

IMPACT OF UNIVERSITY MOTIVATED ENVIRONMENT ON STUDENTS LEARNING

Dr.Talal Al Sawat (Associate Professor)
Dean Albaha University,AlBaha, KSA

Dr.Mairaj Salim (Assistant Professor)
King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, KSA

ABSTRACT: *Purpose: This research paper aims to examine the Impact of University Motivated Environment on Students Learning. Design/Methodology/Approach: Keeping in view the objectives the University Motivated Environment factors has been taken. The study sample of 300 students randomly selected from different departments of Albaha university. The use of the likert scale and a questionnaire containing 35 items related to the university motivated factors were used to measure the impact. Popular statistical T-test ANOVA was applied by using SPSS software highlighting more detailed findings of the study. Findings: The results shows that students are not satisfied with the university motivated learning environment because the services and support provided by the university related to Library, Computer, Parking, Cafeteria, Bus, Air Conditioning, Sports, Lab equipments, Cleanliness, Light, Guidelines, Track Complaints, Website, Internet Wi Fi environment, Training and placement, Update curriculum according to need of Industry, Scholarships, Sufficient number of staff to serve students, Recruiting staff according to the need of students, etc are not proper or given which affect students learning environment. Statistical analysis shows that Hypotheses is accepted in all cases. Originality/value – The value of this research is that the university will improve the services from which students are not satisfied.*

KEYWORDS-: Motivation, University, Learning, Environment, Students, Impact

INTRODUCTION

These days competitive environment needs motivated factors for students learning as motivation is probably the most important factor that universities can target in order to improve learning. Motivation is necessary because it contributes to achievement. There are three things to remember about education is that the first one is motivation, the second one is motivation and the third one is motivation. So the motivation is probably the most important factor that educators can target in order to improve students' learning. Various theories have explained motivation. Most of these theories have some truth and no single theory seems to adequately explain all human motivation. The reality is that human beings and students in particular are complicated creatures with complicated needs and desires.

The five key factors impacting student motivation are: student, teacher, content, method/process, and environment. In psychology, motivation is a force that energizes and directs behavior toward

a goal (Eggen, Kauchak, 1994). Wlodkowski (1995) suggested that motivation describes processes that (a) arouse a desire to investigate behavior, (b) give direction and purpose to behavior, (c) continue to allow behavior to persist, or (d) lead to choosing or preferring a particular behavior. In relation to learning, Crump (1995) stated that the act of motivating could be defined as exciting the mind of the student to receive instruction (Brewer, Burgess 2005). In a word, motivation is defined as an inner state that arouses individual's desire for a goal and maintains their efforts in a certain direction and time. The future of the majority of youngsters is very uncertain. "Grand narratives," that gave identity and direction in life, have disappeared leaving youngsters (and many adults) with the problem how to give meaning to their lives themselves (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1994; Amundson, 2010). Universities are, therefore, increasingly acknowledging that they have a strong responsibility to guide students not only in their academic growth, but also in their career development (Jarvis and Keeley, 2003; Gysbers and Henderson, 2005). The growth of the international education market with increasing export income has created a highly competitive environment among education providers worldwide. The Ministry of higher education is responsible for the supervision of university motivated environment in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The student's role in education is critical and should go beyond the habitual view of student as person or beneficiary of knowledge. In addition to the roles of client and recipient, "students are the raw materials for education and the primary products of educational change and most important students are key members of the labor force involved in creating education" (Lengnick-Hall and Sanders, 1997, p. 1335).

The environment of university is shaped by the totality of the university's programs, personnel, policies and procedures which are designed to promote learning. Although universities provide environments which are widely assumed to smooth learning, there has been surprisingly little organized analysis of the qualities of those environments and the way in which they affect the learners. University motivated environments have generally been conceived of in terms of certain formal, rather superficial factors. Environments have a non-trivial influence on how students spend their time, their satisfaction with college, and what they gain from attending college (Pascarella, 1985). In fact, perceptions of the institution are inextricably intertwined with such outcomes as knowledge acquisition and critical thinking skills (Astin, 1993; Kuh et al., 1997). It is concluded that more activities should be used which either implicitly or explicitly reinforce positive beliefs about the need for self-direction in learning. The whole education system comprises of building, books, materials as well as objectives. But actually this system has two integral personalities and they are the faculties and the students. The University motivated environment plays a major role in student's achievement and their learning. Eschenmann (1991) Universities have to ensure that they are meeting student needs, both academically and emotionally. "It is successful and functional to apply various and interesting activities with moderate challenge to attract students to arouse their peculiarity. Various and interesting activities encourage students involve as much of the time and effort as possible and as well as increase learning motivation"

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Many documents including books, commissioned reports, journal articles, conference papers, and PhD theses were reviewed for the literature addresses issues. Dart and Clarke (1991) sought to

improve the depth of learning of tertiary students by modifying their learning environments. Knowles (1986) argues that contract learning facilitates the development of students' internal locus of control in a learning setting. In 2003, a best evidence synthesis *Quality Teaching for Diverse Students in Schooling* (Alton-Lee, 2003, p. 93) brought together New Zealand and international research findings about what works as quality teaching that will facilitate high achievement and reduce disparities among diverse students. The synthesis makes evident “the central role of teacher creativity and expertise in scaffolding and being responsive to student learning processes”. The subject of learning spaces has engendered a host of conversations that occur at the intersection of the design of physical spaces, the appropriate technology with which to populate newly configured spaces and the impact such spaces have on how faculty teach and students learn in them (Lomas & Oblinger, 2006; Montgomery, 2008; Oblinger, 2006). The other project yielding empirical results in support of learning environments' impact on educational outcomes is the Massachusetts Institute .The study grew out of a large research project investigating the relationship between psychosocial learning environment factors and deep learning in science classrooms (McRobbie and Tobin, 1995; Tobin and McRobbie, 1996; Tobin and McRobbie, In press). Numerous studies have focused on identifying motivation attributes among instructors, the findings differ depending on the population assessed (Betts, 1998; Frayer, 1999; Hood, 2002; Johnson, 2000; MacDonald, Yanchar, & Osguthorpe, 2005; Quick & Davies, 1999; Schifter, 2000; Smylie, 1988; Wang, 2001). Schifter (2000) notes that motivators include personal motivation, previous technology training, scholarly pursuit, and reduced teaching loads. In contrast, factors that inhibit faculty are workload concerns, negative comments made by colleagues, training, lack of support, minimal release time provided by their department.

Research by Smylie (1988) in faculty motivation identifies availability of resources, a system of rewards and incentives, and administrative training and support as key factors in technology use. Based on findings by Quick and Davies (1999), influential factors include release time, availability of innovative software programs, technical support, and professional development support. MacDonald et al. (2005) states that motivating factors include adequate faculty development and support from administrators, reflective practice time, and access to technology. Wang (2001) identified another set of factors that influence motivation and noted that motivation factors should not be generalize and are specific to individual needs; therefore, a needs assessment survey is recommended to find the present research findings for analysis. As such, Senge et al. (1994, p. 489) suggest that teachers should be “producers of environments that allow students to learn as much as possible” In addition, students almost have a “consumer” attitude about learning; it is another acquisition to purchase rather than a learning process. Also, students are use to 24-7 convenience and expect instant gratification from their teachers. Reaching out to students will help in finding a connection between how students learn and how instructors teach. (McGlynn, 2008) Students must also learn how to use a variety of learning strategies and resources in order to conceive of innovative notions or implement them in an innovative manner. Various technologies have been employed in the field of education to enhance learning (Chang & Lee, 2010; Chen, Liu, Shih, Wu, & Yuan, 2011; Feng, Lin, & Liu, 2011; Hassan, Ismail, & Mustapha, 2010; Jou, Chuang, & Wu, 2010; Liu, 2010; Liu, 2011; Liu & Chang, 2010; Liu & Lin, 2009; Liu, Lin, & Chang, 2010; Miller & Robertson, 2010.

Success and satisfaction in any learning environment may be influenced by the student's individual characteristics (Baeten, Kyndt, Struyven, & Dochy, 2010; Baeten, Struyven, & Dochy, 2013). Learning is mediated by collaborative, social interaction and that learning does not only happen in the classroom, but rather in the everyday living spaces (McNiff and Whitehead, 2002). Ramsden & Entwistle (1981) were the first to empirically establish a relationship between approaches to learning and perceived characteristics of the academic environment. Subsequently, research has followed Entwistle's (1989) suggestion that explorations of the relationship between approaches to studying and perceptions of the learning environment may be more productive at the faculty or departmental level, given that findings at this level may be more likely to lead directly to the review course design and teaching practices. A small number of studies, using a mixture of populations and methodologies, have addressed this task. Trigwell & Prosser (1991a) distinguished between the types of learning outcomes students may derive from a course, and found that a deep approach to study was more strongly related to qualitative learning outcomes (the complexity of students' understanding of the aims of a course of study) than quantitative outcomes (assessment results). In parallel to these more general analyses, other researchers have investigated specific aspects of students' perceptions of the learning environment in more depth. For example, Kember and his associates (Kember *et al.*, 1996; Kember & Leung, 1998) have conducted a set of studies with engineering students, focusing specifically on the impact of workload on student learning. These studies have not only confirmed, but also extended, our understanding of the factors influencing students' perceptions.

Kember & Leung (1998), using path analysis, found a positive and reciprocal link between a surface approach and perceived heavy workload—that is, not only do perceptions affect approaches, but approaches also affect perceptions. Importantly, actual workload was not in itself a good measure of perceived workload, with the latter found to be a complex function of a range of factors. Kember *et al.* (1996) modelled the relationship between perceived workload, study behaviours and academic outcomes using both case study and path analysis, and found how students perceive workload to be a function of individual characteristics, approaches to and perceptions of the learning context. Kember *et al.* caution against interpreting questionnaire findings 'as purely a measure of the burden imposed by the curriculum, nor as an indicator of hours worked' There is also evidence indicating that a deep approach results in students achieving higher grades (Entwistle & Ramsden, 1983; Ramsden *et al.*, 1986; Eley, 1992; Drew & Watkins, 1998). Importantly, however, the relationship between study approaches and grades is necessarily moderated by the extent to which the assessment used to measure students' achievement itself emphasises understanding or reproduction of knowledge. Finally, there is some limited evidence (Ramsden, 1992) to suggest that students adopting a deep approach report higher levels of overall satisfaction with a course of study. While it is important to establish the impact of learning environments and approaches on students' affective experiences, such associations should be interpreted cautiously, since student satisfaction and Perceptions of the Learning Environment associated processes, such as interest in a task or subject, may influence as much as result from a student's approach to study.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Main Aim of the empirical research is to measure the “**Impact of University Motivated Environment on Students Learning**”. To serve this purpose, a customized measurement scale is used in order to work on the dimensions by which students evaluate motivated learning environment in a university.

Questionnaire Development.

The survey method, employing the self-administered questionnaire was chosen as the most appropriate data collection method for this particular research. The research instrument was developed covering 35 items each of which corresponded university motivated learning environment from the literature review. Item in questionnaire, corresponding each of the dimension, can be found in Table No: 1.

Description of 35 Questions for University Motivated Environment on Students Learning

1.	University provides sufficient space and proper furniture to sit in classrooms.
2.	University provides proper internet wi fi environment.
3.	University track complaints at main desk, help desk, etc
4.	University notify Students when changes or program are modify
5.	University provides sufficient bus services
6.	University provides all equipment facilities to Students.
7.	University provides sufficient hours to Students to avail Library services.
8.	University provides sufficient hours to Students to avail Computer Lab services.
9.	University maintains cleanliness everywhere in the university.
10.	University provides proper training and placement services to Students.
11.	University provides proper air conditioning services
12.	University update curriculum according to need of Industry.
13.	University provide sufficient number of Staff to Student to serve them.
14.	University policies for recruiting staff are according to the need of students learning.
15.	Students complaints about services provided are not attended/corrected on time.
16.	University thinks that Students are not following guidelines as expected to avail the services.
17.	University provides all teaching facilities in classrooms to staff.
18.	University provides performance appraisal conductions for Staff to improve quality of teaching and learning.
19.	University guidelines are not clear and understandable
20.	University lacks proper scheduling of teaching to Students.
21.	University keeps checks and controls for deadlines of services to Students.
22.	University provides proper parking services
23.	University provides proper cafeteria services
24.	University provides proper light services
25.	University staff dealing with students is good

26.	University admission and other processes are not clear
27.	University provides proper website services
28.	University provides proper sports facilities.
29.	University provides sufficient scholarship.
30	University English language proficiency environment effects students learning.
31.	University environment improves your knowledge.
32.	University environment improves your skills.
33.	University keep checks and controls on Staff teaching quality
34	University environment helps in acquiring the modern capacities and abilities
35	University environment effected my attitude towards dealing with the modern trends

The Sample

A total of 300 students randomly selected from different departments of Albaha university who are using the services provided by the university. Questionnaire was distributed to users in the university then questionnaires were returned, which was considered satisfactory for subsequent analysis

Hypothesis

The research objective is to determine if there is an empirical significance between the perceived university motivated environment on student's learning in Albaha university compared to the students expectations. Based on this research objective, the following hypotheses were developed:

Null Hypothesis. Ho: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$

There is no significant difference between the university motivated environment on student's learning as perceived (μ_1) by its students compared to their expectations (μ_2). (This means that the services offered by Albaha university as perceived do meet students expectations).

Research (Alternative) Hypothesis. H1: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

There is a significant difference between the university motivated environment as perceived (μ_1) by its students, relative to their expectations (μ_2). (This means the services of Albaha university as perceived by its students do not meet students expectations).

Obstacles:

- The survey includes limited respondents more can be added for further research in this area.
- Some of the respondents will have genuine difficulty in understanding the questionnaire, though a sincere effort will made to keep the questionnaire as simple as possible.
- Some respondents will not be able to response the questionnaire on actual data because they are not frequent users.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Data was entered in SPSS. Thereafter overall mean of various scores was taken. In order to know that this difference was statistically significant popular t-tests ANOVA were applied. If the value is greater than .05 this is our Null Hypothesis (H_0). We have tested this at significance level of 5% in all the cases and findings would have been more appropriately discussed and analyzed at various level of significance.

FINDINGS RELATED TO UNIVERSITY MOTIVATED ENVIRONMENT ON STUDENTS LEARNING

Findings shows that Students are not fully satisfied for the services provided by the university sufficient space and proper furniture to sit in classrooms, Library services, Computer Lab services, cafeteria, website, sports, internet wi fi environment, bus, training and placement services, maintain cleanliness everywhere in the university, proper air conditioning, light services, track complaints, Lab equipment facilities to students, teaching facilities in classrooms to staff, number of Staff to Student to serve them, policies for recruiting staff are according to the need of students learning, update curriculum according to need of Industry which means these services directly affecting students on their learning.

Analysis also shows that these factors are also affecting students learning related to performance appraisal conductions for Staff to improve quality of teaching and learning, guidelines are not clear and understandable, keeps checks and controls for deadlines of services to Students, staff dealing with students is not satisfactory, lacks proper scheduling of teaching to Students, admission and other processes are not clear, keep checks and controls on Staff teaching quality,

Findings also shows that university motivated environment also affects students learning for acquiring the modern capacities and abilities, attitude towards dealing with the modern trends, improving their knowledge and skills.

Findings show that there are no scholarships for a student which is the most important motivated factor for the students to study and learn.

Analysis shows that students believe that English language proficiency environment affects their learning.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall perception of University Motivated Environment on Students Learning

The perceptions of all 300 respondents are:

The Students are not satisfied with most of the university services provided to them to motivate their learning environment. Therefore we conclude there is apparently a gap between the

perception and expectation of the university services provided to the students. This university environment gap needs to be filled to motivate students learning.

Hypothesis accepted and rejected by the students

Students are not satisfied with most of the services provided by the university to motivate learning environment but Hypothesis is accepted in all cases.

REFERENCES

- Alton-Lee, A. (2003). *Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling: Best evidence synthesis*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Amundson, N.E. (2010), *Metaphor Making: Your Career, Your Life, Your Way*, Ergon Communications, Richmond.
- Betts, K. S. (1998). *Factors influencing faculty participation in distance education in postsecondary education in the United States: An institutional study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, DC.
- Brewer, W. Ernest. Burgess N. David. Professor's Role in Motivating Students to Attend Class. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education* 42.23 (2005): 23-47
- Beck, U. (1994), "The reinvention of politics – towards a theory of reflexive modernisation", in Beck, U., Giddens, A. and Lash, S. (Eds), *Reflexive Modernisation*, Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 1-56.
- Baeten, M., Kyndt, E., Struyven, K., & Dochy, F. (2010). Using student-centred learning environments to stimulate deep approaches to learning: Factors encouraging or discouraging their effectiveness. *Educational Research Review*, 5, 243-260. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2010.06.001
- Chang, C. Y., & Lee, G. (2010). A major e-learning project to renovate science learning environment in Taiwan. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(1), 7-12.
- Chen, Y. L., Liu, E. Z. F., Shih, R. C., Wu, C. T., & Yuan, S. M. (2011). Use of peer feedback to enhance elementary students' writing through blogging. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(1), E1-E4.
- Dart, B. C. & Clarke, J. A. (1991) Helping students become better learners: a case study in teacher education, *Higher Education*, 22, 317-335.
- Drew, P.Y. & Watkins, D. (1998) Affective variables, learning approaches and academic achievement: a causal modelling investigation with Hong Kong tertiary students, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, pp. 173-188.
- Eggen, D. Paul, Don, Kauchak. *Educational Psychology: Classroom Connections*. The United States: Macmillan, 1994. Wlodkowski, R. *Enhancing Adult Motivation to Learn*. San Francisco: JosseyBass, 1995.
- Eschenmann, K. (1991). Student Perceptions of Teaching Style in The Health Occupation Classroom. *Journal of Health Occupations Education*, 6(1).
- Entwistle, N. (1989) Approaches to studying and course perceptions: the case of the disappearing relationship, *Studies in Higher Education*, 14, pp. 156-157.
- Entwistle, N.J. & Ramsden, P. (1983) *Understanding Student Learning* (London, Croom Helm).
- Eley, M.G. (1992) Differential adoption of study approaches within individual students, *Higher Education*, 23, pp. 231-254.

- Giddens, A. (1991), *Modernity and Self-Identity – The Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Polity Press, London.
- Gysbers, N.C. and Henderson, P. (2005), “Designing, implementing, and managing comprehensive school guidance and counselling programme”, in Sink, C.A. (Ed.), *Contemporary School Counselling: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA, pp. 151-188.
- Hassan, I. S., Ismail, M. A., & Mustapha, R. (2010). The effects of integrating mobile and CAD technology in teaching design process for Malaysian polytechnic architecture student in producing creative product. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(4), 162-172.
- Jou, M., Chuang, C. P., & Wu, Y. S. (2010). Creating interactive web-based environments to scaffold creative reasoning and meaningful learning: From physics to products. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(4), 49-57.
- Jarvis, P. and Keeley, E.S. (2003), “From vocational decisionmaking to career building: blueprint, real games, and school counselling”, *Professional School Counselling*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 244-251.
- Knowles, M. (1986) *University teaching: a framework for effective use*.
- Kember, D. & Leung, D.Y.P. (1998) Influences upon students’ perceptions of workload, *Educational Psychology*, 18, pp. 293–307.
- Lin, C. H., Liu, E. Z. F., Kou, C. H., Virnes, M., Sutinen, E., & Cheng, S. S. (2009). A case analysis of creative spiral instruction model and students’ creative problem solving performance in a LEGO robotics course. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 5670, 501-505.
- Liu, E. Z. F. (2010). Early adolescents’ perceptions of educational robots and learning of robotics. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(3), E44-E47.
- Lomas, C. & Oblinger, D. (2006). Student practices and their impact on learning spaces. In D. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning spaces* (pp. 5.1–5.11).
- Frayser, D. A. (1999). Creating a campus culture to support a teaching and learning revolution. *Cause/Effect Journal*, 22(2), 6-19.
- Hood, P. (2002). Perspectives on knowledge utilization in education. Retrieved June 12, 2006, from http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/perspectives.pdf
- Johnson, J. D. (2000). Levels of success in implementing information technologies. *Innovative Higher Education*, 25(1), 59-76.
- MacDonald, J. K., Yanchar, S.C., & Osguthrope, R. T. (2005). Addressing faculty concerns about distance learning. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(4), 1-12.
- McNiff, J. and Whitehead, J. (2002), *Action Research: Principles and Practice*, 2nd ed., RoutledgeFalmer, London.
- McGlynn, A. P. (2008). Millennials in College: How Do We Motivate Them? *Education Digest*, 73(6), 19-22.
- Miller, D. J., & Robertson, D. P. (2010). Using a games console in the primary classroom: Effects of ‘brain training’ programme on computation and self-esteem. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(2), 242-255.
- Nuutinen, J., Sutinen, E., Botha, A., & Kommers, P. (2010). From mindtools to social mindtools: Collaborative writing with woven stories. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(5), 753-775.
- Quick, D., & Davies, T. G. (1999). Community college faculty development: Bringing technology into instruction. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 23, 641-653.

- Ramsden, P. & Entwistle, N.J. (1981) Effects of academic departments on students' approaches to studying, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 51, pp. 368–383.
- Ramsden, P. (1992) *Learning to Teach in Higher Education* (London, Routledge).
- Schifter, C. C. (2000). Faculty participation in asynchronous learning networks: A case study of motivating and inhibiting factors. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 4(1), 15-22.
- Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. *American Educational Research Journal*, 25(1), 1-30.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., and Smith, B. (1994). *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook: Strategies and Tools for Building a Learning Organization*, NY: Doubleday Currency.
- Trigwell, K. & Prosser, M. (1991a) Improving the quality of student learning: the influence of learning context and student approaches to learning on learning outcomes, *Higher Education*, 22, pp. 251–266.
- Wang, C. Y. (2001). Walk a mile in students' shoes: An approach to faculty development on integrating web-based collaborative learning into instruction. Retrieved May 31, 2005, from <http://newmedia.colorado.edu/cscl/155.html>