Journal of Social Sciences Review (JSSR) DOI: https://doi.org/10.54183/jssr.v3i2.362

How to Cite This Article: Haider, M. M., Zaid, R., & Shah, S. A. (2023). Effects of Teacher Teaching Approaches on Students Engagement and Comprehension at University Level. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(2), 1151-1161. https://doi.org/10.54183/jssr.v3i2.362

Effects of Teacher Teaching Approaches on Students Engagement and Comprehension at University Level

Muhammad Mujtaba Haider	Ph.D. Scholar, Institute of Education and Research, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan, KP, Pakistan.
Raham Zaid	Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, KP, Pakistan.
Sultan Akbar Shah	Ph.D. Scholar, Institute of Education and Research, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan, KP, Pakistan.

Vol. 3, **No.** 2 (Spring 2023)

Pages: 1151 – 1161

ISSN (Print): 2789-441X

ISSN (Online): 2789-4428

Key Words

Autonomous-supportive Teaching Style, Controlling Teaching Style, Curiosity and Comprehension, Student Engagement

Corresponding Author:

Mohammad Nadeem
Email: mujtabahaider786110@gmail.com

Abstract: *Teachers influence academic engagement and lifelong achievement. However, little is known about whether instructional styles explain these associations or whether they differ across academic and "non-cognitive" outcomes. In classrooms, teacher-student interaction helps pupils learn. In this cross-sectional study of 229 university students, perceived teaching style and student engagement, curiosity, and comprehension are examined. Student Engagement Instrument and Curiosity and Comprehension Inventory were employed. Students perceived both Autonomous-supportive and controlling teaching approaches. However, students' ratings of teachers' support and control differed significantly (t (229)=3.942 and 4.774, respectively). Perceived autonomy support teaching style was moderately correlated with student engagement (r=.463), curiosity, and comprehension (r=.318). The findings explain how teaching style affects students' interest and classroom engagement.*

Introduction

Teachers are very important in ensuring the development of their students inside the classroom. Teachers show a lot about how they do their jobs by what they do and how they make the classroom feel. Teachers care not only about how well kids do in class but also about whether or not they are interested in what they are learning. So, you can't say enough about how good it is for your mental health to be in a friendly school. Gillet, Vallerand, Amoura, and Baldes (2010) found that a student's sense of social belonging in the classroom had an effect on how motivated they were to learn and how well they did in school.

Skinner and Belmont's (1993) study shows that how students think their professors are involved has a big effect on how motivated and interested they are in learning. Wentzel and Caldwell (1997) found that a student's level of relatedness with their teachers is a good predictor of how motivated they say they are in school, even after control views and past motivation are taken into account. Universities and colleges put a lot of value on lecturers getting training in how to run a class and teach the subject. Even though teachers have had a lot of professional development training, students are still not driven and don't pay much attention in class. In every classroom, there is a second,

unspoken curriculum that goes beyond the regular school curriculum and how well teachers teach it. This curriculum is made up of the interactions between students and teachers. To get kids excited about school, it's important to know what they think and feel about their teachers. If teachers know how their students think, they will be able to connect with and understand them better. If a child's education has value, it will inspire them to share their talents and drive, and it will channel their intellectual curiosity in a good way.

Educators can use strategies alone or in groups. (Picard, 2004) says that the choice of teaching methods should be based on the tastes of the principal and teacher as well as the skills of the students. Herrell and Jordan (2004) say that these are "the approaches that can be used across curricular areas to support students' learning."

Appropriate ways to teach get students involved in the learning process, which is very important. Teachers have a wide range of options for how to teach in the classroom. By having students work in pairs, they can see how their students act and talk to each other during class. Also, contact between students and between students and teachers is important for keeping students interested and helping them learn in the classroom. Target asking is a great way for teachers to get their students to answer in a way that makes sense. When teachers ask kids about themselves, they answer with a lot of enthusiasm. (Kumar, 2007) says that teachers should always keep an eye on their students.

When students take an active part in the learning process, they are more interested and learn more. They work hard on their minds, read a lot, think critically, and use what they've learned. (Silberman, 1996) says that learning through direct participation is fast, fun, encouraging, and interesting on a personal level. Teachers today use methods like whole-class instruction, small-group instruction, working in pairs, giving students individual assignments, role-playing, reflective learning, structured discussion, decision-making, games, mind maps, and technological tools like DVDs, computers, and overhead projectors. The National Induction Programme for Teachers (2013) suggests that teachers also have their students present their work publicly.

The way teachers teach and motivate their students can have a big effect on how well their students learn English and how interested they are in the process. When teachers change how they teach, student interest and success change, too (Bernaus, Wilson, and Gardner, 2009).

Influence of a Teaching Style

Davis (2003) and Klem & Connell (2004) found that when students see their teachers interacting happily with them, they are more interested in their education and more likely to do well in class. How the teacher runs the class has a direct effect on how well the students can fight and do well. When students know exactly what is expected of them and when their learning tasks and goals are well-defined, their ability to self-regulate gets better. Sierens, Vansteenkiste, Goossens, Soenens, and Dochy (2009) found that students are more likely to use self-regulated learning methods when they are sure of their skills.

The classroom environment has a big effect on how students feel and act about learning. It hurts how well kids do in school and how well they learn to control themselves, be independent, and find their own identities. So, they might not care as much about their schoolwork and wonder why it's important. Ryan and Patrick (2001) say that at this time of development, the classroom setting, including how the teacher seems to teach, is the most important thing.

Autonomous-Supportive and Controlling Teaching Style

Autonomy is based on the idea that a person has the freedom to decide for himself or herself what to do. Any teacher who agrees with this idea will give students a say in things like class tasks and

encourage them to think about other points of view. Studies have shown that when teachers have more freedom to make decisions in the classroom, students are more driven and better able to govern themselves.

Influence of Teaching Style on Students

(Vansteenkiste, Zhou, Lens, & Soenens, 2005; Benita, Roth, & Deci, 2014) As well as better learning, time management, focus, and less stress about grades. In a classroom where students don't work together, and teachers use guilt or threats of punishment to keep control, students are more likely to focus on their ties with teachers than on their work.

Allan, Clarke, and Jopling looked at how students ranked their teachers in 2009. Students think that teachers' high standards for them play a role in whether or not they do well in school and go on to college. When students thought their abilities were being judged too harshly, they were more likely to skim over the information. On the other hand, when they thought their teachers were being encouraged, they were more likely to put in the work. Lizzio, Wilson, and Simons (2002) found that how students felt about the modern learning setting was a better predictor of their success in college than their grades.

Ouyang and Scharber (2017) looked into the importance of teaching style over the course of a school year to help students get along and learn. The results show that teachers take on a more active role as a facilitator in the later years of school after putting more emphasis on student involvement and interaction in the beginning. (Jaggars & Xu, 2016; Ladyshewsky, 2013) Showing up in class has an effect on students' natural curiosity, interest, and ability to interact.

Student Engagement

The future success of students depends on their level of classroom participation. Sinclair, Christenson, and Thurlow (2005) found a correlation between different forms of cognitive and emotional engagement and positive learning and behavior outcomes. Affective involvement comprises familial support, relationship with teacher and peer, and intrinsic motivation, whereas cognitive engagement includes control and relevance for work, future objectives, and motivation. Students are more likely to work together and feel invested in their education when they have positive relationships with their teachers. It has been shown that students place a premium on their relationships with teachers, which in turn increases their level of learning satisfaction and motivation (Ali & Ahmad, 2011).

Curiosity and Comprehension

Hallihan (2008) says that students who get along well with their teachers are more interested in their education. This means they act less disruptively, pay more attention in class, do better on tests, and are more likely to graduate. Parents and peers don't have as much of an effect on a student's desire to learn and discover as teachers do. Reio, Marcus, and Sanders-Reio (2009) found that students are more motivated to learn when they have good relationships with their teachers than when they have good relationships with their peers.

There are two main problems with studies that explain why we haven't learned much about how teachers' actions affect how students do in school. The first problem is that there aren't any good ways to figure out how good a teacher is. Most of the research in this field looks at teaching in labs or classrooms for short periods of time, so it doesn't cover all of the important ways that teachers' practices change over the course of a university year. The second problem is that it's hard to draw conclusions about causes from how a study was set up. This is a problem that keeps coming up in the economics of education (Murnane & Willett, 2011). Prior study is limited by the fact that students were not assigned to teachers at random (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2006; Rothstein, 2010) and that teachers' skills and practices were not evaluated.

Eison (2010) conducted a study entitled "Using Active Learning Instructional Strategies to Create Excitement and Enhance Learning".

The paper says that active learning, The ability of students to think critically and creatively, can be improved by coming up with new ways to teach. The kids can talk about their ideas in pairs or small groups. They can work anywhere and at any time they want. The author of the study says that teachers don't like using instructional strategies because they take too much time and make it hard to cover the subject well. If teachers want to use strategies, they need more time to plan. Due to the size of their classes, teachers sometimes give lectures instead of using methods. Teachers need more tools to use active learning, and students often don't like learning methods that aren't like the standard lecture. But the researcher offers a number of ways to fix this, such as using short exercises to save time, role play, and conversation to make it less likely that important information will be left out. Even though teachers will have to spend a lot of time getting ready, this method makes them less interested because the students do all the work. When students use techniques, they are more interested in the subject matter. The researcher also suggests different methods that can be used in the classroom, such as asking students questions to see how well they understand the subject.

This was looked at in Mocinic's "Active Teaching Strategies in Higher Education" study from 2010. He said that teachers need to change because the way education works has changed. Teachers should use methods that have been shown to get students more involved and improve their success in the classroom. From the answers students gave to a questionnaire, we learned which teaching styles and methods students liked best overall and why. The poll was filled out by 360 students from the School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Medicine and Health Sciences at the University of Pula. The results showed that using a variety of ways to teach students makes them more interested, which leads to better learning and success. Also, the study showed that students can't learn to be responsible and motivated on their own.

Albakri et al.'s 2012 study, "Experienced Teachers' Pedagogical Strategies in Content-Based Instruction Contexts," found that teachers' choices of educational strategies and how they used them were different. Teachers who teach different subjects, have different levels of knowledge, and have been teaching for different amounts of time also deal with techniques in different ways. The ways they teach in the classroom show what they think, how they think, and what they know about how to teach an interdisciplinary program.

Operational Definition

- Teaching Strategies are the techniques that teachers use in the classroom to help students learn and to participate in class.

Research Questions

The present study aims to explore the effects dimensions of teaching style on students' engagement, curiosity and comprehension in their learning environment. Hence, the research asks the following questions:

1. What kind of teaching style is being perceived inside university classrooms?
2. Does perceived teaching style influence students' engagement, curiosity and comprehension differently in university students?
3. Do perceived teaching styles impact students' engagement, curiosity and comprehension in various programs at university?

Research Methodology

Participants

The study's population samples were made up of university pupils. We got in touch with possible participants at six different colleges by using a method called "convenience sampling." There

were a total of 229 people who took part. There were 113 college women and 116 college men. The rest of the volunteers were all college and graduate students between the ages of 19 and 37.

Questionnaire

Most research on classroom participation has been done with surveys that either the teacher or the students have filled out. The assessment has a list of questions that measure how far the kids have come in a few different areas.

Reliability of the Research Instruments

The researcher applied the following methods to establish the reliability of the research instrument (Questionnaire):

A. reliability of the first research instrument- the questionnaire

Using a test-retest method, the researcher checked the stability index and internal consistency of the main study tool (a questionnaire) with a group of 229 male and female students. Then, the researchers found out the following:

1. Person's correlation coefficient as an indication of the stability index through the two applications of the research instrument.
2. Cronbach's Alpha Formula was applied to the first application of the questionnaire as an indication of the internal consistency of the items in the questionnaire.

Table 1

Person's Correlation Coefficient and Cronbach's Alpha forthe Questionnaire.

Questionnaire and its Categories	Stability Index (Pearson)	ConsistencyIndex (Cronbach's Alpha)	Sig*
Curiosity and comprehension	0.81	0.70	0.001*
Student Engagement	0.88	0.73	0.001*
Perceived Autonomy Support	0.74	0.71	0.001*
Perceived Psychological Control		0.80	0.001*

**Significant at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)*

According to Table 1, the internal consistency (Cronbach) of the first research instrument ranges from 0.30 to 0.73 for the items and 0.80 for the entire research instrument, while the stability index (Pearson) ranges from 0.31 to 0.88 for the domains. The results of the analysis indicate that the primary research instrument (the questionnaire) is appropriate for the purpose.

Results and Findings

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Participants' Demographics, N =229

	Profile	F	Percentage
Gender	Male	116	51%
	Female	113	49%
University Degree	Bachelors	155	70%
	Masters	46	20%
	MPhil	23	9.6%
	PhD	5	2.2%

Table 2 shows the information about the 229 people who signed up. The gender of the students, their level of education, and the names of the teaching staff are all shown. There were a total of 113 women and 116 guys. When it comes to how kids are split up. Out of the 229 college students polled, 155 (70%) were working toward bachelor's degrees, 46 (20%) were working toward master's degrees, 23 (9.6%) were working toward Mphil degrees, and 5 (2.2%) were working toward doctoral degrees.

Table 3

Mean, Standard Deviation and Bivariate Correlations of Research Variables

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1	Curiosity and comprehension	34.21	6.826					
2	Student Engagement	76.71	18.344	.209**	.923**	.905**		
3	Perceived Autonomy Support	49.90	13.919	.318**	.432**	.413**	.463**	
4	Perceived Psychological Control	41.12	12.389	.085*	-.198**	-.226**	-.231**	.029

*p < .05 **p < .01 (1 tailed), N = 229

Table 3 provides the response to the first study question by showing the average, standard deviation, and correlation of the independent variables. Correlation research shows that student activities have a substantial effect on how much autonomy students feel they have. Table 2 shows that there is a moderate positive correlation between students' perceptions of autonomy support and their levels of engagement (r =.463, p .001) and curiosity and understanding (r =.318, p .001), while students' perceptions of psychological control have a weak negative correlation with their levels of engagement (r = -.231, p .001). Perceived psychological control and autonomous support do not differ significantly on average. Students have a simultaneous perception of both teaching techniques, as shown by the mean scores.

Table 3

Independent T-test of University Students on the Scores of Curiosity and Comprehension, Student Engagement and Perceived Teaching Styles

	Students	n	M	SD	T	Sig	df
Curiosity and comprehension	Male	116	34.64	6.277	1.045	.29	228
	Female	113	33.92	7.219			
Student Engagement	Male	116	74.50	18.975	-2.131	.03	228
	Female	113	78.43	17.733			
Perceived Autonomous-Support	Male	116	53.01	13.593	3.942	.00	228
	Female	113	47.57	13.484			
Perceived Psychological Control	Male	116	44.45	12.893	4.744	.00	228
	Female	113	38.68	11.373			

The Curiosity and Comprehension scores of male and female students did not vary significantly (Table 4, t (229) = 1.045, p.29). The average score for male students was 34.64, and the average score for female students was 33.92. There was no statistically significant difference between the two. Male students had significantly lower Student Engagement scores (M = 78.43, SD = 17.733) than female students (t (229) = -2.131, p =.03). On the autonomous-support construct (M = 53.01, SD = 13.593) and the psychological-control construct (M = 44.45, SD = 12.893, vs. M

= 38.68, SD = 11.373), male and female students had very different ideas about how teachers taught (t (229) = 3.942, p.00 and t (229) = 4.774, p.00, respectively).

Table 5

One Way ANOVA of University Students with Variables of Curiosity and Comprehension, Student Engagement and Perceived Teaching Styles, (N = 229)

Variable	Group	M	SD	df	F	Sig.
Curiosity And Exploration	**Bachelor**	33.79	6.94			
	Masters	33.57	7.73			
	MPhil	34.96	7.43			
	PhD	35.20	10.94		.890	
Student Engagement	**Bachelors**	79.41	17.17			
	Masters	78.74	17.25			
	MPhil	73.83	21.26			
	PhD	63.80	16.30		4.570	
				2,227		
Perceived Autonomous Support	**Bachelors**	47.75	12.91			
	Masters	43.17	13.60			
	MPhil	53.70	14.60			
	PhD	53.60	12.97		6.332	
Perceived Psychological Control	**Bachelor**	39.38	11.17			
	Masters	38.00	11.69			
	MPhil	33.87	11.18			
	PhD	42.20	14.10		5.877	

The results of a one-way analysis of variance are shown in Table 5. They show that there isn't a big difference between the groups of college students in terms of their levels of interest and understanding (p >.05). F (229) = .890, p < .488. Analysis of variance at the p.05 level showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the amount of student participation. Using the Tukey HSD test for post hoc comparisons, we find that the mean score for PhD students (M = 63.80, SD = 16.30) is very different from the mean score for Bachelor's (M = 79.41, SD = 17.17), Master's (M = 78.74, SD = 17.25), and MPhil (M = 73.83, SD = 21.26) students.

At the p.05 level (F (229) = 6.332, p.001 in a one-way analysis of variance), there are big differences between how high school and college students feel about their own support. Based on posthoc comparisons with the Tukey HSD test, the mean results of students are very different (M = 56.42, SD = 12.29). The mean and standard deviation of MPhil and PhD students are much higher than those of undergraduates (M = 47.75, SD = 12.98) and graduate students (M = 43.17, SD = 13.60). In the same way, students in the MPhil and PhD programs said that their teachers were more independent and helpful than those in the bachelor's and master's programs.

Table 6

The Means of the total score according to the age variable.

Domains	Age	Mean
Students	20-29	4.03
	30-39	4.07

40-49	3.93
50 and more	3.94

Discussion

People often use both strict and permissive ways of teaching. This idea answers the main question of the study, which was whether or not students thought their teachers were more self-supportive and mentally controlling than they actually were. Even though there was a big difference between male and female college students, a teacher's actions could be seen as both empowering and controlling. Soenens and Vansteenkiste (2010) and Vansteenkiste et al. (2012) also back this up.

Tessier, Sarrazin, and Ntoumanis (2008) held training to help students act in ways that support their own liberty in the classroom. Results showed that teachers' attempts to give students more freedom did not make up for their controlled behavior. Instead, even after getting training, students kept acting like they were in charge. In 2001, Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, and Briere did a study on how teachers interact with each other. They found that managers use both autonomous and supporting elements as well as controlling ones.

Also, the main goal of this study was to find the links between how teachers see their students' attention, curiosity, and understanding. Students' views of teachers' autonomous-supportive approaches and their levels of interest, wonder, and understanding were found to have a moderate link, which led to the second study question. The results suggest that students are more interested in class and do better when they think their teacher cares about their success. (Fall and Roberts, 2012) is a good case. So, the fact that students' views of teacher support and relatedness in the classroom can predict their involvement, curiosity, and exploration shows how important the social context of the classroom is and points to important areas for future study. Just and Carpenter (1992) found that students are less likely to be driven by things like interest in the subject or a desire to learn when the curriculum is based on memorization. (Nandi, Chan, Chan, Chan, and Chan, 2006) say that teachers who use this kind of education model need to use both self-directed and controlled ways of teaching. As a result, the results show that matriculating students had more freedom and less psychological control from their teachers than O Level students.

Students in MPhil and PhD programs worked harder than students in bachelor and graduate programs. In bachelor's and master's degree programs, students get their first taste of duty outside of college. Students in their first year of college have a lot to do, but they meet deadlines, study for tests, and get excited about their future jobs because they are intrinsically motivated (Conrad, 2017). For graduate students in M.Phil. and Ph.D. programs, professors are one of the first people they can talk to about their new academic life. This creates a safe relationship between the student and the teacher, with standards that are similar to those of a caretaker. These kinds of demands for independence, curiosity, and study shape how students see their teachers. Because of this, students see their teachers as more supportive of their independence and more in charge of their minds (Riley, 2009). The scores for curiosity and exploration did not change much from one group of students to the next. This means that even in classes where students and teachers don't talk much, teachers still have power over their students by using subtle ways to control them. For every task, presentation, and test, there is a matching academic incentive. When students are given grace marks for even the smallest things, like answering questions properly during a lecture, they learn to always think in terms of rewards and punishments. (Quan-Haase, 2007) To put it another way, students' motivation changes from being based on what they want to

do to being based on how well they do in class and how good their grades are.

Conclusion

From an educational point of view, it's important to stress the whole process of autonomy-supportive style for happiness and competence, as well as controlling style or thwarting. These things show how important it will be for future studies to find a balance between the need for mediation and the need for classroom participation and research. There is also disagreement in the writings about how to understand the different ways of teaching. Some studies show that helping and managing are two different things, while others show that they are two sides of the same coin. So, in future studies, autonomy, help, and control styles will need to be looked at separately. Based on what the study found, we can draw conclusions about how different grading systems and levels of education affect how interested, curious, and smart pupils are. The results of this study show how important it is to realize that a teacher's style is a key factor in how much students participate in class. They also show how important it is to use teaching methods that encourage students to actively participate and work together.

Recommendations

1. It is suggested that the Ministry of Education urge teachers to use teaching strategies in the classroom.
2. Curriculum designers should make the English textbook flexible so that teachers can teach it in different ways.
3. The teachers are told to use different ways to teach in order to get the students more interested and motivated to learn.
4. The teachers are told to interact with their kids and each other more.
5. It is suggested that teachers make the classroom a lively place so that they can use the teaching techniques more easily.

References

Ali, A., & Ahmad, I. (2011). Key factors for determining student satisfaction in distance learning courses: A study of Allama Iqbal Open University. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/6047

Allan, J., Clarke, K., & Jopling, M. (2009). Effective teaching in Higher Education: Perceptions of first year undergraduate students. *The International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *21*(3), 362–372. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ909070.pdf

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the Schools*, *45*(5), 369-386. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20303

Benita, M., Roth, G., & Deci, E. L. (2014). When are mastery goals more adaptive? It depends on experiences of autonomy support and autonomy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *106*(1), 258-267. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034007

Bernaus, M. Wilson, A. and Gardner, R. (2009) Teachers' Motivation, Classroom Strategy Use, Students' Motivation and Second Language Achievement. LainnugeulaVruemz. 25-36. https://doi.org/10.30827/digibug.31869

Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2006). Teacher-student matching and the assessment of teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Human Resources*, *XLI*(4), 778-820. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.xli.4.778

Conrad, L. (2017). Students' attachment styles to their professors: Patterns of achievement, curiosity, exploration, self-criticism, self-reassurance, and autonomy. *All College Thesis Program*, (30).

Fall, A., & Roberts, G. (2012). High school dropouts: Interactions between social context, self-perceptions, school engagement, and student dropout. *Journal of Adolescence*, *35*(4), 787-798.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.11.004

Gillet, N., Vallerand, R. J., Amoura, S., & Baldes, B. (2010). Influence of coaches' autonomy support on athletes' motivation and sport performance: A test of the hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *11*(2), 155-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.10.004

Hallinan, M. T. (2008). Teacher influences on students' attachment to school. *Sociology of Education*, *81*(3), 271-283. https://doi.org/10.1177/003804070808100303

Herrell, A. and Jordan, M. (2004). *Fifty Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners.* New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Jaggars, S. S., & Xu, D. (2016). How do online course design features influence student performance? *Computers & Education*, *95*, 270-284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.01.014

Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1992). A capacity theory of comprehension: Individual differences in working memory. *Psychological Review*, *99*(1), 122-149. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.99.1.122

Ladyshewsky, R. K. (2013). Instructor presence in online courses and student satisfaction. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2013.070113

Lizzio, A., Wilson, K., & Simons, R. (2002). University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: Implications for theory and practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, *27*(1), 27-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070120099359

Močinić, S. N. (2012). Active teaching strategies in higher education. *Metodički obzori/Methodological Horizons*, *7*(2), 97-105. https://doi.org/10.32728/mo.07.2.2012.08

Murnane, R. J., & Phillips, B. R. (1981). What do effective teachers of inner-city children have in common? *Social Science Research*, *10*(1), 83-100. https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089x(81)90007-7

Nandi, P. L., Chan, J. N., Chan, C. P., Chan, P., & Chan, L. P. (2000). Undergraduate medical education: Comparison of problem-based learning and conventional teaching. *Hong Kong Medical Journal*, *6*(3), 301-306.

Ouyang, F., & Scharber, C. (2017). The influences of an experienced instructor's discussion design and facilitation on an online learning community development: A social network analysis study. *The Internet and Higher Education, 35,* 34-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2017.07.002

Pelletier, L.G., Fortier, M.S., Vallerand, R.J. *et al.* Associations Among Perceived Autonomy Support, Forms of Self-Regulation, and Persistence: A Prospective Study. *Motivation and Emotion* **25**, 279–306 (2001). https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014805132406

Quan-Haase, A. (2007). University students' local and distant social ties: Using and integrating modes of communication on campus. *Information, Communication & Society*, *10*(5), 671-693. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180701658020

Reio, T. G., Marcus, R. F., & Sanders-Reio, J. (2009). Contribution of student and instructor relationships and attachment style to school completion. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *170*(1), 53-72. https://doi.org/10.3200/gntp.170.1.53-72

Riley, P. (2009). An adult attachment perspective on the student–teacher relationship & classroom management difficulties. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *25*(5), 626-635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.11.018

Ryan, A. M., & Patrick, H. (2001). The classroom social environment and changes in

adolescents' motivation and engagement during middle school. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(2), 437-460. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038002437

Sierens, E., Vansteenkiste, M., Goossens, L., Soenens, B., & Dochy, F. (2009). The synergistic relationship of perceived autonomy support and structure in the prediction of self-regulated learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *79*(1), 57-68. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709908x304398

Sinclair, M. F., Christenson, S. L., & Thurlow, M. L. (2005). Promoting school completion of urban secondary youth with emotional or behavioral disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, *71*(4), 465-482. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290507100405

Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*(4), 571-581. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.85.4.571

Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). A theoretical upgrade of the concept of parental psychological control: Proposing new insights on the basis of self-determination theory. *Developmental Review*, *30*(1), 74-99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2009.11.001

Tessier, D., Sarrazin, P., & Ntoumanis, N. (2008). The effects of an experimental programme to support students' autonomy on the overt behaviours of physical education teachers. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *23*(3), 239-253. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03172998

Vansteenkiste, M., Zhou, M., Lens, W., & Soenens, B. (2005). Experiences of autonomy and control among Chinese learners: Vitalizing or immobilizing? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *97*(3), 468-483. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.3.468

Wentzel, K. R., & Caldwell, K. (1997). Friendships, peer acceptance, and group membership: Realtions to academic achievement in middle school. *Child Development*, *68*(6), 1198-1209. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1997.tb01994.x