International
Journal of Human Sciences
ISSN:2458-9489

Volume 14 Issue 3 Year: 2017

The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences

Kubilay Çimen[1]

Abstract

This study aims to evaluate the achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences according to a number of variables.

1073 students studying in the Departments of Teaching, Sport Management, Coaching and Recreation in the Faculties of Sport Sciences at Gazi University, Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University and Selcuk University participated in this study voluntarily. Volunteers were asked to complete the Socio-Demographic Information Form, Achievement Orientation Scale and Academic Self-Regulation Scale. The Achievement Orientation Scale was created by Elliot and Murayama in 2008 and adapted into Turkish in 2012 by Uçar with the validity and reliability value of .89. The Academic Self-Regulation Scale, on which validity and reliability studies have been carried out, was created by Martinez Pons in 2000, modified by Maclellan and Soden in 2006 and adapted into Turkish by Kaplan in 2014. Data collected was registered using the IBM SPSS 22 package. Inventories, which contain personal information about participants, were given as frequency (f) or percentage (%) values corresponding to the average score. The data had a non-parametric distribution. Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis analyses were used for statistical analysis.

As a result, it is proven that achievement orientation and self-regulation are directly related to the gender, university and department. The reason for this may be the fact that universities and instructors, who aspire to develop students' professional and personal characteristics and increase students' knowledge and awareness, also desire to make students attain individual self-sufficiency by educating them in accordance with students' goals.

Keywords: Achievement orientation, academic self-regulation, student

INTRODUCTION

Achievement Goal Orientation Theory can be defined as the theory of how individuals concentrate on their goals in order to be successful and attain them. Reasons which make them concentrate are their belief in their ability to regulate their skills (Ames, 1992) as well as their perception of the reasons of learning (Pintrich et al., 1991; Kaplan and Maehr, 2007; Pintrich, 2000).

Achievement goal orientation provides the main motivation that individuals need in order to be successful. That is to say, it deals with the reasons behind the choices that students make in order to be successful in their tasks (Kaplan and Maehr, 2007; Pintrich, 2000). It explains why students are interested in learning and how they perceive their reasons for learning (Pintrich et al., 1991). When it is considered that individuals should place importance on strategies such as self-evaluation, then abilities such as setting objectives and planning so that they attain their goal as

[1] Assist. Prof. Dr., Gelişim University, School of Physical Education and Sports, kcimen@gelisim.edu.tr

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

well as the ability to self-regulate and other skills are needed. Students with the ability to self-regulate manage their own learning process and take action to gain knowledge and skills in educational environments, rather than relying on their instructors, family members or other educative elements in order.

Educational environments which promote self-regulation are required in order to educate students with the ability to self-regulate. Self-regulated learning is the ability to control one's own learning and understanding. In order to do this it is required that objectives be set and strategies chosen which will be useful in reaching these objectives, and that the strategies and processes to attain the objectives be followed.

Students who can self-regulate approach their tasks with self-confidence and discipline. They understand their ability and knowledge. They look for the knowledge that they need in order to become successful. This proves that self-regulation is very important in order to be successful (Aydın, 2012; Zimmerman, 2000). Self-regulation can be defined as the emotions, thoughts and behaviors which are developed by an individual to achieve a goal. On the other hand, 'academic' self-regulation can be defined as the active cognitive and behavioral participation of an individual in order to achieve academic goals.

The adoption of lifelong learning in education, of individuals being responsible for their own learning process, and the prevalence of the constructivist approach in learning has brought the notion of self-regulation to the forefront (Uygun, 2012). One of the most prominent aims in education is to create individuals who take responsibility for their learning, control their own learning process, participate actively in the process, trust their abilities and exploit the advantages these abilities bring (Zimmerman, 2000). After a literature review, it was found that there are some studies examining students' achievement orientation and academic self-regulation (Kaplan, 2014; Uçar, 2012; Solmaz et al., 2014; Maclellan and Soden, 2006; Pepe, 2015). However, no study has been conducted on students studying in different departments of Faculties of Sport Sciences.

This study thus aims to evaluate the achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences according to a number of variables.

METHOD

Formation of the Voluntary Groups:

The population of this study was 1113 randomly chosen volunteer student studying in the Department of Teaching, Department of Sport Management, Department of Coaching and Department of Recreation in the Faculties of Sport Sciences in Gazi University, Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University and Selcuk University. After examining the questionnaires received from universities, some under-filled or wrongly filled in questionnaires were eliminated. In the end, a total of 1073 questionnaires were evaluated. Volunteers were asked to complete the Socio-Demographic Information Form, Achievement Orientation Scale and Academic Self-Regulation Scale.

Socio-Demographic Information Form:

Volunteers were asked to fill in the Personal Information Form which consisted of three questions: gender, university and department.

Achievement Orientation Scale:

In this study, the Achievement Orientation Scale, which was created by Elliot and Murayama in 2008 and adapted into Turkish by Uçar in 2012 with the validity and reliability value of .89, was used to determine the achievement orientation of students. The Achievement Orientation Scale consists of 12 questions and four sub-dimensions. Questions 1, 3 and 7 form the 'learning approach orientation' sub-dimensions. Questions 6, 10 and 12 form the

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

'performance avoid orientation'. Questions 2, 4 and 8 form the 'performance approach orientation'. Questions 5, 9 and 11 form the 'learning avoid orientation'. A five-level Likert scaling was used in the scale, with the items "Strongly disagree", "Disagree", "Neither agree nor disagree", "Agree" and "Strongly agree".

Academic Self-Regulation Scale:

Academic Self-Regulation Scale, on which validity and reliability studies have been carried out and which was created by Martinez Pons in 2000, modified by Maclellan and Soden in 2006 and adapted into Turkish by Kaplan in 2014, was used to determine the academic self-regulation of students. This scale consists of 48 questions. The Academic Self-regulation Scale has four sub-dimensions. In the scale, questions 6 to 20 form the 'goal-setting' sub-dimension. Questions 26 to 39 form the strategy implementation'. Questions 40 to 54 form the 'strategy-pursuing'. Questions 21 to 24 form 'support-taking'. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale is estimated as .97. A seven-level Likert scaling was used, with the items, "Strongly disagree", "Disagree", "Somewhat disagree", "Neither agree nor disagree", "Somewhat agree", "Agree" and "Strongly agree", or, "Never" to "Every time" items.

Statistical Assessment:

Data collected was registered with IBM SPSS 22 package. Inventories which contain personal information about participants were given as frequency (f) or percentage (%) values corresponding to the average score. Data had a non-parametric distribution. Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis analyses were used for statistical analysis.

RESULTS

Table 1 Socio-Demographic Features of the Participants

Variance		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	586	53.7
	Female	487	44.6
University	Gazi University	346	31.7
	Selcuk University	397	36.4
	Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University	330	30.2
Department	Teaching	169	15.5
	Sport Management	265	24.3
	Coaching	350	32.1
	Recreation	289	26.5

It can be understood from Table 1 that 53.7% of the volunteers were men, 44.6% were women, 31.7% were from Gazi University, 36.4% were from Selcuk University, 30.2% were from Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University, 15.5% were studying in the Department of Teaching, 24.3% were studying in the Department of Sport Management, 32.1% were studying in the Department of Coaching and 26.5% were studying in the Department of Recreation.

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics of Answers Given by Participants to the Scales

		N	Min	Max	X±SS
Achievement Orientation	Learning Approach Orientation	1073	1.00	5.00	4.01±0.77
	Performance Avoid Orientation	1073	1.00	5.00	3.74± 0.92
	Performance Approach Orientation	1073	1.00	5.00	3.90±0.81
	Learning Avoid Orientation	1073	1.00	5.00	3.82± 0.79
Academic Self-Regulation	Goal-Setting	1073	1.67	7.00	5.27± 0.93
	Strategy Implementation	1073	1.00	7.00	5.13±1.09
	Strategy-Pursuing	1073	1.22	7.00	5.23±1.23
	Support-Taking	1073	1.00	7.00	5.16 ±1.18

It can be understood from Table 2 that, with regard to the Achievement Orientation Scale, the volunteers' average for the learning approach orientation was 4.01±0.77, for the performance avoid orientation was 3.74±0.92, for the performance approach orientation was 3.90±0.8 and for the learning avoid orientation was 3.82±0.79. With regard to the sub-dimensions of Academic Self-Regulation Scale the average for the goal-setting was 5.27±0.93, for the strategy implementation was 5.13±1.09, for the strategy-pursuing was 5.23±1.23 and for the support-taking was 5.16 ±1.18.

Table 3 Evaluation of Participants' Achievement Orientation Based on their Gender

			n	median	min	max	Z	P
Achievement Orientation	Learning Approach Orientation	Male	586	4.00	1.00	5.00	-1.232	.218
		Female	487	4.00	1.00	5.00		
	Performance Avoid Orientation	Male	586	4.00	1.00	5.00	-.235	.814
		Female	487	4.00	1.00	5.00		
	Performance Approach Orientation	Male	586	3.00	1.00	5.00	-2.067	.039
		Female	487	4.00	1.00	5.00		
	Learning Avoid Orientation	Male	586	3.00	1.00	5.00	-2.948	.003
		Female	487	4.00	1.00	5.00		

The participants' achievement orientation based on their gender are presented in Table 3. It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions of achievement orientation that there was a significant difference between the averages for performance approach orientation and learning avoid orientation ($p<0.05$).

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

Table 4 Evaluation of Participants' Academic Self-Regulation Based on their Gender

			n	median	min	Max	Z	P
Academic Self-Regulation	Support-Taking	Male	586	5.25	1.00	7.00	-3.021	.003
		Female	487	5.50	1.00	7.00		
	Goal-Setting	Male	586	5.27	1.67	7.00	-2.376	.018
		Female	487	5.33	2.20	7.00		
	Strategy Implementation	Male	586	5.29	1.00	7.00	-2.413	.016
		Female	487	5.36	2.29	7.00		
	Strategy-Pursuing	Male	586	5.33	1.22	7.00	-2.193	.028
		Female	487	5.56	1.78	7.00		

Participants' academic self-regulation based on their gender are presented in Table 4. It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions of academic self-regulation that there was a significant statistical difference between the averages of support-taking, goal-setting, strategy implementation and strategy-pursuing($p<0.05$).

Table 5 Evaluation of Participants' Achievement Orientations Based on their University

	University	*n*	*median*	min	max	X^2	P	Difference
Learning Approach Orientation	Gazi University[1]	346	4.33	2.00	5.00	46.119	.000	1-2 1-3 2-3
	Selcuk University[2]	397	4.00	1.00	5.00			
	Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University[3]	330	3.00	1.00	5.00			
Performance Avoid Orientation	Gazi University[1]	346	6.00	1.00	5.00	21.901	.000	1-2 1-3
	Selcuk University[2]	397	4.00	1.00	5.00			
	Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University[3]	330	4.00	1.00	5.00			
Performance Approach Orientation	Gazi University[1]	346	6.00	1.67	5.67	36.664	.000	1-2 1-3
	Selcuk University[2]	397	4.00	1.00	5.00			
	Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University[3]	330	4.00	1.00	5.00			
Learning Avoid Orientation	Gazi University[1]	346	6.00	2.00	5.00	12.000	.002	1-2 1-3
	Selcuk University[2]	397	4.00	1.00	5.00			

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

	Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University[3]	330	4.00	1.00	5.00			

Participants' achievement orientation based on their university are presented in Table 5. It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions of achievement orientation that there was a significant statistical difference between Gazi University and Selcuk University, between Gazi University and Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University and between Selcuk University and Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University regarding learning approach orientation sub-dimension. With regard to the performance avoid orientation, performance approach orientation and learning avoid orientation sub-dimensions, there was a significant statistical difference between Gazi University and Selcuk University, between Gazi University and Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University ($p<0.05$, $p<0.001$).

Table 6 Evaluation of Participants' Academic Self-Regulation Based on their University

	University	***n***	***median***	**min**	**max**	**X²**	**P**	**Difference**
Support-Taking	Gazi University[1]	346	5.25	1.00	7.00	7.890	.019	1-2
	Selcuk University[2]	397	5.50	2.75	7.00			
	MuglaSıtkı Koçman University[3]	330	5.25	1.00	7.00			
Goal-Setting	Gazi University[1]	346	5.27	2.53	7.00	8.950	.011	1-2
	Selcuk University[2]	397	5.47	2.93	7.00			
	Mugla Sıtkı Koçman Universityi[3]	330	5.30	1.67	7.00			
Strategy Implementation	Gazi University[1]	346	5.36	2.07	7.00	6.932	.031	2-3
	Selcuk University[2]	397	5.43	2.29	7.00			
	Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University[3]	330	5.14	1.00	7.00			
Strategy Pursuing	Gazi University[1]	346	5.44	2.00	7.00	9.948	.007	2-3
	Selcuk University[2]	397	5.56	2.44	7.00			
	Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University[3]	330	5.28	1.22	7.00			

Participants' academic self-regulation based on their university are presented in Table 6. It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions for self-regulation that there was a significant statistical difference between Gazi University and Selcuk University regarding the support-taking and goal-setting sub-dimensions. With regard to the strategy implementation and strategy-pursuing sub-dimensions, there was a significant statistical difference between Selcuk University and Mugla Sıtkı Kocman University ($p<0.05$).

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

Table 7 Evaluation of Participants' Achievement Orientation Based on their Department

	Department	*n*	*median*	min	max	X^2	P	Difference
Learning Approach Orientation	Teaching[1]	169	4.00	2.00	5.00	7.735	.052	-
	Sport Management[2]	265	4.33	1.00	5.00			
	Coaching[3]	350	4.00	1.00	5.00			
	Recreation[4]	289	4.00	1.00	5.00			
Performance Avoid Orientation	Teaching[1]	169	4.00	1.00	5.00	18.739	.000	1-3
	Sport Management[2]	265	4.00	1.00	5.00			
	Coaching[3]	350	3.00	1.00	5.00			
	Recreation[4]	289	4.00	1.00	5.00			
Performance Approach Orientation	Teaching[1]	169	4.00	1.67	5.00	13.945	.003	1-3 2-3 3-4
	Sport Management[2]	265	4.33	1.00	5.00			
	Coaching[3]	350	3.00	1.00	5.00			
	Recreation[4]	289	4.00	1.33	5.00			
Learning Avoid Orientation	Teaching[1]	169	4.00	1.67	5.00	18.497	.000	1-3 1-4
	Sport Management[2]	265	4.00	1.00	5.00			
	Coaching[3]	350	3.00	1.00	5.00			
	Recreation[4]	289	3.00	1.00	5.00			

Participants' achievement orientation based on their department are presented in Table 7. It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions for achievement orientation that there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Coaching regarding the performance avoid orientation. With regard to the performance approach orientation, there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Coaching, between the Departments of Sport Management and Coaching and between the Departments of Coaching and Recreation. Regarding the learning avoid orientation, there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Coaching and between the Departments of Teaching and Recreation ($p<0.05$, $p<0.001$).

Table 8 Evaluation of Participants' Academic Self-Regulation Based on their Department

	Department	*n*	*median*	min	max	X^2	P	Difference
Support- Taking	Teaching[1]	169	5.00	2.75	7.00	24.557	.000	1-2 2-4 3-4
	Sport Management[2]	265	5.50	1.50	7.00			
	Coaching[3]	350	5.50	1.00	7.00			
	Recreation[4]	289	5.00	1.00	7.00			
Goal-Setting	Teaching[1]	169	5.67	3.47	7.00	37.700	.000	1-4 2-4 3-4
	Sport Management[2]	265	5.33	2.20	7.00			
	Coaching[3]	350	5.40	1.67	7.00			
	Recreation[4]	289	5.13	2.53	7.00			
Strategy	Teaching[1]	169	5.43	2.07	7.00	13.643	.003	2-4

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

Implementation	Sport Management[2]	265	5.50	1.50	7.00			
	Coaching[3]	350	5.29	1.00	7.00			
	Recreation[4]	289	5.00	2.07	7.00			
Strategy-Pursuing	Teaching[1]	169	5.56	2.00	7.00	33.593	.000	1-4 2-3 2-4 3-4
	Sport Management[2]	265	5.67	1.78	7.00			
	Coaching[3]	350	5.33	1.22	7.00			
	Recreation[4]	289	5.22	2.44	7.00			

Participants' academic self-regulation based on their department are presented in Table 8. It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions for academic self-regulation that there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Sport Management, between the Departments of Sport Management and Recreation and between the Departments of Coaching and Recreation regarding the support-taking. With regard to the goal-setting, there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Recreation, between the Departments of Sport management and Recreation and between the Departments of Coaching and Recreation. Regarding the strategy implementation, there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Sport management and Recreation, whereas in the strategy-pursuing a significant statistical difference was seen between the Departments of Teaching and Recreation, between the Departments of Sport Management and Coaching, between the Departments of Sport Management and Recreation and between the Departments of Coaching and Recreation ($p<0.05$, $p<0.001$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study was conducted assuming that there is a strong relation between the academic self-regulation and achievement orientation of university students, and it has been found that the average of the Achievement Orientation Scale's learning approach orientation sub-dimension was 4.01±0.77, the average of the performance avoid orientation was 3.74±0.92, the average of the performance approach orientation was 3.90±0.81 and the average of learning avoid orientation was 3.82±0.79 for the volunteers who participated in the study. It can be clearly seen that achievement orientation in learning was higher than the achievement orientation in performance. When the literature was reviewed, it was seen in the study conducted by Uçar (2012) on prospective English teachers, that the average of the achievement orientation's learning approach orientation was 4.21, the average of the performance avoid orientation was 2.88, the average of the performance approach orientation was 3.18 and the average of the learning avoid orientation was 4.12. In another study conducted by Arslan (2011) on prospective Turkish, Social Sciences and form teachers, it was found that the learning and performance approach orientation of those prospective teachers was high, while their performance avoid orientation was low. These findings correspond with our study.

Regarding the averages of the sub-dimensions of Academic Self-Regulation Scale, it was seen that the average of the goal-setting was 5.27±0.93, of the strategy implementation was 5.13±1.09, of the strategy-pursuing was 5.23±1.23 and of the support-taking was 5.16 ±1.18. When the literature was reviewed regarding the averages of sub-dimensions of academic self-regulation in a study conducted by Kaplan (2014) of students in a Department of Physical Education and Sports or in a School of Sports, it was seen that the average of goal-setting was (X=4.83, Ss=1.06), strategy implementation was (X=4.49, Ss=1.16), of strategy-pursuing was (X=4.54, Ss=1.17) and of support-taking was (X=4.24, Ss=1.29).

It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions of achievement orientation of participants based on their gender that there was significant difference between the averages of performance approach orientation and learning avoid orientation. When the literature was

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

reviewed, it was found that, in the study conducted by Uçar (2012) on prospective English teachers, there was a significant difference between the learning approach orientation sub-dimension of achievement orientation for male and female candidates (t (184)= -2.678, p= 0.008) and in their general achievement orientation scores (t (184)= -1.981, p= 0.049) depending on their gender. However there was no significant gender-related difference observed in male and female teacher candidates regarding performance avoid (t (184)= -1.387, p= 0.167), performance approach (t (184)= -0.821, p= 0.413) and learning avoid orientations (t (184)= -1.658, p= 0.099). The study conducted by Odacı et al. in 2013 shows that the learning avoid orientation differed depending on gender and that women are more learning avoid-oriented than men. It was also shown that the learning approach, performance approach and performance avoid orientations did not differ depending on gender. On the other hand, in the study conducted on teacher candidates by Solmaz et al. in 2014, the average scores from the learning, performance approach and performance avoid orientations differed significantly based on gender. Other studies in the literature have shown that women are more learning approach- and learning avoid-oriented than men (Bouffard et al., 1995; Elliot and Mcgregor, 2001). The findings of this study show similarity or parallelism with other studies in the literature. The reason for this is thought to be that students and athletes work in different fields and that they have different and individual levels of perception.

It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions of academic self-regulation of the participants based on their gender that there was a significant statistical difference between the averages for support-taking, goal-setting, strategy implementation and strategy-pursuing. When the literature was reviewed, It was found that, inthe study conducted by Yüksel in 2013, there was a significant difference between the achievement orientation of men and women. The study's results showed that prospective female teachers have greater levels of self-regulation abilities than prospective male teachers.Another study, conducted by Schuiteme et al. in 2012, showed that gender affected self-regulation abilities and that female students had higher levels of metacognitive and autonomic abilities than male students. In another study conducted by Kaplan in 2014 on students in Departments of Physical Education and Sports and Sports Teaching, no significant statistical difference could be found between male and female students' average scores for the goal-setting sub-dimension of academic self-regulation (t= 1.747, p=.081). However, a significant statistical difference was observed regarding the average scores for strategy implementation (t= 3.992, p=.000), strategy-pursuing (t= 3.336 p=.001), support-taking (t= 3.137, p=.002) and the Academic Self-Regulation Scale as a whole (t= 3.727, p=.000). In our study, it is clearly seen that female students had greater levels of academic self-regulation abilities than male students. The reason for this may be that the perception, concentration and self-realization levels of students differ during learning and carrying out activities.

It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions of achievement orientation of the participants based on their university that there was a significant statistical difference between Gazi University and Selcuk University, between Gazi University and Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University and between Selcuk University and Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University regarding the learning approach orientation sub-dimension. With regard to the performance avoid orientation, performance approach orientation and learning avoid orientation sub-dimensions, there was a significant statistical difference between Gazi University and Selcuk University, and between Gazi University and Mugla Sıtkı Koçman University. Even though there are studies on the achievement orientation of students in the literature (Akın and Arslan, 2014; Aydın, 2014; Pepe, 2015; Uçar, 2012), a sufficient number of studies on achievement orientation based on university students has not yet been conducted. The study conducted by Küçükoğlu et al. in 2010 showed that the performance approach orientation averages of prospective form teachers differed significantly regarding the type of school, to the benefit of students at Atatürk University. However, there was no significant differentiation between the performances avoid orientation averages of prospective form teachers with regard to the type of school.

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

The reason behind this is thought to be the different relationships between students and the instructors, different opportunities provided by the university, different student profiles and the different implementation in the field of the theoretical and applied knowledge acquired by the students during their education.

It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions of self-regulation of participants based on their university that there was a significant statistical difference between Gazi University and Selcuk University regarding the support-taking and goal-setting sub-dimensions. With regard to the strategy implementation and strategy-pursuing sub-dimensions, there was a significant statistical difference between Selcuk University and MuglaSıtkıKoçman University. Selcuk University had the highest score in the academic self-regulation. Even though there are studies on self-regulation and academic self-regulation in the literature (Sağırlı and Azapağası, 2009; Sağırlı et al., 2010; Çiltaş and Bektaş, 2009; Gömleksiz and Demiralp, 2012; Pintrich and De Groot, 1990; Maclellan and Soden, 2006; Kaplan, 2014), no study has been conducted on academic self-regulation at university. The reasons for this are thought to be the different exam conditions in the special aptitude tests, which contribute to the fact that student levels are not the same, and that students choose different universities in accordance with their goals.

It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions of the participants' achievement orientation that there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Coaching regarding the performance avoid orientation. With regard to the performance approach orientation, there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Coaching, between the Departments of Sport Management and Coaching and between the Departments of Coaching and Recreation. Regarding the learning avoid orientation, there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Coaching and between the Departments of Teaching and Recreation. A study conducted on prospective teachers by Arslan in 2011 showed that there was not a significant relation between the department in which they studied and their opinion as regards achievement and goal orientation. That is to say, their opinion on goal orientation did not change according to the department in which they studied. Students participated in educational activities in accordance with various goals. Their goals affected how they participated, their participation and the maintenance of participation levels (Arslan, 2011). The reason for this may be that they had different curricula, goals, education and self-realization levels.

It was understood from examining the sub-dimensions of participants' academic self-regulation based on their department that there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Sport Management, between the Departments of Sport Management and Recreation and between the Departments of Coaching and Recreation regarding the support-taking. With regard to the goal-setting, there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Teaching and Recreation, between the Departments of Sport Management and Recreation and between the Departments of Coaching and Recreation. Regarding the strategy implementation, there was a significant statistical difference between the Departments of Sport Management and Recreation, whereas in the strategy-pursuing a significant statistical difference was seen between the Departments of Teaching and Recreation, between the Departments of Sport Management and Coaching, between the Departments of Sport Management and Recreation and between the Departments of Coaching and Recreation. The reason for this may be that the assessments of students' learning levels in accordance with their goals and the requirements of their department differ, as do the techniques, methods and teaching models used in a different course.

Consequently, it is proven that achievement orientation and self-regulation are directly related to the gender, university and department.

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

The reason for this may be the fact that universities and instructors, who aspire to develop students' professional and personal characteristics and increase students' knowledge and awareness also desire to make students attain individual self-sufficiency by educating them in accordance with students' goals.

SUGGESTIONS

1. The relation between achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students could be further evaluated.
2. The achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in a Faculty of Sport Sciences and in other faculties could be compared.
3. Materials and methods, which contribute to the achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students in class, and role models which inspire students, could be used as motivational tools.

REFERENCES

Akın A. & Arslan, S., (2014). Başarı Yönelimleri ile Kararlılık Arasındaki İlişkiler [Relations Between Success Orientations and Stability]. Eğitim ve BilimDergisi. Cilt 39 Sayı 175 267-274.

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms Goals Structures and Student Motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol:84.

Arslan A, (2011). Öğretmen Adaylarının Amaç Yönelimleri ile YapılandırmacılığaYönelik GörüşlerininİncelenmesI [Examining Teacher Candidates' Purpose Orientations and Constructivist Views]. OMÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 30:1. 107-122.

Aydın, S. (2012). Proje Tabanlı Öğrenme Ortamlarının Biyoloji Öğretmen Adaylarının Öz-Düzenleme Seviyeleri ve Öz-Yeterlik İnançları Üzerine Etkisi [The Effect of Project-Based Learning Environments on Self-Regulation Levels and Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Biology Teacher Candidates]. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Ortaöğretim Fen ve Matematik Alanlar Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı. Doktora Tezi.155.

Bouffard, T., Boisvert, J., Vezeau, C. &Larouche, C. (1995). The İmpact Of Goal Orientation On Self-Regulation Performance Among College Students. British Journal Of Educational Psychology, 65, 317-329

Çiltaş, A. &Bektaş, F. (2009). Motivation And Self-Arrangements Skills Of Primary School Students` İnto Mathematics Lesson. An International Journal Social Sci. And Humanities, 28,152-159.

Elliot, A. J. & Murayama, K. (2008). On the measurement of achievement goals: Critique, illustration, and application. Journal of Educational Psychology, 100 (3), 613-628.

Elliot, A.J. &Mcgregor, H. (2001). A 2x2 Achievement Goal Framework. Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 80(3), 501-519

Gömleksiz N.M. &Demiralp D. (2012). Öğretmen Adaylarının Öz-Düzenleyici Öğrenme Becerilerine İlişkin Görüşlerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından Değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of Teacher Candidates' Opinions Regarding Self-Regulatory Learning Skills in Terms of Variable Variables]. Gaziantep ÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerDergisi (http://sbe.gantep.edu.tr)11(3):777 -795 ISSN: 1303-0094.

Kaplan, E. (2014). Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Öğrencilerinde Öz-Düzenleme: Ölçek Uyarlama Çalışması [Self-Regulation in Physical Education and Sport Teacher Students: Scale Adaptation Study]. YüksekLisansTezi. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı. Antalya, 99.

Kaplan, A. &Maehr, M. L. (2007). The Contributions and Prospects of Goal Orientation Theory, EducPsychol Rev., 19:141–184.

Çimen, K., (2017). The evaluation of achievement orientation and academic self-regulation of students studying in Faculties of Sport Sciences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *14*(3), 2616-2627. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4682

Küçükoğlu A., Kaya İ. &Turan A, (2010). Sınıf Öğretmenliği Anabilim Dalı Öğrencilerinin BaşarıYönelimi Algılarının Farklı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi Atatürk Üniversitesi ve Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Örneği) [Analysis of the Perception of Success Orientations of Students of Department of Primary School Teacher Education in Terms of Different Variables Sample of Atatürk Universty and Ondokuz Mayıs University]. Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi Fırat University Journal Of Social Science Cilt: 20, Sayı: 2, Sayfa: 121-135, Elazığ-2010.

Maclellan, E. &Soden, R. (2006). Facilitating Self-Regulation İn Higher Education Through Self-Report. Learning Environments Research, 9, 95-110.

Martinez-Pons, M. (2000). Effective Transfer As A Self-Regulatory Process: İmplications For Adult Education. Paper Presented At The Royaumont Symposium On Self-Learning, Paris.

Odacı H., Berber Çelik Ç.&Çıkrıkçı Ö. (2013). Psikolojik Danışman Adaylarının BaşarıYönelimlerinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre Yordanması [Predicting Candidate Psychological Counselors' Goal Orientations As Related to Several Variables]. Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi,4 (39), 95-105.

Pepe O, (2015). Predictive Power Of The Success Tendency And Ego İdentity Status Of The University Students. Educational Research And Reviews. Vol. 10(17), Pp. 2447-2454,

Pintrich, P.R. (2000). An Achievement Goal Theory Perspective on Gssues in Motivation Terminology, Theory and Research. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25, 92-104.

Pintrich, P. & De Groot, A. (1990). "Motivational And Self-RegulatedLearning components Of Classroom Academic Performans", Journal Of Educational psychology, Vol. 82, No.1, Ss, 33–40.

Pintrich, P.R., Smith, D.A.F., Garcia, T. &McKeachie, W.J., (1991). Self-Regulated Learning Strategies, http://www.jan.ucc.nau.edu. ErişimTarihi: 25.03.2016.

Sağırlı, M.Ö. &Azapağası E. (2009). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Öğrenmede Öz-Düzenlemeyi Öğrenme Becerilerinin İncelenmesi [Examining the Learning Skills of Self-Regulating Self-Learned by University Students]. Ankara University, Journal Of Faculty Of Educational Sciences, 42(2),129-161.

Sağırlı, Ö.M., Çiltaş, A., Azapağası, E. &Zehir, K. (2010). Yüksek Öğretimin Öz-Düzenlemeyi Öğrenme Becerilerine Etkisi [The Effect of Higher Education on Self-Regulation Learning Skills] (Atatürk Üniversitesi Örneği). Mayıs Cilt:18 No:2 Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi 587-596

Schuitema, J.,Peetsma, T. & Van Der Veen, I. (2012). Self Regulated Learning And Students'Perceptions Of Innovative And Traditional Learning Environments: A Longitudinal study İn Secondary Education, Educational Studies, 38(4), 397-413.

Solmaz, A., Yalmancı Gürbüzoğlu S. &Yel M. (2014). Fen Bilgisi Öğretmen Adaylarının Başarı AmaçYönelimlerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi [Investigation of Success Goal Orientations of Science Teacher Candidates in Terms of Variable Variables]. KafkasÜniversitesi, e – Kafkas Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1 (1), Ss.31-39.

Uçar H. (2012).İngilizce Öğretmen Adaylarının Özyeterlik İnancı, Başarı Yönelimi ve Çevrimiçi Öğrenme Ortamına Katılım Durumu: Uzaktan İÖLP Örneği [Self-Efficacy of English Teacher Candidates, Success Orientation and Participation in the Online Learning Environment: Remote IOLP Example], Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Uzaktan Eğitim Ana Bilim Dalı, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. AnadoluÜniversitesi. Eskişehir.2012. 120.

Uygun, M. (2012). Öz-Düzenleme Stratejisi Gelişimi ÖğretimininYazılı Anlatıma, Yazmaya Yönelik Öz-Düzenleme Becerisine, Kalıcılığa ve Tutuma Etkisi [Self-Regulation Strategy Development Instruction's Written Narration, Writing Self-Regulation Ability, Persistence and Tutting Effect.]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İlköğretim Ana Bilim Dalı, DoktoraTezi.ss. 172.

Yüksel İ. (2013). Öğretimsel Stil Tercihlerinin Öz-Düzenleme Beceri Düzeylerini Yordama Gücü [The Power of Teaching Style Preferences to Tail Self-Regulating Skills]. Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 20 212-229.

Zimmerman, B.J. (2000). Attainment Of Self-Regulation: Asocial Cognitive Perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P.R. Pintrich, &M. Zeidner (Eds.), Handbook Of Self-Regulation (Pp. 13-39). San Diego, CA: Academic pres.