



Received: 2023/06/11

Accepted: 2023/12/31

Published: 2024/06/06

1. Assistant Professor of
TEFL, Kosar University of
Bojnord, Iran.
Iran.(Corresponding Author)
Email: z.abolfazli@kub.ac.ir

2. Associate Professor of
Persian Language and
Literature, Tarbiat Modares
University, Iran. Email:
abasiz@modares.ac.ir

3. PhD Student in TEFL,
Ilam University, Iran.

How to cite this article:
Abolfazli, Z., Abbasi, Z., &
Belali, J. (2024). Study
Habits and Commitment to
Ethical Codes as Predictors
of Academic Performance in
Schools and Universities: A
Follow up Study. *The
International Journal of
Humanities* 31(2): 1–16.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Study Habits and Commitment to Ethical Codes as Predictors of Academic Performance in Schools and Universities: A Follow up Study

Zainab Abolfazli¹, Zahra Abbasi², Javad Belali³

Few studies have explored the relationship between non-cognitive factors in different educational settings and different age groups. The purpose of this study is to determine whether there is a relationship between Study Habits (SH) and Commitment to Ethical Codes (CEC) and their ability to predict the academic performance of language learners in schools and universities (547 students aged under 18 – above 35 years old). The applied instruments are adapted versions of questionnaires which were made into one survey tool with each measure in distinct sections. The results showed a significant relationship between SH and CEC displaying a positive relationship in all age groups (a highest relationship in the age group of 18-22, $P < 0.05$) and in both male/females with male participants reported having the highest relationship ($P < 0.05$). The study concludes that CEC needs to be considered and assessed during school years with additional training to language learners helping them learn or modify SH to increase their performance at the time of entry into university.

Keywords: Academic performance, Ethical codes, Language learners, Non-Cognitive factors, Study habits.

Introduction

Poor academic performance is one of the main problems affecting the expectations of success in educational settings. Nowhere is this more evident than in the eyes of many scholars to bear ample evidence on the associations between poor performance and difficulties in several factors like time management (Baker et al., 2019), personal ethics (Welch, 2013), motivation (e.g. Kusurkar et al., 2013), memorization (Yusuf, 2010), and dropouts (Li & Carroll, 2020). Seen in this light, the development of academic performance has positive effects on students' changes in behavior or study habits. It has been found that students who possess good study habits tend to perform better than students with poor study habits (e.g. Nonis & Hudson, 2010). It would appear that the rigor of psychological approaches with their emphasis on behavioral factors

(e.g. Abedi et al., 2019, among others) could open the doors to the importance of early intervention plans that prevent educational problems.

Against the backdrop of the previous century, a glance through the past century of educational psychology gives us an interesting picture of varied interpretations of factors which are the most important in academic performance. Perhaps beginning with non-cognitive factors such as teacher behaviors (e.g. Stevens & Rosenshine, 1981; Lovitt, 1981), teacher motivational strategies (e.g. Abbasabadi & Shakerkhoshroud, 2018), reinforcement (Li, Dong, Wei et al., 2020), reconstructive reality (e.g. Ahmadi & Miri, 2023), self-efficacy (Steinemann, Geelan, Zaehringer et al., 2020; Tran et al., 2023), anxiety (e.g. Moazzeni Limoudehi & Mazandarani, 2021), study habits (Bickerdike, O’Deasmhunaigh, O’Flynn & O’Tuathaigh, 2016; Cred’e & Kuncel, 2008) and ethical behavior (e.g. Harahap, 2018), academic performance underwent some revolutionary trends all of which in one way or another came under the scrutiny of scientific research.

Literature review

One of the best examples of academic performance is observed in a series of complex student behavior. This behavior with an emphasis on SH in recent years has captured the attention of many scholars in educational literature (e.g. Clarke, Mullin, McGrath & Farrelly, 2021; Entwistle & Wilson, 1974; Peker Ünal, 2021; Tus, 2020). Studies that have investigated the difference in SH and academic performance provide evidence of gender difference as an important role in human behavior and development. Different results have also been found regarding SH based on gender. For example, Aluja and Blanch (2004) in a study of 887 Spanish students in 29 public schools reported that female students had higher SH than males. However, Mushoriwa (2009) failed to find a significant difference in the study habits of male and female students in Zimbabwe.

However, while emphasizing that SH is different in the case of gender and age (Ossai, 2012), some scholars believe that it is also determined by personal ethics (Hanum, Asari & Syafaruddin, 2021). A good example is attested in Nikmah (2019) study who believed that being able to follow and implement ethics and rules in the learning process results in academic achievement and success. This wave of interest, brings ethical issues into central focus and draws our attention to differentiate academic performance between male and females.

Research based on a view of relationships between ethical behavior and academic performance demonstrated that males and females can exhibit different student behaviors (e.g. Lyng 2009; Reay 2001). Since the late 1980s, researchers have focused not only on the gender differences but also on the diversity within each gender (Lyng, 2009; Skelton 2001). Hodgetts (2008) investigated the performance of Australian students by gender. Hodgetts found an underachievement of boys in comparison to girls. But, one limitation of the study was that there existed no way of knowing whether the grades obtained by the two groups meant a reflection of socioeconomic or ideological difference. It had also been found that female learners are

generally working harder than males and are more in accordance with work styles which are required in schools (e.g. Borg, 2015; Warrington, Younger & Williams 2000). On the other hand, some studies have shown that male students in some cultures maintain a view of masculinity that ignores academic task and formal performance (Jackson & Dempster 2009; Younger & Warrington, 1996). This type of masculinity, according to Borg (2015) is 'associated with disruptive behaviors in class' (p. 1128).

Considering the importance of SHs, ethical issues in academic settings, and the important role that they play in student performance, the relationships between SHs and their predictive power in the case of gender and age remain almost unclear. Few studies have explored the role of age and gender in study habits and CEC. Some had studied these concepts separately, or with other variables (e.g. Hanum et al., 2021). A study done by Veas, Castejon, Gilar, and Minano (2015) with students aged 11–15 years old in which the concepts of self-concept, goal orientation, learning strategies, popularity, and parental involvement were investigated together. Another study points to the importance of mixing different types of cognitive and non-cognitive variables in predicting academic performance with students of different age ranges (e.g. Bozorgian, Fallahpour & Muhammadpour, 2022; Minano, Castejon & Gilar, 2012; Veas et al., 2015) to gender issues (e.g. Ossai, 2012). Replicating these findings with non-cognitive variables, like study habits and ethical considerations of different age ranges and gender, would aim to detect the stronger predictor of academic performance. For these reasons, the following research questions are proposed:

1. Is there any significant difference between male and female students in terms of their SH and CEC of the educational institution?
2. Is there any significant relationship between SH and CEC of the educational institution as regards the age ranges of the students?

Method

Participants

The sample group was high school pupils and university students (B.A., M.A. and Ph.D.) from the anonymous community of Iran. The sample of convenience was made up of 547 students (101 high school, 99 B.A, 232 M.A. and 115 Ph.D.) aged from under 18 to above 45 years old with 287 males and 260 females. The enrolled participants had no sign of mental disorder or no physical disability which could violate the quality criteria of the research process, and had (parental) informed consent to participate in the research. All participants spoke Persian as their first language and English as their foreign language.

Instruments

To fulfill the stated aims of the study, adapted versions of both commitments to ethical codes (CEC) questionnaires (e.g., Jiménez, Dittmar & Portillo, 2021) and the Study Habits Inventory (SHI) (e.g., Wrenn, McKeown & Humber, 1962) were made into one survey tool with each

measure in distinct section being distributed to each participant. To obtain information on respondents' demographic characteristics, an initial section designated "demographics" for participants to provide a written record of their age, gender, field of study, level of education, and language background. For convenient access to respondents from different parts of the country and possibly abroad, an online version of the battery of self-reports was conducted via the Google Forms application in addition to direct contact with respondents to collect the required data.

The aforementioned questionnaires were an adapted version in the form of 20 and 31 items for CEC and SH, respectively, ranging from very little to very much. The adapted versions were then presented to two experts in the field with a theoretical framework and research purpose for estimating validity. The results indicated a good level of validity in both scales. Likewise, to ensure the reliability of the questionnaires, a pilot test from 20 participants was recruited by using Cronbach's alpha index, which indicated a good level of reliability for the SHI (0.82) and a high level of reliability for the CEC scale (0.92).

Procedure

All the participants obtained signed informed consent to participate in the study. The tests were administered by two experts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). The questionnaires were conveyed by a cover letter stating the goals, confirming the privacy of answers, approving to share the responses, and providing the time approximation to complete the scales. After a period of ten months administered from May 2021 to February 2022, usable completed questionnaires were received from 547 participants. The collection process was carried out online, using google forms survey administration software.

Data Analysis

The compiled data analysis was carried out using SPSS version 26. which includes the calculations of descriptive statistics (mean, frequency, standard deviation, variance, minimum and maximum) and inferential statistics (Pearson, Chi-square, and *t*-test and analysis of variance and Duncan's test) were used.

To perform the analysis of the first objective, the Lewins method was applied to assess the equality of variances in age levels scores and Analysis of the Variance (ANOVA) was used to calculate levels of variance among the five groups. All variables were included in two blocks with age ranges as follows: under 18 years, between 18 to 22, 23 to 28, 29 to 34, and 35 above, and gender variable (male and female), using the F ratio to Compare the variance of scores of SH in gender levels, chi-square test for calculating the correlation coefficients between adherence to ethical codes and SH in different age groups and Duncan's test for Comparing average SH in age levels. The level of significance used was .05.

Results

Table 2 provides descriptive data on the study variables. In the case of age, the majority of the participants were 35-above years old. In the case of gender, male students participated most (N = 287) compared to female students (N = 260).

Table 2

Descriptive data of the variables

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
Under 18	73	13.3
18-22	54	9.9
23-28	83	15.2
29-34	100	18.3
35- above	237	43.3
Gender		
Female	260	47.5
Male	287	52.5
Total	547	100

Table 3 shows that based on the average scores of the questions related to the CEC, the number of respondents to this variable was equal to 547 in number. The score range of this index is 4, the minimum score is 1 and the maximum score is 5. The average score of this index for the respondents is 4.1812. The SD and variance of the scores of this index were calculated as 0.633 and 0.402, respectively. Analysis of variable statistics of SH can be done in the same way.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics of the variables

Variable	Range	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance
CEC	4	1	5	4.18	0633	0.402
SH	4	1	5	3.77	0711	0.506

Note: CEC: Commitment to Ethical Codes; SH: Study Habits

Inferential Statistics

Hypothesis 1. There is a significant difference between participants of different age groups in their commitment to ethical codes.

Regarding the existence of 5 age groups, the average comparison test of several independent groups (ANOVA) was used and to determine the equality of the variance of the scores Levine's non-parametric test was carried out. Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics related to the CEC at different ages. The results of Table 4 shows that the participants under 18 years had the highest value and 23 to 28 years had the lowest score concerning their CEC. As follows, since the significance level of the test is greater than the error of 0.05, the assumption of the equality of variance in age levels is confirmed.

Table 4

Descriptive variables of the first hypothesis

Age	Frequency	Mean	SD	SEM	F	DF	P value
Under 18	73	4.399	0.636	0.074	0.218	4 542	0.92
18-22	54	4.148	0.625	0.085			
23-28	83	4.060	0.672	0.0738			
29-34	100	4.114	0.605	0.0605			
34-above	237	4.192	0.620	0.040			
Total	547	4.181	0.633	0.027			

Note: SD: Standard Deviation; SEM: Standard Error of the Mean; DF: Degree of Freedom; P < 0.05

Table 5 shows that since the significance level of the test (P = 0.011) is less than 0.05, the CEC is not different for students of different ages. So, for participants of different ages, the mean scores of the CEC have a significant difference at the error level of 0.05. To compare the mean at different levels, Duncan's post hoc test was used.

Table 5

Results of the difference in the mean scores of the CEC in age levels

SH	RSS	DF	MSE	F	P
Between groups	5.214	5	1.303	3.298	0.011
Within groups	214.211	542	0.395		
Total	219.425	546			

Note: SH; Study Habits; RSS: Residual Sum of Squares; DF: Degree of Freedom; MSE: Mean Square Error; P < 0.05

The results of Table 6 show that there was no significant difference between the age groups of 23 to 28 years, 29 to 34 years, 18 to 22 years, and 35 years and above in their commitment to ethical codes.

Table 6

The comparison of the mean CEC in age levels based on Duncan's test

Age	Frequency	Subgroups	
		1	2
Under 18	73		4.3993
18-22	54	4.148	
23-28	83	4.060	

29-34	100	4.114	
35- above	237	4.192	
P value		0.218	1

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant difference between different age groups in terms of their SH.

According to Table 7, the age group under 18 years had the highest, and 23 to 28 years old group had the lowest mean SH.

Table 7

Variance of scores in age levels

Age	Frequency	Mean	SD	SEM	F	DF	P value
Under 18	73	4.194	0.731	0.085			
					1.540	4	
18-22	54	3.789	0.695	0.094		542	0.189
23-28	83	3.637	0.735	0.080			
29-34	100	3.685	0.783	0.078			
35- above	237	3.720	0.621	0.040			
Total	547	3.771	0.711	0.030			

Note: SD: Standard Deviation; SEM: Standard Error of the Mean; DF: Degree of Freedom; P < 0.05

According to Table 8, The mean SH was not different in different age levels at the 5% error level. So, for students of different ages, the mean scores of SH had a significant difference at the error level of 0.05.

Table 8

Test results of the difference in average scores of SH in age levels

SH	RSS	DF	MSE	F	P
Between groups	15.94	4	3.98	8.292	0.001
Within groups	260.57	542	0.481		
Total	276.51	546			

Note: SH; Study Habits; RSS: Residual Sum of Squares; DF: Degree of Freedom; MSE: Mean Square Error; P < 0.05

Hypothesis 3. There is a significant relationship between CEC and SH in different age groups.

First, the relationship between the two variables was carried out (Pearson correlation) in different age groups to determine if there was a significant relationship between CEC and SH. The results showed a significant relationship, displaying a positive relationship in all age groups:

The highest relationship between CEC and SH was in the age group of 18 to 22 years (with a correlation coefficient value of 0.832) and the lowest was in the age group of 29 to 34 years old. The chi-square test was used to check the difference between correlations (See table 9).

Table 9

Correlation coefficient between CEC and SH in age groups

Age range	Index	CEC and SH	P
Under 18	Pearson	0.78	

	Frequency	73	
18-22	Pearson	0.83	
	Frequency	54	
23-28	Pearson	0.67	0.001
	Frequency	83	
29-34	Pearson	0.61	
	Frequency	100	
34- above	Pearson	0.65	
	Frequency	237	

The results of the Chi-square test (see table 10), revealed an insignificance relationship between SH and CEC in different age groups (P = 0.019). Therefore, the value of correlation coefficients in different age groups shows a significant difference.

Table 10

Comparison of correlation coefficients between CEC and SH in different age groups

Chi-Square	P
11.751	0.019

Note: P < 0.05

Hypothesis 4. There is a significant difference in CEC in both male and female groups.

The fourth hypothesis of the study examined the difference between the two gender groups in their commitment to ethical codes. Table 11 shows the statistics. Firstly, a comparison of the means of the two groups (independent t-test) was carried out to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean of the male group (M = 4.07, SD = 0.70) and that of the female group (M = 4.29, SD = 0.51). The results showed that the female group had the highest CEH. The p-value was 0.001 (smaller than 0.05) which indicated that the assumption of the equality of variance was not confirmed.

Table 11

Descriptive/inferential statistics

Gender	Frequency	Mean	SD	SEM	F	P
Female	260	4.297	0.516	0.032	13.585	0.001
Male	287	4.076	0.708	0.041		

Note: Statistical hypothesis testing; DF: Degree of Freedom; MD: Mean Difference; SD: Standard Deviation

Since the significance level of the test (P = 0.001) was lower than the error of 0.05, there was an insignificant difference in CEC between male and female groups. For that reason, the mean score of CEC by gender had a significant difference at the (5%) error level. In other words, the mean score of CEC was not the same for both male and female participants. As such, according to the positivity of the maximum and the minimum of the confidence interval, the mean score of CEC for female participants was higher than for males.

Table 12

Mean comparison test results of the forth hypothesis

Index	SHT	DF	P	MD	SD	95% confidence interval for mean difference	
						Min	Max
The difference in mean scores of CEC in male and females	4.20	521/ 86	0.001	0.221	0.052	0.117	0.324

Note: Statistical hypothesis testing; DF: Degree of Freedom; MD: Mean Difference; SD: Standard Deviation

Hypothesis 5. There is a significant difference in SH between males and females.

According to the results of Table 13, the female group had the highest mean of study habits with mean and SD of 3.87 and 0.63, respectively, which was statistically significant.

Table 13

Comparison of study habits based on underlying variables

Gender	Frequency	Mean	SD	SEM	F	P
Female	260	3.87	0.63	0.03	7.95	0.005
Male	287	3.68	0.76	0.04		

Note: SD: Standard Deviation; SEM: Standard Error of the Mean; $P < 0.05$

Since the significance level of the test ($P = 0.005$) turned out to be less than the error of 0.05, there was no statistically significant difference between males and females in their study habits. In other words, the mean score of study habits was not the same for male and female participants. Thus, according to the positivity of the min/max of the confidence interval, the mean score of SH for female participants was higher than the average for men.

Table 14

Mean comparison test on underlying variables

Index	SHT	DF	P	MD	SD	95% confidence interval for mean difference	
						Min	Max
The difference in mean scores of CEC in males and females	3.195	540/ 48	0.001	0.191	0.059	0.073	0.308

Note: Statistical hypothesis testing; DF: Degree of Freedom; MD: Mean Difference; SD: Standard Deviation

Hypothesis 6. There is a significant difference between CEC and SH in the two male and female groups.

To determine the relationship between CEC and SH in male and female groups, the Pearson correlation was applied, and the results showed a significant relationship, displaying a positive relationship in two groups:

The highest relationship between CEC and SH was in male participants (with a correlation coefficient value of 0.71). To check the difference between correlations in both groups, the chi-square test was used (See table 16).

The results indicated that the relationship between variables was larger than 0.05, then in two groups, SH and CEC were statistically significant. Therefore, it shows a significant relationship between CEC and SH in both groups.

Table 15

Correlation coefficient between CEC and SH in male and female groups

Gender	Index	CEC and SH	P
Female	Pearson	0.631	0.001
	Frequency	260	
Male	Pearson	0.712	
	Frequency	287	

Note: CEC: Commitment to Ethical Codes; SH: Study Habits; $P < 0.05$

The results of the Chi-square test (see table 16), revealed an insignificant relationship between SH and CEC in both groups ($P = 0.085$). Therefore, the value of correlation coefficients in different groups was not statistically significant.

Table 16

Comparison of correlation coefficients between CEC and SH in different age groups

Chi-Square	P
11.751	0.019

Note: $P < 0.05$

Discussion and Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between study habits and commitment to ethical codes in different academic settings, as well as to analyze the predictive relationship of these variables on both male and female students with different age ranges. The results revealed a positive relationship in all age groups with the highest relationship between CEC and SH in ages between 18 to 22 years old (Pearson = 0.83) and the lowest in the age group of 29-34 (Pearson = 0.61); A positive relationship between CEC and SH in the case of gender with the highest relationship in males ($P = 0.071$) than females ($P = 0.63$). The results obtained from the Chi-square test for checking the difference in correlations showed insignificant relationships in both male/female and age levels.

Commitment to ethical codes and study habit rates in age ranges between 18-22 were about ten percent higher in students taking B.A. courses at the university compared with school students under 18 years. Even though B.A. students' CEC and SH were high in the university, the frequency of CEC and SH in M.A. and Ph.D. (between 23-35 and above) was lower compared with B.A. and school years. Our findings suggest that there might be cumulative

positive immediate effects of contextual factors on CEC and SH that lead to higher academic success.

Our findings for the SH extend previous studies in school (e.g. Julius & Evans, 2015) as well as university (Cerna & Pavliushchenko, 2015; Nonis & Hudson, 2010) students demonstrating that SH and CEC have a positive relationship with academic performance and success. Previous studies assessed the two factors only within particular ages or within a single context, whereas analyzing different age factors in multiple contexts made it possible to estimate study habits and CEC at a large scale; that is, across different academic contexts with participants at different age groups. A previous study used both cognitive (IQ, short-term memory) and non-cognitive factors (study habits) to track academic achievement in two grades of elementary students, but their sample was restricted to volunteers who were studying courses in school contexts (e.g. Capuno, Necesario, Etcuban, Espina, Padillo & Manguilimotan, 2019). By combining SH and CEC with students of both contexts and different age levels, we were able to derive estimates in more than 500 students. This study was carried out to support the idea that CEC and SH were lower as students get older. Moreover, we provided objective evidence that students' study habits often changed as they get older. This was because common reasons included changes in psychological factors like intellectual reasoning, burnout, motivation, and maturity (Ergene, 2011; Smeds et al., 2017, among others).

We believe that student population behavior of commitment to ethical codes can be used to yield a substantial and permanent environmental impact. For example, in universities, especially among M.A. and Ph.D. students, the change that has taken place in the study habits would be equated with the changes in the colligate culture of not taking an active role in maintaining an active educational purpose, lack of loyalty to the intellectual, social roles and academic recognition of the university and instead on the disconnectedness from the organizational culture and processes. However, this conclusion would imply that students engage in academic dishonesty for rational reasons. In other words, the students involved believe that the costs and risks associated with being caught are less than the perceived benefit of 'getting away with it' (see Whitley, 1998). While this may be true in some circumstances, the findings in the literature tend to indicate that academic dishonesty is more likely to be a function of low self-control rather than the product of rational choices (see Tibbetts & Myers, 1999). Our results are consistent with prior statements that commitment to ethical codes in M.A. and Ph.D. students was lower in number than with school students (Simon, Carr, McCullough, Morgan, Oleson & Ressel, 2010).

Based on the results of the study, we believe that family interconnectedness may play an important role in the development of CEC and study habits in young adults than older ones. More precisely, school students are more likely to get engaged in ethical issues. Older students are more likely to have gained the maturity to make important ethical decisions independently of core family members. Our results are similar to a previous study suggesting that older students are less likely to get involved in academic dishonesty (Simon et al., 2010). Likewise,

there are gender differences that shape students' choices regarding CEC and SH, with males being more likely to be guided by moral issues and SH than females.

In our opinion, school students, whether male or female, need to be aware of the ethical codes and SH and apply them. This attitude might be in conflict with their possibility to access the internet, surf the web, and chat on social networks. The relationship between CEC in SH was higher in ages under 18 than the older ones. One main possibility is the parental control of their access to the internet, while this was not available to older students. Findings from previous studies showed a correlation between a wide use of the internet and depression among college students (e.g. Kotikalapudi et al., 2012). Meanwhile, in another study (Cavallo et al., 2013), other bad habits like inactivity were found to be correlated with the great use of computers. The overuse of computers, according to some researchers could affect their attitudes, which in turn affects other behavioral factors like study habits and their commitment to codes of ethics. Therefore, students need to be aware of the harmful use of technologies that can affect their academic lives. Awareness of using technology at an early age can help to improve habits and commitments involved in the academic performance of students in the future.

Conclusion

Academic performance being considered a predictor of success in students' employment, it is important to pay attention to this issue and apply appropriate strategies to improve study habits, commitment to ethical codes, and other non-primary non-cognitive factors. In conclusion, the study of SHs and CEC contain both a word of caution and a challenge to future research. Caution is in order lest we assume that the identification, management, and application of ethical codes in different age levels, especially of younger ones, are simple. The challenge for researchers and those in charge is to maintain the quest to define those factors that are significant for the well-being and success in academic achievement and performance of the students and to continue to find effective means for infusing those findings into classroom pedagogy.

References

- [1] Abbasabadi, M. M., & Shakerkhoshroud, M. (2018). Macro and micro motivational strategies used in EFL classrooms: A case of Iranian EFL teachers. *The International Journal of Humanities*, 25(4), 1-17.
- [2] Ahmadi, F., & miri, S. J. (2023). Reconstructing Allameh Tabatabai's 'Reconstructive Reality Perception) through Social Theory. *The International Journal of Humanities*, 30(2), 54-71.
- [3] Aluja, A., & Blanch, A. (2004). Socialized personality, scholastic aptitudes, study habits, and academic achievement: Exploring the link. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 20(3), 157-165.
- [4] Alvarez, M., & Fernandez, R. (1999). *Cuestionario de Habitos y Tecnicas de Estudio, CHTE*. Madrid: TEA.

- [5] Abedi, S., Ameri, H., & Golfam, A. (2019). Effectiveness of Operant Conditioning on the Development of Language Skills in Persian-Speaking Children with Autism. *The International Journal of Humanities*, 26(2), 50-58.
- [6] Baker, R., Evans, B., Li, Q., & Cung, B. (2019). Does Inducing Students to Schedule Lecture Watching in Online Classes Improve Their Academic Performance? An Experimental Analysis of a Time Management Intervention. *Research in Higher Education*, 60, 521-552.
- [7] Bickerdike, A., O'Deasmhunaigh, C., O'Flynn, S., & O'Tuathaigh, C. M. P. (2016). Learning Strategies, Study Habits and Social Networking Activity of Undergraduate Medical Students. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 7(1), 230-236. doi:10.5116/ijme.576f.d074.
- [8] Borg, E. (2015). Classroom Behaviour and Academic Achievement: How Classroom Behaviour Categories Relate to Gender and Academic Performance. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36(8), 1127-1148.
- [9] Bozorgian, H., Fallahpour, S., & Muhammadpour, M. (2022). Grammar Instruction to Young Adolescents at Lower Proficiency Levels Through Metacognitive Intervention. *Language Related Research*, 13(3), 339-369.
- [10] Capuno, R., Necesario, R., Etcuban, J. O., Espina, R., Padillo, G., & Manguilimotan, R. (2019). Attitudes, Study Habits, and Academic Performance of Junior High School Students in Mathematics. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 14(3), 547-561.
- [11] Cavallo F, Giacchi M, Vieno A, Galeone D, Tomba A, Lamberti A, Nardone P, Andreozzi S. (2013). *Studio HBSC in Italia (Health Behavior in School-aged children): rapporto sui dati 2010*. Rapporti ISTISAN 13/5. Roma: Istituto Superiore di Sanità.
- [12] Cerna, M. A., & Pavliushchenko, K. (2015). Influence of Study Habits on Academic Performance of International College Students in Shanghai. *Higher Education Studies*, 5(4), 42-55.
- [13] Ch, A. H. (2006). Effect of Guidance Services on Study Attitudes, Study Habits and Academic Achievement of Secondary School Students. *Bulletin of Education & Research*, 28(1), 35-45.
- [14] Clarke, C., Mullin, M., McGrath, D., & Farrelly, N. (2021). University Students and Study Habits. *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 38(2), 1-10.
- [15] Credé, M., & Kuncel, N. R. (2008). Study Habits, Skills, and Attitudes: The Third Pillar Supporting Collegiate Academic Performance. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 3(6), 425-453.
- [16] Entwistle, N. J., Thompson, J., & Wilson, J. D. (1974). Motivation and Study Habits. *Higher Education*, 3(4), 379-396.
- [17] Ergene, T. (2011). The Relationships among Test Anxiety Study Habits Achievement Motivation and Academic Performance among Turkish Secondary School Students. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 36(160), 320.
- [18] Hanum, L., Asari, H., & Syafaruddin, S. (2022). Personal Ethics and Time Management on Students' Learning Habits Iain Langsa. *Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 10(01), 521-537.
- [19] Harahap, A. (2018). Education Thought of Ibnu Miskawaih. *Sunan Kalijaga International Journal on Islamic Educational Research*, 1(1), 1-14.
- [20] Hodgetts, K. (2008). Underperformance or 'Getting It Right'? Constructions of Gender and Achievement in the Australian Inquiry into Boys' Education. *British journal of sociology of education*, 29(5), 465-477.
- [21] Jackson, C., & Dempster, S. (2009). 'I Sat Back on My Computer... With a Bottle of Whisky Next to Me': Constructing 'Cool' Masculinity through 'Effortless' Achievement in Secondary and Higher Education. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 18(4), 341-356.
- [22] Julius, M., & Evans, A. S. (2015). Study of the Relationship between Study Habits and Academic Achievement of Students: A Case of Spicer Higher Secondary School, India. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 7(7), 134-141.
- [23] Katikalapudi, R., Chellappan, S., Montgomery, F., Wunsch, D., & Lutzen, K. (2012). Associating Internet Usage with Depressive Behavior among College Students. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 31(4), 73-80.

- [24] Kusurkar, R. A., Ten Cate, T. J., Vos, C. M. P., Westers, P., & Croiset, G. (2013). How Motivation Affects Academic Performance: A Structural Equation Modelling Analysis. *Advances in health sciences education*, 18(1), 57-69.
- [25] Li, I. W., & Carroll, D. R. (2020). Factors Influencing Dropout and Academic Performance: An Australian Higher Education Equity Perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 42(1), 14-30.
- [26] Li, J. A., Dong, D., Wei, Z., Liu, Y., Pan, Y., Nori, F., & Zhang, X. (2020). Quantum Reinforcement Learning During Human Decision-Making. *Nature human behaviour*, 4(3), 294-307.
- [27] López Jiménez, D., Dittmar, E. C., & Vargas Portillo, J. P. (2021). New Directions in Corporate Social Responsibility and Ethics: Codes of Conduct in the Digital Environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 168 (4), 1-11.
- [28] Lovitt, T. C. (1981). Notes on Behavior Modification. *The Journal of Special Education*, 15(3), 395-400.
- [29] Lyng, S. T. (2009). Is There More to “Antischoolishness” Than Masculinity? On Multiple Student Styles, Gender, and Educational Self-exclusion in Secondary School. *Men and masculinities*, 11(4), 462-487.
- [30] Miñano, P., Gilar, R., & Castejón, J. L. (2012). A Structural Model of Cognitive-motivational Variables as Explanatory Factors of Academic Achievement in Spanish Language and Mathematics. *Anales de psicología*, 28(1), 45-54.
- [31] Moazzeni Limoudehi, M., & Mazandarani, O. (2021). Anxiety when learning a foreign language: The cases of proficiency and gender. *Language Related Research*, 11(6), 605-634.
- [32] Mushoriwa, T. (2009). The Study Strategy–Performance Function Among Students in Three Teachers’ Colleges in Masvingo and Harare, Zimbabwe. *Nigerian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 14(1).
- [33] Nonis, S. A., & Hudson, G. I. (2010). Performance of College Students: Impact of Study Time and Study Habits. *Journal of education for Business*, 85(4), 229-238.
- [34] Ossai, M. C. (2012). Age and Gender Differences in Study Habits: A Framework for Proactive Counselling against Low Academic Achievement. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(3), 67-73.
- [35] Peker Ünal, D. (2021). Factors Affecting Study Habits in Higher Education During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Anatolian Journal of Education*, 6(2), 109-124.
- [36] Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A Conceptual Framework for Assessing Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning in College Students. *Educational Psychology Review*, 4(16), 385–407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x>.
- [37] Reay, D. (2001). 'Spice Girls', 'Nice Girls', 'Girlies', and 'Tomboys': Gender Discourses, Girls' Cultures and Femininities in the Primary Classroom. *Gender and education*, 13(2), 153-166.
- [38] Richardson, M., Abraham, C., & Bond, R. (2012). Psychological Correlates of University Students’ Academic Performance: A systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(2), 353–387. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026838>.
- [39] Skelton, C. (2007). Gender, Policy and Initial Teacher Education. *Gender and Education*, 19(6), 677-690.
- [40] Smeds, M. R., Thrush, C. R., McDaniel, F. K., Gill, R., Kimbrough, M. K., Shames, B. D., ... & Bentley, F. R. (2017). Relationships between Study Habits, Burnout, and General Surgery Resident Performance on the American Board of Surgery In-Training Examination. *Journal of Surgical Research*, 217, 217-225.
- [41] Simon, C. A., Carr, J. R., McCullough, S. M., Morgan, S. J., Oleson, T., & Ressel, M. (2004). Gender, Student Perceptions, Institutional Commitments and Academic Dishonesty: Who Reports in Academic Dishonesty Cases? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(1), 75-90.
- [42] Steinemann, S. T., Geelan, B. J., Zaehringer, S., Mutuura, K., Wolkow, E., Frasseck, L., & Opwis, K. (2020). Potentials and Pitfalls of Increasing Prosocial Behavior and Self-Efficacy over Time Using an Online Personalized Platform. *PloS one*, 15(6), e0234422.
- [43] Stevens, R., & Rosenshine, B. (1981). Advances in Research on Teaching. *Exceptional Education Quarterly*, 2(1), 1-9.

- [44] Tus, J. (2020). Academic Stress, Academic Motivation, and its Relationship on the Academic Performance of the Senior High School Students. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 8(11), 29-37.
- [45] Tran, T., Duong, T., & Le, S. (2023). Does EFL students' self-efficacy in English language skills matter their self-regulated language learning strategy use?. *Language Related Research*, 207-0.
- [46] Veas, A., Castejón, J. L., Gilar, R., & Miñano, P. (2015). Academic Achievement in Early Adolescence: The Influence of Cognitive and Non-Cognitive Variables. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 142(4), 273-294.
- [47] Warrington, M., Younger, M., & Williams, J. (2000). Student Attitudes, Image and the Gender Gap. *British Educational Research Journal*, 26(3), 393-407.
- [48] Welch Jr, J. S. (2013). The Importance of Self-Efficacy in Ethical Education for Business Undergraduates. *Southern Journal of Business and Ethics*, 5, 214.
- [49] Whitley, B. E. (1998). Factors Associated with Cheating among College Students. A Review. *Research in Higher Education*, 39 (1), 235-274. doi:10.1023/A:1018724900565
- [50] Wrenn, C. G., McKeown, R. B., & Humber, W. J. (1962). *Study-Habits inventory*. Stanford University Press. California, US.
- [51] Younger, M., & Warrington, M. (1996). Differential Achievement of Girls and Boys at GCSE: Some Observations from the Perspective of One School. *British journal of Sociology of Education*, 17(3), 299-313.
- [52] Yusuf, M. (2010). Memorization as a Learning Style: A Balance Approach to Academic Excellence. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 1(6), 49-58.



عادات مطالعه و تعهد به کدهای اخلاقی به عنوان پیش‌بینی‌کننده عملکرد تحصیلی در مدارس و دانشگاه‌ها: مطالعه تکمیلی

زینب ابوالفضلی^{۱*}، زهرا عباسی^۲، جواد بلالی^۳

چکیده

مطالعات اندکی رابطه بین عوامل غیرشناختی را در محیط‌های آموزشی مختلف و با گروه‌های سنی مختلف بررسی کرده‌اند. هدف از این مطالعه به بررسی ارتباط بین عادات مطالعه و تعهد به کدهای اخلاقی و توانایی آن‌ها در پیش‌بینی عملکرد تحصیلی زبان‌آموزان در مدارس و دانشگاه‌ها (۵۴۷ دانش‌آموز بین ۱۸ تا ۳۵ سال) می‌پردازد. ابزارهای مورد استفاده، نسخه‌های اقتباسی پرسشنامه‌ها هستند که در یک ابزار پیمایشی با هر مقیاس در بخش‌های مجزا ساخته شده‌اند. نتایج نشان داد که بین عادات مطالعه و تعهد به کدهای اخلاقی رابطه معنی‌داری وجود دارد که در تمام گروه‌های سنی یک رابطه مثبت نشان می‌دهد. بیشترین رابطه در گروه سنی بین ۱۸-۲۲ سال و در هر دو گروه (مرد/زن) با شرکت‌کنندگان مرد نشان می‌دهد. این مطالعه نتیجه می‌گیرد که پایبندی به کدهای اخلاقی باید در طول سال‌های مدرسه با آموزش‌های اضافی به زبان‌آموزان در نظر گرفته و ارزیابی شود تا به آن‌ها کمک کند تا عادات مطالعه را یاد بگیرند یا اصلاح کنند و عملکرد خود را در زمان ورود به دانشگاه افزایش دهند.

کلمات کلیدی: عملکرد تحصیلی، کدهای اخلاقی، زبان‌آموزان، عوامل غیرشناختی، عادات

مطالعه

۱. استادیار گروه آموزش زبان انگلیسی، دانشگاه کوثر بجنورد، ایران. نویسنده مسئول. ایمیل: z.abolfazli@kub.ac.ir
۲. دانشیار گروه زبان فارسی، دانشگاه تربیت مدرس، تهران، ایران. ایمیل: abasiz@modares.ac.ir
۳. دانشجوی دکتری گروه آموزش زبان انگلیسی، دانشگاه ایلام، ایلام، ایران.