



ijcrr

Vol 04 issue 06
Category: Research
Received on: 19/01/12
Revised on: 28/01/12
Accepted on: 10/02/12

COMPARISON OF MOTIVATIONAL BELIEFS IN SELF-REGULATION LEARNING BETWEEN INTELLIGENT, LEARNING-DISABLED AND NORMAL STUDENTS IN PRIMARY SCHOOL IN RASHT

Shohreh Ghorbanshiroudi

Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

E-mail of Corresponding Author: s.shiroudi@toniau.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

An insight into people trend toward academic activities plays an important role in psychology and pedagogy. The aims of this study to compare self-regulation learning among normal, intelligent, and learning-disabled children, so 76 intelligent students, 77 normal students, and 49 learning-disabled students in 12-10 age range were randomly selected from schools in Rasht. Two different forms of academic self-regulation learning questionnaire (SQR) Ryan & Connell (1989) were used to collect data via 4 methods i.e. external regulation, introjections, identification, internal regulation. Statistical analysis show that in external regulation method, the learning-disabled children got higher grads than the normal and intelligent ones. In introjections and identification method, intelligent children had better averages than normal and learning-disabled ones, while in internal regulation method, there was no significant difference between intelligent and normal students, whereas these two groups were significantly different from the learning-disabled ones ($p < 0.01$). It is mention worthy that the results were testified in two i.e. control regulation and autonomy methods. Moreover, multi-variable regression statistical analysis shows that among demographic variables, father's job and mother's education degree have positive and meaningful predictability.

Keywords: Motivational Beliefs, Self Regulated Learning, Learning Disability

INTRODUCTION

Research and reflection on causes of people engagement to academic and scholastic activities have a special position in psychology and instruction and training instrumental and non-instrumental reasons people often present about educational affairs have been studied as a motivational beliefs (Nicholls 1984, Rotter 1966, Connell & Wellborn 1991).

Several theories and views have studied and analyzed motivational beliefs. Also emphasis is placed on individual merits, expectation of success and failure and

consequences control in self-efficiency theory of Bandura (1997) and control theories such as locus of control. (Rotter 1966, Crandall, et al. 1965, Connell & Wellborn 1999). In other groups of theories, such as intrinsic motivation theory (Nicholls 1984, Heyman & Dweck 1992) and self determination theory (Deci & Ryan 1985, Cameron & pierce 1994), people's reasons in engagement to scientific duties are studied. In other words, in this group of views, goals and values of duties are considered by presenting the main question of "why", in the third group of views, value and expectation are considered as a combination in motivational beliefs. (Eccles 2008, Graham

2009, vainer,2005), and finally theories also analyzed and study two elements of motivation and knowledge (Pentrich et al. 1993, Schunk & Zimmerman 2004; Bouakaterz, 1999). Thing that increases the motivational beliefs' importance in educational scopes is the relation of these beliefs with self regulated learning. Researchers and experts have stated several definitions to this type of learning such as Zimmerman & Martinez Pons (2010) who define self-regulation as a process during which learner considers learning as a regular and controllable process and is responsible for his educational consequences such as students participate in learning processes from an ultracognitive, motivational and behavioral view points actively. Other group of psychologists believes that self regulated learning. Is an individual's ability to behave based on change of internal and external conditions and includes self-executed processes in planning, execution and guidance of actions (Schunk 2005, Pintrich 2009). According to Bandura (1997), self-regulation is a use of abilities and efficiencies of self-guidance, self-control and self-governing. Accordingly, mentioned capabilities are influenced by individuals' belief about self-efficiency in different activities and behaviors. A common point of the above mentioned definitions is existence of three elements of knowledge, ultra-cognition and motivation in the self-regulation process. (Pintrich & Groot, 2010) that several views are existed in relation to each of the mentioned elements. As definitions are obvious, motivational beliefs have an important and fundamental role in self-regulated learning. One of the best theories that have been presented in this regard is a self determination theory (Chandler & Connell

1987; Deci & Ryan 1985; Ryan & Connell 1989).

These researchers have explained their theories based on the concept of "Perceived locus control" of Hayder that differentiates between personal causality (that is behaviors based on internal motivation) and impersonal causality (actions based on environmental elements). In Deci & Ryan (1985) theory, the most important issue is principle of "internalization" through which individuals transform external guiding reasons of actions to internal reasons. Two general dimensions of this internalization is "autonomy" that is described as regulatory styles in an appendix (Ryan & Lynch 1989; Deci & Ryan 1985; Deci & et al. 1992; Ryan & Connell 1989).

Ryan & et al. believe that individuals have four regulatory style in educational activities, in case educational behaviors are done based on external elements such as reward, threat and punishment, it is representative of external regulation. Although in introjected regulation style, individuals' reasons in educational activities are internal, external elements' pressure through threat of self-idea, anxiety and sense of guilt forces individual to act. When an individual do an action based on internal self-values has a identification regulation in which external motivations have been internalized in an individual values system. In other words, an individual do actions that are important to him in person. And finally when an individual do an action without considering consequence of a behavior, merely to take internal pleasure, excitement and eagerness has internal regulation style. The present study has been done along with a comparison of motivational beliefs in a self-regulated learning among students of intelligent schools, normal schools and learning students with learning disabilities

mentioned regulation styles by Ryan et al. (2008). Several researches have compared motivational bases of behaviors of intelligent, normal and learning disabled children under titles of locus of control, self-concept, community friendly practices, compatibility self-efficiency beliefs and etc. Wide group of researches shows that intelligent children have internal motivational bases for educational affairs than normal children. Janos & Robinson (2005) believe that in intelligent children being good, paying attention to other's well-being, and doing internally form faster than normal children. Alborzi and Mazidi (2009) found that intelligent children have internal locus of control and normal children have external locus of control. Chalpianlo and Hasani (2009) also gained the same result. Razaviye and Alborzi (2003) in comparison of community friendly practices between intelligent and normal children found that intelligent children have more internal motivations in occurring community friendly practices than their peer normal children. In other words, they are less influenced by environment elements. Alborzi and (Joukar) (2006) obtained the same by comparison of religious beliefs of the intelligent and normal children. Kelanki (1992) believes that intelligent children are superior than their normal coequals in respect of attributes of thought, self criticism, collaboration, social responsibility and reasoning. Karnes, McGinnis & Christopher (1996) also obtained the same results. Of course there are researchers that believe there isn't any difference between intelligent and normal children in respect of the mentioned attributes (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan, Lyons and Hanmer, 1989). But generally put, most of the mentioned researches show that intelligent children are more internal than

normal children. In other words, they after behave according to their internal motivations. Other group of researches have compared learning disabled children with normal and intelligent children. Results show that disabled children have external motivational bases in doing their homework than intelligent and normal children, and this causes more stress and anxiety. Accordingly, in the present research with respect to the pattern of motivational beliefs of Ryan and et al. (2008), intelligent, normal and learning disabled students were compared in four style of external, introjected, identification and internal regulations and two styles of autonomy and control. It is worth mentioning that autonomy regulation style is a combination of identification and internal regulations and control regulation is a combination of external regulation and introjected regulation. The purpose of this study is to answer the following questions:

1) Is there a meaningful difference among intelligent, normal and learning disabled children in the external, introjected, identification and internal regulations according to gender and educational conditions (intelligent, normal, learning disabled)?

2) Is there a meaningful difference among intelligent, normal and learning disabled children in two styles of control regulation and autonomy according to gender and educational conditions (intelligent, normal, learning disabled)?

In addition to the above-mentioned questions, the following question is also studied in the present research:

Which of these variables of age, father's educations, mother's educations, father's job, and mother's job is a better predictor of "relative autonomy indicator"?

RESEARCH METHOD

Research society and sample:

understudied society in this research included all of the elementary students of intelligent, normal and learning disabled student's schools in educational year of (2010-11) in Rasht. Selection of Normal students was done by random-cluster sampling. That is, among four educational regions in Rasht, first region one was selected as a reference region based on the opinion of primary school expert of educational organization. Then among all girl's and boy's schools of the region, one girl's and one boy's school were selected randomly of each school one grade-five

class was placed randomly in a sample group and finally the sample included 77 male and female students was studied. Also of students who were accepted in an entrance exam of the intelligent, 76 intelligent male and female students were place in the sample group randomly. In addition to this, 49 disabled students in grade five were referred to the exceptional education center of educational organization, were also studied. Finally, 202 students, in age range of 10 to 12 (with the average of 11 years and standard deviation of 0.52) were studied. Demographic characteristics of the subjects are shown in table 1.

Table 1: Demographic characteristic of understudied sample group

Educational condition	gender	number	Total sum
Normal	Female	40	77
	Male	37	
Intelligent	Female	40	76
	Male	36	
Learning disabled	Female	17	49
	Male	32	
Total sum		202	202

Research tools

1) Academic self-regulation questionnaire (SRQ-A):

This questionnaire was prepared by Ryan and Connell (1989) to evaluate motivational beliefs of primary and guidance school children in educational affair, and includes four styles of external, introjected, identification and internal regulation. Each regulation style is evaluated on the basis of four types of activity (reasons to do homework, reasons to have a good behavior at school, reasons to do class activities, reasons to answer the questions in a class) by eight questions. This scale questions are as a four-degree range (completely right = 4 to completely wrong = 1). Additionally, to being informed of personal and familial specifications of a

subject such as age, gender, father's and mother's education and etc., these information were asked beginning of a questionnaire.

Academic self regulation questionnaire has three different forms. One from is specific to the adults and the second form is particular to children in primary and guidance school levels, and the third one is specific to the disabled children. In the present research, special forms for normal children and learning disabled children have been used. It is worth mentioning that compilers in the first form of the mentioned questionnaire questioned seven activities but mentioning four activities has a better psychometry.

Validity and Reliability of a questionnaire:

Validity and reliability of

the questionnaire were obtained by Alborzi and Razaviye (2003). If its validity is obtained based on the factor analysis and correlation with the same tests such as: religions self regulation questionnaire (SRQ-R), friendship self regulation questionnaire (SRQ-F) and community-friendly practices self regulation questionnaire and academic average, reliability results of the questionnaire obtained by retest methods an Cronbach's alpha are indicative of reliability of SRQ-A.

Results show efficiency and adequacy of this scale to be used in Iranian culture. It is mentionable that SRQ-A questionnaire was used to calculate statistical "relative autonomy" index (RAI). By the use of calculation formula of relative autonomy index ($2 \times \text{Intrinsic} + \text{Identified} - \text{Introjected} - 2 \times \text{External}$), a number is obtained that is indicator of quality of undivided condition based on the regulation style. Negative score shows control regulation and positive score shows autonomy regulation style.

2) SQR-A specific to children with learning disabilities:

The mentioned questionnaire was prepared by Deci, Hadge, Pearson and Tomasoun (1992) for children with learning disabilities. Test makers believe that the useable form of normal children is difficult for children with learning disabilities. Thus, a more brief form was prepared included 17 questions that has the same characteristic as the main form and studies self regulated learning in four styles of external, introjected, identification and internal regulations. In this questionnaire, total score is calculated based on the statistical "Relative Autonomy Index" (RAI).

RESULTS

Results are as the following:

A. Research results in relation to frequency of types of the motivational beliefs in groups of intelligent and normal children and children with learning disabilities are as the following.

Table 2: Frequency results of types of motivational beliefs in the intelligent, normal and learning disabled children in the external, introjected, identification, internal and autonomy regulation styles

Group	Number	External		Introjected		Identification		Internal		Control		autonomy	
		X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
Normal	77	11.35	2.3	11.04	1.9	7.10	1.71	6.75	1.1	22.35	3.6	13.85	2.2
Intelligent	76	8.86	1.8	12.63	3.3	8.38	1.46	6.53	1.8	21.5	4.5	14.92	2.6
Learning disabled	49	19.88	0.85	9.7	3.1	4.8	1.6	5.2	2.0	29.58	3.2	9.96	3.4

Results of the table show in normal children, external regulation style has the highest average and internal regulation style has the lowest average. That is, normal children have more external motivational beliefs in their educational affair. In the intelligent children, introjected regulation style has the highest average and internal regulation has the

lowest average, and this shows that intelligent children have introjected motivational beliefs. And finally, in children with learning disabilities external regulation style also has the highest average and internal regulation has the lowest regulation. It is worth mentioning that results obtained in the control and autonomy regulation approve the results.

B. To study whether there is a meaningful difference among intelligent, normal and disabled children in external, introjected, identification and internal regulation styles according to the gender, educational

conditions (intelligent, normal, learning disabled), 3- way ANOVA (Analysis of variance) 2 3 4 statistical method was used (table 4 and 5).

Table 3: Frequency, mean (average) and standard deviation of four external, introjected, identification and internal regulation styles based on gender and educational conditions (normal, intelligent, learning disabled)

Variable	Educational conditions	Gender	Number	Average	Standard deviation
External	normal	Male	37	11.24	1.83
		Female	40	10.77	1.98
		Total sum	77	11	1.91
	Intelligent	Male	36	9.05	1.62
		Female	40	8.7	1.97
		Total sum	76	8.86	1.81
	Learning disabled	Male	32	19.81	1.04
		Female	17	19.85	1.25
		Total sum	49	19.88	0.84
Introjected	normal	Male	37	11.32	2.81
		Female	40	11.37	1.83
		Total sum	77	11.35	2.34
	Intelligent	Male	36	12.80	3.71
		Female	40	12.47	2.92
		Total sum	76	12.63	3.29
	Learning disabled	Male	32	10.52	3.04
		Female	17	8.12	2.75
		Total sum	49	9.7	3.14
Identification	normal	Male	37	6.86	1.27
		Female	40	7.25	2
		Total sum	77	7.06	1.69
	Intelligent	Male	36	8.58	1.46
		Female	40	8.2	1.47
		Total sum	76	8.38	1.47
	Learning disabled	Male	32	5.15	1.56
		Female	17	4.12	1.49
		Total sum	49	4.8	1.6
Internal	normal	Male	37	6.65	1.25
		Female	40	6.8	1.06
		Total sum	77	6.73	1.15
	Intelligent	Male	36	6.8	1.9
		Female	40	6.3	1.78
		Total sum	76	6.53	1.85
	Learning disabled	Male	32	5.88	1.91
		Female	17	3.76	1.48
		Total sum	49	5.16	2.03

Table 4: A summary of variance analysis of four styles of external, introjected, identification, internal based on gender and educational

Variance source	Variable	Sum of squares	Degree of Freedom	Squares average	F
Educational conditions (intelligent, normal, learning disabled)	External	361.722	2	180.861	**64.43
	Introjected	311.565	2	155.782	**18.632
	Identification	398.080	2	199.040	**80.19
	internal	115.685	2	57.843	**22.54
Gender	External	2.125	1	2.125	0.75
	Introjected	36.96	1	36.96	*4.42
	Identification	5.492	1	5.492	2.21
	internal	31.41	1	31.41	**12.24
Gender/ educational conditions	External	3.18	2	1.591	0567
	Introjected	45.63	2	22.817	2.73
	Identification	14.97	2	7.484	*3.01
	internal	36.73	2	18.365	**7.15
Intragroups	External	552.984	197	2.807	
	Introjected	1647.104	197	8.361	
	Identification	488.981	197	2.482	
	internal	505.445	197	2.566	
Sum	External	4456.256	202		
	Introjected	1973.567	202		
	Identification	894	202		
	internal	644.099	202		

** p < 0.01

* p < 0.05

Written results in table 3 and 4 show that the difference among mentioned regulation styles on the basis of gender and educational conditions is meaningful if:

1) In the external regulation style, there is a meaningful difference between intelligent, normal and learning disabled children based on the educational conditions ($F = 64.43$, and $P < 0.01$). Use of pursue test shows that the resulted difference is between children with learning disabilities and normal ones, children with learning disabilities and intelligent ones, intelligent and normal children (average of children with learning disability = 19.88, average of normal children = 11, and average of the intelligent children = 8.86). In other words, children with learning disabilities have more external regulation that two other groups.

2) In the introjected regulation style, there is a meaningful difference between intelligent, normal and learning disabled

children based on the educational conditions ($p < 0.01$, $F = 18.632$) and gender ($p < 0.05$, $F = 4.45$). Pursue test shows that intelligent children have higher mark than normal and normal children have higher mark than children with learning disabilities. (average of intelligent children = 12.62, average of normal children = 11.35 and average of children with learning disabilities = 9.7). In addition to this, available gender difference in a group of children with learning disability is to the interest of male children (male average = 10.52 and female average = 8.12).

3) In the identification regulation style, there is a meaningful difference between intelligent, normal and learning disabled children based on the educational conditions ($p < 0.01$, $F = 80.19$) and interaction of educational conditions and gender ($p < 0.05$, $F = 3.01$). Results of a pursue tukey's test shows that intelligent children have higher mark than normal

children and normal children have higher mark than children with learning disability (average of intelligent children = 8.38, average of normal children= 7.06, and average of children with learning disability = 4.8). That is; intelligent children have higher marks than the other two groups in this regulation style.

4) In the internal regulation style; there is a meaningful difference between intelligent, normal and learning disabled children based on the educational conditions ($p<0.01$, $F=22.544$) and the gender ($p<0.01$, $F=12.24$) and interaction of educational conditions and gender ($p<0.01$, $F=7.15$). Results of a pursue tukey's test shows that the difference is based on the educational conditions between normal children and children with learning disability, and intelligent children and children with learning disability, but there is no meaningful difference between

normal and intelligent children. Available gender difference in a group of children with learning disabilities is to the interest of male children (male average = 5.88, female average=3.76). Meaningfulness of the interaction of gender and educational conditions also means that children regulation style depends on their gender and educational conditions.

C. By statistical method of 3-way variance analysis (3-way ANOVA) $2 \times 3 \times 2$, it was determined whether there is a meaningful difference among intelligent, normal and learning disabled children in two styles of control regulation (external regulation + introjected regulation) and autonomy regulation (identification regulation + internal regulation) according to gender and educational conditions (intelligent, normal and learning disabled)? Results of this analysis are presented in table 5 and 6.

Table 5: Frequency, average and standard deviation of four styles of external, introjected, identification and internal regulation based on gender and educational conditions (normal, intelligent, learning disabled)

Variable	Educational conditions	Gender	Number	Average	Standard deviation
Control regulation	normal	Male	37	22.57	3.76
		Female	40	22.15	3.43
		Total sum	77	22.35	3.58
	Intelligent	Male	36	21.86	4.88
		Female	40	21.17	4.30
		Total sum	76	21.5	4.57
	Learning disabled	Male	32	30.33	3.18
		Female	17	28.12	2.76
		Total sum	49	29.58	3.20
Autonomy regulation	normal	Male	37	13.51	1.95
		Female	40	14.05	2.38
		Total sum	77	13.79	2.19
	Intelligent	Male	36	15.39	2.77
		Female	40	14.5	2.35
		Total sum	76	14.92	2.58
	Learning disabled	Male	32	11.03	3.18
		Female	17	7.88	2.85
		Total sum	49	9.96	3.39

Table 6: Sum of variance analysis of two control and autonomy regulation styles based on gender and educational conditions

Variance source	Variable	Sum of squares	Degree of Freedom	Squares average	F
Educational conditions	Control	1867.232	2	933.616	**61.86
	Autonomy	885.248	2	442.624	**67.15
Gender	Control	56.815	1	56.815	*3.76
	Autonomy	63.179	1	63.179	**9.586
Gender/ educational conditions	Control	24.721	2	12.360	0.89
	Autonomy	96.225	2	48.113	7.3
Intragroups	Control	2973.360	197	15.093	
	Autonomy	1298.433	197	6.591	
sum	Control	5274.887	202		
	Autonomy	2206.099	202		

** P<0.01

* p<0.05

Written results in table 6 and 7 show that there is a meaningful difference in the control and autonomy regulation styles based on gender, educational conditions and interaction of gender with educational conditions:

1) There is a meaningful difference between intelligent children and children with learning disabilities and between normal children and children with learning disabilities in the control regulation style, but there is no difference between intelligent and normal children ($F=61.86$, $p<0.01$). In other words, children with learning disabilities are more controlled than intelligent and normal children (average of children with learning disabilities=29.58, average of normal children=22.35 and average of intelligent children=21.5). According to gender, there is a difference between girls and boys in the group of children with learning disabilities to the interest of the boys (male average=30.33 and female average=28.12 with $F=3.76$ and $p=0.05$).

2) There is a meaningful difference in the autonomy regulation style among intelligent, normal and learning disabled children based on the educational conditions ($F=67.15$, $p<0.01$) and gender ($F=9.586$, $p<0.01$) and interaction of

gender and educational conditions ($F=7.3$, $P < 0.01$). Pursuit test shows that intelligent children have higher mark than normal children, and normal children have higher mark than children with learning disabilities (average of intelligent children=14.92, average of normal children=13.79, and average of children with learning disabilities= 9.96). Additionally, the available gender difference in each of three groups of (intelligent, normal and learning disabled) children is to the interest of the male.

3) To answer this question that which of these variables of age, father's educations. Mother's educations, father's job, and mother's job is a better predictor of "relative autonomy indicator" (RAI), multi-variable regression analysis (Enter method) was used. Results are as the following:

Table 7: Analysis of multi-variable regression of age, father's education, mother's education, mother's job, father's job on RAI of the subjects

Independent Variable	Beta regression coefficient	R	R ²	Meaningful level
Age	-.02	0.25	0.06	--
Mother's education	0.18			0.05
Father's education	-0.16			---
Father's job	0.31			0.01
Mother's job	-0.08			--

As it obvious from table 7, multiple correlation coefficient equals $R=0.25$ shows that mother's education and father's job have correlation with the relative autonomy of the subjects. Determination coefficient was calculated $R^2 = 0.06$ that shows 6 percent of variance of the relative autonomy indicator is justifiable by mother's education and father's job variable.

To specify which types of independent variables have greater role in subject's RAI, Beta regression coefficient was used.

By comparing coefficient it is observed that among these five variables. Only father's job ($p<0.01$) and mother's education ($p<0.05$) have the positive and meaningful power of predicating and other variables don't have a meaningful role.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY

Results of the present research shows that students with learning disabilities have higher marks in the external regulation style than intelligent and normal children, and intelligent children have higher marks in the introjected and identification regulation style than normal children, but there isn't any difference between intelligent and normal children in the internal regulation style. A comparison of subjects on the basis of control and autonomy regulation confirm the obtained results. The present results in relation with intelligent children are along with the

researches (karenz & McGinnis 1996, Kan 1992, Zimerman, B.J. & Martinez-Pons 1990, Risemberg & Zimerman 1992, Kanog & et al. 1980, Alborzi & Mazidi 2009, Alborzi & Joukar 2006, Razaviye & Alborzi 2003, Chalpianlo & Hasani 2009) and are not along with researches of (Gilligan 1982; Gilligan and et al. 1989). The results obtained in relation with children with learning disabilities are also along with researches done by Linda 1983, Kanog and et al. 1990, Dou 1998 and Kampan, 1988.

Results of the comparison show that all of the three groups of children in the motivational beliefs are influenced by external elements more than being internal, of cours with this explanation that intelligent children are at the beginning of internalization (introjected regulation styles). The results obtained based on the effective environmental elements on behavior are justifiable in this way that each of three groups is influenced by the same educational system and the same educational conditions as a member of a united society. That is perception and thought of plurality that is dominant in the society influence behavior, beliefs and even individuals affections, in the case that an individual gain external orientation to begin and continue their activities. But in the present research, the differences among intelligent, normal and learning disabled children in each level show effective personal elements on their behavior. In

other words, if it supposed that subjects of the present research are put in the internalization continuum of Ryan and et al (1993) Children with learning disabilities have completely external orientation, normal children have external regulation but less than the first ones and intelligent children are at the beginning of internalization. Because intelligent children take less influence of the environment according to their intelligent and thought; however, it does not mean that they profit completely of they reasoning potential have intensity and weakness of taking influence is presented. On the other hand, in the autonomy theory of Ryan and et al, the main element internalization and self regulation of individual's experiences is conflict of the external environmental with the internal desires. The more conflict is between the external and internal of individual, behavior is more internalized in the primary continuum level and its self regulation is less. The less conflict, the easier internalization, in this relation, the available educational system increase the mentioned conflict; particularly for intelligent children that intelligent is obvious in their behavior as a mediator factor, this conflict is more severe and problematic. But children with learning disabilities are completely under influence of external factors and lake any kinds of self regulation and autonomy in learning. If personal needs and environmental demands come into agreement, internalization of behavior are done easier in different individual with different abilities and talents. In fact, results of the present research show the most fundamental problem of the present educational system. If students are engaged in education without motivational beliefs and necessary knowledge to internalization of learning, removal of their personal needs in each

groups according to the quality of cognitive and motivational processes is a basic step in creation of the self regulated learning in them. Thus, it is suggested that the future researches, in addition to the educational conditions study a wide set of effective variables (age, familial conditions, relationships with peers, teachers teaching method and test at school and etc.) on the student's motivation and cognition in several sets (house, school, society).

Other results of present research is the predictability power of demographic variables such as father's job and mother's education in the quality of formation of motivational beliefs and self regulated learning of the children. Educated mother's have more positive sensitivity and attitude in forming internal motivational beliefs in their children. In one hand, this issue is related to their education and awareness, and in the other hand, it is the expectations of the society of them. But in relation to father's job it is worth mentioning that in the modern society if seems that father's job is very important in children's motivational belief as an income and validity source. Such fathers often try to create internal motivations in their children by having positive attitude towards their training.

In sum, it is worth mentioning that results of the present research have useful notes for the parents and instructors in relation to the quality of their behavior in the formation of student's motivational beliefs behaviors that represent severe control removal of personal choice and decision making ability. Creates wrong motivational beliefs in children based on disability and inefficiency and lead to their passitiveness. Thus, parents awareness of the quality of motivational beliefs creation in the children and emphasis on their role in this scope, has an influential effect on the

improvement of their individual and educational behavior. This is true about teachers and those who are in charge of the educational organization.

PERSIAN REFERENCES

1. Alborzi Mahboube & Joukar Bahram (2006). "A comparison of self-management of prodigious school students and ordinary school students in Rasht".
2. Alborzi Mahboube & Mazidi Mohammad (2009), "A comparison of self-esteem and control center in prodigious school students ordinary school students". The first national conference on prodigious, 23-24 October.
3. Alborzi Mahboube & Razaviye Asghar (2003), "A study of validity and dynamics of questionnaire on self-education (SRQA)", to be published.
4. Razaviye Asghar & Alborzi Mahboube (2002), "A comparison of socially accepted moral reasons among prodigious ordinary and blind students", Psychology Magazine, Second Edition.
5. Chalpianlo Gholamreza & Hassani Ja'afar (2009), "A comparison of controcenters, self-respect, and contrastive methods in prodigies, and ordinary people", the first national conference on prodigies, 23-24 October.
6. Virginia, Z. Arltch (2010), "Prodigious children" (Translated by Akram Kalanki), Alhoda Publications.

ENGLISH REFERENCES

1. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
2. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.

3. Boekaerts, M. (1999). Self regulated learning: Where we are today: *International Journal of Educational Research*, 31, 445-457.
4. Cameron J, Pierce WD. (1994). Reinforcement, reward, and intrinsic motivation: a meta-analysis. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 64: 363-423.
5. Chapman, TW. (1988). Learning disabled children's self concepts. *Review of Educational Research*, 58: 347-371.
6. Chan, L.K.S. (1992). Causal attributions, strategy usage and reading competence. Paper presented at the AARE/NZARE Joint Conference, 22-26 Nov. 1992. Geelong.
7. Chandler, C.L. & Connell, J.P. (1987). Children's intrinsic, extrinsic, and internalized motivation: A developmental study of behavioral regulation. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 5, 357-365.
8. Connell JP, Well born JG. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: a motivational analysis of self-system processes. In *Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology*, ed. M Gunnar, LA Sroufe, 23:43-77. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
9. Crandall, V.C. Katkovsky W, Crandall, V.J. (1965). Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual-academic achievement situations. *Child Dev.* 36: 91-109.
10. Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
11. Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). What and why of goal purporsits: Human needs and the self determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4): 227-268.

12. Deci, E.L., Hodges, R. Pierson, L. & Tomassone J. (1992). Autonomy and competence as motivational factors in students with learning disabilities and emotional handicaps. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 25: 457-471.
13. Dev, Poonam C. (1998). Intrinsic Motivation and the Student with Learning Disabilities, *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 31(2): 98-108.
14. Eccles JS. (1987). Gender roles and women's achievement-related decisions. *Psychol. Women Q.* 11:135-72.
15. Gray, L. E. (1982). *Aptitude constructs, Learning processes and achievement*, Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.
16. Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
17. Gilligan, C. Lyons, N.P., & Hanmer, T.J. (Eds.). (1989). *Making connections: the relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School*. Troy, NY: Emma Willard School.
18. Golumba, L.R. Hillman, S. (1990). "A Comparison of Learning Disabled and Nondisabled Adolescent Motivational Processes". *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association* (98th Boston, MA, August, 10-14).
19. Graham S. (2009). "A review of attribution theory in achievement contexts". *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* 3: 5-39.
20. Heyman, G.D., & Dweck, C.S. (1992). Achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: Their role in adaptive motivation. *Motivation and Emotion*, 16: 231-247.
21. Linda, H.D. (1983). A Comparison of Emotional-Motivational (A-R-D Theory) Personality Characteristics in Learning Disabled, Normal Achieving, and High Achieving Children. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association* (Montreal, Canada, April 11-14).
22. Karnes, F.A.; McGinnis, J. Christopher (1996). Self-actualization and locus of control with academically talented adolescents. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education* (2): 369-372.
23. Kanog, R.C.III, and others (1980). Locus of control and self-concept in achieving and underachieving bright elementary students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 17:395-399.
24. Janos, P.M. & Robinson, N.M. (2005). Psychological development in intellectually gifted children. In F.D. Horowitz & M. Obrien (Eds.), *The Gifted and talented: Developmental Perspective* (pp. 194-195). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
25. Jacobsen, B., Lowery, P., & DuCette, J. (1986). Attributions of learning disabled children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(1): 59-64.
26. Leahey, E. & Guo, G. (2001). Gender differences in mathematical trajectories. *Social Forces*. 80: 713.
27. Manning, M.L. (1998). Gender differences in young adolescent's mathematics and science achievement. *Childhood Education*, 74(3), 168-171.
28. A. Mulcahy, R; and others (1990), Perceived competence, self concept and locus of control for high ability students, as compared to average and learning disabled students. *Canadian Journal of Special Education*, 6: 42-49.
29. Nicholls JG. (1984), Achievement motivation: conceptions of ability,

- subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychol. Rev.* 91: 328-46.
30. Pentrich, P.R. (2009). The role of motivation in promoting and sustaining self regulated learning, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 31:459-470.
 31. Pentrich, P.R. & De Groot, E. (2010). Motivational and self regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82: 33-40.
 32. Pintrich PR, Marx R.W., Boyle RA. (2003). Beyond cold conceptual change: the role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 63: 167-99.
 33. Risemberg, R. & Zimmerman RJ. (2002). Self-regulated learning in gifted students. *Roeper Review*, 15(2): 98-101.
 34. Rogers, H. & SakloAke, D.H. (1985). Self concepts, locus of control and performance expectations of learning disabled children. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 18: 273-279.
 35. Rotter JB. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement *Psychol. Monogr.* 80: 1-28.
 36. Ryan, R.M. & Connell, J.P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 572: 749-761.
 37. Ryan, R.M., & Lynch, J. (1989). Emotional autonomy versus detachment: Revisiting the vicissitudes of adolescence and young adulthood. *Child Development*, 60: 340-350.
 38. Ryan, R M., Rigby S., King, K. (2008). Two types of religious internalization and their relations to religious orientations and mental health *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65: 586-596.
 39. Swanson, S., & Howell, C. (1996). Test anxiety in adolescents with learning disabilities and behaviour disorders. *Exceptional Children*, 62: 389-397.
 40. Schunk, D.H. (2005). Self Efficacy and school learning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 22: 208-223.
 41. Schunk OH, Zimmerman BJ, eds. (2004). *Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
 42. Yun Dai, D. (2000). A comparison of gender differences in academic self-concept and motivation between high-ability students *Journal of Secondary Gifted Students*, 13(1): 22-33.
 43. Zimmerman, B.J. & Martinez-Pons, M. (2009). Student differences in self regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self efficacy and stragy use *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82: 51-69.
 44. Zimmerman, B.J. & Martinez-Pons, M. (2008). Construct validation of a strategy model of student self regulated learning *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80: 284-290.
 45. Weiner B. (2005). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychol. Rev.* 92: 548-73.
 46. igfield, A., Eccles, J.S., & Pintrich, P.R. (2006). Development between the ages of 11 and 25. In D.C.