

An Investigation of the Achievement Goals and Study Process of Athletes in Individual Sports and Team Sports

ORCAN MIZRAK¹, EMRE BELLİ¹

¹Sport Science Faculty, Atatürk University, Erzurum/Turkey

Correspondence to: Dr Emre BELLİ, Email. emre.belli@atauni.edu.tr, Cell: +9004422312254

ABSTRACT

Aim: The aim of this study is to investigate of the achievement goals and study process of athletes in individual sports and team sports

Methods: For data collection, "Achievement Goals Scale" was used which was developed by Akin³ and For data collection, "Study Process Scale" was used which was developed by Biggs et al⁴ and was adapted to Turkish by Yılmaz and Orhan⁵ to 369 participants in total consisting of 126 female and 243 male students.

For data analysis, through SPSS statistical packet program, frequency analysis, descriptive statistics, independent sample t-tests, one-way anova, tukey, pearson correlation analyze were performed.

Results: Significant differences were found in the comparison of the participants' achievement goals and study process according to the type of sport, and their achievement goals and study process ($p < 0.05$).

Conclusion: According to this; It is seen that those who do team sports have a higher average in achievement goals levels and study process than those who do individual sports.

Keywords: Achievement Goals, Study Process, Team Sports, Individual Sports

INTRODUCTION

Sports is a multidisciplinary concept that closely concerns people. This reason sports; many sciences such as psychology, sociology, physiology, anatomy, biomechanics interacts with the branch. In recent years, scientific studies in the social sciences researches deal mostly with the sociological and psychological aspects of sports activities. It is of great importance in the development and progress of sports in all its dimensions¹. At present in sports world, the line between winning and losing has started to be prominent with the increase in the intensity of competition. The idea that athletes who are physically superior is insufficient for success, and psychological performance is thought to be important as well as physical performance².

Along with technological innovations; In the changing and developing new world, the modernizing and differentiating education methods in the field of science have revealed the necessity of constantly monitoring and arranging the information. Naturally, an adaptation to these innovations in education should be provided not only by the instructors but also by the students. Experiencing differences in adaptation to renewed education opportunities from individual to individual; makes it necessary to plan according to the level of individuals. Therefore, learning approaches and study approaches using keywords such as perception, personality, attention, motivation become important for the success of education. These factors are; It is thought that it is effective in students' integrating with their own personalities, setting goals for success and exhibiting goal-oriented behaviors.⁽³⁾

In the light of these data, when we look at the relevant literature; We see that one of the concepts that is thought to be the most effective in learning is the concept of achievement orientation. Achievement orientation refers to individuals' perspectives on their personal approaches that affect their cognitive, emotional and behavioral responses in the learning process. Individuals can perform the act of learning for different purposes. Individuals may turn to

learning because of factors such as gaining knowledge and skills, being successful, increasing self-confidence, gaining recognition and approval by others, showing that they are hardworking, proving that they have superior abilities, avoiding negative reactions from their relatives and avoiding failure⁴

In our study, we investigate two types of achievement goals as performance orientation and learning orientation. Learning orientation is the individual's internalization of everything related to education during the learning period and trying to master the concepts by approaching learning. The performance orientation is; It is the individual's motivation for what he will achieve as a result of learning rather than learning. Because his motivation for elements such as promotion, gaining status, and looking smart is different from his motivation for pure knowledge.

MATERIAL & METHODS

The aim of this study is to investigate of the achievement goals and study process of athletes in individual sports and team sports.

For data collection, "Achievement Goals Scale" was used which was developed by Akin⁵ and For data collection, "Study Process Scale" was used which was developed by Biggs et al⁶ and was adapted to Turkish by Yılmaz and Orhan⁷ to 369 participants in total consisting of 126 female and 243 male students.

2x2 Achievement orientation scale; It consists of 26 questions and 4 sub-dimensions: learning approach goal orientation (8 items), learning-avoidance goal orientation (5 items), performance approach goal orientation (7 items), and performance-avoidance goal orientation (6 items). Dimensions can be examined in 2 sub-dimensions as performance and learning.⁸

The scale of study process; It is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 2 sub-dimensions, a deep learning approach (10 items) and a surface learning approach (10 items).

For data analysis, through SPSS statistical packet

program, frequency analysis, descriptive statistics, independent sample t-tests, one-way anova, tukey, pearson correlation analyze were performed.

RESULTS

Table 1. Participants' Information in terms of Demographical Features

Gender	N	%
Men	243	65.9
Women	126	34.1
Age	N	%
20 years and under	118	32
Between 21-25 ages	196	53.1
Age 26 and over	55	14.9
Branch Type	N	%
Individual Sports	131	35.5
Team Sports	238	64.5
Grades	N	%
Grade 1	85	23.1
Grade 2	95	25.7
Grade 3	103	27.9
Grade 4	86	23.3
Total	369	100

When the table 1 is analyzed in terms of gender, it is seen that % 65.9 of the participants are men, %34.1 are women; in terms of branch type %35.5 are individual sports, %64.5 are team sports; in terms of age %32 are 20 years and under, %53.1 are between 21-25 ages, %14.9 are 26 age and over; in terms of grades, it is seen that %23.1 participants are at Grade 1, %25.7 are at Grade 2, %27.9 are at Grade 3 and %23.3 are at Grade 4.

Table 2. Comparison Between the Participants Level of Achievement Goals Depending on Gender

Sub Dimension	Gender	Mean	s.d	t	p
Learning Orientation	Women	51,21	,245	-,289	,000*
	Men	48,40	,213		
Performance Orientation	Women	36,30	,163	-,145	,000*
	Men	39,88	,189		

*(p<0,05)

When the datas are analyzed, there are meaningful dissimilarities in sub-dimension of learning orientation (p=,000), performance orientation (p=,000). According to this data, women (x=51.21±.245) have a higher learning orientation than men participants (x=48.40±.213); It is seen that men (x=39.88±.189) have a higher performance orientation than women (x=36.30±.163).

Table 3. Comparison Between the Participants Level of Study Process Depending on Gender

Sub Dimension	Gender	Mean	s.d	t	p
Deep Approach	Women	65,37	,635	,482	,000*
	Men	63,49	,748		
Surface Approach	Women	34,61	,667	,396	,000*
	Men	37,53	,639		

*(p<0,05)

When the datas are analyzed, there are meaningful dissimilarities in sub-dimension of deep approach (p=,000), surface approach (p=,000). According to this data, women (x=65,37±,635) have a higher deep approach than men participants (x=63,49±,748); It is seen that men

(x=37,53±,639) have a higher surface approach than women (x=34,61±,667).

Table 4. Comparison Between the Participants Level of Achievement Goals Depending on Branch Type

Sub Dimension	Branch Type	Mean	s.s	t	p
Learning Orientation	Individual Sports	50,10	,347	,347	,000*
	Team Sports	47,11	,325		
Performance Orientation	Individual Sports	39,20	,213	,258	,000*
	Team Sports	36,18	,275		

*(p<0,05)

When the data are analyzed, there are meaningful dissimilarities in sub-dimension of learning orientation (p=,000), performance orientation (p=,000). According to this data, individual sports athletes (x=50,10±,347) have a higher learning orientation than team sports athletes (x=47,11±,325); It is seen that individual sports athletes (x=39,20±,213) have a higher performance orientation than team sports athletes (x=36,18±,275).

Table 5. Comparison Between the Participants Level of Study Process Depending on Branch Type

Sub Dimension	Branch Type	Mean	s.d	t	p
Deep Approach	Individual Sports	34,16	,135	,357	,000*
	Team Sports	31,21	,167		
Surface Approach	Individual Sports	33,11	,218	,159	,000*
	Team Sports	30,15	,273		

*(p<0,05)

When the data are analyzed, there are meaningful dissimilarities in sub-dimension of deep approach (p=,000), surface approach (p=,000). According to this data, individual sports athletes (x=34,16±,135) have a higher deep approach than team sports athletes (x=31,21±,167); It is seen that individual sports athletes (x=33,11±,218) have a higher surface approach than team sports athletes (x=30,15±,273).

Table 6. Comparison Between the Participants Level of Achievement Goals Depending on Grades

Sub Dimension	Grades	Mean	s.d	f	p
Learning Orientation	Grade 1	51,43	,703	,268	,269
	Grade 2	51,11	,773		
	Grade 3	51,49	,698		
	Grade 4	50,95	,864		
Performance Orientation	Grade 1	34,10	,212	,358	,276
	Grade 2	33,16	,231		
	Grade 3	33,86	,259		
	Grade 4	33,19	,261		

*(p<0,05)

When table 6 is analyzed, there is no meaningful dissimilarity in the participants' level of learning orientation (p=,269) and performance orientation (p=,276) depending on grades (p>0,05)

When table 7 is analyzed, there is no meaningful dissimilarity in the participants' level of deep approach (p=,427) and surface approach (p=,354) depending on grades (p>0,05)

Table 7. Comparison Between the Participants Level of Study Process Depending on Grades

Sub Dimension	Grades	Mean	s.d	f	p
Deep Approach	Grade 1	35,15	,587	,119	,427
	Grade 2	34,86	,574		
	Grade 3	34,66	,526		
	Grade 4	33,99	,563		
Surface Approach	Grade 1	32,10	,485	,123	,354
	Grade 2	32,65	,475		
	Grade 3	32,78	,436		
	Grade 4	33,11	,426		

*(p<0,05)

Table 8. Comparison Between the Participants Level of Achievement Goals Depending on Ages

Sub Dimension	Ages	Mean	s.d	f	p
Learning Orientation	20 and under	33,15	,268	1,187	,000*
	21-25 age	32,66	,236		
	26 and over	31,56	,274		
Performance Orientation	20 and under	31,10	,362	1,247	,000*
	21-25 age	31,98	,357		
	26 and over	33,81	,329		

*(p<0,05)

When the data are analyzed, there are meaningful dissimilarities in sub-dimension of learning orientation (p=,000), performance orientation (p=,000). According to this data, 20 and under participants (x=33,15±,268) have a higher learning orientation than 26 and over participants (x=31,56±,274); It is seen that 26 and over participants (x=33,81±,329) have a higher performance orientation than 20 and under participants (x=31,10±,362).

Table 9. Comparison Between the Participants Level of Study Process Depending on Ages

Sub Dimension	Ages	Mean	s.d	f	p
Deep Approach	20 and under	32,35	,156	2,325	,356
	21-25 age	32,26	,136		
	26 and over	32,76	,198		
Surface Approach	20 and under	31,45	,163	2,145	,245
	21-25 age	31,56	,198		
	26 and over	31,23	,137		

*(p<0,05)

When table 9 is analyzed, there is no meaningful dissimilarity in the participants' level of deep approach (p=,356) and surface approach (p=,245) depending on ages (p>0,05)

Table 10. The Relationship between Participants' Achievement Goals and Study Process

		Achievement Goals	Study Process
Achievement Goals	Pearson Korelasyonu	1000	,769**
	P		,000
	N	369	369
Study Process	Pearson Korelasyonu	,769**	1000
	P	,000	
	N	369	369

**(p<0,01)

When the data are examined, it is seen that there is a strong and significant positive relationship between the participants' achievement goals and study process (r=.769,

p<0.01). According to this data, as the success orientation of the participants increases; It is seen that study approaches increase, and as success orientations decrease, study approaches decrease.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the individual sports and team sports status of the students at Atatürk University Faculty of Sports Sciences; The following results were obtained in this study, which was conducted to examine achievement orientations and study approaches.

When comparing the achievement orientation levels of the participants according to their gender, significant differences were found in favor of women in the learning orientation sub-dimension. This result may be due to the fact that women have a more learning-oriented approach than men in order to establish themselves in our society, especially in the field of education. In the literature, there are many results with similar results with our study. (9,10,11,12) These findings support our findings. There were also studies in the literature that did not find any significant difference. (13,14,15). These findings contradict our findings.

When comparing the achievement orientation levels of the participants according to their genders, it was concluded that males had a higher average than females in the performance orientation sub-dimension. This may be due to the more result-oriented nature of men due to their social structure. Aydin and et al. 16 in their study on science teachers found that male students were more highly oriented than female students in performance orientation. This finding supports our finding.

When comparing the study process according to the gender of the participants, it is seen that women have a higher average in the deep approach sub-dimension. This is the case for women with a high learning orientation; It may have naturally been caused by studying with a deep approach method in order to learn better. Soyer and Kırıkkanat 17 reached similar findings in their study on university students.

When comparing the study process according to the gender of the participants, men have a higher average in the surface approach sub-dimension. This is the case for men with low learning orientation; acquiring status, passing a class, etc. to the act of learning. may have resulted from their approach to obtain something in such a way.

In the comparison of the success orientation levels of the participants according to the sport type, significant differences were found in favor of those who do individual sports in the sub-dimensions of learning orientation and performance orientation. This is the case for those who do individual sports; because their personal characteristics and abilities directly affect their success; This may be due to individuals being more willing to learn. However, although individuals in team sports may not perform well, the team may win as a result. When we look at individual sports, the individual needs his own abilities and learning capacity in order to succeed. Therefore, these individuals may be more eager to learn.

In the comparison of the study levels of the participants according to the type of sport, significant differences were found in favor of those who do individual sports in the sub-dimensions of deep approach and surface

approach. This situation can be interpreted as an expected finding since those who do individual sports with high learning orientation give more importance to studying in order to realize learning.

Learning is an action that manifests itself in all areas of life and continues until the end of life. For this reason, it is necessary to organize "conference, seminar, symposium" style trainings to improve the attitudes of both individuals who are engaged in team sports and individuals who are engaged in individual sports. By following the exam results; feedback can be applied to improve students' deep approach to learning attitudes.

REFERENCES

1. Çelik, A., Zengin, S. & Baş, M. (2017). Determining The Level Of Aggression In Athletes High School Students. *Gaziantep University Journal of Sport Sciences* 2(4): 20-31.
2. Zengin, S. & Kirbir, F. (2020). Investigation of Mental Training in Sports Branches. *International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology* 9(10): 65-72.
3. DeShon, R. P., Gillespie, J.Z. (2005). A motivated action theory account of goal orientation. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1096–1127.
4. Lin, Y. G., McKeachie, W. J. & Kim, Y. C. (2002). College student intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivation and learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 13, 251-258
5. Akin, A. (2006). 2x2 Achievement orientations scale: validity and reliability study. *Journal of Sakarya University Faculty of Education*; 12, 1–13.
6. Biggs, J., Kember, D., Leung, D. (2011). The revised two-factor SPQ: R-SPQ-2F. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 71(1): 133–149
7. Yılmaz B., Orhan F. (2011). The validity and reliability study of the Turkish version of the study process questionnaire. *Education and Science*. 36(159) 70-85.
8. Canpolat, C. (2019). Investigation of Achievement Goals and Study Approaches According to Personalities of Students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences, Celal Bayar University, Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Psycho-Social Fields in Sport, Master's Thesis, Manisa.
9. Kaya, F. (2016). Investigation of the Prediction Levels of Classroom Teaching Students' Achievement Orientation, Self-Inhibition Behaviors and Demographic Characteristics of Alienation from School, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Classroom Teaching, Master's Thesis, Adana.
10. Küçükoğlu, A., Kaya, H. İ., Turan, A. (2010). Investigation of achievement orientation perceptions of US primary school teachers in terms of different variables (Atatürk University and Ondokuz Mayıs University example). *Fırat University Journal of Social Sciences*, 20(2), 121-135.
11. Dorak F, Canpolat AM, Yıldız L. (2014) The Effect of Study Process Approaches and Learning Modalities on the Achievement Goal Structures in Physical Education Teacher Candidates. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*. 6(3):638-64.
12. Elliot, A. J. & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 x 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(3), 501-519.
13. Menderes, Ç. H. (2009). Examination of university students' achievement-goal orientations according to their stress coping styles, emotional states and academic achievements. Unpublished master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.
14. İzci, E. and Koç, S. (2012). Investigation of achievement orientation levels of students receiving pedagogical formation education. *Dicle University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 8, 31-43.
15. Odacı, H., Berber-Çelik, Ç., Çıkrıkçı, Ö. (2013). Predicting Success Orientations of Psychological Counselor Candidates According to Some Variables. *Turkish Journal of Psychological Counseling and Guidance*, 4(39), 95-105.
16. Aydın, S., Yalmanlı, S. G., Yel, M. (2014). Investigation of success goal orientations of science teacher candidates in terms of various variables. *e-Kafkas Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1), 51-59.
17. Soyer MK, Kirikkanat B. (2018) Undergraduates' Achievement Goal Orientations, Academic Self-Efficacy and Hope as the Predictors of Their Learning Approaches. *European Journal of Educational Research*. 8(1):99-106.