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ABSTRACT: The present study was an attempt to investigate the possible role of the hidden curriculum on academic achievements of high school students and to provide a plausible model to decrease the negative effects of the hidden curriculum. Research method was mixed. The statistical population was all female high school students. The sample comprised 9 high school who were purposeful sampling selected the schools and classrooms observed for 8 months. Different instruments were used including: 1. academic achievement mean, 2. observation checklist 3. the standardized open-ended interview and informal conversational. Several statistical procedures including one-way repeated measure ANOVA, Scheffe’s test, Pearson coefficient of correlation, and multiple regression analysis were used to analyze the data. The coefficient of correlation between hidden curriculum and academic achievement variables was 0.50, which was not significant at the level of 0.05. With reference to $R^2$, the data showed that 24.77% of students’ academic achievements have been influenced by hidden curriculum. After qualitative analysis of the findings on the hidden curriculum, the model was further explained and provided through eight chapters: 1. theoretical, 2. philosophy, 3. fundamental variables, 4. dimensions, 5. objectives, 6. principles, 7. methods 8. feedback and evaluation system.
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INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study was to search and discover the effect of hidden curriculum of schools on the academic achievement of high school students and providing a model for the design of better learning environments. Although the most important factors that influence learning and real academic achievement of students are non-obvious, unintentional and unforeseen, and most experts, consider extension, the stability and influence of these seemingly quiet and hidden lessons in the formation of learning more than explicit curriculum; However, most studies have been conducted on formal curriculum. Unfortunately, there are no research yet conducted on the effects of the hidden curriculum on students' learning. Therefore, the need to search and ponder the effects of this program as an anatomy of a training black box is felt. The main importance of this study is to call for thoughtfulness in what is happening in classrooms and schools. Unrealistic learning achievement scores of students are not in accordance with the will of the education system and special measures have not been taken to prevent them. Thus, there is a need for research in this area.

Identification and dissection of this program can be used as an educational tool, at the service of personnel of education. This gave them the message that any educational decision, any training procedure and behavior that they are doing, directly or indirectly have an impact on student learning and real academic achievement.

Eisner (1979) pointed to a preferential rating for various curriculum materials and thread as one aspect of the hidden curriculum of schools. For example, students think that the course materials, such as art and physical education are without value and as a second-order, compared to subjects such as math and science materials.

While Eisner emphasized the preferential rating, Myles and Andreon (2001), Chikeung and Doganay (2009) emphasized the social dimension of the program. They believed that the hidden curriculum indicate student’s learning from their relationships with other students, teachers and parents of school. These learning which is also influenced by the values and expectations of each teacher and the fabric of society, is hidden in each student and have effects on how to learn, learning time and how to do homework.

Ausbrooks (2000), also in line with these experts, mention social aspect of this program. He knows that it is a body of knowledge that students acquire through attending classes and school and form their learning environments. He believes that students should be able to recognize it and respond to it effectively to be able to
consolidate their place in the educational institution. Myles and Andreon (2001) knew that the success of every student is in learning tricks and rules of the game in every classroom.

Other researchers focused on the cognitive aspects of this program and investigated the effects of the hidden curriculum on content and images of textbooks. They believed that content and images of textbooks carry an implicit message that sometimes these messages such as stereotypes, racial and sex discrimination, are officially opposed to educational goals and curriculum (Bergenhenegouven, 2009; Redish, 2009; Sharifathuray, 2010).

Some other scholars such as Smith and Montgomery (2008) in their research showed that students' attitudes to various courses are influenced by school governor evaluation process in lessons. Lessons such as mathematics, experimental sciences, and technology which were more important from the viewpoint of school governor were also more important from the viewpoint of students.

Finally, another group of experts in curriculum such as Weber (2009), and Ferriter (2009) studied Physical aspect of the program. They examined the effect of physical environment on student academic achievement. They showed that the beautiful, decorated classrooms with light and adequate physical facilities for Teaching are one of factors for academic success.

In this study, with an integrated approach, three aspects were discussed but greater emphasis was on the social aspect of the program. Diagnostic criteria of hidden curriculum in this study were:

- Interaction of Teachers with students
- Interactions of educational personnel with students and with each other
- Interaction of students with each other
- Teaching and evaluation methods
- The content of the subject matter
- Rules and Regulations
- The uniform, dress up and make up rule
- Physical facilities of the school

Indicator of academic achievement in this study was the mean scores of students. The question of the current study was what is the effect of hidden curriculum on academic achievement and their actual learning? And how it is caused?

**METHOD**

**Sample**

In this study, mixed research method was used. In the qualitative part, case study was used to gather information about the hidden curriculum. Case or unit of analysis in this study was classroom or school. Population of the present study was the entire girl high schools located in district 1 Education in Tehran in 2012-2013 Academic Year which was 41 schools. The population selected using purposeful sampling. The district 1 was selected because in this district experienced teachers are working and high school students were selected because these students were in the period of transition to the labor market or university and were more influenced by the social environment of the school and its consequences. 9 schools were selected with random sampling method. In each school one of the third grade classrooms was selected.

**Tools**

Academic achievement mean scores
Observation forms to examine the hidden curriculum
The standardized open-ended interview and informal conversations

For making tools, the theoretical foundations and viewpoints of educational psychology and curriculum experts were used and were conducted three times, preliminarily. After each performance, validity and reliability of tools were computed to be ready for final implementation. To determine the reliability of the hidden curriculum assessment tools, qualitative data obtained from observations and interviews were changed into quantitative data and repeated phrases were deleted. Of total 293 Phrase 117 phrases remained in the final form. Reliability coefficient, by using Cronbach's alpha was 0.94. To determine Construct validity of tools, Factor analysis was used in three steps, Correlation matrix, Extraction of primary factors by principal components analysis, and Varimax rotation method to achieve the final solution. After seven testing rotation, matrix was at its best. To assess Factor matrix, two indices the adequacy of sampling and Bartlett's test of Sphericity were calculated. KMO index of sampling adequacy was equal to 0.697 and Bartlett's Sphericity test score was \( \chi^2 = 17514.805 \) which was significant with df = 6441 at the level of \( p < 0.001 \). For determining the Factors for rotation, Kaiser Criterion and Cattell Scree test were calculated. Based on the Kaiser criterion, 21 factors were determined as extracted factors. These 21 factors explained generally 81.98% of the total variance. To extract the number of factors, the amount of variance explained by each factor and specially Scree plot should
According to Scree plot, only four factors of the constituent elements of assessment tool of classroom hidden curriculum is higher than the slope of the line. These four factors were:

- Interaction of teachers with weak students
- Evaluation methods and the content of the subject matter
- Teaching methods and teachers dress up and make up
- Interaction of teacher with strong students

Other factors were excluded from further related analysis. In total, construct validity of 114 phrases, was confirmed by factor analysis.

RESULTS

According to Figure 1, it is obvious that among components of the hidden curriculum, component of "Rules and Regulations of school" has the highest average and component of "Interaction of students with each other" and "teaching methods and teachers make up and dress up" has the lowest average. The Status of average and standard deviation of components showed that interaction of teacher with the students (weak and strong) in school code 6 was weaker with an average of 1.80 and in school code 1 was stronger with an average of 2.37. Teaching methods and teachers dress up and make up with an average of 1.63, methods of teacher evaluation and textbooks content with 1.87 in school code 4 were weaker and in school code 7 with an average of 2.90 and 2.42 were stronger.

To determine significant difference between the social components of the hidden curriculum of schools, repeated measures analysis was used (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sum of the squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>72.08</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social components</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>68.64</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between school and social components</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>70.96</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in table 1, correlation of school, social components and Interaction between school and social components are significant. This means that status of each the social components of the hidden curriculum in different schools are significantly different. Figure 2 shows interaction of social components of the hidden curriculum in different schools.

According to figure 2, “Teacher interaction with strong students” was better than other three components of the hidden curriculum in classrooms. Component “teaching methods and teachers appearance” was in lower place than the rest of the components. In this way, “Teacher interaction with weak students”, “teacher evaluation and textbooks content” and “teaching methods and teachers appearance” in all schools were in lower than 3 which was not satisfactory.

Then evaluation of academic achievement was performed. As shown in Table 2 and Figure 3, as seen, School Code 1 with an average of 17.91 have the lowest mean scores and school code 8 with an average of 19.59 have the highest mean scores among the schools.
Table 2. The mean and standard deviation of academic achievement in different schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Average comparison of academic achievement in different schools

Then, to find relationships between academic achievement and hidden curriculum, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted and its significance was assessed. Its results are shown in Table 3.

According to Table 3, the correlation coefficient between academic achievement and hidden curriculum of school, social environment, and physical environment are equal to 0.50, 0.49, and 0.42, respectively. These correlation coefficients were moderate. Determination coefficient of hidden curriculum of school, social environment, and physical environment are equal to 0.25, 0.24, and 0.18, respectively. We used T-test in order to test the significance of the correlations between hidden curriculum and each of the components. According to Table 3, calculated t for the hidden curriculum of the school and its main components (social and physical environment) was not significant at the 95 percent confidence level, so the null hypothesis is accepted and is no significant relationship between hidden curriculum and its main components.
Table 3. Pearson correlation analysis between mean score of students and all physical and social environment components of hidden curriculum in school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Correlation (r)</th>
<th>Coefficient of determination (r²)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Steady</th>
<th>Ramp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers interaction with weak students</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-3.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation method and contents of the subject matter teaching methods and teacher dress up and make up Teacher interaction with strong students</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-3.35</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of students with each other Interactions of administrator educational with students Interactions of administrator educational with each other</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational system Rules and Regulations of school Social environment Physical environment hidden curriculum</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-test results for the subscales of social environment of school suggests that there is significant correlation at 95% confidence level between subscales of "Teacher interaction with weak and strong students, Interactions of educational personnel with students, and teaching methods, dress up and make up "with academic achievement scores, but between subscales of "Interaction of students with each other, Interactions of educational personnel with each other, content of textbooks and Rules and Regulations of school" and academic achievement scores, there was no significant correlation. To study the effect of hidden curriculum on the academic achievement multiple regression analysis was used (table 4).

Table 4. Multiple regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>multiple regression coefficient (R)</th>
<th>Coefficient of determination</th>
<th>Adjusted coefficient of determination</th>
<th>F[2,6]</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>standard error of estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social environment</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 4, multiple regression coefficient of social and Physical environment was 0.50 which, considering value of f and the calculated error at 95 percent confidence level was not significant. Coefficient of determination was 0.2477. Thus, it was found that 24.77% of student achievement scores are influenced by these two components. Other percentage changes in academic achievement are resulting from errors or variables that the researcher has not measured.

In order to investigate the effect of hidden curriculum on academic achievement scores, qualitative analysis was conducted by using Hidden curriculum approaches and theories of the psychology of learning.

Teacher interaction with students Results showed that in most of the observed classroom, teachers' interaction with students and, especially, with weak students in the class was negative. Most of teachers had attention only to a limited number of strong students of classrooms. Most teachers stated that they have this kind of interaction for creating a sense of competition in students and increase academic achievement scores. Unlike the views of the theorists of associationism, Piaget's cognitive development theory and theories of Skinner they believed that if they meet students, if they are friendly with students and respect them, or have a sense of humor in the classroom, students will misuse and will not give attention to lesson and they will not be able to control their classes. According to these teachers, by running classroom with autocratic and authoritarian techniques, they can reach their goals much faster and easier than using democratic ways. The teachers knew the secret of their success in having a serious and too strict behavior with poor students. Although in the...
majority of classrooms, teachers' interactions with students were negative, but in some classes, from the perspective of learning psychologists, it was positive and could increase student academic achievement.

These teachers, when entering the classroom, greet students and leave class with a smile. They are friendly with students and respect them, and have a sense of humor in the classroom. In sharing their attention with students, they respect equity. They allowed them to express their opinions. Students were consulted on the decisions. They use feedback and verbal encouragements. Classroom interaction is mainly focused on their school work. These classes are not required in disciplinary action. His students follow their rules and regulations.

The results of the qualitative analysis of the findings were consistent with Bloom's School learning theory, cognitive development theory of Piaget, Vygotsky and Bruner, behavioral and motivational theories of associationism as well as researches of Cox and Orehave (2007), Lesley et al (2009).

Cox and Orehave (2007) in their research showed that teachers and other educational personnel positive interactions outside of the classroom increases the current academic achievement of students and their interest in future developments. Lesley et al (2009) were studied the relationship between interpersonal behavior of teachers and learning of English in southwest China. Their findings indicated that authoritarian and domineering behavior of teachers had a significant and negative correlation with Students participation in classroom and academic achievement.

**Interactions of educational personnel with students and with each other**

Researcher observations revealed that in the schools with code 1, 2, 3, 4 and non-profit 6 and 8, Interactions of educational personnel with students were in contrast with theories of functionalism, associationism and immaturity-maturity theory of Argris, but in schools with codes 5, 7 and 9 it was consistent with those theories.

In schools that interactions of educational personnel with students were negative, Students have not the right to comment, criticize or suggest and there was no freedom, equality and mutual respect. The educational personnel, by strict law enforcement, control over student behavior, and students are forced into passivity and obedience. Authorities of these schools stress on discipline instead of teaching and learning. Due to poor communication between students and teachers, and an atmosphere of fear and terror, students could not report deficiencies and weaknesses of teaching staff to deputies and administrators. Sometimes the teacher teaches a lesson that does not have any expertise in it. In these schools administrators did not evaluate staff's performance and quality of teaching and did not have a guide to colleagues about teaching in class. Staff interactions with each other were based on promotion and professional development of teachers, not on student achievement.

But in schools with codes 5, 7 and 9 there was a good relationship between educational personnel and students and they treat each other with full respect. One of the goals of these educational personnel was to transfer information and scientific facts in order to increase academic achievement scores. Another goal was religious moral and ethical education of students in order to preserve Islamic values. Findings from the qualitative analysis were consistent with the findings of Pace and at al (2006), Holcomb (2006) and Blatchford et al (2009).

Pace and at al (2006) showed that interactions of educational personnel with each other, level of responsibility, expectations and their willingness to cooperate in the work of the school is directly correlated with the student learning. Holcomb (2006) showed that increase in positive interactions of students with educational personnel and letting them to express Interests, needs and preferences regarding course content, will enhance learning and academic achievement. Blatchford et al (2009) in their research showed that support of students by educational personnel cause students’ commitment to learn more and play more active role in interactions with adults.

**Interaction of students with each other**

The findings showed that in schools WITH CODES 1, 2, 3, 4 which were ruled by autocratic ways and teaching methods and evaluation of teachers, unlike the theories of Piaget and Vygotsky, were based on individual competition; students experience less positive interactions with each other. Obtaining high scores in strong students caused other students to get disillusioned. Instead of cooperation and positive interactions, it increased competition among students, encouraged compromise and stifled creativity.

In schools with codes 5, 7 and 9 that students for admission had passed moral disciplinary, educational, and intellectual selection steps, their relationship was based on mutual respect for each other’s ideas. In most classrooms of these schools, teachers used learner-centered teaching methods, and encouraged students to work and Team competition. As Piaget, Vygotsky and Bandura predicted, using this method of learning, increased students’ enthusiasm for learning. Findings were consistent with the findings of Cox and Orehave (2007), Waite Hall (2008) and Hsieh Chang and Smith (2008).
Cox and Orehoive (2007) in New Zealand, found that positive interaction and understanding between local and foreign students in the classroom promote education and also increase academic activities and positive attitude of students to the university. According to findings of Waite Hall (2008), when students' interaction possibility with each other is provided, learning course materials, interest in learning and student achievement scores also will raise. In another study Hsieh Chang and Smith (2008) evaluated the effects of personal interaction on distance learning and student satisfaction with these courses. His findings indicated that the students interaction with each other not only enhance the academic achievement scores, but also cause them more satisfied with their course materials.

TEACHING AND EVALUATION METHODS

Teaching and evaluation methods in most classrooms were contrary to perspectives of learning theorists. They do not give students an opportunity to explore ideas and applying them. Teachers do the marking, annotating, summarizing, distinguishing important points from unimportant and highlighting important points and the original meanings themselves so the opportunity to organize new information and link between the prior knowledge and new information was taken from the learner. Most of these teachers during teaching spend time only on those sections that are part of the final exam questions. Other sections of the lessons were excluded or teacherson't spend time on them, like sections: know more, think about, group discussion, research and analyzes, conclusions, and data collection activities. Most applied training methods were lecture without the use of the teaching techniques of these methods. Most teachers have not additional studies and information about the course they were teaching and sometimes they have not scientific and technical basis of the lessons. Findings were consistent with the findings of Park and Shin (1999), Ian (2009) and Mumthas and Blessytha (2009).

Park and Shin (1999) showed that Student-centered teaching methods in the development of problem-solving ability, and motivation to learn mathematics are effective. Ian (2009) examined the effects of academic teaching of science lesson and showed that practical teaching is effective on learning and real and deep understanding of science concepts. Mumthas and Blessytha (2009) in their studies found that teachers are more effective that have a greater implicit knowledge about curriculum content and pass this practical knowledge to the students.

Content of the subjects matter

The findings showed students' attitudes to the content of the subjects matter and non-compliance with the criteria chosen by planners is not associated with student achievement scores. Students, specially strong ones (educationally) because of the high level of achievement motivation study the content of the material carefully, and obtain high scores, regardless of the lack of engaging content, lack of need, being irrelevant in real and everyday life, being repetitive and tedious, and new or its not updated information. Courses that students were not interested in their content were mnemonic lessons such as religion, Quran, Arabic, history and geography. Thus, students with repeat and review the material could easily earn high scores. Moreover, the majority of teachers highlights important content and provides to students questions and answers similar to the quiz questions. Findings were consistent with the findings of Kuo – An and Chia (2008), Shen et al. (2009), MC Loughin and Pardaig (2009).

Kuo – An and Chia in their research concluded that the content of most textbooks do not prepare students to deal with the problems of everyday life. Shen et al. found that emotional and affective involvement with the content of course materials will cause deep learning in students. MC Loughin and Pardaig concluded that when the content is applied and students are not independent in the content, learning rate will increase.

Rules and Regulations

In public schools with code 1, 2, 3, 4, rules and regulations of school, regarding student achievement, emphasized on effort and attempts of individual learner. In the case of low academic achievement, parents are informed to help students. If, after notification to parents, school problems remain, contrary to the theories of achievement motivation, attribution, expectation multiplied by the value, and sociocultural approaches, students were belittled, insulted, blamed and disrespected. They were accused of stupidity and weakness and were rejected from the school educational system, implicitly. In studied non-profit schools with code 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, School rules regarding student achievement, was very serious. To ensure the achievement of students in these schools, from the first arrival to the school system, student is governed by strict rules. Before enrollment, each student's academic achievement scores of previous years, is controlled. Then intelligence and aptitude diagnostic tests and academic achievement tests are taken in written. After that students are interviewed. If successful in the tests, they are reenrolled. In the school with code 7 that had tougher regulations in the field of staff also should pass difficult stages for the selection and recruitment. Prior to employment, education, research and teaching experience of teachers are examined. Then, they are attended in the recruitment test of the institute.
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and if successful, they are interviewed. Once hired, teachers are required to study and update their information about modern methods and techniques of teaching and student motivation. Thus, having a high IQ and talented students and with academic, disciplined and regulated students in terms of behavior and having educated and experienced teaching staff, student achievement at school is guaranteed. Our findings were consistent with findings of Thornberg (2008) and (2009). He in his study showed that the implementation of school rules and regulations will increase the academic achievement of students.

The uniform dress up and make up rule

The findings showed that one of the features of popular teachers, from the view of students, was dandyism and appearance adornment. Variation in clothing and color matching in uniform, scarf, bags and shoes of teachers from the view of students was very important. Attending classes with bushy eyebrows, not shaving and wearing dark, dirty, wrinkled and old clothes causes student feel that teachers are unprepared in classrooms and they are not interested in the lessons and students and they do not care about it. Therefore, students also did not care to school and study and did not want to attend such classroom.

Findings of this section of the paper were consistent with findings of Cardon and Okoro (2009) and Taylor (2009). They show that style of dress and appearance adornment of teachers is effective on their success in teaching.

Physical facilities of the school

The results showed that, according to forecasts of humanists, environmentalists and theorists like Piaget, the new Piaget and constructivism, Good facilities of the physical environment had effect on deeper learning of lessons real and academic achievement of students. In schools that there is not enough laboratory and workshop facilities, Teacher responses to tests verbally and students take notes in the margins of their books. Students do practical works of career and technology lesson at home and bring the ready work to the classroom. In many cases, practical works were done by parents or older siblings of students; Thus, the real and profound learning was not achieved. Though this had no effect on student achievement scores. The results of the qualitative analysis of this section were consistent with research findings of Khmis (2009), Ritchie et al (2009), Tanner (2009) and Sterling (2009).

Khmis (2009) found a significant direct relationship between support, assistance of teacher, and physical facilities of classroom and school and academic achievement of students with learning disabilities. Ritchie et al (2009) in their study showed that the physical environment of schools provides a supportive environment and is very effective on how children learn and develop their skills and abilities. Findings of Tanner (2009) shows that the new designation and changes in the physical environment of schools and also, designing laboratories with more features impact on achievement scores in math and science. Sterling (2009) also indicated that the physical environment, rules and policies governing the classroom are effective in what students learn.

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study showed that the effects of social and physical environment of the hidden curriculum in most schools, on deep, meaningful and lasting learning of students was undesirable and negative, but these effects are to increase the academic achievement scores.

According to the results, a model was proposed to reduce the negative effects of the hidden curriculum and enhance its positive effects on student learning and real academic achievement. The proposed model includes eight main components. These components were:

Theoretical basis
Philosophy
Fundamental variables
Dimensions
Objectives
Principles and methods
Execution stages
Evaluation and feedback system

Theoretical basis component include various theories of learning psychology and the hidden curriculum that was used in the qualitative analysis of findings. Philosophy component is about why the proposed model was created. The philosophy of the model was to increase experiences and the positive learning and reduce the negative experiences and learning of the hidden curriculum. For fundamental variables of proposed model, after referring to the theoretical principles and editing basic tools, factor analysis was used to measure the hidden curriculum and then, appropriate factors were extracted. These factors were, interaction of teachers with students (weak and strong), teaching and evaluation methods, the content of the subject matter and the uniform, dress up and make up rule. Proposed model was developed in five dimensions of psychological, sociological,
scientific, political and religious, ethical. Dimensions of the model were developed according to obtained effects of hidden curriculum on academic achievement. Proposed model objective is to increase deep, meaningful, and sustainable learning of the course material. The proposed model was presented in 8 principles and methods. These principles were:

- To create variety of teaching and evaluation methods
- To create variety of ways to motivate students
- To balance in the role of teacher and student in the learning process
- To value of all the subject matter
- Designing and setting favorable learning environments
- Considering the effects of physical facilities of the classroom and school on students' deep learning
- The necessity of teaching staff familiarity with the psychological characteristics of students
- Considering extra-curricular activities for developing talents and intelligence of all students

Considering impact of motivation on students' learning process

In the implementation stages of the proposed model, various stages for implementing the model, with respect to the positive and negative effects of hidden curriculum on academic achievement, was developed. It should be noted that the proposed model after additional study and validation can be implemented by experts and scholars of the curriculum.

System of feedback and evaluation in the model was designed as a systematic and ongoing activity to collect, analyze and interpret data in order to discover the effects of hidden curriculum on academic achievement.

According to the research findings, it is suggested that officials of the education system and senior managers, with holding specialized training courses, should train teachers a variety of teaching methods and evaluation practically in retraining courses. Also, they should convince teachers to replace active learning methods (such as cooperative learning, role playing, group discussions, etc.) with the passive methods of repetition, review, and speech. Teachers should be required to read books on educational psychology, learning, motivation, and management practices in classrooms and schools. With written and functional exams and repeated observations of classrooms by professional inspectors, their work should be evaluated and feedback.

The main limitation of this study is the lack of a valid tool for measuring the hidden curriculum, and thus spending lots of time for making tools. Since the study was qualitative, problems in the methodology of this study was also discussed. It is recommended that the researcher, before starting a study to normalize circulation, must be present in the research environment.
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