (for example, see Hoy, 2000; Hoy & Jalovick, 1979; Morrison et al., 1999).

3 Results

Relations among all the variables included in this study were explored and explains in the following Matrix of variables.
Table 1: Correlation matrix of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>self-regulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognition</td>
<td>.720***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meta-cognition</td>
<td>.795***</td>
<td>.395***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal orientation</td>
<td>.479***</td>
<td>.386***</td>
<td>.428***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mastery</td>
<td>.499***</td>
<td>.347***</td>
<td>.395***</td>
<td>.822***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>-.366***</td>
<td>-.216***</td>
<td>-.267***</td>
<td>.818***</td>
<td>-.423***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control ideology</td>
<td>.48(*)</td>
<td>.126(*)</td>
<td>.122(*)</td>
<td>.246(**)</td>
<td>.216(**)</td>
<td>-.166(*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic</td>
<td>.720(**)</td>
<td>.645(**)</td>
<td>.623(**)</td>
<td>.812(**)</td>
<td>.561(**)</td>
<td>-.187(*)</td>
<td>.692(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>custodial</td>
<td>-.422(**)</td>
<td>-.374(**)</td>
<td>-.359(**)</td>
<td>-.458(**)</td>
<td>-.287(**)</td>
<td>.197(*)</td>
<td>.759(**)</td>
<td>-.373(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.01 (**), p < 0.05 (*)
4 Conclusion

This study aimed to evaluate the influence of teachers’ learning behavior and their control ideology in teaching environment.

In general, the results from our co-relational analysis were consistent with previous literature. For instance, learning goal orientation has been tied to greater use of deep level of cognitive and meta-cognitive regulation strategies (Ames, 19; Wolters & Rosental, 2000; Pajares et al, 2000, Zweig & Webster, 2002).

Goal setting is an effective time-management strategy. Learners, who set overall learning goals and subordinate into short-term goals, are self-regulating their efforts by evaluating goal progress. In the process of goal setting, students set time limits for accomplishing sub-goals. The belief that they are making progress instills in them self-efficacy in learning.

Other findings of this study also indicate a relation between learning performance and self-regulated learning. Thus, these findings provide some evidence that individual who are oriented toward performance goals will not necessarily stop working or disengage when faced with motivational problems.

Results for the proposed structural equation model supported the proposed casual relationship among the proposed variables. The reports of mastery goal orientation in teaching environment were related to a better self-regulation in learning situation, and teachers who reports mastery goal orientation in the classroom were likely of using humanistic control ideology. The effect of self-regulation on control ideology is indirect through the mediating effect of mastery goal orientation.

Students who believe they are capable of performing tasks (self-efficacy Belief) use more cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies and persist longer at those tasks than those who do not (self-regulatory characteristic). Academic self-efficacy influences cognitive strategy use and self-regulation through use of meta-cognitive strategies, and it is correlated with in-class seatwork and homework, exams and quizzes, and essays and reports; Pintrich and De Groot (1990). Suggested that self-efficacy plays a facilitative role in the process of cognitive engagement, that raising self-efficacy beliefs might lead to increased use of cognitive strategies and, thereby, higher achievement, and that students need to have both the will and the skill to be successful in classrooms.

Using strategies, in turn, influenced by the learner’s motivation and beliefs, students’ beliefs about themselves and the nature of learning have a marked influence on motivation. Motivational factors also influence both the quality of thinking and information processing as well as the individual’s motivation to learn. Although, the students’ performance is influenced by several factors, but the students’ beliefs are good predictors of their school performance. When the students’ beliefs are coordinated with their knowledge and skills, they use self-regulated strategies.

According to the research reviewed and findings of this research, There is a need for investigating researches with learners in actual educational settings (Schunck & Zimmerman, 1994). In most of the self-regulation researches and in the present study, students are simply required to complete questionnaires consisting of their self-regulatory activities. We need more information on the extent to which learners who report that they use self-regulatory strategies (cognitive, meta-cognitive & motivation) which actually engage them during learning. Such a shift of inquiry focus requires increased collaboration with teachers, because they have critical role in classroom to create an autonomous atmosphere that allows students making their own choices, using their own way of learning and strategies.
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