I J A B E R, Vol. 14, No. 5, (2016): 3179-3192

LEARNING ORIENTATION AND PERCEIVED SIMILARITIES EFFORTS IN DRIVING THE SUCCESSFUL TEAM LEARNING IN THE STUDENTS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITAS BUDI LUHUR – JAKARTA, INDONESIA

Ratih Puspitaningtyas Faeni*

Abstract: *Learning styles and the learner orientation are considered instrumental in the success of student learning. In addition, other factor such as learning environment also can be attributed to the differences in the students orientation based on certain subjects. The main question of this research relates to the type is whether the learning styles of students formed by their response to the learning environment and the types of courses. There are different learning styles that students do such as choosing to read a book, write or create a student records and memorization style. In the team's activities, they may tend to learn on campus or off campus. This study has the respondents as samples from the population of students registered in Universitas Budi Luhur in Jakarta, Indonesia. The respondents were grouped into male and female students. This study uses SPSS to analyze their response. Our analysis results showed that learning orientation and perceived similarities among respondents had significant influence on the team learning. Even though the students learning orientation can affect the team learning, however, the perceived similarities had no significant effect to the success of the team learning. This study provides input to readers on how to apply the concept of learning orientation and perceived similarities on the success of team learning in the college environment.*

Keywords: *learning style, learning orientation, team learning*

INTRODUCTION

Several studies noted that learning environment and student ability has been long studied for many years (Lizzio *et al.*, 2002; Schaefer, 2003). Goal orientation is also important to establish team learning success (Hirst *et al.*, 2009). However, it is questioned about how students can achieve their learning goal through team partnership and group participation (Morrissey, 2000). In addition, several studies also showed that learning goal are also influenced by gender and learning orientation (Greene, 1996; Pajares, 2002; Bettencourt, 2004).

* Lecturer of Faculty of Economics, Universitas Budi Luhur, Jalan Ciledug Raya, Petukangan Utara, DKI Jakarta 12260, Indonesia *E-mail: ratihpuspitaningtyasfaeni@gmail.com*

Learning process is very important for classroom development (Huitt, 2003), because by studying a student who does not originally know will start to learn (Biggs, 1993), therefore their problem can be identified rapidly. However, it is questioned about how teachers can perform their role to improve their student ability and can consciously assist them to learn and get support from their interaction with the classroom environment (Biggs, 2011).

As students get older, they find that learning has multipurpose goals including obtaining a new insight and change as a result of his own experience in interacting with the environment (Bok, 2009). Paechter, *et al.,* 2010 added that learning is a process by individuals to acquire new behavior and change their old habits as a whole or a part resulted from experience and interaction on their chosen environment. In line with the above opinion, Stated that learning is essentially is a process of mental activity of a person in interacting with the environment so as to produce a behavioral change into positive direction which re-shapes their knowledge, attitude, and psychomotoric aspects (Krathwohl, 2002; Redmond, 2013).

In the class setting, the learning process contains several aspects such as pedagogical, psychological and didactical (Kansanen, 2002). Pedagogical aspect has been main aspect in the teaching activities which need facilitators to manage the environment and interaction (Maor, 2003). In addition, the facilitator must be educated in the teaching to supervise students in the development of appropriate maturity toward the learning goal in the classroom (Dörnyei, 2007). From psychological aspect, it showed that students are has various backgrounds of physical and psychological conditions (Kansanen, 2002). It impacted on their learning results of memorizing, learning motor skills, learning concepts, and learning attitude (Novak, 2010). This diversity makes student learning also varies according to the type of learning activities (Kwakman, 2003). From the didactical aspects, students always need a facilitator such as teacher, tutor, and coach to participate in their learning activities. In the class setting, teacher as the facilitator should determine the most effective method for the student to participate in the learning process in accordance with the instruction and learning goals (Sungur, 2006).

There are three types of learning styles, e.g., audio, visual, and kinesthetic (Gilakjani, 2011). However, it is still argued of the kinds of learning style to support better for the success of the team learning (Pashler *et al.,* 2008). Even though there are many explanations about the approach to improve student learning goal, however, it is still questioned about how students can maintain certain dominant learning style. In addition, it is also important to know the aspect to help the students to improve their learning styles and interaction in classroom (Oxford, 1997). As student grow up, they get more awareness that their own learning style can support them or make them experience drawback in achieving

learning goal. Student learning outcomes also has been influenced by the teacher ability to manage the interaction preferences (Woolfolk, 1990). Teacher must modify the classroom for better interaction in order to reduce student disappointment, confusion and stress (Boekaerts, 2002). However, it is questioned about how teacher can understand the student learning style and what preferences which suitable for the learners? The ability of the teacher to give better preferences and classroom setting can bring big effect to student to nurture positive influence on learning outcomes. Therefore, student factor is also important to be taken into consideration in the learning process (Guskey, 2002). According to Collier (1999), teacher must have experience to recognize and know the students characteristics. To do so, teacher also must adjust the learning method to suit the student characteristics and ability in order to achieve higher learning goal.

The learning materials and processing information is also a goal of learning activities in the class (Arends, 2014). Teacher has a role to help the learner to give enjoyable meaning even though each learner has difference ability and characteristics (Cercone, 2008). According Harris (1995) even two individuals grew up in same neighborhood and got the same treatment, their characteristics will be different and has different thinking about the surrounding world. Each student will develop its own perspective and meaning on every event they have experienced (Fry, 2009).

Another aspect which important in the class setting is the student learning orientation to achieve their learning outcomes (Nicol, 2006). In fact, the orientation of each learner is different from one another, and then teacher must be able to help the student to perform actions which help them to stay comfort in the class environment (Biggs, 2011). When the student feels uncomfortable with the class setting, they tend to behave ignorant, sleepy, disturb other students, reading comics and absentee (Harlock. 1980, p. 166).

All it can affect the desired goal of learning activities. Therefore, the competence of teacher to understand the differences in the student characteristics will help the students to understand the learning objectives learners and help them to achieve higher learning results (Nicol, 2006). In other words, teacher has a roll in the student orientation and brings them to ready to face the challenges both in school and in society (Julie, 2005; Biggs, 2011). The process of orientation will help the students to improve their interpretation toward their surrounded environment.

Such efforts have been studied by many researchers. One of the models of student orientation to understand their learning environment is Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) scale which developed by Nicol (2006). It is one type of cooperative learning models that emphasized the interaction among

students to and their environment and help each other with both their peers and teachers in mastering the material learning (Oxford, 1997). It also supports the learners to gain the optimum achievement. This model has been admitted as an approach to help teacher to establish cooperative learning (Julie, 2005).

Students' learning environment is also important to develop better team learning among student. Julie, (2005) stated that there are two types of environment learning, e.g. conducive and unconducive environments. Conducive learning environment is characterized by high and intense knowledge interaction. Several studies argued that learning environments is not only about physical and facilitation but also about significant relationship and interaction between students and teachers. It is also questioned about how student can participate actively in the team activities to motivate them to achieve learning goals.

In Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) the students are divided into team learning consisting of four people of different abilities, gender, and ethnic background. Teachers deliver lessons, and students work in their team to ensure that all members of the team are immersed in the class activities of the lesson. It is followed up by fulfilling quizzes on individual tasks.

Goal orientation also has been studied for years in relation to the learning success. The student participation in team activities has been related to goal orientation for both individual and group/team. However it is questioned about how student perceived their learning goals and what support they need from their team.

For certain cases, learning environment has been reported can improve student success in the team participation. However, it is not clear what aspect can influence the student's high learning score. In addition, since learning score has many constructs such as teacher involvement, curriculum, and facilitation, it is not clear what variable to measure the effect of low achieved learning goal among the students.

This study try to observe what factors can impact on the team learning (Morrissey, 2000; Julie, 2005; Hirst, 2009). In addition, it is also has a goal to explain the cause of student can achieve their learning objective. Even though teacher has great role to manage the task and assignment in the class, however, the student must be the priority and center of activities. Therefore, it is important to know together the variable above and what aspects can contribute to the student capability to achieve higher results than the student working alone.

In addition, it is also interesting to know the aspects which can increase the student participation in the team and how their learning style can be different among audio, visual or kinesthetic learning styles (Gilakjani, 2011). Even though

student motivation is important, however, this construct is not observed for the purpose of focusing on the student learning styles, their learning orientation and effect of environment conduciveness.

This is become more important for school opened international class where the students have different background and multicultural. In addition, the students also come from different countries with their perspective and perception about learning goals. Therefore, for international school, the teachers are demanded to have higher competence than conventional school especially for the management of the class and curriculum. This is also experienced by many international schools in Jakarta. From the report of Department of Education of Jakarta, many school teachers were faced with the challenge of teaching certification and training. Even though that the report showed that almost teachers had followed monthly teaching, however, their competence in the classroom management is still questionable. In addition, with the increased number of students in the class and the curriculum development, it also demanded the teachers to manage and update their strategies in classroom interaction. Therefore, it is interesting to observe the efforts conducted by school teachers in Jakarta to manage their classroom activities and the competence to be facilitator and counselor for their students.

Based on the above background, this study will observe and test the topic of "Learning Orientation and Perceived Similarities Efforts in Driving the Successful Team Learning in the Students of the Faculty of Economics, Universitas Budi Luhur - Jakarta, Indonesia".

LEARNING STYLES AND TEAM ORIENTATION

Characteristics of the students in question in this research are their learning style and the team orientation (Yazici, 2005). Kolb, et al (2001) states that learning styles explain how individuals learn or the way in which each person will concentrate their minds on the process of resolving difficult problem and collect new information through a different source. There are students who have a tendency to absorb more leverage information through multiple sources, e.g., sight (visual), hearing (auditory), and physical activity (kinesthetic) (Gilakjani, 2011). Some students also can use multiple learning styles to improve their results (Landry, 2011).

Their ability to combine these styles will comprise into team orientation which characterized by the students to use more than one style of learning (Pashler, 2008). it drives them to have good team learning and modify suitable environment with their activities in order to reduce the limit to learning achievement (Kwakman, 2003). These give benefits of reduced stress level while improving higher excitement (Maor, 2003).

Novak, (2010) argued that it is important for teachers to know the learning styles of each students to help them to raise awareness about the learning goals and what works and does not fit with their learning style. In addition, it is also important to help them to determine the right choice of the activities which important for them (Sungur, 2006). Student must be directed to gain learning experiences and find the effective study skills in order to help them to improvise and analyze the level of individual success (Collier, 1999).

Landry, (2011) stated that students also have their responsibility to identify their own learning style and recognizing their learning style. After they can find the effective way of learning and how to utilize their maximum learning ability, the student can get more optimal practice (Lankshear, 2011). They study used VAK (visual-audio-kinesthetic) scale which measured through learning styles questionnaire adopted from Bobby DePorter (2001). In addition, they also used motivation questionnaire of ARCS (attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction) by John Keller for learning outcomes of biology students.

In their approach, some studies are intended to identify the learning styles of their peers and to find the specific learning style that can improve their achievement both in team learning or individual learning (Kolb, 2005). The final result showed that they are more satisfied during the lecture (Baker, et al, 1987). Other results showed that students with similar learning styles of certain subjects, tended to have better achieved learning goal or higher levels of satisfaction (So, 2008). Research by Felder, (2005) which intended to compare the tendency of learning styles, had found that accounting students were likely to have different learning styles than management students or business students. Their difference was ultimately sourced from their various learning styles and lecturer's strategy in presenting the subjects.

H_1: students' learning styles impacted on the success of team learning

LEARNING ORIENTATION AND TEAM LEARNING SUCCESS

There are many preliminary studies by Scevak and Archer (1998) showed that learning setting needs control associated with a desire to gain an understanding of the topic, selecting task and use learning strategies more effectively. Conversely, the more achieved learning goal is associated with a tendency to avoid challenging tasks, negative feelings of shame and guilt when getting a bad result, and use of learning strategies such as rote learning (Brophy, 2013).

Zimmerman, (2008) states that all students are trying to do a self-regulation in learning, but there is a clear difference with regard to the method of learning and confidence between high- and low- self-regulation students. The first tends to have goal orientation, and the second tends to have self regulation of team goal achievement.

H_2: learning orientation has effect on success of team learning

STUDYING ENVIRONMENT INFLUENCES ON THE SUCCESS OF THE TEAM LEARNING

Learning environment has an important role in the student learning process (Arends, 2014). For example, a complete learning environment with adequate facilities and infrastructure can support the educators to do their job well, and vice versa, there will be obstacles if learning environment is not eligible to be a place of learning due to unconducive and lack of facility (Towse, 2002). According to Noguera, (2003) environmental psychology plays an important role in human behavior, especially classroom, because this is where treatments are continuous and structured given to students so that students are expected to change their behavior as expected.

To achieve learning success or effectiveness of learning, it is influenced by many factors, among them the atmosphere of the learning environment (Yan, 2008). Atmosphere is an assessment of the state of learning environment that is a place is conducive for education interaction and improve the student motivation to learn new things (Kazerounian, 2007). As stated by Biggs, (2011) that learning environment should be a quiet place to study, and contains learning facility to support teaching activities.

Squire, (2003) Stated that the learning environment is a facility for students to adsorb knowledge and develop new behavior into new routine activities. In other words, the learning environment can be interpreted as a "laboratory" or a place for students to explore and express themselves to get new concept and new information as a form of learning outcomes.

H_3: environment has impact on the success of the team learning

RESEARCH METHODS

This study is quantitative research by collecting and analysis data in the form of statistical numbers. It also added with qualitative data to support the analysis result (Hsieh, 2005). The qualitative approach used questionnaire and consultations or interviews between investigators and informants (Flick, 2009).

In quantitative part, the study design was cross-sectional study of Quantitative Analytical with cross sectional approach (Hawker, 2000). The data has been taken during the interview session through a questionnaire and observation. This research was conducted in October 2015 until January 2016 at the Economics Faculty of the Universitas Budi Luhur – Jakarta, Indonesia. The study population was all students with a sample of 100 students. The data analysis technique was conducted with the test requirements analysis and hypothesis testing.

DISCUSSION

The analysis result showed that the characteristics of respondents by sex in this study was dominated by 83 women (83%) while 17 men remaining (17%). Learners were grouped in teams with some members. Members of the team were a mixture of the student ability. Teachers presented a lesson and then students worked in their teams to ensure that all team members had completed the lesson. Finally, all students were subject to individual quiz about instructional materials, at which time they should not help each other. The learners' quiz score were compared with the average score of their past, and the points were awarded based on how far learners can equal or surpass their previous achieved learning goal.

Table 1
Learning styles and team learning success

No	*Variable*	*Team learning success*		*PR (95% CI)*	*p-Value*
		Female student	*Male student*		
1	Visual	34 (70, 8%)	14 (29, 2%)	2.265 (0.852 - 6.017)	0.001
	Low (<median)				
	High (> median)	44 (84, 6%)	8 (15, 4%)		
2	Audio				
	Not good (<median)	31 (68, 9%)	14 (31, 1%)	2.653 (0.996 - 7.069)	0.050
	Good (> median)	47 (85, 5%)	8 (14, 5%)		
3	Kinesthetic				
	Low (<mean value)	31 (64, 6%)	17 (35, 4%)	1.353 (0.583 - 3.141)	0.482
	High (> mean)	37 (71, 2%)	15 (28, 8%)		
4	combined learning styles				
	Low (<median)	20 (41, 7%)	28 (58, 3%)	9.000 (3.373 - 24.017)	0.000
	High (> median)	45 (86, 5%)	7 (13, 5%)		

Source: Author, Binary logistic test result

Table 1 illustrated the analysis testings of the relationship between visual learning styles on the team learning success. From the table it is known that 44 (84.6%) female students indicated that they have a higher visual learning style, while 34 (70.8%) they have a lower visual learning style. About 14 people (29.2%) have a lower learning styles compared to 8 people (15.4%) have a higher visual learning style. Statistical analysis showed a significant association between a visual learning style to the success of the team learning ($p = 0.001$; $\alpha = 0.05$).

The analysis results of the relationship between audio learning styles on the team learning success were also tested. From the analysis result (table 1), it is

known that 47 (85.5%) female students indicated with higher audio learning style while 31 (68.9%) have a lower audio learning style. This is higher than 14 people (31.1%) o having a lower audio learning style and 8 people (14.5%) have a higher audio learning style. Statistical analysis showed a significant relationship between audio learning style to the team learning success ($p = 0.050$; $\alpha = 0.05$).

The analysis results for the statistical testing of kinesthetic learning styles on the team learning success were also tested in this study. From the table it is known that 37 (71.2%) female students indicated that they have a higher kinesthetic learning styles while 31 (64.6%) have a lower Kinesthetic learning style. About 17 people (35.4%) have a lower kinesthetic learning style compared to 15 people (28.8%) have a higher kinesthetic learning style. Statistical analysis showed a significant relationship between kinesthetic learning style to the team learning success ($p = 0.482$; $\alpha = 0.05$).

It is also tested for combined learning styles on the team learning success. From the table 1, it is known that 45 (86.5%) female students indicate they have a higher combined learning style whereas 20 (41.7%) have a lower combined learning style. There are 28 (58.3%) students with a lower combined learning style compared to 7 people (13.5%) with a higher combined learning style. Statistical analysis showed a significant relationship for both variables, e.g., combined learning style and team learning success ($p = 0.050$; $\alpha = 0.05$).

Table 2
Learning orientation and learning environment to the team learning success

No	*Variable*	*Team learning success*		*PR (95% CI)*	*p-Value*
		Female student	*Male student*		
1	Orientation objective of learning				
	Low (<median)	26 (54, 2%)	22 (45, 8%)	3.554 (1.455 - 8.683)	0.005
	High (> median)	42 (80, 8%)	10 (19, 2%)		
2	Orientation goal achieved learning goal				
	Not good (<median)	25 (52, 1%)	23 (47, 9%)	1.598 (0.718 - 3.555)	0.251
	Good (> median)	33 (63, 5%)	19 (36, 5%)		
3	learning environment				
	Not good (<mean value)	30 (62, 5%)	18 (37, 5%)	7.200 (2.222 - 23.327)	0.001
	Good (> mean)	48 (92, 3%)	4 (7, 7%)		

Source: Author, binary logistic test result

Table 2 illustrated the testing of two three variables, e.g., student, goal orientation and team learning success. From the table it is known that 42 (80.8%)

female students indicate with a higher goal orientation, while 26 (54.2%) have a lower goal orientation. As for the students, there are 22 people (45.8%) have a lower goal orientation, while 10 people (19.2%) have a higher goal orientation. Statistical analysis showed a significant correlation between goal orientation to team learning success ($p = 0.005$; $\alpha = 0.05$).

The relationship between students achieved learning goal on the team learning success. From the table it is known that 33 (63.5%) female students indicate that they have a high achieved learning goal compared to 25 (52.1%) with a lower achieved learning goal. in addition, 23 (47.9%) from all student have a achieved a higher learning goal compared to 19 (36.5%) with a lower achieved learning goal. Statistical analysis showed a significant relationship between achieved learning goal against the team learning success ($p = 0251$; $\alpha = 0.05$).

This study also tested the other variables such as students' learning environment and team learning success. From the table 2, it is known that 48 (92.3%) female students indicate that they have a conducive learning environment, while 30 (62.5%) have a unconducive learning environment. For the total respondents, 18 (37.5%) considered to have conducive learning environment compared to four (7.7%) stated otherwise. Statistical analysis showed a significant relationship between the learning environment to the success of the team learning ($p = 0.001$; $\alpha = 0.05$).

CONCLUSION

The discussion above gives a wide insight about how the student learning styles help them to participate in the team activities and drives the success of the team learning. A significant relationship between audio learning style to the success of the team learning give an explanation on how student can improve their learning goal by listening style also give contribution to the knowledge for the teacher in class setting. Even though, there is no significant relationship between kinesthetic learning style to the success of the team learning, this also give an insight that teacher sometimes does not aware that their students has certain dominant learning style.

For combined learning styles and the success of team learning, it gives a significant relationship for both variables. It showed that there are differences in learning styles between students of Universitas Budi Luhur – Jakarta, Indonesia. This is also supported by research conducted by Tyner (2014) where a school sometimes does not give much learning preferences with motion activities (kinesthetic) since many syllabus and lessons only dominated with theory not for practice. The school tends to use kinesthetic only for lesson of sport and Monday flag ceremony. Therefore, it can bring drawback for students with kinesthetic learning style for many years struggling in school activities who obtained only a

sense of disappointment, confusion and stress. However, teacher can manage the learning style preferences after get insight from this study to have a positive influence on learning outcomes.

Statistical analysis showed a significant correlation between goal orientation and learning success. This means that for students which consider that their team can help them to achieve their learning goal will also consider that their learning success is caused by the support from their team existence.

For the learning environment, it is also considered to improve student success in the team participation. This is also supported by Wang (2005) that students who have high learning score is also followed by a higher goal orientation. However, their study also used the self-regulation as a variable to measure the effect of the variables toward low achieved learning goal.

Compared to the results of data analysis in this study, it showed that the average score of each variable above has significant effect on other variables. In total, the success of team learning has been influenced by many variables such as learning environment, orientation objective and the achieved learning goal. It is reasonable, since the data showed that students who learn the material through teams will have higher competence to manage the task together and also more capable to achieve higher results than the student working alone.

SUGGESTION

Based on the analysis above, it give several explanation to increase the success of the team learning which lecturers can use to combine learning model between visual learning models and audio learning models to help their student to achieve maximum results.

The involvement of the teachers in the student learning is important to create active immersion in the learning participation. In addition, the student participation in the learning activities also improves their motivation in the group learning which conducive to the achievement of the learning goal. Supposedly teacher must active to improve the quality of the class environment and bring suitable role to help the students to achieve higher wellness and learning achievement.

Lecturers need to pay attention to the learning styles particularly for the students to be motivated to improve his achieved learning goal by focusing more on the process of mastering the material and appropriate learning styles for the students.

References

Archer, J., & Scevak, J. J. (1998). Enhancing students' motivation to learn: Achievement goals in university classrooms. Educational Psychology, 18 (2), 205-223.

Arends, R. (2014). Learning to teach. McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Baker, R. E., Simon, J. R., & Bazeli, F. P. (1987). Selecting instructional design for introductory accounting based on the experiential learning model. Journal of Accounting Education, 5 (2), 207-226.

Bettencourt, L. A. (2004). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors: The direct and moderating influence of goal orientation. Journal of Retailing, 80 (3), 165-180.

Biggs, J. (1993). What do inventories of students' learning processes really measure? A theoretical review and clarification. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 63 (1), 3-19.

Biggs, J. B. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Boekaerts, M. (2002). Bringing about change in the classroom: Strengths and weaknesses of the self-regulated learning approach—EARLI Presidential Address, 2001. Learning and instruction, 12 (6), 589-604.

Bok, D. (2009). Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more. Princeton University Press.

Brophy, J. E. (2013). Motivating students to learn. Routledge.

Cercone, K. (2008). Characteristics of adult learners with implications for online learning design. AACE journal, 16 (2), 137-159.

Collier, S. T. (1999). Characteristics of reflective thought during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 50 (3), 173-173.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In International handbook of English language teaching (pp. 719-731). Springer US.

Felder, R. M., & Spurlin, J. (2005). Applications, reliability and validity of the index of learning styles. International journal of engineering education, 21 (1), 103-112.

Flick, U. (2009). An introduction to qualitative research. Sage.

Fry. (2009). AHandbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.This edition published by Routledge.

Gilakjani, A. P. (2011). Visual, auditory, kinaesthetic learning styles and their impacts on English language teaching. Journal of Studies in Education, 2 (1), 104-113.

Greene, B. A., & Miller, R. B. (1996). Influences on achievement: Goals, perceived ability, and cognitive engagement. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21 (2), 181-192.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 8 (3), 381-391.

Harris. (1995).WhereIs the Child's Environment? A Group Socialization Theory of Development. Psychological Review, Vol.102, No. 3, 458-489

Hawker, D. S., & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: a meta analytic review of cross sectional studies. Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 41 (4), 441-455.

Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., & Zhou, J. (2009). A cross-level perspective on employee creativity: Goal orientation, team learning behavior, and individual creativity. Academy of Management Journal, 52 (2), 280-293.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. Qualitative health research, 15 (9), 1277-1288.

Huitt, W. (2003). A transactional model of the teaching/learning process. Educational Psychology Interactive.

Julie Yazici, H. (2005). A study of collaborative learning style and team learning performance. Education+ training, 47 (3), 216-229.

Kansanen, P. (2002). Didactics and its relation to educational psychology: Problems in translating a key concept across research communities. International review of education, 48 (6), 427-441.

Kazerounian, K., & Foley, S. (2007). Barriers to creativity in engineering education: A study of instructors and students perceptions. Journal of Mechanical Design, 129 (7), 761-768.

Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. Academy of management learning & education, 4 (2), 193-212.

Kolb, D. A., Boyatzis, R. E., & Mainemelis, C. (2001). Experiential learning theory: Previous research and new directions. Perspectives on thinking, learning, and cognitive styles, 1, 227-247.

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. Theory into practice, 41 (4), 212-218.

Kwakman, K. (2003). Factors affecting teachers' participation in professional learning activities. Teaching and teacher education, 19 (2), 149-170.

Landry, J. M. (2011). Learning Styles of Law Enforcement Officers: Does Police Work Affect how Officers Learn? (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2011). New Literacies: Everyday Practices And Social Learning: Everyday Practices and Social Learning. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

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.

Maor, D. (2003). The teacher's role in developing interaction and reflection in an online learning community. Educational Media International, 40 (1-2), 127-138.

Morrissey, J. (2000). Indicators of citizen participation: lessons from learning teams in rural EZ/EC communities. Community development journal, 35 (1), 59-74.

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education, 31 (2), 199-218.

Noguera, P. A. (2003). The trouble with Black boys: The role and influence of environmental and cultural factors on the academic performance of African American males. Urban education, 38 (4), 431-459.

Novak, J. D. (2010). Learning, creating, and using knowledge: Concept maps as facilitative tools in schools and corporations. Routledge.

Olson, D. R., & Bruner, J. S. (1996). Folk psychology and folk pedagogy. The handbook of education and human development, 9-27.

Oxford, R. L. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in the language classroom. The Modern Language Journal, 81 (4), 443-456.

Paechter, M., Maier, B., & Macher, D. (2010). Students' expectations of, and experiences in e-learning: Their relation to learning achievements and course satisfaction. Computers & education, 54 (1), 222-229.

Pajares, F. (2002). Gender and perceived self-efficacy in self-regulated learning. Theory into practice, 41 (2), 116-125.

Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., & Bjork, R. (2008). Learning styles concepts and evidence. Psychological science in the public interest, 9 (3), 105-119.

Redmond, A. M. (2013). The Lived Experience of Learning Psychomotor Nursing Skills (Doctoral Dissertation, Trinity Western University).

Schaefer, K. M., & Zygmont, D. (2003). Analyzing the teaching style of nursing faculty: Does it promote a student-centered or teacher-centered learning environment?. Nursing Education Perspectives, 24 (5), 238-245.

So, H. J., & Brush, T. A. (2008). Student perceptions of collaborative learning, social presence and satisfaction in a blended learning environment: Relationships and critical factors. Computers & Education, 51 (1), 318-336.

Squire, K. (2003). Video games in education. Int. J. Intell. Games & Simulation, 2 (1), 49-62.

Sungur, S., & Tekkaya, C. (2006). Effects of problem-based learning and traditional instruction on self-regulated learning. The journal of educational research, 99 (5), 307-320.

Towse, P., Kent, D., Osaki, F., & Kirua, N. (2002). Non-graduate teacher recruitment and retention: some factors affecting teacher effectiveness in Tanzania. Teaching and Teacher Education, 18 (6), 637-652.

Tyner, K. (2014). Literacy in a digital world: Teaching and learning in the age of information. Routledge.

Valle, R. S., King, M., & Halling, S. (1989). An introduction to existential-phenomenological thought in psychology (pp. 3-16). Springer US.

Wang, F., & Hannafin, M. J. (2005). Design-based research and technology-enhanced learning environments. Educational technology research and development, 53 (4), 5-23.

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. Journal of educational Psychology, 82 (1), 81.

Yan, J. X., & Horwitz, E. K. (2008). Learners' perceptions of how anxiety interacts with personal and instructional factors to influence their achievement in English: A qualitative analysis of EFL learners in China. Language Learning, 58 (1), 151-183.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2008). An essential dimension of self-regulated learning. Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications, 1.