Effectiveness of Educational and Behavioral Performance Evaluation
Modelsin Students' Self-efficacy and Self-regulation

Reza Zamani[1]and Hassan Toozandehjani[2]*

[1]*B.A. in general psychology, Department of Psychological Sciences, Faculty of Humanities,
Neyshabur Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neishabur, Iran.*
[2]*Assistant Professor of psychology, Department of Psychological Sciences, Faculty of Humanities,
Neyshabur Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neishabur, Iran.*
_____

ABSTRACT

This research is a semi-experimental study (pretest-posttest and follow-up design with a nonequivalent control group) and aims to investigate the impact of two evaluation models for students' educational performance on their self-efficacy and self-regulation behavior. The statistical population consists of all the students in the second period of primary school in the academic year 2014-15, who amounted to three million people and 360 individuals were selected as the sample through multi-stage cluster sampling from District 1 of Mashhad. The students were assigned into six groups using stratified allocation method. After taking the pretest of Wheeler and Ladd Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) and Zimmerman and Pons Self-Regulation Inventory for Students (SRLIS) and assessment of educational and behavioral performance of all groups, each of the three experimental groups randomly received 360 and 720 degree educational performance appraisal program for two months. Afterwards, a posttest was taken from the experimental and controlgroups and after two months, a follow-up test was conducted. In the end, the data was analyzed through single-factor analysis of variance with repeated measures. The results of this study revealed that the effect of 720 degree appraisal method on self-efficacy and educational performance has been significant, but it had no influence on self-regulation. Further, 360 degree appraisal method has had an impact on self-efficacy and self-regulation, but had no effect on educational performance.

Keywords: 360 and 720 degree performance appraisal, self-regulation, self-efficacy
_____

INTRODUCTION

Behavior analysis can be effective in improving the state of the society and deal with the problems of ordinary people and scientific societies [1]. Empirical analysis of performance and task (EAB= Empirical Analysis of Behavior) refers to the method of analyzing the environmental interactions of the behavior. Performance analysis includes the classification of behavior based on the performance response with regard to environmental analysis in time periods ofperformance arousal. There are two ways to categorize the behavior:structural and functional. In the structural category, behavior is classified according to age and stage of growth. Performance analysts classify behaviors based on the history of the results produced by a particular or similar behavior. In the structural category, attention is paid to the individual and his characteristics; but in the functional category, the arousal created by the environment is put under observation. It seems that these two perspectives are complementary in behavioral analyses [2].

The first warning signs that indicate the child's future problems are revealed in the primary school. Learning difficulties, general states (unhappiness and depression) and incompatibility or mistreatment (fights, disputes, disturbances, restlessness, moodinessand honesty) are among them[3].It is now obvious that behavioral management techniques that focus heavily on punishment and reward are relatively ineffective in reducing problematic behaviors in children and can

even intensify them. Over the past decade, weakness in self-regulation has been proved to be the cause of many problematic behaviors [4].

Functional assessment is to evaluate a set of "functional tasks". Functional tasks organize a situation in which stimuli are present and the individual is asked to perform a practical action in these circumstances in order to provide a response and reaction with regard to the quality standards. Standard scores are given to the final product or process of presenting the response[5].Development of performance appraisal has been conducted in four separate stages (technical, continued, evaluation and stabilization) which are remembered as «TEAM». Performance evaluation includes past performance review, reward to the past performance, goal setting for future performance and individual or staff development[6]. Performance evaluation techniques are divided into two objective or subjective and traditional or advanced types[7]. Among the advanced techniques of performance evaluation are 360 degree and 720 degree performance appraisals. 360 degree performance appraisal method includes the assessment of different levels and receiving feedback from others including colleagues, subordinates and spouse. This program refers to behavior change through increased self-awareness and also comprises self-assessment [7]. In 720 degree performance appraisal, in addition to identifying the individuals' performance from new perspectives and dimensions, their performance are again reviewed and examined in the courses of 12 to 18 months. This review enables the leaders of organizations to precisely identify strengths and weaknesses and understand where they should spend extra time, energy and costs in order to maximize their values [8]. Performance (functional) tests are those tests that directly assess the process and results of student learning and include written functional types, identification, performing the function in simulated situations and work samples[9].

Zimmerman (1998) raised and classified the components of self-regulation with an emphasis on the questions related to self-regulation, psychological dimensions, task conditions, characteristics of self-regulation and related processes. In his opinion, the most important processes of self-regulation consist of goal selection, self-learning, time management, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, inference, giving structure to the environment and help seeking (Zimmerman & Kat Santos, 2014). In Vygotsky's theory, language is both an important tool for social interaction and a means of thinking and self-regulation or self-organization. By self-regulation in this theory, it means the ability to think and solve problems without the help of others.

Pintrich (2008) has proposed a theoretical framework based on a cognitive and social perspective. His aim is the classification and analysis of different processes that guide part of the self-regulated learning, which include four stages: Planning, self-monitoring, control and evaluation. Although government regulation is usually accompanied by self-regulation, this type of self-regulation is done under the patronage of government. This means that if the government does not intervene, the public interest is seriously threatened [6]. If the government and individual regulators work together in institutions, it is called "cooperation regulation". If this type of self-regulation is bone by the government in the way that the duration of the state involvement is regulated, it is called "self-regulated regulation" [6]. Self-regulation can be imagined as different perspectives. A powerful model of self-regulation has been identified as a description of the capacity for the "feedback loop" as the "TOTE" loop (an acronym for Test - Activity - Test - Exit).

"Self-efficacy" is a sign of self-confidence in the ability to control one's impulses, behavior and social environment. Self-efficacy in a branch of Health Psychology is applied to prevent the behaviors such as self-management of chronic diseases, smoking cessation, alcohol consumption, eating and pain control applications (Kerry & Forsyth, 2014)."Self-efficacy" is considered as part of Albert Bandura's social cognitive theory. "Social cognitive theory" is composed of four specific processes or objectives: Self-monitoring, self-assessment, self-reaction and self-efficacy (Redmond, 2015). Self-efficacy also affects the individuals' sustainability to continue the effort when faced with problems. Four sources of self-efficacy include past performance, substitution learning, verbal persuasion and emotions. Organizational and managerial implications of self-efficacy in the workplace include selection and promotion, training and development and goal setting .Meta-analysis test by Gulli et al. (2002) indicates that collective self-efficacy has a direct relationship with individuals' performance.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted using a semi-experimental research method (pretest-posttest and follow-up design with a control group). The statistical population comprised all the students studying in the second period of primary school in the academic year 2014-15 in Mashhad who amounted to 6000 people, of which 360 individuals were selected as the sample size including six 30-people experimental and control groups from each sex. Then, a pretest was taken from all the experimental and control groups in two fields of self-regulation and self-efficacy. In the next step, each of the two experimental groups received the special program of 360 degree and 720 degree educational performance appraisal; but the control group received no special assessment program. Afterwards, all the experimental and control groups took a posttest and after two months, a follow-up test was repeated for all the experimental and control groups.

Research tools

Wheeler and Ladd Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children: This measure consists of 22 items and has been designed by Wheeler and Ladd (1982) to examine the self-efficacy of third to fifth grade children in relationships with their peers. Each item in this scale represents a social situation which has been written in the form of an incomplete sentence and after that, four options including very easy (4 points), easy (3 points), difficult (2 points) and very difficult (1 point) have been provided and the child is asked to complete the item by choosing one of the options. The total score in this scale ranged from 22 to 88. This questionnaire was measured by Chary (2007) in terms of validity and reliability. To determine the construct validity of the self-efficacy scale, factor analysis was applied using the principal components method. KMO coefficient value was equal to 0.90 and the numerical value of X2 index in Bartlett's test of sphericity was equal to 2.2421 which was significant at the level of P=0.00001. To calculate the reliability of the self-efficacy scale, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used. The value of this coefficient for the total scale was equal to 0.87.

Zimmerman and Pons Self-Regulation Inventory for Students (SRLIS): The self-regulated learning strategy including self-report, organization and transfer of information, dividing the goals into smaller objectives and planning, search for information, recording and taking notes and self-monitoring, organizing the environment, self-consequence, creating hierarchies and memorizing, getting help from peers, teachers and adults, reviewing the previous exams and reviewing the notes, handouts and textbooks have been considered in this questionnaire. The subject is asked to rate the amount of using the abovementioned strategies in six learning situations on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from rarely to frequently. In addition to the fourteen strategies, a question, i.e. question number 15, has been also used that does not refer to any strategy but allows for the student's creative response in a creative manner from the above cases. Scores vary from 15 to 60.

In the end, the data of this research was analyzed using SPSS21 software and through descriptive statistics method and one-factor analysis of variance with repeated measures.

Findings

The first research hypothesis indicated that "the program for recording the average of behavior rating by the teacher, parents and student's self-assessment (360 degree appraisal program) influences the students' self-regulation behavior". To prove this hypothesis, multivariate analysis of variance, Greenhouse–Gasserpost hoc test and Bonferroni intergroup comparison were applied and the significance of this hypothesis was established according to Table (3).

The second research hypothesis suggested that "the program for recording the average of behavior rating by the teacher, parents and student's self-assessment (360 degree appraisal program) affects the students' self-efficacy". Table 4 shows the confirmation of the significance of this hypothesis. But intergroup comparison based on the Bonferroni test calls into question the implementation of a follow-up test for the continuation of significance.

The third research hypothesis indicated that "the program for providing feedback regarding the behavior rating by the teacher, parents and student's self-assessment during the session once every two weeks (720 degree appraisal program) affects the students' self-regulation", which according to the results of Table (5), its significance is rejected.

The fourth research hypothesis suggested that "the program for providing feedback regarding the behavior rating by the teacher, parents and student's self-assessment during the session once every two weeks (720 degree appraisal program) influences the students' self-efficacy". The significance of this hypothesis was confirmed based on the results of Table (6). Summary of the results of multivariate analysis of variance, Greenhouse–Gasserpost hoc test and Bonferroni intergroup comparison which were applied to test the hypotheses have been presented in tables 1 to 6.

Table 1: Summary of the results of multivariate analysis of variance and self-efficacy and self-regulation tests- 360 and 720 degree appraisal methods

Statistical index Source of change	Wilks' Lambda	Significance level	F
Self-regulation in 360 degree performance evaluation method	0.297	0.000	26.012
Self-efficacy in 360 degree performance evaluation method	0.489	0.000	11.481
Self-regulation in 720 degree performance evaluation method	0.795	0.024	2.832
Self-efficacy in 720 degree performance evaluation method	0.179	0.000	50.617

According to the results of Table 1 and considering the values of Sig. which are mostly lower than the significance level of the test (α= 0.05), the null hypotheses indicating the non-influence of 360 degree and 720 degree educational performance evaluation methods on self-efficacy and self-regulation of students are rejected. Thus, it can be said with 95% confidence that the effect of each of the independent variables on the dependent variables is significant. To recognize the significance between groups, we compare the mean difference of groups using Greenhouse-Gasser post hoc tests.

Table 2: Summary of the results of Greenhouse-Gasser post hoc test and self-efficacy and self-regulation tests - 360 and 720 degree appraisal methods

Statistical index Source of change	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean Square	F	Sig
Self-regulation in 360 degree performance evaluation program	1225.925	4.322	2836.196	18.1416	0.000
Self-efficacy in 360 degree performance evaluation program	11659.28	4.573	2549.688	10.225	0.000
Self-regulation in 720 degree performance evaluation program	2163.600	4.414	490.117	2.718	0.026
Self-efficacy in 720 degree performance evaluation program	34772.722	4.102	8477.578	32.247	0.000

Based on the results of Table 2 and given that the significance level is lower than the error level of test (0.05), F value of tests is significant. Hence, it can be said with 95% confidence that there is a significant difference between the mean score of self-regulation and self-efficacy in the experimental and control groups receiving 360 degree and 720 degree appraisal programs. To prove it more accurately, we need Bonferroni multiple comparisons of test scores in different groups.

Table 3: Summary of the results of Bonferroni multiple comparisons of the mean score of self-regulation tests – 360 degree appraisal method

Variable	360 degree self-regulation tests	Mean difference	Standard error	Significance
Pretest of the experimental group - 360 degree	posttest of the experimental group	15.250	1.755	0.000
	Follow-up of the experimental group	10.083	1.795	0.000
	Pretest of the control group	3.283	2.145	1.000
	Posttest of the control group	0.350	2.364	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	0.883	2.494	1.000
Posttest of the experimental group - 360 degree	Follow-up of the experimentalgroup	5.167	1.660	0.043
	Pretest of the control group	11.967	1.848	0.000
	Posttest of the control group	15.600	2.016	0.000
	Follow-up of the control group	14.367	2.266	0.000
Follow-up of the experimental group - 360 degree	Pretest of the control group	6.800	2.035	0.022
	Posttest of the control group	10.443	1.970	0.000
	Follow-up of the control group	9.200	2.166	0.001
Pretest of the control group – 360 degree	Posttest of the control group	3.633	2.364	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	2.400	2.361	1.000
Posttest of the control group	Follow-up of the control group	1.233	2.145	1.000

According to the results of Table 3, the Sig. values in comparing the means of most groups together including pretest, posttest and follow-up of the experimental group and in comparing each with the control groups are lower than the error level of the test (0.05). On the other hand, this rate in comparing the scores of pretest, posttest and follow-up of the control group together is higher than the significance level. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected with a 95% confidence level and it can be said that 360 degree educational and behavioral performance evaluation method affects self-regulation.

Table 4: Summary of the results of Bonferroni multiple comparisons of the mean score of self-efficacy tests – 360 degree appraisal method

Variable	360 degree self-efficacy tests	Mean difference	Standard error	Significance
Pretest of the experimental group - 360 degree	posttest of the experimental group	13.833	2.790	0.000
	Follow-up of the experimental group	12.417	2.504	0.000
	Pretest of the control group	0.450	2.953	1.000
	Posttest of the control group	1.183	3.240	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	3.783	2.874	1.000
Posttest of the experimental group - 360 degree	Follow-up of the experimental group	1.417	2.428	1.000
	Pretest of the control group	13.383	2.630	0.000
	Posttest of the control group	12.650	3.165	0.003
	Follow-up of the control group	10.050	2.745	0.008
Follow-up of the experimental group - 360 degree	Pretest of the control group	11.967	2.410	0.000
	Posttest of the control group	11.233	2.576	0.001
	Follow-up of the control group	8.633	2.698	0.033
Pretest of the control group – 360 degree	Posttest of the control group	0.733	2.806	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	3.333	2.538	1.000
Posttest of the control group	Follow-up of the control group	2.600	2.845	1.000

Based on the results of Table 4 and Sig. values between the groups, it can be deduced that the significance level (Sig.) between the pretest, posttest and follow-up test of the experimental group is 0.000 and this criterion for the control group is 1.00. On the other hand, the significance level between posttest and follow-up test of the experimental group is 1.00. Through pairwise comparison of each of these values with the significance level of the test (0.05), it can be said with a 95% confidence level that the null hypothesis is rejected and the impact of 360 degree educational performance appraisal on self-efficacy is significant. But the follow-up test has challenged this effect and has questioned the stability of its impact.

Table 5: Summary of the results of Bonferroni multiple comparisons of self-regulation tests – 720 degree appraisal method

Variable	720 degree self-regulation tests	Mean difference	Standard error	Significance
Pretest of the experimental group - 720 degree	posttest of the experimental group	6.000	2.080	0.082
	Follow-up of the experimental group	5.483	2.087	0.164
	Pretest of the control group	0.350	2.573	1.000
	Posttest of the control group	2.233	2.250	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	3.533	2.609	1.000
Posttest of the experimental group - 720 degree	Follow-up of the experimental group	0.517	2.031	1.000
	Pretest of the control group	6.350	2.363	0.140
	Posttest of the control group	3.767	2.506	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	2.467	2.139	1.000
Follow-up of the experimental group - 720 degree	Pretest of the control group	5.833	2.502	0.347
	Posttest of the control group	3.250	2.300	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	1.950	2.354	1.000
Pretest of the control group – 720 degree	Posttest of the control group	2.583	2.329	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	3.883	2.136	1.000
Pretest of the control group – 720 degree	Follow-up of the control group	1.300	2.189	1.000

By comparing the mean of self-regulation scores of different groups which were under 720 degree educational performance evaluation program, since Sig. values in Table 5 are greater than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis indicating the equality of the mean of groups is rejected. Therefore, it can be said with a 95% confidence level that 720 degree educational performance evaluation method has not have a significant impact on self-regulation scores of the students.

Table 6: Summary of the results of Bonferroni multiple comparisons of self-efficacy tests – 720 degree appraisal method

Variable	720 degree self-efficacy tests	Mean difference	Standard error	Significance
Pretest of the experimental group - 720 degree	posttest of the experimental group	22.067	2.560	0.000
	Follow-up of the experimental group	20.600	2.565	0.000
	Pretest of the control group	0.617	3.070	1.000
	Posttest of the control group	1.767	2.772	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	1.117	3.385	1.000
Posttest of the experimental group - 720 degree	Follow-up of the experimental group	1.467	1.826	1.000
	Pretest of the control group	22.683	2.226	0.000
	Posttest of the control group	20.300	2.253	0.000
	Follow-up of the control group	20.950	2.587	0.000
Follow-up of the experimental group - 720 degree	Pretest of the control group	21.217	2.283	0.000
	Posttest of the control group	18.833	2.581	0.000
	Follow-up of the control group	19.483	2.628	0.000
Pretest of the control group – 720 degree	Posttest of the control group	2.383	3.166	1.000
	Follow-up of the control group	1.733	3.004	1.000
Pretest of the control group – 720 degree	Follow-up of the control group	0.650	2.871	1.000

According to the results of Table 6, since in comparing the means of pretest, posttest and follow-up test of the experimental group together and with the control group, Sig. is 0.000 and in comparing the means of the control groups, Sig. is 1.00, the null hypothesis indicating the equality of the mean of groups is rejected. Thus, it can be mentioned with a 95% confidence level that 720 degree performance evaluation method has an impact on self-efficacy of the students.

DISCUSSION

As previously stated, this research seeks to investigate the influence of 360 and 720 degree educational performance evaluation methods on self-efficacy and self-regulation. As can be concluded from the results, this study confirms the findings of the research conducted by Yousefzadeh, Ya'qoubi and Rashidi (2011) and Errorfield (2005)[13][14]. Beside, Vahedi (2011) in a study has emphasized the role of non-supportive parents (rejection and leniency) and self-regulation as the predictor variable in children's aggression. But in this study, identification of family system and family style of children's parents has not been addressed while it seems that this component is also effective in educational performance, self-efficacy and self-regulation of students[15].

In examining and explaining the impact of 360 degree performance evaluation on self-efficacy, it should be stated that this evaluation method is based on the social-cognitive theory which includes four processes of self-monitoring, self-assessment, self-reaction and self-efficacy according to Redmond (2015). This evaluation method comprises all of them. But ignoring the parenting style of families and also teachers' attitude and teaching method could be effective in the development of individuals' self-efficacy.

The classical results of Rosenthal and Jacobson (1986) have confirmed this issue. Yousefzadeh, Ya'qoubi and Rashidi (2011) came to the conclusion that the rate of focus on the purpose, meditation on the objective, intrinsic motivation, problem-solving skills and self-assessment of the students receiving metacognitive skills training are greater compared to the students who lack such training[13]. This study has indirectly addressed the development of metacognitive skills in children, which is effective in the growth of self-efficacy.

In examining and explaining the impact of 720 degree educational performance evaluation on self-efficacy, it should be mentioned that given the sources ofself-efficacy in Bandura's (1982) view, verbal persuasion can improve self-efficacy, which has been considered in this model. Further, the Pygmalion effect is a self-gratifying prediction according to which believing that something is true can help to correct it. By providing the positive feedback component, this evaluation program can create self-efficacy in individuals. On the other hand, since this performance evaluation model is based on the principles of metacognition, it is able to influence the development of self-efficacy.

Additionally, the results of this study are consistent with the findings achieved by Boomster and Hithron (2012)[16]. Wolfgang,Schultzand Thorsten (2005) in a study presented a set of answers to the key questions about changing the role of government particularly in the regulation of transnational communications and industry and provided a tool called "self-regulated regulation" which is applicable around the world[6]. This method of educational performance can lead individuals from the need for governmental regulation to self-regulation and Education can assume the role of "self-regulated regulation" in the best possible way.

In examining and explaining the impact of 360 degree performance evaluation method on self-regulation of students, it should be stated that this educational and behavioral performance evaluation method is based on Zimmerman's theory (1998) in which the development of self-regulation is considered as a process including the selection of purpose, self-learning, time management, self-monitoring, self-assessment, inference, structuring the environment and help seeking. According to Vygotsky, the longer the time of self-regulation training, the greater the development of self-regulation will be. Moreover, because this method of behavior evaluation has not taken the students' freedom of action, it could affect their self-regulation. In this model, through self-monitoring in addition to others' supervision, an individual can deal with identifying and regulating the feelings and emotions within himself by expressing them.

The result of this research rejects the findings obtained by Ahmadi (2014), Kareshki, Kharrazi and Ezheei (2009) and Wilford, Whitaker, Vitello and Downer (2013)[9][11][10]. On the other hand, according to Ohlhausen (2013)[12], self-regulation is not a complete solution and cannot be considered as a complete replacement for traditional rules. Participation in self-monitoring should be voluntary and everyone should be encouraged for participation. Quality and clarity of the standard in self-monitoring helps its overall success. In addition, legal frameworks lack clear and practical standards and cannot sufficiently protect consumers. On the other hand, the result of this study is inconsistent with Canada's self-regulatory initiative (asri)which has been established to help the parents and educators improve children's behavior and deals with understanding the causes of behavioral problems in children through paying attention, ignoring, inhibiting one's incentives, modulating one's emotions, etc. In examining and explaining the rejection of the effect of 720 degree appraisal on self-regulation, it can be said that this model is more based on governmental regulation. By inducing the policies that the student has not have a role in their selection and planning, teachers and parents push the students towards their goals and their individual differences, interests and opinions are not effective in implementing these models. Hence, they do not struggle for the purpose which they have not selected. Rejection of this hypothesis can be due to going beyond self-assessment to the evaluation of others. The assessment and judgment of others and provision of guidance by a consultant, teacher or family question the role of self in the regulation of behavior. Lack of sufficient skills on the part of parents and educators in dealing with behavioral problems can reduce self-regulation. Therefore, this method of performance evaluation can develop other-regulation or self-censorship. Use of indirect and non-directive and metacognition-based counseling styles can help to solve this problem.

REFERENCES

[1].Critchfield,Thomas S.(2011) Translation Contribution of the Exoerimental Analysis of Behavior.The Behavior Analyst2011,34,3-17No (Spring).

[2].Vorges.(2014). Handbook of Self-Regulation, Second Edition: Research, Theory, and Applications.

[3].Gayathri, H.(2013). Measurement Technology Applications in Performance Appraisal.Gibson, R. & Michael, M. (2001).Fundamentals of counseling and guidance. Translated by B. Sanaei et al. Tehran: Be'sat Publications.

[4].Heatherton & Wagner; cited in Yousefi.(2014).

[5].Stycher.(2010). Department of Psychology, Syracuse University.

[6].Wolfgang, S. and Thorsten,h. (2005). Regulated Self-Regulation as a Form of Modern Government. University of Luton Press (March ,2005).

[7].Aggarwal, A. & Thakur, M. GourSundar.(2013). Techniques of Performance Appraisal-A Review. International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology (IJEAT). ISSN: 2249 – 8958, Volume-2, Issue-3, February 2013.

[8].Nazarmohammadi, M. &Najjari, R. (2010).A comparative analysis of 180, 360, 540 and 720 degree feedback in evaluating the performance of employees. Journal of Human Resource Management, University of Imam Hussein (AS), 2 (1).

[9].Ahmadi, A., HamzehBeigi, T., Rastegar, T., Taheri, H., Forouzbakhsh, F. & Sadat Yasini, Z. (2010). Teacher's guide in descriptive evaluation. Tehran: Publications of the general office of printing and distribution of textbooks.

[10].Williford, A.P. & Vick Whittaker, J.E. &Vitiello, V. E. & Downer, J.T. (2013). Children's engagement within the preschool classroom and their development of self-regulation. Early Education & Development, 24(2), 162.

[11].Kareshki,   Kharrazi   and   Ezheei(2009).   Self-Efficacy   and   Social   Cognitive   Theories https://wikispaces.psu.eduShadravan, MR., Rajaeipour, S., Kazemi, I. &Zamani, E. (2012). Determining the multiple relationships between trust and individual and collective self-efficacy among university faculty members.Journal of Research and Planning in Higher Education, 64: 19.

[12].Ohlhausen, M. K .(2014). Success in Self-Regulation: Strategies to Bring to the Mobile and Global Era, BBB Self-Regulation Conference.

[13].Yousefzadeh, MR., Ya'qoubi, A. &Rashidi, M. (2011).Investigating the effect of metacognitive skills training on self-efficacy of secondary school female students. Journal of School Psychology, 3: 118.

[14].Errorfield. (2005). Self-efficacy in the workplace: Implications for motivation and performance. (M. Forouhar). Monthly magazine of automotive industry, No. 175. (2011).

[15].Stecher, B. (2010). Performance Assessment in an Era of Standards-Based.Vahedi, Sh. (2013). Self-regulation as a mediator between the dimensions of non-supportive parents and adolescents' aggression: Structural equation modeling. Health Magazine of April and May, 2011.

[16].Boomster and Hithron (2012).