© 2011, Science-Line Publication
www.science-line.com
Journal of Educational and Management Studies
J. Educ. Manage. Stud., (1)1: 52-64, 2011
JEMS

The impact of dynamic classroom on increasing educational motivation

Abbas Khorshidi* and Robab Tahmanesh

Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University (IAU), Islamshahr, Iran

* Corresponding author's Email: a_khorshidi40@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: The present study examines the effect of dynamic classrooms on improvement of educational motivation among the students at high school in Tehran Department of Education, Tehran City. To test the following hypotheses: 1. Dynamic classrooms may lead to rising educational motivation among high school students; 2. Female teachers administer more dynamic classrooms than male teachers; 3. Educational motivation in female is greater than in male students. The participants in this study include all principals and their training assistants and students in high schools in Tehran City that comprise our statistical populations; according to simple randomized sampling technique and H.S. Bola formula for determination of sample space, 100 principals and educational assistants (separately 25 female principals and 25 male principals as well as 25 female assistants and 25 male assistants) and 300 high school students (separately 150 female students and 150 male students) have been elected for this study and then two questionnaires were administered for them respectively 40- questions dynamic classroom questionnaire for principals and their assistants and 50- question educational motivation questionnaire for students and the results of data have been calculated and based on statistical T-tests, Pearson correlation Test and regression that suggest the following outcomes: 1. Dynamic classrooms may lead to rising educational motivation among high school students; 2. There is no difference between educational motivation in females and males; 3. There is no significant difference among classrooms administered by female teachers and male teachers in terms of educational dynamism.

Keywords: dynamic classrooms, motivation, educational progress

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTRODUCTION

Due to having spiritual, economic, social and political goals etc., educational system is especially important in different communities. The major significance of educational system lies in its social role. This role is fulfilled by presentation of a series of information that originated from collective culture to individual.

Today, training centers make effort to realize the aforesaid objectives as the basic cornerstone of the enormous organization of formal teaching and training while they are directly connected to the community as a social reality.

The results came from studies that conducted by Goldberger (1982), Martnic and Zichovesky (1977) indicated that participation of students in decision-making processes for planning and the content that is to be purposed by students' activity might create and raise several grounds among students and this is not observed in some plans in which the teacher has full authority in all activities toward them. Of those useful results that came from the programs in which students act is to sense of satisfaction caused by physical action and this may improve creativity, self- reliance and social cooperation (Quoted from Soheili, 2008).

The role educational system is to convert human resources into human capitals. Now, one should ask: What factors may play role in realization of educational higher goals? The educational experts argue that many factors may influence in realization of this objective and play role in this sense including schools, principal, personnel, environment, family and other coeval students etc and teacher as well (Khorshidi, 2009).

Considering subject of effectiveness has made us to know which of teacher's activities might cause improvement of effectiveness and how to try toward fulfillment of this paramount factor. All of teacher's performances, including his/ her behavior and impression with student and teaching etc may enhance training effectiveness and contribute educational practitioners to approach long run objectives of education and training (Doll et al., Transl. by Khorshidi, Khosrozadeh, 2009).

Educational effectiveness may depict those beliefs that student have about their learning ability and achievement in classroom. Effectiveness denotes capacity to predict self- thriving. Children who expect for success may take strides toward high achievement while those students who expect for educational failure may behave in such a way that it guarantees their failure

To cite this paper: Khorshidi A and Tahmanesh R, 2011. The impact of dynamic classroom on increasing educational motivation. *J. Educ. Manage. Stud.,* 1(1): 52-64.

(Bandura, 1986). These concepts signify that motivation is foremost effective research fields in individual's behavior and teacher has to inevitably create motivation in order to guide learners toward educational higher objectives. Motivation stands for complex and leading forces, requirements and tension- making conditions or other mechanisms that initiate individual's activity toward realization of his/ her goals and resume them (Robins, 2004).

In general, findings of Erick (2006, quoted from Mirkamali, 2004) suggest that motivation is an impetus for moving of human resources in organizations; as a result, whatever human resources possess greater motivation, they will enjoy greater creativity, innovation, dynamism, productivity and effectiveness etc. to the same extent. Thus, with respect to sensitive nature of education and training, particularly in high school period that is realism career where students are turned into useful citizens, schools and especially teacher may play vital role in this regard. Consequently, that teacher may exercise higher effectiveness that he/ she revives spirit of activity in students and this important point will be fulfilled only by stimulating natural inclinations in student and encouraging them for the given action. In an study, Tileston (2007) showed that genuine, deep and retained learning is done in active classroom and these classrooms may lead to exert favorable changes in learners' behavior and eventually this bring up students flexible, active and dynamic.

For this reason, the present study has reviewed the impact of dynamic classrooms on rising motivation for educational progress among high school students.

Regarding to relationship between dynamic classrooms with educational progress motivation, many studies have been carried out so we deal with some of them here:

Asgari (1998) has achieved some noticeable findings about comparison between educational motivation in girls and boys. Of those findings, this point is implied that females have greater educational motivation than males in all educational grades.

In a study, Khorami (2004) came to this result that in contrast to male students, female students enjoyed higher motivation in educational progress.

In his research about progress motivation and its impact on students' educational performance, Amerizadeh (2002) concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship among motivation and educational performance. In a study on relationship between motivation with mental health in students' educational progress, Zare Kooshk and Ghazi (2004) concluded that there is a positive and significant relation among progress motivation and educational achievement. Also there is a significant difference among motivation in female and male students and males' motivation is greater than females'. Similarly, there is no significant difference between educational progress in female students and male students.

In a study, Khorshidi (2007) indicated that active classrooms might directly lead students to enjoy skills in collective process and group administration. Concerning to indirect impacts one may also improve indirectly adaption of "memory- based" model of students' rational and mental potential and create a habit for accurate thinking and inclination to exploration in students indirectly by employing "pre- organizing" model.

During a research, Seyf (1994) found that in active classrooms, teacher is a person that might help student in application of skill. Those skills that learners may acquire them by training are manual and behavioral skills. Teacher is considered as meritorious if he/ she provides such conditions in a classroom and make students to observe the aforesaid points. By adaption of modern teaching models and techniques in active classrooms, teacher may realize educational objectives of textbook (lesson) among their students.

In a study, Shariatmadari (2003) has attached importance for the relations between parents and students in learning and development of this trend so that parents should be informed about what takes place in classroom in this respect.

Seyf (1994) argues that individuals with higher progress motivation may outperform others in doing the given tasks including learning.

Within several studies, Johnson (1970) concluded that a classroom with warmly and intimate environment not only enhances motivation for educational achievement but also facilitates the greater self- esteem, lower anxiety and better learning (Quoted from Salehi, 1994). During some researches, Moayednia (2005) came to the result in that continuous training and learning is necessary due to increase in volume of knowledge and information. Thus, this type of training requires new learning technique. For this reason, if the importance and necessity of leaving traditional techniques and strategies in educational system and paying attention to modern strategies and method in teaching and expiry of the iterative traditional techniques are not accepted then new techniques of training task will not be fulfilled.

During several studies, Akbari (3005) concluded that classroom is the place for interaction among student and teacher and teaching is the most major example of such an interaction. To make teaching more

effective, both sides of this interaction should live free from mental concerns and in confidence.

In a study, Macckiyachyvilin (1985) came to the result that learning strategies are not always led to better educational performance. They acknowledged that sense of personal effectiveness or progress motivation might play important role. In another research that Woldend (1997) carried out on high school students in Canada, he executed educational motivation scale on them. The results have shown that those students who had the higher internal motivation, enjoyed greater educational achievement. Similarly, it was characterized in this study that girls have higher internal motivation than boys (Quoted from Tohidi, 2002).

Keith and Kohl (1997), in their studies, found several important factors like learners' ability, teachers' training and learning motivation. Afterwards, two other significant factors comprised teacher's training and the latter was motivation for learning (Seyf, 1993, p.189).

The results came from studies done by Goldberger, Martnic and Zichovesky (1977, p.52) showed that participation of students in decision-making processes and content that is to be purposed by students' activity might train different fields in students and this measure is not observed in this way in those programs where teacher has full authority in doing activities. Of more useful outcomes came from the programs in which students are active is sense of satisfaction which is resulted from physical activity and this, in turn, might improve creativity, self- reliance and social collaboration (Quoted from Soheili, 2008, p.42).

Doll and Zucker Brehm (2004, p.197) have obtained the same results in several studies.

- School officials shall know what is effective in active classrooms and they should do the same and identify effective programs in school following to adjustment of training and personality process in students.

- In a study, they have deemed active classrooms as places for emotional, educational and social successes of students and he believes in that despite of having a lot of problems, student will achieve to high educational progress.

- When the relations among teacher and student are reduced during teenage and maturity careers, lowering educational quality is inevitable during middle years in school. In fact, in comparison with relations with classmates or parents and other student, teacher-student relationships are more closely related to educational motivation and achievement.

- In future world, active classrooms in the field of standard models and preparation of students to achieve occupational success in future may try extremely at levels of school and other training areas and in this course the amending plans may play essential role in active classrooms.

- The efficiency of those teachers who teach by means of active teaching methods is higher than teachers that emphasize on conveying contents and information to students.

- In active classrooms, teachers should pay attention to individual differences among students and their spirit and at the same time establish relationship between school and family.

In a study, Boris Joyce (2004, p.66) came to this result that if teachers adapt active teaching techniques at any educational period and make their classrooms dynamic, their student will enjoy motivation for educational achievement and obtain to ever- increasing successes.

Findings of Erick (2010) suggest that teacher with modern teaching method might enjoy the sufficient motivation and inclination in classroom administration and this may be transferred to learners as well and led to genuine, deep and dynamic learning among learners (Quoted from Khorshidi, 2009).

During several studies, Noblit et al (1995) concluded that in order to create a supportive and secured environment in classroom, quality and stability of teacher's adaption to students is always the foremost element; the first important steps toward establishing adaptation are identifying students and contributing them to recognize each other.

Wantles and Watkins (2002) came to this result in a study that socially accepted behaviors like participation, assistance and cooperation are vital norms since they lay foundation for important educational processes such as problem- solving and educational motivation.

When parents attach respect for teachers of their children and strengthen their rules and recommendations this possibility became stronger that they establish relations with their teacher more easily. All these three relations play role in classroom social platform for learning and they create an environment that is tranquil spiritually while it encourages riskability and generates a sense of self- worth and self- esteem among students (Doll et al., Transl. by Khorshidi & Khosronejad, 1987).

During their studies in 1996, Pianta and Walsh emphasized that learning problems have not been internalized in child but they are latent sue to lack of

correspondence between child and one the existing features in classroom (Ibid.).

In his MA thesis, Mr. Mahmoud Goshtasbi has implied others' findings about motivation as follows:

Unlike most of motivational structures, achievement motivation that has been occasionally called as requirement for progress was not disputed. To great extent, the existing agreement was due this fact that study on motivation served as performance of an intellectual school and done by some of theoreticians and researchers that were working on leadership of DC McCland (Quoted from DC Widler that has collected an abstract from attributes of progressive individuals). During several years before study of McCland, many researches were conducted in order to examine nature and effects of motivation. Some of these studies reviewed and discovered personality characteristics of individuals that enjoyed higher motivation for achievement. Namely, such individuals act based on some certain methods. As a result, several outstanding researches were carried out during those years and a lot of findings were obtained about nature of person that is extremely progressive.

According to Alshuler (1937) persons who enjoy higher motivation for progress are interested in preference for the sake of preference but not for the reward that might be followed by it; they do not work on a task because of the money that might have as an outcome.

Based on study of Atkinson and Reitman (1956), they evaluate the roles according to the opportunities that may be provided not because of their validity (Burnstein et al, 1963).

Their interest in progress is not affected by working in group but it receives the impact from working (French, 1958).

They prefer to elect experts as assistants instead of their friends (McCland and Winter, 1969).

They prefer those situations in which they can assume personal responsibility for results of their efforts. They tend to control their own fate not to assign these affairs to destiny, chance and or luck (French et al, 1985; Mackhausen, 1967).

They would like to judge independently according to their own assessments and experiences not based on others' ideas (Mackhausen, 1967).

Persons who have higher motivation for progress worry more for middle term future than in long run and they have longer vision toward next time (Ricks, 1960).

Michel (1961) states: They mainly expect for the future and prefer greater reward in the future than smaller rewards at present.

Knob (1963) argues that individuals with higher achievement motivation feel that they have not sufficient time to do anything.

In order to continue still moving toward their achievement of their goals, they like to receive instant, routine and real feedback about the way of their progress (French 1985; Mose and Kakan 1961).

In his studies, Hoffman (1972) by review of subjects like progress motivation and social role and thought presumes that need to cohesion is one that influences behavior and progress motivation more than other factors in time. Girls are less encouraged to independence and they are more rarely under stress to possess any identity rather than their mother's. Consequently, the confidence and appropriate skills are not grown among them so they tend to be dependent on others.

Hurmze (1972) argues that this is not the main problem that females have not the motivation for achievement but in fact they are stimulated to avoid progress. Females enjoy this self- assumption that they deem competition, independence, merit and progress as attributes that do not essentially correspond to their life.

In a study done by Franckle (1960) (quoted from Samuel Ball) he concluded that in contrast to talented but successful students, the intelligent but unsuccessful students might hate school and school lessons further. It is implied that such aversion was created, at least to some extent, by the experiences that exercised based on classic conditioned model.

Quoted from Seyf Agor and Glow, Walberg (1979) examined correlation coefficient between values of educational motivation and progress obtained from studies that have been conducted on 63'700 students from Grade 1 to Grade 12 and showed mean value of correlation coefficient of case study is +34%.

Bloom (1982) has reported this coefficient as +560%.

Cited from Salehi, in studies of Johnson (1970), not only motivation for achievement may be improved in a warmly and intimate class or environment but it facilitates greater self- esteem, lower anxiety and better learning.

Baumerind (1973) says: parents who behaved affectionately with their children at reasonable level and at same time expected them proper behavior, their children reflected great persistence and made several efforts toward achievement and enjoyed higher motivation for progress.

In his studies, Bandora (1981) has believed that background of educational achievement is one of the reasons for expecting higher achievement among children. But higher expectations, in turn, may create sense of effectiveness among children where this sense is a satisfactory ability and stimulate them to make greater efforts in the future; however, Bartle (1987) and Ruiter (1975) adapted cause- analysis for achievement motivation and implied four major reasons in this regard.

During their studies, Nichols and Nalone (1994) have considered subject of teachers' awareness of motivation and its relationship with student's motive and suggested that lack of collective knowledge about student's motivation among teachers is not save this fact that students are less interested in further learning (Goshtasbi, Mahmoud, 1996).

With respect to what it implied, the main objective of this paper is to study and test the following hypotheses:

1. Dynamic classrooms may lead to rising educational motivation among high school students.

2. Female teachers administer more dynamic classrooms than male teachers.

3. Educational motivation in female is greater than in male students.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The current research is of developmental type in terms of goals and quantitative kind in terms of data and it is of correlation type from nature and method since we intend to measure its relation with dependent variable without manipulation of independent variable. Statistical population of case study includes all high school students at Grade I from public schools and also all their principals and educational assistants in high school career in Tehran Department of Education with MA degree in the field of Educational Sciences. To select a referent sample as well as to increase accuracy of measurement, simple randomized sampling techniques has been adapted and according to H.S. Bola formula for determination of sample space (1970, Transl. by Abily, 1999), 100 personnel (50 principals and 50 assistants) and 300 female and male students constitute this sample.

Measurement tools in this study are two questionnaires that consist of respectively a 40-question dynamic classroom questionnaire, which was drawn up by Doll and Zucker and Brehm (2004) and translated by Khorshidi (2010), and a 50- question motivational questionnaire that formulated by Bhargava (1994) and translated by Karami (2009) while dynamic classrooms questionnaire included a triple- choice appendix (Yes, Sometimes, and No) that denote 1, 2 and 3 respectively and achievement motivation questionnaire comprised of three choices: a, b and c. Any question which indicates achievement motivation (need to progress) take score 1 and all scores include the score of need to normalized relevant progress purposed in this test.

Validity of both tools was calculated by means of Cronbach's alpha Coefficient where their values were computed 75% and 74% for achievement motivation and dynamic classrooms, respectively. Validity of both tools was obtained by Face Validity technique (i.e. confirmation by 15 experts).

RESULTS

a) *Data description*: Statistical attributes of dynamic classrooms (principals) are given in Table 1.

The following cases can be inferred from the figures in above tables:

1- Comparison among data in terms of sample groups indicates that mean values of female assistants in scales of self- reliance, accountability, obedience of rules, teacher of my school, classmates and relationship with parents are higher than in male assistants. Similarly, mean value of motivation is greater among male students than in female students.

2- The comparison in standard deviation values through sample group shows variance in scales of self-reliance, accountability, obedience of rules, and classmates and relationship with parents among male assistants are higher than in female assistants but variance of my teacher variable is greater among females than in males. Also, standard deviation of motivation is higher in female students than in males.

3- From sample group's view, the minimum and maximum scores for each factor in scale of dynamic classrooms are 1 and 4 respectively while these values are 1 and 50 in educational motivation scale, respectively.

4- Positive skewness signifies that skewness of distribution moves toward right side of normal distribution while positive kurtosis indicates the given distribution is higher than normal distribution.

Independent T- test was adapted in order to describe data and to generalize study results to population from which they were extracted and results of this test are given in the following tables respectively.

Hypothesis I: Dynamic classrooms may lead to rising educational motivation among high school students.

Table 1. Statistical attributes of dynamic classrooms (principals)

Elements	Background		Minimum		Range		Kurtosis		Skewness		Variance		Standard Deviation		Mean		Quantity	
Gender	female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	**Male**
Self - reliance	4	3	1.3	1	2.6	2	0.57	-0.89	-0.003	-0.37	0.32	0.35	0.57	0.59	2.59	2.30	25	**25**
Account ability	3.4	3	1.2	1.9	2.1	1.7	0.05	-081	-0.22	-0.48	0.25	0.27	0.50	0.52	2.32	2.41	25	**25**
Obedience of rules	3	3	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.3	-0.86	-0.93	-0.56	-0.44	0.30	0.18	0.55	0.43	2.38	2.49	25	**25**
My teacher	4	3.5	1.6	2	2.3	1.5	0.41	-0.45	0.57	-0.9	0.38	0.14	0.62	0.38	2.75	2.68	25	**25**
Classmates	3.4	3	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.1	-0.47	-1	0.24	-0.1	0.22	0.13	0.47	0.36	2.37	2.47	25	**25**
Parent's relations	3.3	3	1.5	1.5	1.8	1.5	-0.50	0.30	-0.15	-0.78	0.23	0.16	0.48	0.40	2.42	2.56	25	**25**

Table-2. Statistical attributes of dynamic classrooms (assistants)

Elements	Background		Minimum		Range		Kurtosis		Skewness		Variance		Standard Deviation		Mean		Quantity	
Gender	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	**Male**
Self - reliance	2.9	2.83	1.62	1	1.28	1.83	0.39	1.85	-0.48	-1.15	0.10	0.18	0.32	0.42	2.40	2.6	25	**25**
Account ability	3	3	1.85	1.4	1.15	1.5	0.58	-0.28	-0.20	-0.35	0.10	0.18	0.32	0.42	2.46	2.34	25	**25**
Obedience of rules	3	3	1.6	1.62	1.38	1.38	-0.36	-0.8	-0.19	-0.09	0.11	0.15	0.34	0.38	2.39	2.28	25	**25**
My teacher	3.10	3	1.6	1.67	1.45	1.33	-0.02	-0.63	-0.43	-0.12	0.14	0.11	0.37	0.33	2.39	2.31	25	**25**
Classmates	2.95	3	1.7	1.8	1.25	1.20	-0.59	-0.80	-0.42	-0.06	0.07	0.10	0.27	0.32	2.39	2.37	25	**25**
Parent's relations	2.88	3	1.7	1.67	1.18	1.3	0.77	-0.29	-0.37	-0.13	0.07	0.12	0.27	0.34	2.39	2.41	25	**25**

Table 3. Comparison among female and male students in educational progress motivation (By means of independent T-test)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance level
Male	25	17.42	2.42	0.132	48	0.89
Female	25	17.32	2.56			

The results in Table 3 suggest that T observed value (T_{ob} = 0.132) with degree of freedom (df = 48) is smaller than T- value in the given table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference among females and males Null Hypothesis is verified and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference among progress motivation in females and males.

Hypothesis II: Female teachers administer more dynamic classrooms than male teachers.

Table 4. Comparison among assistants and principals (Self- reliance variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Self- reliance of principal	50	2.45	0.59	0.191	98	0.23
Self - reliance of assistant	50	2.33	0.38			

The results from Table 4 suggest that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 1.191) with degree of freedom (df= 98) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). Consequently, based on lack of difference in variable self-reliance among principals and assistants, Null Hypothesis is verified and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference among assistants and principals in terms of variable self- reliance.

Table 5. Comparison among assistants and principals (Accountability variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Accountability of principal	50	2.36	0.51	0.44	98	0.65
Accountability of assistant	50	2.40	0.38			

The results of table 5 denote that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 0.44) with degree of freedom (df= 98) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in accountability variable among assistants and principals, Null Hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in accountability variable among assistants and principals.

Table 6. Comparison among assistants and principals (Obedience to rules variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Rules obedience by principal	50	2.43	0.49	1.155	98	0.25
Rules obedience by assistant	50	2.33	0.36			

The results of Table 6 denote that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 1.155) with degree of freedom (df= 98) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in rules obedience variable among assistants and principals, Null Hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in rules obedience variable among principals and assistants.

Table 7. Comparison among assistants and principals (My teacher variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Teacher of principal	50	2.72	0.51	4.156	98	0.001**
Teacher of assistant	50	2.35	0.35			

The results of Table 7 signify that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 4.156) with degree of freedom (df= 98) is greater than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). Consequently, based on lack of difference in school teacher variable among principals and assistants, Null Hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in school teacher variable among principals and assistants.

Table 8. Comparison among assistants and principals (Classmates variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Classmate- principal	50	2.42	0.42	0.565	98	0.57
Classmate- assistant	50	2.38	0.29			

The results of Table 8 suggest that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 0.565) with degree of freedom (df= 98) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in student's classmates variable among principals and assistants, Null Hypothesis is verified and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in student's classmates variable among principals and assistants.

Table 9. Comparison among assistants and principals (Relationships with Parents variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Parents' relations with principal	50	2.49	0.44	1.136	98	0.25
Parents' relations with assistant	50	2.40	0.31			

The results of Table 9 denote that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 1.136) with degree of freedom (df= 98) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in parents' relationships variable among principals and assistants, Null Hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in parents' relationships variable among principals and assistants.

Hypothesis III: There is no significant difference among males and females in dynamic classrooms.

Table 10. Comparison among male and female principals in dynamic classrooms (self- reliance variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Self- reliance in male	25	2.50	0.59	1.73	48	0.08
Self- reliance in female	25	2.59	0.57			

The results of Table 10 denote that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 1.73) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in self-reliance variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in self- reliance variable among males and females.

Table 11. Comparison among male and female principals in dynamic classrooms (accountability variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Accountability in males	25	2.41	0.59	0.66	48	0.51
Accountability in females	25	2.32	0.57			

The results of Table 11 signify that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 0.66) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). Consequently, based on lack of difference in accountability variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is verified and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in accountability variable among males and females.

Table 12. Comparison among male and female principals in dynamic classrooms (rules obedience variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Rules obedience in males	25	2.49	0.59	0.76	48	0.45
Rules obedience in females	25	2.38	0.57			

The results of Table 12 express that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 0.76) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). Consequently, based on lack of difference in rules obedience variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in rules obedience variable among males and females.

Table 13. Comparison among male and female principals in dynamic classrooms (My teacher variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
School teacher for males	25	2.68	0.37	0.45	48	0.64
School teacher for females	25	2.75	0.62			

The results of Table 13 signify that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 0.45) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in school teacher variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is verified and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in school teacher variable among males and females.

Table 14. Comparison among male and female principals in dynamic classrooms (classmate variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Classmate for males	25	2.47	0.36	0.81	48	0.42
Classmate for females	25	2.37	0.47			

The results of Table 14 imply that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 0.81) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). Consequently, based on lack of difference in classmate variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in classmate variable among males and females.

Table 15. Comparison among male and female principals in dynamic classrooms (Parents' Relationships variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Parents' relationships for males	25	2.56	0.40	1.165	48	0.25
Parents' relationships for females	25	2.42	0.48			

The results of Table 13 signify that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 1.165) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in parents' relationships variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is verified and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in parents' relationships variable among males and females.

Table 16. Comparison among male and female assistants in dynamic classrooms (Self- reliance variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Self- reliance in males	25	2.26	0.42	1.29	48	0.20
Self- reliance in females	25	2.40	0.32			

The results of Table 16 denote that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 1.29) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). Consequently, based on lack of difference in self-reliance variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is verified and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in self- reliance variable among males and females.

Table 17. Comparison among male and female assistants in dynamic classrooms (accountability variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Accountability in males	25	2.34	0.42	1.10	48	0.27
Accountability in females	25	2.46	0.32			

The results of Table 17 imply that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 1.10) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in accountability variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in accountability variable among males and females.

Table 18. Comparison among male and female assistants in dynamic classrooms (rules obedience variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Rules obedience in males	25	2.28	0.38	1.102	48	0.27
Rules obedience in females	25	2.39	0.34			

The results of Table 18 suggest that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 1.102) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). Consequently, based on lack of difference in rules obedience variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in rules obedience variable among males and females.

Table 19. Comparison among male and female assistants in dynamic classrooms (My teacher variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Male school teacher	25	2.31	0.33	0.84	48	0.40
Female school teacher	25	2.39	0.37			

The results of Table 19 express that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 0.84) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in school teacher variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is verified and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in school teacher variable among males and females.

Table 20. Comparison among male and female assistants in dynamic classrooms (classmate variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Male classmate	25	2.37	0.32	0.22	48	0.82
Female classmate	25	2.39	0.27			

The results of Table 20 state that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 0.22) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). Consequently, based on lack of difference in classmate variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is confirmed and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in classmate variable among males and females.

Table 21. Comparison among male and female assistants in dynamic classrooms (Parents' relationships variable)

Gender	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	Degree of Freedom	Significance Level
Parents' relationships in males	25	2.41	0.34	0.19	48	0.84
Parents' relationships in females	25	2.39	0.27			

The results of Table 21 denote that T- observed value (T_{ob} = 0.19) with degree of freedom (df= 48) is smaller than T- value in this table at certainty level (α = 0.05). As a result, based on lack of difference in parents' relationships variable among males and females, Null Hypothesis is verified and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in parents' relationships variable among males and females.

Table 22. Results of Kolmogorov- Smirnov (K-S) Test

Progress	Parents' relations		Classmates		Teacher		Rules obedience		Accountability		Self- reliance		
	Assistant	Principal	Assistant	Principal	Assistant	Principal	Assistant	Principal	Assistant	Principal	Assistant	Principal	
1/20	0/71	0/93	0/67	0/67	0/57	1/21	0/61	1/04	0/46	0/75	0/97	1	K-S
0/11	0/68	0/98	0/75	0/29	0/89	0/35	0/85	0/75	0/98	0/10	0/29	0/22	SIG

Table 23. Pearson's correlation relationships between principals' dynamic classrooms with educational progress

Item	Progress motivation	Parents' relations	Classmates	Teacher	Rules obedience	Accountability	Self- reliance
Self- reliance							1
Accountability						1	0.489**
Rules obedience					1	0.464**	0.228
Teacher				1	0.186	0.323*	0.469**
Classmates			1	0.381**	0.436**	0.520**	0.395**
Parents' relations		1	0.522**	0.086	0.291*	0.552**	0.150
Progress motivation	1	0.522**	0.677**	0.443**	0.529**	0.549**	0.443**

Kolmogorov- Smirnov (K-S) Test was employed to measure normalization of population, where the given results represent normalization of data for all variables.

Hypothesis IV: There is a significant relationship between educational progress and dynamic classrooms.

By application of Pearson's momentum correlation coefficient, the relationship between variables of principals' dynamism and educational progress motivation was explored. The primary analyses were carried out to make sure of lack of any violence from parameters of normalization, linearity and uniform variance. Table 23 shows the variables of principals' dynamism and educational progress motivation; obtained correlation values (p<0.01, n=50, r=0.443 self- reliance) (p<0.01, n=50, r=0.549 accountability) (p<0.01, n=50, r=0.529 rules obedience) (p<0.01, n=50, r=0.443 teacher) (p<0.01, n=50, r=0.677 classmates) (p<0.01, n=50, r=0.522 parents'

relationships) are positive and significant thus Null Hypothesis (i.e. lack of relation) is rejected; namely, from principals' view, by rising score in dynamic classrooms, a significant increase is created in students' progress motivation. Similarly, Table- 21 represents the relations among dynamic variables where except for (parents' relationship with self- reliance and teacher variables) and (Teacher with rules obedience variables), all these relations are positive and significant.

DISCUSSION

In order to answer to test questions and research hypotheses, statistical tests have been adapted such as independent T-test, Pearson correlation coefficient and regression so that results of tests express the following points:

The first finding of the present study implies that dynamic classrooms lead to rising educational motivation in high school students on Grade I. as a result, Null Hypothesis is rejected that express lack of relationship between dynamic classrooms and students' educational motivation so that it can concluded with 95% of certainty level that holding of dynamic classrooms will lead to rising of educational motivation in students. This finding is in compliance with the results came from backgrounds for the present research.

The second finding from the current study signifies that there is no difference between progress motivations in female high school students with male student in Grade I. Consequently, Null Hypothesis is verified that implies lack of difference among females and males in this variable so it can be concluded with 95% of certainty level that there is no significant difference in progress motivation among male and female students.

This finding is not sometimes in conformance to results of backgrounds of the current research such as: Findings by Asgari (1998) and Khorami (2004). One may ascribe the reason for this contradiction in current study to the following factors:

a) In the past time, Iranian communities considered man (male) as economic core (pole) for family and assigned woman (female) for doing of tasks inside home; for this reason, path of progress was automatically prepared for males. Thus, according to the aforesaid reason, females might acquire higher internal motivation in the society.

b) Previously, it was assumed that since woman is responsible for playing role of child- nurture so she might not need to pass educational degree up to high levels and conversely male should acquire higher education in order to earn income and this idea caused women to possess higher internal motivation.

Third finding from this study denotes that female teachers administer more dynamic classrooms than male teachers. As a result, Null Hypothesis is rejected that implies there is no difference among classrooms of male teachers and of female teachers so it can be concluded at certainty level (95%) that female teacher have more dynamic classrooms than male teachers. This finding is in compliance with background results from the present study.

Researcher has not found any background that expresses classrooms administered by female teachers are more dynamic than male teachers' while the results of this study indicate lack of difference among the given elements.

REFERENCES

Akbari, Ali (2005). "Modern methods in teaching", Payvand educational- training monthly journal, Vol. 313. Organization of Parents & Mentors Association.

Amerizadeh, Majid. (2002). "The impact of progress motivation on educational performance of students at Guidance School Career". MA thesis.

Bandora A . (1986) .Social foundations of thought and action: Asocial congitiue theory . Englewood Cliffs NJ: prentice Hall

Boris, Joyce. (2004). "Teaching models". Translator: Mohammad Reza Behrangi (Berenji). 1st Vol. Tehran. Golchin Pub.

Doll, Zucker and Brehm (2009). "Dynamic classrooms". Translators: Khorshidi & Khosrozadeh.

Khorshidi, Abbas A. (2009). "Educational management and leadership". 2nd Ed. Tehran: Yastoroon Pub.

Khorshidi, Abbas; Ghoreishi, Seyed Hamid Reza. (2007). "Manual for preparation of thesis and educational dissertation" (from theory to practice). Tehran: Yastoroon. 2nd Ed.

Khorami, Anonymous. (2004). "Review of the relationship between progress motivation and intelligence with educational achievement in high school students from Shiraz City". MA thesis.

Moayednia, Anonymous. (2005). Payvand educational-training monthly journal (September Vol.), Central Organization of Parents & Mentors Association.

Noblit, G . W .,Dwight . L .R .,& McCadden, B . M . (1995) . In the meantime: The possibilities of caring . Phi Delta Kappan,76,680-684

Robins, Stephen P. (2010). "Principles of Organizational Behavior". Translators: Parsayian, Aarabi, Seyed

Mohammad. 26th Ed. Tehran: publication of Cultural Researches Center.

Seyf, Ali Akbar. (1994). "Measurement and metrics in educational sciences". Tehran, Payam-E-Noor University (PNU).

Soheili, Mansoor. (2008). "The relation among social growth, intelligence and progress motivation". MA thesis from Islamic Azad University, Sciences & Researches Branch (SRB).

Tileston, D.W.(2007).Teaching Strategies For active Learning: Five essentials for your teaching plan.www.ERIC.com.

Tohidi, Mohsen. (2002). "Study on documentary styles, anxiety and progress motivation with educational achievement".

Wentzel, K. R., & Watkins.,D. E.(2002).Peer relationships and Collaborative learning as Contexts for academic enablers. School Psychology Review ,31, 366-377.