

The Current Situation of Learning Drive of Local College Students and its Promotion Strategy

Cheng Xiangjin and Roselan Baki

Abstract – Higher education is a leader in the construction of a powerful country in education, and it has become a top priority to promote the high-quality development of higher education and cultivate more high-quality talents with innovative spirit and practical ability. However, how to stimulate the learning drive of college students is the difficulty of improving the quality of education. Based on the empirical investigation of 568 students from 5 colleges and universities in Shandong Province, this paper analyzes the differences of college students' learning drive and explores the direct influence of internal factors and external environment on college students' learning goal orientation, academic self-efficacy and learning effect with the help of analysis software on the status of local college students' learning drive. Therefore, it is necessary to construct effective strategies to improve learning drive from the three levels of self-education, school education, family education, so as to truly achieve the purpose of improving the quality of higher education.

Keywords – Local college, Undergraduate, Learning drive, Promotion strategy

I. INTRODUCTION

Under the background of the new era, higher education is the leading education power construction, and improving the quality of higher education development has become the focus of today's society. The learning power of college students directly affects the quality of higher education development. In recent years, some new popular words have appeared on the Internet, such as "Laid-back", "lying flat" and "Slack off". The social metaphors behind them mean that young people tend to have a negative attitude towards life. The learning drive of college students is gradually affected by the diversified and changeable values, showing the characteristics of complexity, dynamics and contradiction. According to the existing research, there exist various phenomena of local college students skipping classes without reason, failing the final exam, rushing to the "leisure and entertainment area" and "pension area" in the back of class to facilitate playing online games, sleeping and so on. (Qin zhaofeng, Yang Jingjing, 2021). Students' learning drive is the basic element of their own academic growth. The lack of students' learning drive will directly reduce the learning efficiency, weaken the effectiveness of learning, and further restrict students' self-efficacy and professional development, which is also a common problem faced by many colleges and universities.

Cheng Xiangjin, City University Malaysia, Malaysia (Email address: cxj930922@163.com).
Roselan Baki, City University Malaysia, Malaysia (Email address: dr.roselan@gmail.com).

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Learning drive is the driving force to stimulate learning, maintain learning and guide learning to a certain goal, and is the premise and basis for college students to play their learning enthusiasm and initiative (He Husheng, Zhao Wenxin, 2019). Stimulating the learning drive of college students is not only the development demand of college students' growth and talent, but also an important task of the Party and the country, and it is an inevitable trend of the development of The Times (Zhang Rui, 2024). However, how to stimulate and enhance students' learning drive and how to truly promote the high-quality development of higher education has always been an important topic studied by universities and educators (Qin haiyan, 2018). In view of this, this study breaks through the limitations of the existing research paradigm, takes the comprehensive index of "learning drive" as the core theme, and analyses the following three questions: First, the current situation of the learning drive of local college students; Second, the difference analysis of college students' learning drive; The third is the influencing factors of college students' learning drive, so as to propose innovative and targeted improvement strategies.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the contemporary era of knowledge-based information technology, the learning drive serves as an intrinsic motivating force that directly propels students' academic pursuits, stimulating and encouraging them to strive toward specific objectives. It plays a crucial role in the learning process. The activation of learning drive can be influenced by both internal and external factors. Researchers have proposed diverse interpretations of learning drive, leading to the formation of various theoretical perspectives. The following section provides a concise review of relevant research on learning drive, along with a general evaluation of these studies.

Throughout the evolution of research perspectives and key milestones across various schools of thought, the study of learning drive prior to the 1960s was predominantly influenced by mechanistic materialism and Darwinian evolutionary theory. Researchers primarily focused on animal subjects, examining their behaviours with an emphasis on internal causality and external incentives. The exploration of behavioural motivation from both internal and external perspectives led to the introduction of pivotal concepts such as instinct, drive, need, and incentive. Notably, studies delved into chemical control, neural structure, homeostatic mechanisms, stimuli and arousal, drive, external incentives, defence mechanisms, and activity levels in animal behaviour (Young P T, 1936). Key figures

during this period included James, McDougall, Freud, and Hull. At this time, the research paradigm viewed the subject as a mechanical entity, predominantly controlled by external environmental factors, lacking autonomy. Consequently, the focus was on elucidating external causes. In the 1960s, a significant paradigm shift occurred, introducing cognitive psychology as an intermediary factor that garnered attention from most researchers. Motivation research began transitioning from a mechanistic view of animal behaviour to a cognitive perspective centered on human behaviour. Cognitive psychology gradually emerged as the dominant framework for motivation research, with notable contributors including Atkinson, Weiner, and Deci. Since the 1980s, theories such as achievement motivation, self-efficacy, self-determination, and attribution have come to prominence, offering new insights into the complex social motivations of humans.

The theoretical framework and practical pathways of learning drive have undergone multidimensional development within the academic domain. As the pioneer who introduced the concept of "learning motivation," Soviet educator M. A. Danilov first elucidated it in 1957 through his research on stimulating students' enthusiasm. With the evolution of educational practices, contemporary scholars have continuously expanded the theoretical boundaries via empirical studies. Zorn C (2018) discovered through simulations of role-playing teaching scenarios that effectively enhancing learning motivation necessitates establishing a tripartite support system: one grounded in an expectation management mechanism, a participatory learning model driven by roles and tasks, and collaborative optimization of the physical teaching environment and psychological atmosphere. This finding resonates with Fischer M (2018)'s research on learning confidence and engagement, which confirmed through quasi-experimental design that a dynamic feedback mechanism can not only immediately reinforce learning behaviour but also continuously stimulate intrinsic motivation by cultivating metacognitive abilities. This cognitive reconstruction process transforms learning engagement from passive response to active construction. Notably, Kim Y E (2018) developed a simplified motivational adjustment scale for college students, validated through psychometric analysis, revealing the operational feasibility of a motivational adjustment system for college students in academic settings. The consistent application of motivational strategies not only demonstrates strong internal consistency and reliability but also provides educators with a concrete intervention framework. This marks a significant breakthrough in the study of learning drive, transitioning from theoretical construction to standardized assessment.

IV. METHOD

Design

The aim of this study is to examine the current characteristics of learning drive among local college students and to develop effective strategies for enhancing their learning drive. Five colleges and universities in Shandong Province were selected based on regional distribution and institutional characteristics using a

quantitative research approach to ensure the representativeness and diversity of the sample. Within each institution, students from freshman to senior levels were stratified by grade, followed by random cluster sampling of entire classes to minimize selection bias. Ultimately, 568 valid samples were obtained. Statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS 27.0.

Participants

In this study, a stratified cluster sampling method was employed to select undergraduate students ranging from freshmen to seniors across five local universities in Shandong Province. To ensure the authenticity and reliability of the data, an anonymous response protocol was implemented. A total of 627 questionnaires were distributed, with 568 being effectively collected, resulting in an effective recovery rate of 93.3%. The participants ranged in age from 18 to 24 years (mean = 20.17 years, standard deviation = 1.26 years). Table 1 provides a comprehensive overview of the participant demographics.

TABLE1: BASIC INFORMATION OF PARTICIPANTS

| content | | | |
|-----------|---------------------|--------|---------------|
| Variables | Groups | number | percentage(%) |
| Gender | Male | 273 | 48% |
| | Female | 295 | 52% |
| Residence | Village | 186 | 33% |
| | City | 382 | 67% |
| One-child | Yes | 165 | 29% |
| | No | 403 | 71% |
| Major | Science Engineering | 358 | 63% |
| | Liberal arts | 210 | 37% |
| Grade | Freshman | 159 | 28% |
| | Sophomore | 184 | 32% |
| | Junior | 135 | 24% |
| | Senior | 90 | 16% |

Measures

In this study, the questionnaire of College Students' Learning drive compiled by Zhang Rui et al. is selected as a reference questionnaire, which is revised for measurement and application. The questionnaire of college students' learning motivation consists of 40 items, and the investigation content consists of basic information and specific items. The basic information mainly includes 5 items, such as student gender, grade, major, place of residence, and whether the student is the only child. These items represent the sample characteristics of the survey object. The specific questions include seven dimensions: learning motivation (6-10 questions), goal orientation (11-15 questions), self-efficacy (16-20 questions), learning interest (21-25 questions), learning attitude (26-30 questions), family environment (31-35 questions) and school environment (36-40 questions). All items were scored with 6 points, and the classification method was "completely inconsistent, mostly inconsistent, partially inconsistent, partially consistent, mostly consistent, completely consistent", which were respectively calculated as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 points. The higher the score, the more inclined to a certain type of learning motivation, and the lower the score, the weaker the motivation.

In terms of reliability and validity analysis, this study evaluated the reliability and validity of the measurement tool through Cronbach's α coefficient, KMO test and Bartlett test. In terms of reliability, Cronbach's α coefficient and standardized Cronbach's α coefficient were both 0.812 (>0.80), indicating that the internal consistency (reliability) of the measurement tool was high, the questionnaire results could reflect the measured characteristics more truly, and the questionnaire data analysis was also reliable. In addition, the study covered 26 measures and used 568 samples, which helped to improve the reliability of the reliability analysis. In terms of validity, the KMO value was 0.847 (>0.70), showing that the items of the measurement tool had a significant correlation in constructing the factors. The results of Bartlett's sphericity test show that the observed data are suitable for factor analysis, with an approximate chi-square value of 6237.081, a degree of freedom of 465, and a P-value less than 0.001, indicating that the validity quality of the survey data is very good. The results of reliability analysis and validity analysis show that the measurement tool has excellent performance in internal consistency and applicability, which provides a reliable basis for the reliability and validity evaluation of college students' learning drive.

V. FINDINGS

General condition

SPSS27.0, a statistical and processing tool, was used to make a general statistical description of all 568 data of the Questionnaire on Learning drive of college students, and the basic situation of the current learning drive of college students in local universities was obtained. For details, see Table 2. According to the average data, it can be seen that the average values of college students in learning motivation, goal orientation, self-efficacy and learning interest are slightly higher than 4, showing an above-average motivation trend, which indicates that on the whole, they basically hold a positive attitude towards learning drive factors. However, specific data also show that many students still lack strong learning drive. In addition, the standard deviation of college students in the seven dimensions is relatively small, indicating that the scores of college students in learning drive are relatively concentrated and show relatively stable characteristics on the whole. The average value of the dimension of learning motivation is 4.73, which is close to 5.00, and the median value is 5.00, which means that most of the students choose this item. The influence of school environment on learning drive is relatively low, with the mean value of 3.53 and the median value of 3.49, which means that most students choose some items that do not meet this requirement. In terms of kurtosis value, kurtosis >3 indicates that the distribution of sample data is sharp. For skewness, the skewness value is negative, which shows that the data has a trailing feature on the left side, which means that most students show a moderate tendency to these learning drive, however, there are still some individuals in some characteristics of the performance may not reach the expected level.

TABLE2: COLLEGE STUDENTS' LEARNING DRIVE DISTRIBUTION TABLE

| Project Category | M \pm SD | Median | Max | Min | Rank |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------|------|------|------|
| Learning motivation | 4.73 \pm 1.16 | 5.00 | 6.00 | 1.00 | 1 |
| Goal orientation | 4.65 \pm 1.09 | 4.98 | 6.00 | 1.00 | 2 |
| Self-efficacy | 4.59 \pm 1.02 | 4.72 | 6.00 | 1.00 | 3 |
| Learning interest | 4.28 \pm 1.27 | 4.49 | 6.00 | 1.00 | 4 |
| Learning attitude | 3.85 \pm 1.26 | 4.01 | 6.00 | 1.00 | 5 |
| Family environment | 3.53 \pm 1.37 | 3.49 | 6.00 | 1.00 | 6 |
| School environment | 3.52 \pm 1.08 | 3.47 | 6.00 | 1.00 | 7 |

Difference analysis of learning drive

Focusing on the difference of learning drive of students in local universities, five demographic variables such as gender, grade and major category were selected as the observation dimension to systematically investigate the difference characteristics of learning drive level of college students in different groups. In terms of research methods, by establishing an analysis model with five demographic characteristics as independent variables, independent sample T test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) are used to test the significance of differences in learning drive. The results are shown in Table 3.

Data analysis showed that gender factors showed a significant differentiation trend at the learning drive level ($p < 0.01$). The study confirmed that the female group systematically surpassed the learning drive dimensions such as learning motivation, goal orientation and self-efficacy, and their standardized scores showed statistically significant advantages over the male group. Specifically, there were significant differences in learning motivation ($T=4.13$, $\Delta M=0.13$), goal orientation ($T=4.76$, $\Delta M=0.22$) and self-efficacy ($T=3.67$, $\Delta M=0.21$). According to the effect size index test, gender had the strongest influence on goal orientation (Cohen's $d=0.41$), reaching the medium effect level; while the family environment dimension was statistically significant ($t=4.59$), but the effect size was only $d=0.17$, belonging to the weak effect category. This not only validates the objective existence of differences between groups from the probability dimension, but also reveals the substantial impact of gender variables on the learning drive structure from the perspective of educational practice.

The differential influence of grade dimension on learning drive structure of college students was investigated by one-way analysis of variance. The results showed that except for the self-efficacy dimension ($F=2.44$, $p=0.032$), the other six dimensions showed no statistically significant difference among different grades. Specifically, the score of self-efficacies showed a gradual increasing trend with the increase of grade, gradually increasing from the baseline level of freshman year (4.43 ± 1.01) to the peak value of senior year (4.68 ± 0.79), with a cumulative difference of $\Delta M=0.25$. This significant difference may be related to the cumulative effect of higher education. With the deepening of the professional curriculum system and the improvement of the participation in scientific research and practical activities, senior students gradually build a more stable sense

of academic efficacy through continuous accumulation of successful experience.

The independent sample T-test was used to systematically analyze the differences in seven dimensions of learning drive between liberal arts and science and engineering students, and the data results showed that there were highly significant statistical differences in all observed variables between the two groups of students ($p < 0.01$). From the comparison of mean values, liberal arts students showed relative advantages in all indicators, and the difference in learning motivation was the most prominent ($M_{\text{liberal arts}} = 4.79 \pm 1.24$ vs $M_{\text{science}} = 4.67 \pm 1.19$, $t = 10.37$). Although the difference between goal orientation ($M_{\text{arts}} = 4.70 \pm 0.73$ vs $M_{\text{science}} = 4.63 \pm 0.79$, $t = 11.05$) and self-efficacy ($M_{\text{arts}} = 4.61 \pm 1.10$ vs $m_{\text{science}} = 4.53 \pm 1.13$, $t = 9.83$) was small in numerical level, the T-value exceeded the critical threshold. It shows that the influence of subject attribute on cognitive-affective variables is robust. It is worth noting that the inter-group difference test values of learning interest ($t = 11.87$) and learning attitude ($t = 10.61$) reached the peak value, reflecting that liberal arts students are more inclined to link subject content with personal values, and their emotional engagement and cognitive engagement in the learning process may be positively regulated by the humanistic attributes of the subject. The instrumental learning characteristics of science and engineering students in the structured knowledge system may lead to the relatively limited score of their intrinsic interest dimension ($M_{\text{liberal arts}} = 4.31 \pm 1.02$ vs $M_{\text{science}} = 4.25 \pm 0.83$). In terms of environmental variables, although the difference between family environment ($t = 9.96$) and school environment ($t = 9.89$) reached a significant level, the absolute score was generally lower than that of psychological variables, and the standard deviation was small (family environment $SD_{\text{liberal arts}} = 0.86$ vs $SD_{\text{science}} = 0.74$; School environment $SD_{\text{Liberal arts}} = 0.65$ vs $SD_{\text{Science}} = 0.64$).

TABLE3: TEST THE DIFFERENCE OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF DIFFERENT SAMPLES IN THE DIMENSIONS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS' LEARNING DRIVE(M±SD)

| Characteristic | Learning motivation | Goal orientation | Self-efficacy | Learning interest | Learning attitude | Family environment | School environment |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Female | 4.82±0.96 | 4.75±1.14 | 4.66±0.90 | 4.34±1.29 | 4.02±1.28 | 3.62±1.42 | 3.56±0.82 |
| Male | 4.69±1.28 | 4.53±1.05 | 4.45±1.12 | 4.17±1.23 | 3.72±1.19 | 3.39±1.26 | 3.47±0.79 |
| T/F | 4.13*** | 4.76*** | 3.67*** | 4.09*** | 2.98*** | 4.59*** | 3.58*** |
| Freshman | 4.35±0.89 | 4.40±0.90 | 4.43±1.01 | 4.31±0.95 | 3.78±0.91 | 3.33±1.14 | 3.31±1.06 |
| Sophomore | 4.41±1.04 | 4.46±0.74 | 4.57±0.98 | 4.26±0.89 | 3.85±0.87 | 3.41±1.05 | 3.46±1.17 |
| Junior | 4.69±0.96 | 4.72±0.65 | 4.64±0.73 | 4.29±0.87 | 3.90±0.85 | 3.30±0.67 | 3.59±0.93 |
| Senior | 4.78±1.37 | 4.72±0.71 | 4.68±0.79 | 4.36±0.76 | 4.02±0.73 | 3.73±0.65 | 3.76±0.94 |
| T/F | 0.85 | 1.16 | 2.44* | 1.03 | 1.15 | 0.53 | 0.69 |
| Liberal Arts | 4.79±1.24 | 4.70±0.73 | 4.61±1.10 | 4.31±1.02 | 4.27±1.18 | 3.62±0.86 | 3.59±0.65 |
| Science Engineering | 4.67±1.19 | 4.63±0.79 | 4.53±1.13 | 4.25±0.83 | 4.01±1.09 | 3.49±0.74 | 3.48±0.64 |
| T/F | 10.37*** | 11.05*** | 9.83*** | 11.87*** | 10.61*** | 9.96*** | 9.89*** |
| Rural | 4.89±0.88 | 4.85±0.64 | 4.42±0.87 | 4.29±1.07 | 4.21±1.23 | 3.43±0.56 | 3.58±0.81 |
| Urban | 4.63±1.25 | 4.54±1.53 | 4.61±0.84 | 4.27±0.95 | 3.79±1.01 | 3.66±0.87 | 3.57±0.83 |
| T/F | 5.76*** | 3.95** | 3.73** | 2.35* | 5.68*** | 5.01*** | 2.29* |
| Only Child | 4.63±0.81 | 4.36±1.16 | 4.39±0.87 | 4.45±0.75 | 3.70±0.84 | 3.91±1.03 | 3.52±0.76 |
| Non-only Child | 4.81±0.89 | 4.67±1.02 | 4.51±0.96 | 4.21±1.02 | 3.84±1.12 | 3.55±0.77 | 3.54±0.74 |
| T/F | 5.07*** | 5.15*** | 6.24*** | 5.55*** | 5.43*** | 4.71*** | 4.59*** |

Note:***p、**p、*p represent significance levels of 0.01, 0.05 and 0.1, respectively.

The performance of rural ($n=186$) and urban ($n=382$) students in seven dimensions of learning motivation, goal orientation and self-efficacy was analyzed. The results showed that there were statistically significant differences between urban and rural students in most of the observed indicators ($p < 0.05$), but the direction and degree of differences were asymmetrical, reflecting the multi-dimensional influence of urban and rural education ecology on students' learning characteristics. In terms of core driving force, the scores of "learning motivation" (4.89 ± 0.88 vs 4.63 ± 1.25 , $t = 5.76^{***}$) and "goal orientation" (4.85 ± 0.64 vs 4.54 ± 1.53 , $t = 3.95^{**}$) of rural students were significantly higher than those of urban students. This result may stem from the deep-rooted belief that "education changes destiny" in the rural environment, and the family's instrumental expectation of education strengthens students' extrinsic motivation. It is worth noting that rural students show a stronger tendency of continuous engagement in the dimension of "learning attitude" (4.21 ± 1.23 vs 3.79 ± 1.01 , $t = 5.68^{***}$), which may be related to the reality of relatively scarce educational resources, which encourages students to cherish learning opportunities more. However, the "self-efficacy" of urban students was significantly better (4.61 ± 0.84 vs 4.42 ± 0.87 , $t = 3.73^{**}$), indicating that the urban education system, through the diversity of curriculum and extracurricular activities, more effectively increased students' confidence in complex tasks. In terms of environmental support, the urban and rural groups showed a contradictory pattern of difference, and the "family environment" score of urban students was significantly higher (3.66 ± 0.87 vs 3.43 ± 0.56 , $t = 5.01^{***}$), which was related to the dominant status of family economic capital and cultural capital.

For the difference analysis between the only child ($n=165$) and the non-only child ($n=403$), the independent sample T test was used to test the difference in 7 dimensions, and the results showed that there were significant differences between the two groups in all dimensions. In the dimensions of motivation (4.81 ± 0.89 vs. 4.63 ± 0.81) and goal orientation (4.67 ± 1.02 vs. 4.36 ± 1.16), the mean value of non-only children was significantly higher than that of only children ($p < 0.01$). Non-only-child has better self-efficacy (4.51 ± 0.96) ($T = 6.24^{***}$), while only-child has a slight advantage in learning interest dimension (4.45 ± 0.75) ($T = 5.55^{***}$). Only-child usually receives more concentrated input in family education and has more systematic interest development. The environmental score of one-child families (3.91 ± 1.03) was significantly better than that of non-one-child families (3.55 ± 0.77 , $T = 4.71^{***}$), which is consistent with the prediction of resource dilution theory: one-child families can provide more intensive emotional support and material resources. However, some of the high family support did not translate into better learning attitudes (3.70 ± 0.84 vs. 3.84 ± 1.12), which may be related to social environment, traditional attitudes and other factors. From the perspective of school environment, there is no substantial difference between the two groups.

Correlation analysis of learning drive

Focusing on the endogenous influence mechanism of learning drive of local college students, systematic analysis

finds that there are complex dynamic correlations between learning drive and core internal factors such as learning motivation, goal orientation, self-efficacy, learning interest and learning attitude. Based on theoretical construction and significance test (p values less than 0.001). The results are shown in Table 4. The action paths and coordination mechanisms of each element on learning drive can be summarized as follows: As the core engine of the dynamic system, learning motivation presents a significant positive correlation between the strength of students' learning motivation and learning drive, or a significant two-way reinforcement relationship. That is, the stronger students' learning motivation is, the stronger their learning drive will be. At the same time, the inner driving force of individuals is further consolidated through the feedback loop of academic achievement, forming a virtuous closed loop of "motivation stimulates action -- action strengthens motivation"; Goal orientation has a structural influence on learning drive through cognitive focus and path guidance. Students with clear and specific achievement goals can provide clear learning direction and value anchor for individuals, and promote learning behaviour from passive acceptance to active exploration. On the contrary, students with missing or vague goals have relatively weak learning drive; In the dimension of self-efficacy, students' self-efficacy has a significant positive impact on learning drive. Students with high self-efficacy tend to respond to academic challenges in a positive mode, and their internal confidence level and behavioural resilience together support the stability of learning drive. On the contrary, students with weak sense of efficacy are easy to fall into the negative cycle of "cognitive doubt, emotional burnout and behaviour withdrawal", which leads to the structural imbalance of dynamic system. In the dimension of learning interest, students' learning interest, as the initial motivation of students, has a significant positive effect on learning drive. Strong learning interest can activate students' deep learning drive and promote knowledge construction from mechanical memory to meaning generation. At the same time, through the improvement of classroom interaction participation, the spiral pattern of "interest drives input - input deepens interest" is formed. In the dimension of learning attitude, there is a significant positive correlation between learning attitude and learning drive. Positive learning attitude not only strengthens individuals' value perception of learning tasks, but also effectively filters external environment interference and forms a stable endogenous dynamic support system. On the whole, college students' learning drive is influenced by multiple internal factors and forms a synergistic effect through multi-level interaction. These factors interact with each other within individuals and jointly promote the formation of learning drive.

TABLE 4: ANALYSIS OF THE INFLUENCE OF INTERNAL ELEMENTS OF LEARNING DRIVE ON LEARNING DRIVE

| Dimensionality | learning drive | Learning motivation | Goal orientation | Self-efficacy | Learning interest | Learning attitude |
|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Learning drive | 1(0.000***) | | | | | |
| Learning motivation | 0.915(0.000***) | 1(0.000***) | | | | |
| Goal orientation | 0.938(0.000***) | 0.862(0.000***) | 1(0.000***) | | | |
| Self-efficacy | 0.944(0.000***) | 0.823(0.000***) | 0.870(0.000***) | 1(0.000***) | | |
| Learning interest | 0.949(0.000***) | 0.853(0.000***) | 0.852(0.000***) | 0.865(0.000***) | 1(0.000***) | |
| Learning attitude | 0.951(0.000***) | 0.837(0.000***) | 0.848(0.000***) | 0.831(0.000***) | 0.879(0.000***) | 1(0.000***) |

Through the correlation analysis of the external environment (family environment, school environment) and learning drive of students in local colleges and universities, the correlation between the two is discussed, and the significance test is conducted (p value is less than 0.001). The results are shown in Table 5. At the level of family environment, there is an obvious positive correlation between family environment and learning drive. As a key channel to shape learning habits and autonomous learning ability, family can effectively promote students' academic development by providing emotional support and growth space through positive environmental elements such as learning atmosphere creation, interest stimulation mechanism and behaviour norms cultivation. In terms of school environment, the empirical analysis also reveals a significant positive correlation between school environment and learning drive. The research finds that the professional competence, personality charisma and harmonious teacher-student interaction of the teacher team significantly affect students' classroom participation. The positive interaction between peer groups constitutes the source of continuous learning motivation. The collective elements such as class culture, academic atmosphere and dormitory environment also have a significant gain effect on learning drive.

TABLE 5: ANALYSIS TO THE INFLUENCE FACTORS OF THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT OF LEARNING DRIVE ON LEARNING DRIVE

| Dimensionality | learning drive | Family environment | School environment |
|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Learning drive | 1(0.000***) | | |
| Family environment | 0.937(0.000***) | 1(0.000***) | |
| School environment | 0.935(0.000***) | 0.895(0.000***) | 1(0.000***) |

VI. DISCUSSION

This research aims to disclose the multi-dimensional characteristics and influencing factors of the learning impetus of students in local universities through empirical analysis, thereby offering a scientific basis for the further construction of enhancement strategies. Judging from the abovementioned data and investigation results, the learning impetus, due to the interactive influence of internal and external elements, has led to the weakening of the learning impetus effect of students in local universities at present. For this reason, targeted suggestions are proposed from the three aspects of self-education, family education, and school education. Through systematic intervention, the endogenous

motivation of students is stimulated, the external support environment is optimized, and ultimately, the comprehensive improvement of the quality of higher education is achieved.

At the Self-education level: endogenous motivation to stimulate students' self-development

Self-education constitutes the core for the generation of learning motivation, the crux of which lies in stimulating students' self-regulatory capacity and intrinsic driving force. Data analysis reveals that self-efficacy ($\beta=0.944$, $p<0.001$) and learning interest ($\beta=0.949$, $p<0.001$) are the most potent predictive variables of learning drive. Firstly, enhance self-awareness and construct a distinct learning goal orientation. The elevation of self-awareness serves as the basis for students' autonomous learning. Only when students have a clear understanding of their interests, strengths, weaknesses, and goals will they be able to identify the genuine impetus in the learning process. Well-defined learning goals can assist students in maintaining focus and motivation throughout the lengthy learning process, and the realization of these goals brings a sense of achievement, further stimulating the motivation to learn. Secondly, establish a scientific learning behaviour pattern and set tasks and reward mechanisms by stages. Effective time management represents an important means to enhance the motivation of self-education. If students can rationally plan their time, avoid procrastination and ineffective learning, they will improve learning efficiency and reduce learning pressure, such as the Pomodoro Technique (25 minutes of concentration + 5 minutes of rest), integrated curricula, DDL reminders, focus timing functions, and so forth. Finally, shape positive psychological capital and establish a self-motivation mechanism. Self-motivation is at the core of learning drive. Students in local universities typically confront considerable pressure and challenges. How to overcome predicaments and maintain a positive mindset is the key to stimulating learning drive. Self-motivation is not merely driven by the external environment but also stems from the inner source of power within students. Guide students to establish positive thinking patterns, assist them in drawing experiences from failures, and enhance psychological resilience. Encourage students to engage in self-affirmation, regularly summarize their progress and achievements, and strengthen their confidence in their own capabilities.

At the family education level: From resource compensation to the creation of growth-oriented environment

Family education is an important source of students' learning drive, especially in local universities. In such cases, family often provides the greatest support when students encounter difficulties. Family environment ($r = 0.937$, $p < 0.001$) has a significant positive effect on learning motivation, but the performance of rural students and urban students, as well as only-child groups, shows asymmetry. Data shows that although rural students have an advantage in "learning motivation" ($M = 4.89$) and "goal orientation" ($M = 4.85$), their family environment score ($M = 3.43$) is significantly lower than that of urban students ($M = 3.66$),

which also confirms the explanation of the dilution of resources theory for the insufficient support from non-only-child families. The role of family education is reflected in aspects such as emotional support, creation of a learning atmosphere, and guidance of values. Firstly, family emotional support can enhance students' psychological resilience and help them maintain a positive attitude when facing academic pressure. Parents' care and encouragement, especially when students encounter difficulties or setbacks, can give them sufficient confidence and motivation. Encourage parents to establish good communication channels with their children, regularly care about their learning situation and psychological state, and help them relieve learning pressure. Parents can provide appropriate guidance in learning, but avoid excessive interference, allowing children to explore and grow independently with the support of parents. Secondly, create a good family learning environment. A good family learning environment is crucial for enhancing students' learning motivation. A family environment with a good learning atmosphere can stimulate students' interest in learning and provide sufficient space and resources for autonomous learning. Finally, guide correct life values and career planning. Through teaching and personal example, help children establish correct academic views, encourage parents to participate in discussions about their children's career planning, provide diverse career selection information for children, and help students clarify their future development goals.

At the school education level: From standardized teaching to the reconstruction of ecological support systems

School education is an important aspect for enhancing the learning drive of students in local universities. Schools not only impart knowledge but also create a diverse learning environment and social platform for students. Through reasonable teaching design, teacher incentives, and support from school resources, schools can provide strong motivational support for students. School environment ($r = 0.935$, $p < 0.001$) indirectly shapes learning drive through teacher interaction, peer motivation, and cultural atmosphere. However, the overall score of school environment is relatively low ($M = 3.53$), and the "learning interest" of science and engineering students ($M = 4.25$) is significantly weaker than that of liberal arts students ($M = 4.31$), highlighting the insufficient adaptability of traditional teaching models to the characteristics of disciplines. Firstly, innovative teaching models and stimulating learning interest. Traditional teaching methods often overly emphasize the imparting of knowledge and neglect students' initiative and participation. To enhance students' learning drive, schools should actively adopt various teaching models, such as interactive teaching, project-based learning, and flipped classrooms, to increase students' sense of participation and achievement, and encourage teachers to adopt teaching methods such as group discussions, case analysis, and field research to enhance students' practical operation ability and interest in learning content. Secondly, incentive mechanisms and academic support. Schools should establish a complete academic incentive mechanism through rewards, commendations, academic competitions, etc., to stimulate students' learning motivation. At the same

time, schools should also provide sufficient academic support to help students solve learning difficulties. Schools can set up scholarships, outstanding academic awards, etc., to encourage students to achieve excellent results in academic research and extracurricular activities. In addition, they can provide services such as academic tutoring and psychological counselling to help students overcome learning obstacles and maintain a good learning state. Finally, social practice and career development support. Local university students usually face employment pressure, so when enhancing learning drive, schools should also pay attention to providing students with career planning and social practice opportunities. Through practical activities, students can apply the knowledge they have learned to practice, enhancing their sense of achievement and practical ability. Encourage schools to cooperate with enterprises, social institutions, etc., to provide abundant internship opportunities and social practice projects, allowing students to discover interests and gain experience through practice. Schools should offer career development courses to help students understand workplace needs, formulate personal career plans, and enhance their long-term motivation for learning.

VII. LIMITATION

This study contributes to the literature by presenting significant and useful findings. It also enables teachers to pay attention to the differential needs of various types of students and design diverse learning tasks to ensure that each student can reap the maximum benefits from their development. Nevertheless, this study has certain limitations. Firstly, the sample was selected from five local ordinary colleges in Shandong Province, China. It remains unclear whether the research results can be extended to other regions or universities at other levels. For a larger sample group, further studies need to be conducted in diversified regions. Secondly, in future research, a mixed qualitative and quantitative research approach can be adopted. Through classroom observations and in-depth interviews, a foundation can be provided for causal relationships. Long-term tracking and monitoring can be carried out, which will help reduce possible measurement biases.

REFERENCES

- Fischer M, & Sliwka D. (2018). Confidence in Knowledge or Confidence in the Ability to Learn: An Experiment on the Causal Effects of Beliefs on Motivation. *Games & Economic Behaviour*, 111(9):122-142.
- He Husheng,Zhao Wenxin,(2019).On the triple logic of integrating revolutionary culture into ideological and political theory courses in colleges and universities. *Teaching and research*,(8):76-83.
- Kim Y E, Brady A C, & Wolters C A. (2018). Development and validation of the brief regulation of motivation scale. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 67(10):259-265.
- Qin Chaofeng, Yang Jingjing. (2021). Study on Learning Motivation and Motivation Strategies of post-1995 college students: A case study of Physics Department of Yuncheng University. *Forestry Teaching*, (6):104-108.
- Qin Haiyan.(2018). Study on the stimulation of freshmen's learning motivation by efficient incentive method: Based on the empirical investigation of two universities in Anhui Province. *Journal of Huainan Teachers College*,20(1):135-140.
- Young,P.T. (1936). *Motivation and Behaviour*. New York: Wiley, 1936.
- Zhang Rui.(2024).Investigation on the current situation of college students' learning motivation in ideological and political courses and improving strategies----Take three universities in Jiangsu Province as examples. *Jiangsu higher education*,(3):110-115.
- Zorn C, Dillenseger J P, Bauer E, et al.(2019). Motivation of student radiographers in learning situations based on role-play simulation : A multicentric approach involving trainers and students. *Radiography*, 25(1):18-25.