

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN QUALITY OF LIFE, ACADEMIC BEHAVIOR AND STUDENT MOTIVATION IN TEACHERS' TRAINING INSTITUTE, MALAYSIA.

Kamaruddin Ilias

Ipoh Teacher Training Institute
MALAYSIA.

kama.ilias@yahoo.com

Mubin Md Nor

Ipoh Teacher Training Institute
MALAYSIA.

mubin_nor@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine whether there is a significant relationship between quality of life of academic conduct, determine whether there is a significant relationship between quality of life with motivation, determining whether a significant relationship between academic and behavioral student motivation. This study design in the form of quantitative correlation with student samples of students from Pre-Bachelor Program Teaching (PPISMP) Group K (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970) at the Institute of Teacher Education, Campus Ipoh. Quality of life instrument is the Quality of School Life by Malin & Linnakyla (2001). The instrument consists of six dimensions of satisfaction, student teacher relationship, the status of students in the class, identity formation, achievements and opportunities and negative effects. Academic behavior Instruments Iliina Motivation for Learning Instruments by Iliin (2000) is composed of three dimensions of intrinsic motivation, professional lecturer and self-discipline. Instruments of motivation from the motivated self-efficacy dimensions Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) by Pintrich et al. (1993) and goal orientation dimensions instruments of Instrument of Goal Inventory (Plants, 2000). The study showed that there was no significant relationship quality of life for students with academic behavior, there is no significant relationship with student motivation quality of life and there is no significant relationship between academic and motivational behavior.

Keywords: Quality of Life, Academic Behavior and Motivation

INTRODUCTION

Quality of life is a degree of prosperity which is felt or enjoyed by an individual or a group of people (Ross & Willigen, 1997). Williams and Batten (1981), quality of life is the well-being, happiness, satisfaction, positive and negative experiences. Austin et al. (2007) quality of life refers to schools with the development of a positive learning climate that is reflected through the support of the school environment, school safety and school attachment.

According to Schalock (1996), the quality of human life consists of emotional well-being, interpersonal relationships, physical wellbeing, personal development, decision-making, social relationships and rights. Quality of life domain consists of achievement, school management, teacher student relationships, peer relationships, learning and school work (Tian, 2008). Next, Williams and Batten (1981), contains the dimensions of quality of life satisfaction, student teacher relationship, the status of students in class, identity formation, achievements and opportunities and negative affect. Williams and Roey (1997), consists of the dimensions of quality of life satisfaction, student teacher relationship, the status of students in class, identity formation, achievements and opportunities and negative affect. To build a good quality of life it is very important educational role. Ross and Wu (1996) state education have the greatest impact on life opportunities to acquire and maintain the quality of life.

The concept of behavior (Azizi, 2005) is the appearance, as a result of changes in translation or expression of emotions, feelings and thoughts. It involves physical elements that can be seen by the naked eye whether positive behavior, and devian delinkuan. Contains the dimensions of academic behavior intrinsic motivation, professional lecturer and self-discipline. The concept of student motivation is self-efficacy is students' perceptions of their confidence in the ability and academic performance. Goal orientation and learning orientation is a statement about the attitudes and behavior are used in determining their goals. Student motivation of self-efficacy dimensions, learning goals and performance goals. While the motivation of self-efficacy dimensions, learning goals and performance goals.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Schools and teachers have an influence on the behavior of students (Jill & Joy, 2009). According to Mortimore and Whitty (in Jill & Joy, 2009) states that good planning interventions in schools can help students of social problems and the school must provide a safe environment to assist in the development of children, especially in the face of experience and negative influence in schools. In fact, the schools pay scant attention to the aspects of quality of life. This can be proved with many of the problems in school disputes, fights, bullying, gangsterism, vandalism, lack of infrastructure facilities, student health problems and so on. The matter can be seen with the problem of disputes and quarrels occurred (Ismail & Maimonides, 1994), bullying (Frisen et al., 2007) and (Azizi & Abdul Latif, 2005), gangsterism (EPRD, 1999), vandalism (Azizi & Abdul Latif, 2005) and lack of infrastructure (Ismail & Maimonides, 1994). It does affect the quality of life and have an impact on the behavior of academic and student motivation.

STUDY HYPOTHESIS

The hypothesis of this study are:

HO1: There is no significant relationship between quality of life with academic behavior

HO2: There is no significant relationship between quality of life with motivation.

HO3: There is no significant relationship between academic and motivational behavior.

METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This study also used correlation analysis. According Zukarnain and Dean (2001) correlation analysis seeks to determine whether there is or not the relationship between variables, describing the strength of relationships and the relationships between variables

Study sample

Semester student population involves three Preparatory Programme Bachelor Teaching (PPISMP) who takes a subject of Social Studies in the IPG Campus Ipoh. The total population of 95 students. Sample of 76 students based on the estimated 95 semester students taking the subject of three PPISMP Social Studies 1 (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Simple random sample selection.

Research Instruments

Instruments of quality of life of the Quality of School Life by Malin and Linnakyla (2001) which contains 29 items. The instrument consists of six dimensions of satisfaction, student teacher relationship, the status of students in the class, identity formation, achievements and opportunities and negative effects. Instruments and students' academic behavior from Iliin Motivation for Learning Instruments by Iliin (2000) which consists of 15 items and contains the dimensions of intrinsic motivation, lecturers and professional dimensions of self-discipline dimensions. While the instrument is motivated from motivated self-efficacy dimensions

Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) by Pintrich et al. (1993) as well as the instruments of the goal orientation dimensions Goal Instrument Inventory (Plants, 2000) and used in the study Saemah Rahman (2004). The instrument consists of 25 items of self-efficacy of eight items, nine items of the learning goals and performance targets of 8 items.

Reliability Tools Reviews

Table 1: The reliability coefficient measuring instrument's quality of life, academic behavior and motivation

measuring instrument	Cronbach Alpha
The quality of life	0.76
academic behavior	0.83
Motivation	0.89

Based on Table 1 above, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of this study to measure the quality of life instrument was 0.76, the behavior of a measuring instrument is 0.83 and the academic motivation gages 0.89.

FINDINGS

Background of Respondents

The following is a demographic profile of respondents in terms of gender.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to demographic

<i>profile</i>	<i>frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Sex		
Male	36	47.4
Female	40	52.6

Table 2 above shows the distribution of respondents according to demographic profile of gender

Quality of Life Relationship with Academic Behavior and Motivation

Table 3: Relationship of Quality of Life with Academic Behavior quality of life

quality of life		
	r	p
academic behavior	0.344**	0.005

Based on Table 3, the relationship between quality of life with academic behavior indicates that the value of $p = 0.005$ smaller than the value $\alpha = 0.05$. This means there is no significant relationship between quality of life with academic behavior. Pearson correlation coefficient (r) obtained is 0.344 ** and this means that there is a low correlation. Positive correlation coefficient r values showed a positive relationship between quality of life of academic conduct.

Table 4: Relationship of Quality of Life With Motivation

	quality of life	
	r	p
Motivation	0.291**	0.004

Based on Table 4 above, the relationship between quality of life by motivating shows the value of $p = 0.004$ is smaller than the value $\alpha = 0.05$. This means there is no significant relationship between quality of life with motivation. Pearson correlation coefficient (r) obtained is 0.291 ** and this means that there is a low correlation. Positive correlation coefficient r values showed a positive relationship between quality of life with motivation.

Academic Behavior Relationships With Motivation

Table 5: Association of Academic Behavior In Motivation

	Academic behavior	
	r	p
Motivation	0.021	0.842

Based on Table 5, the relationship between the academic and motivational behavior shows the value of $p = 0.842$ is greater than the value $\alpha = 0.05$. This means there is no significant relationship between academic and motivational behavior.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the findings of the study showed there was no significant relationship quality of life for students with academic behavior and student motivation. But there is no significant relationship between academic and motivational behavior. Generally, the study was a large benefit to the country's education system as consistent with the National Education Philosophy which ensure that Malaysians are able to achieve personal well-being or quality of a sound mind and attitude, soul and a strong self patience to face the challenges, problems and obstacles life and be able to establish good relations with others (Ray & Khayati, 2003). It is also in line with Vision 2020, aims towards the formation of a moral society and a caring society (Yusof & Khayati, 2003). The study is also in line with the Education Development Master Plan 2006-2010 (Planning and Policy Research, 2006) and the concept of 1 Malaysia.

REFERENCES

- Austin, G., Hanson, T., Bono, G., & Cheng., Z. (2007). The achievement gap, school well being and learning support, CHKS Factsheet #8. Los Alamitos, CA: WestEd. <http://www.closingtheachievementgap.org/cs/ctag/view/resourc>
- Azizi Yahaya & Abdul Latif Ahmad (2005). Persepsi guru dan pelajar terhadap perlakuan buli di kalangan pelajar sekolah menengah daerah Batu Pahat. *Jurnal Teknologi*, 43(E), 63-86.
- Bahagian Perancangan dan Penyelidikan Dasar Pendidikan (1999). *Kajian gengsterisme di sekolah menengah harian*.

- Frisen, A., Jonsson, A., & Persson, C. (2007). Adolescents perception of bullying: Who is the victim? Who is the bully? What can be do to stop bullying?. *Adolescence*, 42,(168), 749-761.
- Ismail Othman & Maimon Hussien (1994). *Asrama desa sekolah rendah Sabah: Satu tinjauan*. Prosiding Seminar Nasional ke 4 Pengurusan Pendidikan, Institut Aminuddin Baki. Pahang Malaysia.
- Iliin,P. (2000). Motivatsia y motivy [Motivation and motives]. Dalam Khramtsova, I., Saarnio, D.A., Williams, K., & Khramtsova, I. (2007) Happiness, Life Satisfaction, and Depression in College Students: Relations with Student Behaviors and Attitudes. *American Journal of Psychological Research*, 13 (1), 8-16.
- Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research. *Educational and Psychological Measurements*, 30, 607-610.
- Malin, A & Linnakyla, P (2001). Multilevel modeling in repeated measures of the quality of Finnish school life. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 45, (2).145-166 validity of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 53,(3), 801-813.
- Plant, R.T.(2000). The relationship of motivation and metacognition to academic performance in Graduate Medical Education. Unpublished Doctoral Dessertation, The University of Memphis.
- Pintrich, P.R., Smith, D.A., Garcia.T., & Mc Keachie, W.J. (1991). Reliability and predictive
- Saemah Rahman (2004).Hubungan antara metokognitif, motivasi dan pencapaian akademik pelajar universiti.Tesis PhD yang tidak diterbitkan, Fakulti Pendidikan, Universiti Malaya.
- Tian, L. (2008). Development of Adolescents' School Well-being Scale. *Psychological Development and Education*, 24, 100-106.
- Williams,T., & Batten, M. (1981). *The Quality of School Life*, ACER Research Monograph no. 12. Hawthorn, Victoria: ACER.
- Williams, T., & Roey, S. (1997). Consistencies in the quality of school life. In M. Binkley, M., Rust, K., & Williams, T. (Eds) *Reading Literacy in an International Perspective*, pp. 193–202. Washington, DC:US Department of Education.
- Zulkarnain Zakaria & Hishamuddin Md. Som (2001). Analisis data menggunakan SPSS Windows. Skudai: Universiti Teknologi Malaysia