Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi
Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute
Yıl/Year: 2021♦ Cilt/Volume: 18♦ Sayı/Issue: 47 s. 174-192

OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS OF K6-8 STUDENTS' LEARNING SHAPING

Vali MEHDINEZHAD
Department of Educational Planning and Management, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran, valmeh@ped.usb.ac.ir
Orcid ID: 0000-0002-6148-5991

Makale Geliş Tarihi: 20.06.2020 **Makale Kabul Tarihi:** 19.04.2021
Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Atıf: Mehdinezhad, V. (2021). Opportunities and Threats of K6-8 Students' Learning Shaping. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 18 (47), 174-192

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine the opportunities and threats that shape student learning in middle schools. A quantitative method was used in this study; 380 subjects were selected, from middle school students in the sixth grade (12-year-olds) and eighth grade (14-year-olds). Samples selection was determined by stratified random sampling, proportionate to the size. Data was collected by questionnaire using measures for student attention during instruction as cited in Bru et al. (2002). Results showed that students gave relatively high scores to factors effective on shaping student learning. However, student influence and parental monitoring had more effect on shaping learning. In terms of factors that threaten shaping of student learning, respondents gave high scores to student and opposition to teachers and off-task orientation was given a score above the average. In order to compare beliefs between male and female students regarding opportunities for shaping student learning, findings showed significant difference between the two groups for the factor of teachers' emotional support (average scores showed boys marked higher than girls) and in parental care (average scores showed that girls marked higher than boys). Regarding factors that threaten shaping student learning, opposition to teachers (average scores showed that girls marked higher than boys); and for the factor opposition to teachers (average scores showed that boys marked higher than girls).

Key words: *shaping of learning, opportunities, Threats, K6-8, students*

K6-8 ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN ÖĞRENME ŞEKİLLENDİRMESİNİN FIRSATLARI VE TEHDİTLERİ

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, ortaokullarda öğrencilerin öğrenmesini şekillendiren fırsat ve tehditleri incelemektir. Bu çalışmada nicel bir yöntem kullanılmıştır; Altıncı

sınıftaki (12 yaşındaki) ve sekizinci sınıftaki (14 yaşındaki) ortaokul öğrencilerinden 380 konu seçildi. Numune seçimi, boyutla orantılı, tabakalı rastgele örnekleme ile belirlendi. Veriler, Bru ve diğ. 'De belirtildiği gibi öğretim sırasında öğrenci dikkatine yönelik ölçüler kullanılarak anket yoluyla toplanmıştır. (2002). Sonuçlar, öğrencilerin öğrenmeyi şekillendirmede etkili faktörlere görece yüksek puanlar verdiğini göstermiştir. Bununla birlikte, öğrenci etkisi ve ebeveyn izleme, öğrenmeyi şekillendirmede daha fazla etkiye sahipti. Öğrencilerin öğrenmesini şekillendirmeyi tehdit eden faktörler açısından, katılımcılar öğrenciye yüksek puanlar vermiş ve öğretmenlere muhalefet vermiş ve görev dışı oryantasyona ortalamanın üzerinde bir puan verilmiştir. Öğrencilerin öğrenmesini şekillendirme fırsatlarına ilişkin erkek ve kız öğrenciler arasındaki inançları karşılaştırmak için, bulgular öğretmenlerin duygusal destek faktörü (ortalama puanlar erkeklerin kızlardan daha yüksek olduğunu gösterdi) ve ebeveyn bakımı (ortalama puanlar) açısından iki grup arasında anlamlı farklılık gösterdi. kızların erkeklerden daha yüksek puan aldığını gösterdi). Öğrencilerin öğrenmesini şekillendirmeyi tehdit eden faktörlerle ilgili olarak, öğretmenlere muhalefet (ortalama puanlar kızların erkeklerden daha yüksek puan aldığını göstermiştir); ve öğretmenlere muhalefet faktörü için (ortalama puanlar erkeklerin kızlardan daha yüksek puan aldığını göstermiştir).

Anahtar Kelimeler: *öğrenmenin şekillendirilmesi, fırsatlar, Tehditler, K6-8, öğrenciler*

Introduction

There are many factors that influence the shape of student learning. Some factors facilitate learning such as, emotional support from teachers, academic support from teachers, monitoring by teachers and parents, parental care and influence of other students; there are also barriers to student learning such as, off-task orientation, opposition to teachers, and student bullying. These factors are explained separately in the following.

According to Semmer, Elfering, Jacobshagen, Perrot, Beehr and Boos (2008) teachers have reported that emotional support is important in any activity as it creates empathy and friendships, provides encouragement, and fosters confident students. In fact, the definitions of emotional support provided by teachers most commonly involve the attributes of attitude, confidence, warmth, respect, love and empathy (Patrick, Kaplan, & Ryan, 2011; De Wit, Karioja, Rye, & Shain, 2011). In other words, teacher emotional support refers to approval and an explicitly caring manner. This kind of support is likely to foster connection or attachment in relationships between teachers and students. Teachers who provide emotional support are also more likely to enhance a student's belief in himself or herself to do well at school, thereby improving motivation. Findings reported in several studies indicate that students who had felt emotionally supported by their teachers were more likely to enjoy learning, more highly motivated to strive for academic success and they displayed on-task behavior (Fraser & Fisher, 1982; Merrett & Wheldall, 1987). Emotional support by teachers is a direct way to provide students with experiences

that foster motivational and learning-related experiences that are important to proper academic functioning (Crosnoe, Johnson & Elder, 2004; Greenberg, Weissberg, O'Brien, Zins, Fredericks & Resnik, 2003; Gregory & Weinstein, 2004; Rimm-Kaufman, LaParo, Downer, & Pianta, 2005; Zins, Bloodworth, Weissberg & Walberg, 2004). The findings of Malecki and Demaray (2003) showed that emotional support from teachers, conveying feelings of trust and love, rather than being instrumental in shaping student learning and appraisal, was the strongest contributor to development of social skills and academic competence.

Academic support can be misunderstood as an emotional component to encourage and help students to academic behavior and performance (Chouinard, Karsenti, & Roy, 2007; Patrick, Ryan, & Kaplan, 2007). According to DiPerna (2006) academic support from teachers enables students to organize materials, and manage their time in an educational program. In fact, one objective is to train teachers to help students develop the disciplines of self-efficacy, independent learning and self-management. Teachers' academic support for students in grades six through to eight has been consistently perceived as the strongest predictor of motivation according to evaluations of intrinsic interest, perceived value and expectations of success. Wentzel (1998) reported a positive association between teachers that communicated social and academic support and several indicators of positive school values such as intrinsic interest, pursuit of pro social goals (e.g., helping others in the class): and pursuit of social responsibility goals (e.g., paying attention to a teacher's request).

According to Mayorov (2005), given the strong correlation between observing students' performance by teachers, it is essential that teachers gain the necessary skills to monitor their students (Khairo, 2014). Research on teachers' decision-making processes has confirmed a lack of appropriate monitoring among many teachers. According to this research, a great many teachers were reluctant to change their strategy of instruction or pace of lessons once they had been planned, even with evidence that instruction and learning were progressing poorly (Khairo, 2014).

Parental monitoring is defined as a set of correlated parenting behaviors that involve paying attention to and tracking a child's whereabouts, his or her activities, and adaptations (Racz & McMahon, 2011). Research has also shown that an authoritative parenting style, characterized by parental warmth and consistent parental monitoring, provides the optimal environment for school success in adolescents (Annunziata, Hogue, Faw & Liddle, 2006; Attaway & Bry, 2004; Marchant, Paulson & Rothlisberg, 2001; Spera, 2006). When parental monitoring is high quality, or even moderate, then adolescents are more engaged in school. A supportive home environment can function as a protective factor for 'at-risk' adolescents. Annunziata et al (2006) reported that a supportive family environment has been determined as an attribute of resilient children. Annunziata et al, (2006) has defined educational resilience in terms of students that are engaged in school and perform well, even when they are faced with risk factors such as inadequate

home and school environments. These family variables have been applied to predicted students' achievements, perceived competence levels, sense of relatedness to peers, and academic effort (Annunziata et al., 2006). The effects of parental involvement on student achievement can influence an adolescent's social, cognitive, and emotional development.

The literature on student influence has been somewhat overlooked. Recently, however, more attention has been given to how increased student autonomy in shaping learning tasks that can affect motivation and behavior. Research suggests that students who perceived that their classroom climate allowed for a degree of autonomy were more committed and motivated than those who perceived a more controlling environment (Boggiano, Shields, Barrett, Kellam, Thompson, Simons & Katz, 1992; Firestone & Rosenblum, 1988; Grolnick & Ryan, 1987).

This study focused on three different types of student misbehavior or behavior that threatens learning. These were: off-task orientation, opposition to teachers and student bullying. Bru, Stephens and Torsheim (2002) found students' perceptions of class management in terms of teacher support and teacher monitoring accounted for more variance in off-task orientation (i.e., not concentrating on a school task) and opposition to teachers (i.e., confrontations with teachers) than bullying. A possible explanation for this finding is that off-task and oppositional behavior is triggered by frustration related to meeting goals, in other words a student's need for academic support is thwarted. Bullying would not be a logical response to that frustration, because such behavior seems unrelated to the cause of frustration at that particular moment. Bullying behavior might be used by students to protect their sense of self-esteem or popularity, or as a reaction to an experience of frustration with respect to social goals. Making distinctions between these different processes requires instruments that can assess specific behavior, personal and school goals, and perceptions in specific contexts.

Myers and Anderson (2010) defined off-task behavior as occasions as a student's engagement in an activity unrelated to that directed by the teacher. Research indicates that student off-task behavior is less 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 be present then, the use of distal feedback or "cross group feedback" reduced off-task behavior among students. Distal or cross group feedback is defined as teacher feedback given to the students furthest away from the teacher. Overall, the evidence appears to suggest that off-task behavior is associated with poorer learning in a variety of instructional settings (Baker, Corbett, Koedinger, & Wagner, 2004).

According to Ayenibiowo and Akinbode (2011), bullying describes aggression of one or several individuals on a vulnerable peer, and it can be manifested in three forms: physical, verbal or psychological. General definitions of bullying, as described by experts, are as follows. Physical bullying is any kind of hitting, kicking, spitting, pushing, grabbing personal belongings and such like; verbal bullying is any kind of

taunt, harassment, stalking, threatening, yelling, humiliation, spreading rumors and such like; and psychological bullying is any kind of manipulation of social relationships, extortion and such like (Carrera, DePalma, & Lameiras, 2011; James, 2011; Jimerson, Swearer and Espelage, 2010; Klomek et al., 2011). Research has been done to establish reasons for student bullying and a survey has shown that while 40% of students indicated that those who were picked on rarely or never deserved it (Glover, 2000). There are several reasons that students might justify bullying behavior. Students often feel pushed into bullying by peers who bully, because disapproval of the social group could lead to being bullied in the future. In a study done at Keele University in 2002, the survey found that most bullies indicated that students who worked hard in school were targeted more than any other group during early secondary school years of education. A person that bullies often holds no value for academic success or is not capable of the same success so they choose to harass a student that is successful at school. Because the bully does not value education, nor does he or she value cultural difference, the bully exerts authority to show that she or he is superior over the person he or she is teasing (Boulton, 2002). This study also intends to look at the phenomenon of bullying from the same three perspectives: physical, verbal and psychological.

The main objective of this research was to explain the opportunities and threats to shaping student learning on middle school students by asking the following questions:

What is the rate of influence of each factor on opportunities and threats of students' learning shaping?

Is there any relationship between these factors that affect opportunities of students' learning shaping?

Is there any relationship between the factors that affect threats of students' learning shaping?

Is there any difference in perceptions of male and female students in terms of factors that affect opportunities of students' learning shaping?

Is there any difference in perceptions of male and female students in terms of factors that affect threats of students' learning shaping?

Is there any difference in students' perceptions of the factors that affect opportunities of students' learning shaping by grade?

Is there any difference in students' perceptions of the factors that affect threats of students' learning shaping by grade?

Method

The methodology of this study was quantitative research. The study population consisted of 29935 Iranian middle school students (16735 boys and 13200 girls). 380 subjects were selected using the Krejcie, and Morgan (1970) sample size table with stratified random sampling proportionate to the size (Table 1).

Table 1. *Population and Sample*

Variables			Population	Sample
Students	Gender	Boy	16735	212
		Girl	13200	168
	Grade	6	11186	142
		7	9926	126
		8	8823	112

Data were collected by questionnaire using attention of students during instructions by Bru et al. (2002). The questionnaire had 38 items and included the following nine components; teachers' emotional support; teachers' academic support; teachers' monitoring; parental monitoring; parental care; student influence; and three inhibiting factors on shaping learning: off-task orientation; opposition to teachers; and student bullying. The subjects responded to each item on a 5 point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Cronbach's alpha was used to estimate validity of the questionnaire (Table 2).

Table 2. *Summary measures of reliability*

Variables	N. of Items	α
Teachers' emotional support	6	.82
Teachers' academic support	4	.69
Teachers' monitoring	5	.73
Parental monitoring	6	.79
Parental care	4	.65
student influence	2	.68
Off-task orientation	4	.65
Opposition toward teachers	3	.84
Bullying of other students	4	.65
Total	38	.81

Data analysis included calculations for Means, Standard Deviation, Eigenvalues, Variance Explained, Correlation, t-test, Analysis of Variance, and Bonferroni Post Hoc test by SPSS20.

Results

- What is the rate of influence of each factor on opportunities and threats of students' learning shaping?

Table 3. *Rate of influence of following factors on opportunities and threats of students' learning shaping (N=380)*

	Variables	Min.	Max.	Mean
Opportunities	teachers' emotional support	6.00	30.00	18.6263
	teachers' academic support	4.00	20.00	12.9789
	teachers' monitoring	5.00	25.00	15.6579
	parental monitoring	10.00	30.00	24.4105
	parental care	4.00	19.00	11.1789
	student influence	2.00	10.00	7.5316
Threats	off-task orientation	4.00	20.00	11.7263
	opposition toward teachers	3.00	15.00	9.8263
	bullying of other students	8.00	20.00	15.0838

The instrument of this research included items intended to tap the effective factors on shaping and inhibition of student learning. The figures shown in Table 3 demonstrate that students had relatively high scores for effective factors on shaping student learning. However, comparisons showed that student perception, student influence (M=7.53, SD=2.07) and parental monitoring (M=24.41, SD=4.21) were the most effective factors on shaping learning. In terms of barriers to shaping student learning, respondents gave higher scores to bullying (M=15.08, SD=2.66) and opposition to teachers (M=9.83, SD=2.21) compared to off-task orientation (M=11.72, SD=2.45).

- Is there any relationship between these factors that affect opportunities of students' learning shaping?

Table 4. *Eigenvalues, Variance Explained, and Intercorrelation between the effective factors on opportunities of students' learning shaping (N=380)*

	teachers' emotional support	teachers' academic support	teachers' monitoring	parental monitoring	parental care	student influence
Teachers' Emotional Support	1					
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**	1
Eigenvalues	7.85	2.28	1.59	1.44	1.19	1.10
Variance explained	29.1%	8.4%	5.9%	5.3%	4.4%	4.%
Total: 57.3%						

**P < .01

Table 4 shows Eigenvalues, variance and correlation between factors. In fact, there was relatively high positive correlation between the factors under consideration. The highest correlation was 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 the other factors. Altogether, factors explained 57.3% of variance.

- Is there any relationship between the factors that affect threats of students' learning shaping?

Table 5. *Eigenvalues, Variance Explained, and Intercorrelation between the effective factors on threats of students' learning shaping (N=380)*

	off-task orientation	**opposition toward teachers**	**bullying of other students**
Off-Task Orientation	1		
Opposition toward Teachers	.292**		
Bullying of Other Students	.308**	.071	1
Eigenvalues	4.44	1.59	.74
Variance explained	44.4%	15.9%	7.4%
Total: 67.7%			

**P < .01 P > .05

Table 5 shows Eigenvalues, variance and correlation between factors. Analysis of data about correlation between effective factors on the inhibition of learning showed a relatively high positive correlation between bullying with off-task orientation (r=.308); and opposition to teachers with off-task orientation (r=.292).

There was no significant correlation between bullying and opposition to teachers. Altogether, factors explained 67.7% of the variance.

- Is there any difference in perceptions of male and female students in terms of factors that affect opportunities of students' learning shaping?

Table 6. *The comparison of boy and girl students' perception about effective factors on opportunities of students' learning shaping (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

Independent sample t-tests were performed to compare beliefs among boys and girls on opportunities for shaping student learning, .These analyses revealed a significant difference between the two groups in opportunities for shaping student learning. There was significant difference in scores between 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 (averages showed that boys scored higher than girls); 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 (averages showed that girls scored higher than boys); 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] for parental care (averages showed that girls scored higher than boys).

- Is there any difference in perceptions of male and female students in terms of factors that affect threats of students' learning shaping?

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

Variables	Sex	N	Mean	Std. D.	df	t
off-task orientation	boy	212	11.6509	2.39685		-.674

	girl	168	11.8214	2.51063		
opposition toward teachers	boy	212	9.6321	2.14774	378	-1.930**
	girl	168	10.0714	2.27344		
bullying of other students	boy	192	15.4375	2.46998		2.729**
	girl	166	14.6747	2.81816		

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

Independent sample t-tests were performed to compare perceptions between male and female students about threats to student learning (Table 7). These analyses revealed a significant difference between the two groups in some effective factors on inhibition to 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 the factor of opposition to teachers (averages showed that girls scored higher than boys); 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 to teachers factor (averages showed that boys scored higher than girls). There was no significant difference between the two groups for the factor of off-task orientation [*M*=11.65, *SD*=2.39; *t*(378)=0.674, P > .05].

- Is there any difference in students' perceptions of the factors that affect opportunities of students' learning shaping by grade?

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

Variables		Sum Sq.	df	Mean Sq.	F	Grade	Mean	Std. D.
teachers' emotional support	B. G.	853.693	2	426.847	13.807**	K6	20.5352	5.05244
	W. G.	11655.2	377	30.916		K7	17.1667	5.63099
	T.	12508.9	379			K8	17.8482	6.07196
teachers' academic	B. G.	44.608	2	22.304	2.355	K6	13.2817	2.95202
support	W. G.	3571.22	377	9.473		K7	12.5000	3.17931
	T.	3615.83	379			K8	13.1339	3.11779
teachers' monitoring	B. G.	276.111	2	138.056	8.965**	K6	16.6761	3.87673
	W. G.	5805.41	377	15.399		K7	14.6587	3.48749
	T.	6081.52	379			K8	15.4911	4.41740

parental monitoring	B. G.	276.544	2	138.272	8.095**	K6	25.5070	3.55254
	W. G.	6439.41	377	17.081		K7	23.6349	4.74401
	T.	6715.95	379			K8	23.8929	4.07886
parental care	B. G.	140.857	2	70.429	8.635**	K6	11.9296	3.02858
	W. G.	3074.97	377	8.156		K7	10.9524	2.46530
	T.	3215.83	379			K8	10.4821	3.03428
student influence	B. G.	127.898	2	63.949	16.129**	K6	8.2817	1.71917
	W. G.	1494.72	377	3.965		K7	7.1190	2.14143
	T.	1622.62	379			K8	7.0446	2.13250

P > .05 **P < .001

The comparison of students' perceptions about opportunities for shaping learning by grade with use of Analysis of Variance showed a significant difference between the groups. The sixth grade students described factors of teachers' emotional support, teachers' monitoring, parental monitoring, parental care, and student influence on shaping of learning as more effective than did students in grades seven and eight. Bonferroni Post Hoc test certified the mean score differences between sixth grade students with scores given by students in grades seven and eight (Table 8).

- Is there any difference in students' perceptions of the factors that affect threats of students' learning shaping by grade?

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

Variables		Sum Sq.	df	Mean Sq.	F	Grade	Mean	Std. D.
off-task orientation	B. G.	6.838	2	3.419	.570	K6	11.7465	1.93305
	W. G.	2260.69	377	5.997		K7	11.5556	2.58783
	T.	2267.53	379			K8	11.8929	2.84227
opposition toward teachers	B. G.	60.283	2	30.141	6.333**	K6	10.3099	1.79512
	W. G.	1794.25	377	4.759		K7	9.3730	2.06585
	T.	1854.53	379			K8	9.7232	2.69537

bullying of other students	B. G.	21.532	2	10.766	1.525	K6	14.8768	2.68125
	W. G.	2505.95	355	7.059		K7	14.9913	2.80818
	T.	2527.48	357			K8	15.4571	2.44567

P > .05 **P < .001

In Table 9, the compute of Analysis of Variance on students' perceptions about threats to learning by grade showed significant difference between groups in the factor of opposition to teachers, and the sixth grade students gave a higher score to this factor for inhibiting learning in comparison with the other grades. Bonferroni Post Hoc test certified this difference. In the other factors, there was no significant difference between the groups.

Discussion

The present study set out to explore perceptions of middle school students on factors effective on shaping and inhibiting learning. Today, education plays a critical role in children's personal development. Research indicates that teachers, parents and students themselves can exert optimal influence on learning processes and thereby achieve higher test scores, overall better performance and academic success. In other words, there are several factors that promote effective learning in children such as teachers' and parents' beliefs, attitudes and perceptions on education. These can have a positive affect on children's learning.

In the first step, data analysis showed that students gave relatively high scores for factors affective on shaping student learning. However, the factors of student perception, student influence and parental monitoring were most effective on shaping learning. The computations for median and rank order confirmed that these factors outranked other components. In terms of barriers to shaping student learning, respondents gave a higher score to bullying and opposition to teachers than to off-task orientation.

Results also indicated a relatively high positive correlation between factors effective on shaping and inhibiting learning (Tables 4 and 5). However, there was significant difference in scores for boys and girls for the factor of teachers' emotional support; significant difference in scores for boys and girls in parental monitoring; significant difference in scores for boys in parental care; and significant difference in scores for boys and girls in opposition to teachers; and significant difference in scores for boys and girls for opposition to teachers (Tables 6 and 7). These differences were observed in some factors by comparisons of students' perception by education grade. In fact, sixth grade students described the factors of teachers' emotional support, teachers' monitoring, parental monitoring, parental care, and student influence on shaping learning as more effective than did students in grades seven and eight (Table 8): and in terms of grade, scores for factors that inhibit learning

showed that sixth grade students gave higher scores to this factor on inhibition of learning in comparison with other grades (Table 9).

The results of this study support by results of previous studies as follows: in teachers' emotional support (Crosnoe et al., 2004; Greenberg et al., 2003; Gregory & Weinstein, 2004; Roeser, Midgley & Urdan, 2000; Zins et al., 2004; Bru et al., 2002; Malecki & Demaray, 2003; Murdock, Miller & Kohlhardt, 2004; Ibanez, Kuperminc, Jurkovic & Perilla, 2004; Ryan, Patrick & Shim, 2005; Marchant et al., 2001; Duchesne & Larose, 2007); teachers' academic support (Chouinard, Karsenti & Roy, 2007; Midgley, Feldlaufer & Eccles, 1989; Patrick, Ryan & Kaplan, 2007; Cheryl, 2009; Plunkett, Henry, Carolyn, Houltberg, Sands, & Tovah; Abarca-Mortensen, 2008); teacher monitoring (Goldberg, 1989; Stalling, 1985); parental monitoring and care (Ratelle, Larose, Guay & Senecal, 2005; Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2005; Niemiec, Lynch, Vansteenkiste, Bernstein, Deci & Ryan, 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); student bullying (Jimerson et al., 2010; Glover, 2000; Boulton, 2002); and opposition to teachers (Bru et al., 2002).

Conclusion

This study examines the opportunities and threats associated with the shaping of student learning. Therefore, before results concluded, some of its methodological limitations are discussed. Data collected through quantitative and cross-sectional studies may be more subjective than objective, and also students' perceptions may change in place and time. Such limitations make it prudent to extend the results to other situations. As the findings of this study, the findings of other researchers show that among younger adolescents have also revealed associations between teacher monitoring and academic achievement, less academic alienation and lower levels of problem behavior. However, these ratings are somewhat different (Bru et al., 2002; Eccles et al., 1997). Therefore, based on the findings of this study and other researchers, teachers have a great impact on motivating students as well as proper shaping of students' learning (Legault, Green-Demers, & Pelletier, 2006; Wentzel, 2002). Teachers' scientific support for students is another component that can be effective as an opportunity to shape student learning (Bru, Stephens, & Torsheim, 2002; Thuen & Bru, 2000; Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2006). In fact, students who see their teachers as supportive try harder and, instead of being frustrated or quitting, feel less alienated from school (Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Thuen, Bru, & Ogden, 2007). In this regard, teachers' emotional support and monitoring also have a significant impact (although moderate) on the shaping of students' learning (Reeve, Deci, & Ryan, 2004; Thuen & Bru, 2000).

In contrast to these findings, the findings are in accordance with previous results indicating off-task orientation can therefore become an important source of conflict between pupils and teachers, and this can be a serious threat to the formation of student learning (Birkemo, 2000). So a change in off-task orientation

can significantly turn this threat into an opportunity (Murberg & Bru, 2003; Thuen & Bru, 2000). If students do not feel comfortable in their school environment, their ability to learn new things and concepts is compromised. Student frustration in the classroom can lead to opposition from teachers (Cakmakci, 2019; Bru, Stephens, & Torsheim, 2002). Bullying of students is another threat to the shaping of learning, which is confirmed by this and other research (Glover, Gough, Johnson, & Cartwright, 2000). At the same time, it is recommended that teachers use supportive strategies instead of control strategies to reduce these threats.

Results suggest that teachers need to reach a sufficient level of pedagogical knowledge in order to deliver 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 strongly recommended. These findings suggest that tailoring management strategies to individual students and avoiding individual favoritism might present the best opportunity to improve student behavior. However, previous research suggests that teacher behavior has a greater impact learning among younger students (Pianta, 1999). Moreover, further research with other methods of data collection is needed to validate the findings of the present study, which have been determined by self-reporting. More experimental or longitudinal studies, with sufficient variance 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 inhibiting learning might interact with characteristics of individual students and determine specific responsibilities of teachers, parents and students in order to implement positive factors and remove the negative factors on student 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.

Ayenibiowo, K. O., PhD., & Akinbode, G. A. (2011). Psychopathology of bullying and emotional abuse among school children. *Life Psychologia, 19(2)*, 127-141.

Baker, R.S., Corbett, A.T., Koedinger, K.R., & Wagner, A.Z. (2004). Off-task behavior in the cognitive tutor classroom: When students "game the system." *Proceedings of ACM CHI 2004: Computer-Human Interaction*, (pp. 383-390), Vienna, Austria

Birkemo, A. (2000). Kan ungdomsskolen forbedres? [Can the secondary school be improved?; in Norwegian]. In G. Grepperud (Ed.), Tre a˚rs kjedsomhet [Three years of boredom]. Oslo, Norway: Gyldendal Akademisk

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

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. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-4405(02)00104-8

Cakmakci, M. (2019). Interaction in Project Management Approach within Industry 4.0 Advances in Manufacturing II (pp. 176-189): Springer

Carrera, M. V., Depalma, R., & Lameiras, M. (2011). Toward a more comprehensive understanding of bullying in school setting. *Education Psychology Review, 23*,479-499. doi:19.1007/s10648-011-9171-x

Cheryl, T. Jeffries (2009.) Academic Support and Academic Identity of African American Males Labeled Emotionally Handicapped (EH)

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.

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.

De Wit, D. J., Karioja, K., Rye, B. J., & Shain, M. (2011). Perceptions of Declining Classmate and Teacher Support Following the Transition to High School: Potential Correlates of Increasing Student Mental Health Difficulties. *Psychology in the Schools, 48*(6), 556-572. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.20576

DiPerna, J. C. (2006). Academic enablers and student achievement: Implications for assessment and intervention services in the schools. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*, 7-17

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.

Eccles, J. S., Early, D., Fraser, K., Belansky, E., & Mc Carthy, K. (1997). The relation of connection, regulation, and support for autonomy in the context of family, school, and peer group to successful adolescent development. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 12, 263–286.

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.

Furrer, C., & Skinner, E. A. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 148 –162.

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. doi.org/10.1080/001318800363782

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)

Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'Brien, M. U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H. (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. (1987). Autonomy in children's learning: an experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 52(5),* 890–898.

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.

James, D., Flynn, A., Lawlor, M., Courtney, P., Murphy, N., & Henry, B. (2011). A friend in deed? Can adolescent girls be taught to understand relational bullying? *Child Abuse Review, 20*, 439-454. doi: 10.1002/car.1120

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

Khairo, M. O. (2014). Information System in Monitoring Education Students Achievements, *International Journal of Computer Applications,* 95(2), 33-36

Klomek, A. B., Kleinman, M., Altschuler, E., Marrocco, F., Amakawa, L., & Gould, M. (2011). High school bullying as a risk for later depression and suicidality. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 41(5)*, 501-516. doi: 10.1111/j.1943-278X.2011.00046.x

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W., (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement.* 30, 607-610

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

Legault, L., Green-Demers, I., & Pelletier, L. G. (2006). Why do high school students lack motivation in the classroom? Toward an understanding of academic amotivation and the role of social support. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98, 567-582

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.

Murberg, T. A., & Bru, E. (2003). School related stress and psychosomatic symptoms among Norwegian adolescents. School Psychology International, 25(3), 317-332. doi. org/10.1177/0143034304046904

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.

Myers, A., & Anderson, S. (2010). How Teacher Positioning in the Classroom Affects the On-Task Behavior of Students, e-Journal of Student Research, 2(1), 1-9

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., Kaplan, A., & Ryan, A. M. (2011). Positive Classroom Motivational Environments: Convergence Between Mastery Goal Structure and Classroom Social Climate. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(2), 367-382. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/A0023311

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.

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), 333-355

Racz, S. J., & McMahon, R. J. (2011). The Relationship between Parental Knowledge and Monitoring and Child and Adolescent Conduct Problems: A 10-Year Update, Clin Child Fam Psychol Rev, 14(4), 377–398, DOI 10.1007/s10567-011-0099-y

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.

Reeve, J., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Self-determination theory: A dialectical framework for understanding the sociocultural influences on student motivation. In D. M. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Eds.), Research on sociocultural influences on motivation and learning: Big theories revisited (Vol. 4, pp. 31–59). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Press

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., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. C. (2000). 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.

Semmer, N. K., Elfering, A., Jacobshagen, N., Perrot, T., Beehr, T. A., & Boos, N. (2008). The emotional meaning of instrumental social support. *International Journal of Stress Management, 15*(3), 235-251. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.15.3.235

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.

Thuen, E. & Bru, E. (2000). Learning environment, meaningfulness of schoolwork and ontask-orientation among Norwegian 9th grade students. *School Psychology International,* 21, 393-413.

Thuen, E., Bru, E. and Ogden, T. (2007) 'Coping Styles, Learning Environment and Emotional and Behavioural Problems. Students' Perceptions of Learning Environment', *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 51: 347–69.

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.

Wentzel, K. R. (2002). Are effective teachers like good parents? Teaching styles and student adjustment in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 73(1), 287-301.

Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social support and adjustment in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 202–209.

Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Chipuer, H. M., Hanisch, M., Creed, P. A., & McGregor, L. (2006). Relationships at school and stage-environment fit as resources for adolescent engagement and achievement. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29(6), 911-933.

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.