

Students' Academic Quality of Life and Learning Motivation in Iran Medical University - pilot from south Iran

RITA REZAEI¹, ELHAM PABARJA², LEILI MOSALANEJAD³

¹Quality Improvement in Clinical Education Research Center, Shiraz University Of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

²Medical Education Center, Quality Improvement in Clinical Education Research Center, Shiraz University Of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

³Medical Education Department, Jahrom University of Medical Sciences, Jahrom, Iran

Correspondence: Leili Mosalanejad, E-mail: lmosalanejad@jums.ac.ir Tel: 98-791-334-1508; 98-917-792-0813.

ABSTRACT

Aim: Students' academic quality of life and its role in learning and increasing academic awareness and academic achievement have been studied in this study.

Methods: This cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted on 204 students of Jahrom University of Medical Sciences by random sampling. Data were collected using the Academic Quality of Life Questionnaire by Sierji et al. (2010), with five fields and seventy questions, and the Power of Learning Motivation Questionnaire by China and Shay (2005), with six domains and thirty five questions. Data analysis was conducted using descriptive and inferential statistical tests at a significant level of $P < 0.05$.

Results: The results of statistical tests indicated that satisfaction with academic quality of life significantly increased learning motivation in students ($r = 0.194$, $p = 0.005$). Satisfaction with educational ($r = 0.266$), social dimensions ($r = 0.262$) and with facilities ($r = 0.221$) significantly increased learning motivation in students ($p < 0.05$). The results also showed that 12% of variations in students' motivation were affected by satisfaction with facilities, educational and social dimensions. Among the above-mentioned dimensions, only satisfaction with educational dimension was a positive and significant predictor of students' learning motivation ($p < 0.05$). Additionally, there was no significant relationship between satisfaction with quality of life and learning motivation in students ($r = 0.074$, $p = 0.294$).

Conclusion: The results of this study demonstrated that satisfaction with educational and social dimensions as well as facilities significantly increased the learning motivation in students, and satisfaction with the educational aspect was a positive and significant predictor of learning motivation in students.

Keywords: Academic Quality of Life, Learning Motivation, Students, IRAN

INTRODUCTION

Today, in many educational programs in modern scientific methods, with the aid of technology development, improving students' academic literacy and helping them to understand science and its nature, and acquire basic scientific concepts and realization of communication between science, technology, society and the environment are among the most important goals of the educational system. More importantly, acquiring scientific values and attitudes and continuing scientific studies with full satisfaction inside or outside the educational system are the other major objectives of the educational system¹. The dramatic increase in the number of university students, the budget constraints, dependence of universities on government budgets, growth of costs in various sectors of education, food and housing during the last decade, and the disproportion of the growth of faculty members of universities with the number of students have made problems for universities in providing the necessary facilities for students, having a direct impact on students' quality of life. The decline in the funding and facilities of universities in recent years has been the most prominent issue in the research sector and in cases like its students' welfare. Undoubtedly, decreasing budgets for student welfare services such as food subsidies and dormitory facilities can lead to a decline in students' quality of life, thereby reducing students' satisfaction². Students' quality of academic life as an active and prominent group of society has a significant impact on learning and increasing academic awareness as well as academic achievement.

Students' quality of academic life includes various aspects such as educational, physical and psychological, behavioral, research, cultural and social, welfare, recreational, economic, futuristic and individual development dimensions. In fact, students' quality of life is a significant sign of their degree of satisfaction with student life³. Pintrich and Schank (1996) recognize motivation as a process in which a goal-oriented activity is provoked and sustained⁴. Motivation and motive are often used as synonyms; however, motivation can be seen as more precise than motive. Therefore, motive is considered to be the generic factor of behavior, but motivation is regarded to be the specific factor of a particular behavior⁵. Many factors can be effective in reducing or increasing students' academic burnout. Among the variables affecting academic burnout are environmental and educational conditions, lack of satisfaction with school conditions and generally the quality of academic life, which can reduce the motivation for learning and education, and the individual's success in the field of study⁶. Academic motivation is one of the most influential factors affecting students' academic performance⁷. Different factors affect educational motivation. For example, clinical education has been suggested as an important and influential factor in students' motivation and performance⁸. There have been many studies into the impact of motivation on learning and academic achievement. Kim et al (2014) who examined the relationship between learning goals and motivation strategies in medical students, showed that pursuing academic goals was related to self-efficacy, strategies

learning, and motivation in students⁹. The results of the study conducted by Jollah et al. (2018), which determined the academic motivation and its relation with some factors in the dental students of Islamic Azad University of Medical Sciences, showed that 64.5% of students had high academic motivation, being positively correlated with students' gender and economic conditions¹⁰. The results of the study by Salehi et al (2010) showed that factors such as teacher's teaching skills and methodologies, lack of guarantee in jobs and job recruitment, lack of university education facilities and lack of participation in teaching and learning led to a decrease in academic motivation¹¹. According to the studies, knowledge about students' quality of academic life and development of its promotion is considered essential in the higher education system¹². Therefore, the researcher attempted to investigate the relationship between students' quality of academic life and their learning motivation.

METHODS

This cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted on 204 students of Jahrom University of Medical Sciences by random sampling. The statistical population included the students of Jahrom University of Medical Sciences. The sample size was calculated using Cochran formula and Morgan table ($p = 0.5$, $z = 1.96$, $d = 5\%$, and 1042 : N) equivalent to 196 people, and 220 questionnaires were distributed.

$$n = \frac{\frac{z^2 pq}{d^2}}{1 + \frac{1}{N} \left(\frac{z^2 pq}{d^2} - 1 \right)}$$

Academic Quality of Life Questionnaire: To identify the factors affecting the academic quality of life, the Quality of Life Questionnaire developed by Sierji et al.(2010) has been used, which was translated by alahati (2013) and its validity and reliability were assessed. It was based on four dimensions of satisfaction with academic life, and quality of life included four questions with alpha Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0/8, satisfaction with educational dimension included twenty two questions with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0/822, social satisfaction included twenty two questions with the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0/819 and satisfaction with facilities included twenty-two questions with an alpha Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0/8. Students determined the degree of satisfaction with each of these dimensions on the five-choice Likert scale (very little to very high)².

Learning Motivation Questionnaire: To study the factors affecting the learning motivation, a SMTSL questionnaire by Power, Chin and Shay (2005) was used. This study was translated by Dr. Hossein Zare and Maryam Bakhshh in 2013, and its reliability and validity were verified. This questionnaire consisted of 6 psychological subscales like self-efficacy that included 7 questions with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.835, active learning strategy (8 questions) with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.835 science learning value (5 questions) with Cronbach's alpha

coefficient of 0.834, objective function, (4 questions) with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.846, the goal of progression consisting of 5 questions with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.839 and stimulation of learning environment including 6 questions with Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.839, which is specific to assessing the amount of motivation for learning science and includes 35 options. This questionnaire was made using the five-choice Likert scale (totally opposite to fully agree). Propositions 2, 4 to 7 and 21 to 24 were negative and the remaining propositions were positive. Scoring for negative propositions is inverse¹³.

RESULTS

Among 204 respondents, 69.1% were female and 30.9% were male. A percentage of 92.6% of the students were single and 6.6% were married. The statistics of the place of residence are dormitory resident, 66.7%, personal home 1%, with wife 2.9% and 26.5% live with parents. In 22.2% of the students, father's education was below diploma, in 29.9%, it was diploma or Associate's degree, in 30.9% bachelor's degree, in 14.7% postgraduate degree, and in 4.9% Ph.D. degree. In 31.9% of the students, mother's education was below diploma, in 33.8%, it was diploma or Associate's degree, in 23% bachelor's degree, and in 9.3% postgraduate degree. In 52% of the students, their fathers were employees, and in 39.2%, they were self-employed. Maternal occupation was in 67.2% of students, their mothers were housewives, and in 25% employees. Table 1 shows the information about the student's field of study:

The result of Spearman's correlation coefficient in Table 3 showed that satisfaction with quality of life in the students increased with increasing academic quality of life ($r = 0.745$). Additionally, satisfaction with the facilities ($r = 0.203$) and educational satisfaction ($r = 0.267$) and social satisfaction ($r = 0.339$) improved with satisfaction with the quality of academic life in the students. Improving educational satisfaction ($r = 0.194$) and social satisfaction ($r = 0.250$) leads to increase in students' satisfaction with quality of life. However, there was no significant relationship between satisfaction with facilities ($r = 0.17$) and satisfaction with quality of life ($p > 0.05$).

The results of Table 2 show that the average satisfaction with the quality of academic life and quality of life in the students is higher than the average.

Table 4 shows the levels of learning motivation and their dimensions. Among the learning motivation dimensions, the highest mean is related to the target achievement component (3.99 ± 0.80), and the lowest mean belongs to the environmental learning stimuli component (2.83 ± 0.90). Given that the minimum and maximum learning motivation scores are 1 and 5, respectively, 3 is defined as the average motivation for learning. Considering that the average of learning motivation is (3.37 ± 0.46), it can be mentioned that students' learning motivation is above average.

The mean of the male students in terms of satisfaction with educational dimension and satisfaction with social dimension and satisfaction with facilities was higher than that of the female students, but the average

satisfaction with academic quality of life and satisfaction with the quality of life of the female students were higher than those of the male students. The highest motivation was learning observed in the female students (3.39 ± 0.45) compared to the male students (3.32 ± 0.48).

The highest level of educational satisfaction was observed in public health students (3.3%), and the lowest educational satisfaction was associated with operating room students (2.65). The highest level of social satisfaction was observed in medical emergency students (3.31), and the lowest social satisfaction was related to anesthesia students (2.87). The highest level of satisfaction with facilities was observed among students in medical emergency (3.34%), and the lowest satisfaction was associated with anesthesia students (2.43). The highest satisfaction with academic quality of life was observed in nursing students (3.20), and the lowest satisfaction with quality of life was seen in college students (2.80). The highest quality of life satisfaction was observed in nursing students (3.76), and the lowest satisfaction with quality of life was seen in operating room students (3.22). The highest rate of learning motivation was observed in public health students (59.3), and the lowest learning motivation was shown in nursing students (3.22).

The results of Spearman's correlation coefficient in Table 5 show that satisfaction with academic quality of life significantly increases learning motivation in students (r = 0.194, p = 0.005). Furthermore, there was no significant relationship between satisfaction with quality of life and learning motivation in the students (r = 0.074, p = 0.294). Table 5: The relationship between satisfaction with academic quality of life and satisfaction with quality of life with learning motivation in the students

The results of Spearman's correlation coefficient on the re. Relationship between academic quality of life and learning motivation in Table 6 indicate that satisfaction with the educational dimension (r = 0.266), social dimension (r = 0.262) and facilities (213 / 0 r =) significantly increases learning motivation in the students (p <0.05).

The results of the Spearman's correlation coefficient in Table 7 examining the relationship between items in each of the three dimensions of academic quality of life show that among educational dimensions, satisfaction with instructors (r = 0.215), satisfaction with teaching method (r = 0.335), satisfaction with the assignment (r = 175/0), satisfaction with scientific reputation (r = 141/0) and satisfaction with class quality (r = .200) significantly increase learning motivation in students (p <0.05). Furthermore, satisfaction with facilities, satisfaction with library (r = 0.280), satisfaction with treatment (r = 0.214), and satisfaction with food services (r = 0.263) significantly increased learning motivation in students (p <0.05). Among the dimensions of satisfaction with social dimension, satisfaction with scientific services (r = 162/0), satisfaction with dormitories (r = 0.256), satisfaction with spiritual and religious programs (r = 0.286), and satisfaction with sports facilities (r = 0.174) significantly increases learning motivation in the students (p <0.05);

The results of the Spearman's correlation coefficient on the relationship between the dimensions of academic quality of life and learning motivation showed that satisfaction with educational dimension (r = 233.03),

satisfaction social dimension (r = 29.83) and satisfaction with facilities (197/0 r =) significantly increased active learning in the students (p <0.05). In addition, social dimension satisfaction (r = .179) significantly increased the students' learning in science (p <0.05) and satisfaction with educational dimension (r = 0.385), satisfaction with social dimension (156 / R = 0) and satisfaction with facilities (r=0.273) significantly increased the environmental learning stimuli in the students (p <0.05). Independent t-test results showed a significant relationship in the demographic variables between father's occupation and satisfaction with educational dimension in the students (p=0.002). The average of satisfaction with the educational dimension was higher among students whose fathers were employees than those whose fathers had other jobs. No significant relationship was found between the mean of social dimension satisfaction and demographic variables in the students (p> 0.05). However, the mean of social satisfaction in students with employee occupation was higher than that with other jobs. Independent t-test showed a significant relationship between the mean satisfaction with facilities and marital status in the students (p = 0.015). The average satisfaction with facilities in the married students was higher than in the single students. The results of statistical analysis with nonparametric tests indicated lack of a significant relationship between the mean satisfaction with academic quality of life and satisfaction with quality of life in terms of demographic variables in the students (p> 0.05). The results of statistical analysis with nonparametric tests showed lack of a significant relationship in the mean of students' learning motivation in terms of students' demographic variables (p> 0.05). The Spearman's correlation coefficient on the relationship between research indices and academic variables showed that increase in GPA significantly increased the quality of academic life and learning motivation in the students (p = 0.031). To measure the simultaneous effect of satisfaction dimensions on facilities and educational satisfaction as well as social satisfaction on the students' learning motivation, multiple regression analysis was used. Table 8 presents the results. The value of the determination coefficient indicates that what percent of the variation of the dependent variable is influenced by the independent variable. The coefficient of determination (R2 = 122/122) indicates that 12.2% of students' learning motivation changes are influenced by satisfaction variables with facilities and educational satisfaction and social satisfaction, and the rest is due to other variables. Among the above-mentioned dimensions, only satisfaction with the educational dimension is predictive of students' learning motivation.

Table 1: Academic variables (Major of students (%))

Medical emergency	3.4%
Public health	7.8%
Laboratory	9.3%
Anaesthesia	10.8%
Operating room	11.3%
Nursing	16.2%
Medicine	41.2%

Table 2: Descriptive statistics indicators of the levels of academic life quality and their dimensions

Component	No. of questions	Mean	SD
Satisfaction with the instructors	4	2.83	.75
Satisfaction with the teaching method	7	2.94	.67
Satisfaction with the assignment	2	2.71	.77
Satisfaction with scientific reputation	2	2.57	.94
Satisfaction with diversity	2	2.89	.87
Satisfaction with the quality of the class	5	2.90	1
Educational satisfaction	22	2.81	.61
Satisfaction with scientific services	4	2.80	.76
Satisfaction with the campus	9	3.14	.71
Satisfaction with religious spiritual programs	5	2.96	.77
Satisfaction with sports facilities	4	2.97	.90
Social satisfaction	22	3.14	.61
Satisfaction with the library	7		.75
Satisfaction with treatment	4	2.59	.89
Satisfaction with bookstores	2	2.23	1.13
Satisfaction with food service	5	2.59	.89
Satisfaction with communication services	4	2.52	.98
Satisfaction with facilities	22	2.62	.69
Satisfaction with the quality of academic life	3	3.04	.75
Satisfaction with quality of life	1	3.46	1

Table 3: Relationship between academic quality of life dimension and satisfaction of quality of life

Correlation	r	p
Satisfaction with the quality of line		
Academic quality of life	.747	.001
Facilities dimension	.117	.096
Social dimension	.250	.001
Educational dimension	.194	.006

Table 4: Descriptive statistics indicators of learning motivation in students

Component	No. of questions	Mean	Sd
Efficacy	7	2.86	.50
Active learning	8	3.72	.70
Learning science	5	3.73	.75
Performance goal	4	3.12	.89
Achievement goal	5	3.99	.80
Environmental learning stimuli	6	2.83	.90
Learning motivation	35	3.37	.46

Table 8: Regression coefficients; the simultaneous effect of satisfaction with facilities and educational satisfaction and social satisfaction on the students 'learning motivation

Independent variable	R	R2	B	SE	Beta	T	P
Constant	.349	.122	2.509	.167		14.985	.001
Satisfaction with educational dimensions			.143	.063	.189	2.280	.24
Satisfaction with social dimension			.105	.070	.138	1.439	.137
Satisfaction with facilities			.055	.059	.942	.348	

Table 5:

	Learning motivation	
	r	p
Satisfaction with academic quality of life	.194	.005
Satisfaction with quality of life	.074	.294

Table 6: Relationship between dimensions of satisfaction with academic quality of life and learning motivation in the students

	Learning motivation	
	r	p
Satisfaction with facilities	.213	.002
Satisfaction with social dimension	.262	.001
Satisfaction with education dimension	.276	.001

Table 7: Relationship between educational and social dimensions and facilities, and learning motivation in the students

	Learning motivation	
	r	p
Satisfaction with education dimension		
Satisfaction with instructors	.215	.002
Satisfaction with the teaching method	.355	.001
Satisfaction with the assignment	.175	.012
Satisfaction with scientific reputation	.141	.044
Satisfaction with diversity	.121	.084
Satisfaction with the quality of the class	.200	.004
Satisfaction with social dimension		
Satisfaction with scientific services	.162	.021
Satisfaction with the campus	.256	.001
Satisfaction with religious spiritual programs	.287	.001
Satisfaction with sports facilities	.174	.013
Satisfaction with facilities		
Satisfaction with the library	.280	.001
Satisfaction with the treatment	.214	.022
Satisfaction with bookstores	.099	.175
Satisfaction with food service	.263	.001
Satisfaction with communication services	.082	.245

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between academic quality of life and learning motivation in the students of Jahrom University of Medical Sciences. The results showed that satisfaction with academic quality of life significantly increased learning motivation in students. Comparative analysis of the results showed that these findings were consistent with those obtained by Ambache and Varzzinsky (2005), Zetlin et al. (2004), Brackhon et al. (2000), Zepkit et al. (2006), Cumber and Ling (2005), Surinse and Wolf (2008), Mohammadi (1393) and Shaykh al-Islam (1394)^{21,20,19,18,17,16,5,14}.

The relationship between the mean levels of academic quality of life and the mean of learning motivation levels in the students revealed that satisfaction with educational dimension, satisfaction with social dimension and satisfaction with facilities significantly increased learning motivation in the students, being consistent with the results of Austin (1993) and Vicky (2007). Austin's research (1993) indicated that proper quality of life during studying at university played a crucial role in students' academic progress and learning process. In addition, Kayhan's (2007) research showed that students with better quality of life had better academic performance. Stress and anxiety during studying at university and poor quality of the academic life environment can affect students' functions such as their academic achievement and cause them to degrade in their education (Flaming et al., 2006)²². Among the above-mentioned dimensions, only satisfaction with the educational dimension is a positive and significant predictor of students' learning motivation. These results are consistent with those of Sheikholeslami's study (2014). Sheikholeslami (2014), in the study into prediction of academic burnout on the basis of academic quality of life and the hope of employment in students, showed that there was a significant and negative relationship between academic quality of life and academic burnout and that approximately 24% of the variance in academic burnout was predictable based on the quality of academic life. Among the dimensions of academic quality of life, the educational dimension with beta (0.40) ($t = -0.57$, $p < 0.05$) had a significant negative predictive power for academic burnout. However, other aspects of the quality of academic life did not have the power to predict academic burnout. Accordingly, it can be concluded that academic quality of life is one of the important variables associated with students' academic burnout. The more the university campus is knowledgeable and dynamic in all its dimensions, the more the students are naturally motivated and enthusiastic about pursuing their goal. In justifying the obtained result, it should be mentioned that the dynamic environment of university, in addition to increasing students' motivation, passion and enthusiasm, should make students more interested in participating in university and classroom activities and spend more time on studying without feeling tired and losing academic motivation and burnout (21). Generally, students enjoying a satisfactory level of quality of life can be better off by providing stronger social networks, social support, and emotional stability, predicting future desirable goals having effective

compromise with environmental stressors from academic burnout, and achieving good academic goals. Academic burnout in students means experiencing fatigue while doing homework and studying, having a pessimistic attitude toward studying and learning content, and feeling an academic inadequacy (22). Consequences such as academic impulsivity, inability to continue attending classrooms, not participating in classroom activities, lack of sense in classroom activities, and lack of ability to study subjects eventually lead to academic failure (21). The results of Mohammadi's research (2014), providing a causal model of the quality of university environment, academic and social cohesion and academic burnout of 289 students at Shiraz University, showed that the university environment was a significant and negative predictor of academic burnout as well as a positive and significant predictor of academic and social cohesion of students. Accordingly, it can be mentioned that the university environment cannot directly lead to students' burnout. When the quality of the university environment is preserved at its highest in many respects, the grounds for creating coherence is provided to the student (20). Therefore, the quality of academic life and students' understanding of the quality of academic life can act as an effective factor in reducing or increasing academic motivation. If the quality of academic life is high in students, the educational motivation increases and the degree of academic burnout decreases in students, and if the quality of academic life of the students is low, the educational motivation decreases, and the students' academic burnout can increase. Accordingly, the higher the quality of life of the university environment, the more motivationally students strive and pursue their goals and do not suffer from academic burnout (21). The results showed that the level of academic life satisfaction in students was higher than average. While Mehdi (2015, 2011), Ma'arefand (2013) and Soltani et al. (2010) evaluated students' quality of life significantly less than average, which is not consistent with the results of the present study. In addition, by improving the dimensions of satisfaction with facilities, educational satisfaction and social satisfaction, the satisfaction with academic life increases in students, and increasing the quality of academic life leads to an increase in the quality of life in students. The comparative study of the research shows that these findings are in line with the research results obtained by Falahati (2013), and Sirji et al. (2010). Likewise, Falahati studied students' quality of academic life in a research entitled "The Case Study of Tehran and Kurdistan Universities". In this research, students' quality of academic life was assessed in three dimensions of satisfaction with education, social dimension, facilities of the university. The results of the study showed the effect of satisfaction with university facilities on satisfaction with the educational dimension and social dimension of academic life. Furthermore, the results showed that satisfaction with academic quality of life had a significant effect on satisfaction with students' quality of life². The results of this study are applicable at three levels of theory, the development of the subject literature in Iran and policy-making. Theoretically, the findings of this research confirm the Sirji et al. (2010) model in predicting

academic life quality. Based on the assumptions of Sirji et al. (2010), the overall quality of life of a person is influenced by different dimensions of life, and academic quality of life in university students plays an important and effective role²³. The results of this study show the effect of academic quality of life on general satisfaction of life and confirm the basis of the theory of satisfaction. The results of multiple regression analysis on the effect of satisfaction with facilities, educational and social dimensions on students' learning motivation indicate that 12.2% of students' motivation learning changes are affected by the variables of satisfaction with facilities and educational and social dimensions. Therefore, it can be concluded that the proposed model of research is significant ($p < 0.05$); therefore, the hypothesis is confirmed. The results of the study showed that students' learning motivation was above average, which are consistent with the results of Jolhar (2018) and Rohi (2007)^{24,10}. As in Jolhar's study (2018), the findings showed that in 217 dental students of Islamic Azad University of Medical Sciences of Tehran in 2016, 64.5% of students had high academic motivation, being positively associated with the students' gender and economic conditions(10). In the research by Roohi (2007), the findings showed that among 474 students of Golestan University of Medical Sciences, most students were motivated and there was no difference between educational motivation according to gender and field of study²⁴. There is also a difference between students' motivation according to gender and field of study, which is different from the study by Spirituality (2007). In the fifth step, the results showed that among the demographic variables, there is only a significant relationship between father's job (employee) and the educational satisfaction and marital status (marital status) and satisfaction with facilities. There is no significant relationship with student learning motivation. At the last stage, there was a significant relationship between student's academic indices and research variables, which increased with the increase in grade, academic quality of life and student learning motivation ($p < 0.05$), being consistent with the results obtained by Dayani (2008) Sadeghi Movahedet al.(2009-2010) and Sohrabi (2016)^{25,26,27}. The results of Dayani's (2008) study aiming at investigating the factors influencing study motivations showed a significant relationship between the motivations of being effective, challenging, curious and homework and student's GPA²⁵. The study results obtained by Sadeghi Movahed(2009-2010) with the aim of determining the individual and environmental factors affecting the progression or lack of academic achievement of medical students of Ardabil University of Medical Sciences showed a significant relationship between the GPA and students' academic achievement²⁶. The results of Sohrabi's(2016) research aiming at investigating the relationship between the motivation of academic achievement and time management with the academic success of undergraduate students of the Paramedical School of Iran University of Medical Sciences indicated a significant linear correlation between the GPA and the motivation score of progression ($r = 0.003$, $p < 0.001$). Other research and papers show that this study opened up a new window on the context of studies into academic quality of life and student learning motivation.

CONCLUSION

In general, in this research, it was attempted to show a positive and significant correlation between academic quality of life and student learning motivation. Theoretically, the findings of the research confirm the Sirji et al. (2010) model. Policy-makers and educational planners in medical sciences can benefit from the present study findings to improve students' quality of academic life and then to develop their learning motivation as the country's scientific reserves, thereby we will have a prosperous and honored country with an excellent reputation.

Acknowledgement: I appreciate all students who participated in this study.

Conflict of interest: None

REFERENCES

1. Yılmaz H, Çavaş P. Reliability and validity study of the Students' Motivation toward Science Learning (SMTSL) 2007;6(3):430-40
2. Falahaty Leila. Student's Quality of Academic Life: A Case Study of Students in Tehran University and Kurdistan University. Fall of 2013, Volume 6, Issue 3: 151-172.
3. Lee DJ. A model of quality of college life (QCL) of students in Korea. Social Indicators Research. 2008; 87(2):269-85.
4. Pintrich PR. A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). (1991).
5. Tuan HL, Chin CC. Promoting junior high school students' motivation toward physical science learning (III). Report for Taiwan National Research Council (NSC 89-2511-S018-030). 2000.
6. Elliot AJ, Covington MV. Approach and avoidance motivation. Educational Psychology Review. 2001; 13(2):73-92.
7. Molavi, Rasulzadeh, Behzad, GhamariGivi. The Effective Factors in Reducing Academic Motivation in Students of Ardabil University of Medical Sciences. Journal of Islamic Republic of Iran Medical Sciences, Volume 25, Issue 1, Spring 2007: 58-53.
8. Orsini C, Evans P, Jerez O. How to encourage intrinsic motivation in the clinical teaching environment? A systematic review from the self-determination theory. J EducEval Health Prof. 2015 Apr 8;12:8.
9. Kim S, Hur Y, Park JH. The correlation between achievement goals, learning strategies, and motivation in medical students. Korean journal of medical education. 2014; 26(1):19-24
10. Jolhar, Maryam, Farhadi, Sara, Rahimi Kian, Arash. Educational motivation and its relationship with some factors in freshman to junior dental students of Islamic Azad University of Medical Sciences of Tehran, Journal of Research in Dentistry. 2018, 15 (1): 55-49.
11. Salehi Mohammad, Hajizad Mohammad, Fallah Ali, Salim BahramiSeyyedehHamideh. Investigating the Factors Affecting the Reduction of Academic Motivation in Male and Female Students of Islamic Azad Universities of Mazandaran Province. Journal of Social Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Shoushtar Branch. 2010, 4 (9): 86-73.
12. Makwandi Somayeh, Zamani Mariam. Study of quality of life and its different dimensions among students of Islamic Azad University of Ahvaz in 2010, 4 (5): 191-200.
13. Zareh Hussein, Bakhshesh Maryam. Reliability and Validity of Knowledge Learning Motivation Questionnaire. Training and Evaluation of Educational Quarterly Journal of. 2013, 6th Year, No. 24: 66-51.
14. Umbach PD, Wawrzynski MR. Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. Research in Higher Education. 2005; 46(2):153-84.

15. Zeitlin-Ophir I, Melitz O, Miller R, Podoshin P, Mesh G. Variables affecting the academic and social integration of nursing students. *Journal of Nursing Education*. 2004; 43(7):326-9.
16. Braxton JM, Milem JF, Sullivan AS. The influence of active learning on the college student departure process: Toward a revision of Tinto's theory. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 2000; 71(5):569-90.
17. Zepke N, Leach L, Prebble T. Being learner centred: one way to improve student retention? *Studies in Higher Education*. 2006; 31(5):587-600.
18. Kember D, Leung DY. The influence of active learning experiences on the development of graduate capabilities. *Studies in Higher Education*. 2005; 30(2):155-70.
19. Severiens S, Wolff R. A comparison of ethnic minority and majority students: Social and academic integration, and quality of learning. *Studies in higher education*. 2008; 33(3):253-66.
20. Mohammadi, Mehdi; Keshavarzi, Fahimeh and Heidari, Elham. Presenting the causal model of university quality, educational and social cohesion, and academic burnout of students. *Psychological methods and models*. 1393, 16 (4): 28-11.
21. Sheikholeslami, Karimianpour, Ghaffar, Weysi, Ronak. The prediction of academic burnout based on the quality of academic life and the hope of employment in students. *Quarterly Journal of Educational Psychology*. Spring 1395, 12 (39): 25-43.
22. Fleming DA, Sheppard VB, Mangan PA, Taylor KL, Tallarico M, Adams I, Ingham J. Caregiving at the end of life: Perceptions of health care quality and quality of life among patients and caregivers. *Journal of pain and symptom management*. 2006; 31(5):407-20.
23. Sirgy MJ, Lee DJ, Grzeskowiak S, Grace BY, Webb D, El-Hasan K, Vega JJ, Ekici A, Johar JS, Krishen A, Kangal A. Quality of college life (QCL) of students: Further validation of a measure of well-being. *Social Indicators Research*. 2010; 99(3):375-90.
24. Ruhi, Ghanbar, Hosseini, Seyyed Abedin (2007) Educational motivation and its relation with some factors in students of Golestan University of Medical Sciences. Nursing and Midwifery faculty. *Developmental steps in medical education*. 4 (2): 83-77.
25. Dayyani Mohammad Hussein, TaghiPanahiFateme. Study of factors affecting study motivation in primary and secondary school students. 2008, Volume 11 (3), 56-29.
26. SadeqiMovahed, Rumi, Yousefi, Kamel. Investigating the Individual and Environmental Factors Affecting the Progression or Failure of Academic Achievement of Medical Students of Ardabil University of Medical Sciences.
27. Sohrabi Z, ghovati F, mirhosseini F, hosseini F. The relationship between achievement motivation and time management and academic achievement Undergraduate Medical University of Medical Sciences. *RJMS*. 2016; 23 (150):35-45.