Investigation of Achievement Orientation of Nursing and Midwifery Students
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ABSTRACT: Purpose: This study was conducted to determine the achievement orientation of nursing and midwifery students and to examine some factors that may affect their achievement orientation. Material/Methods: The descriptive sample of this research was created by 209 first-year students voluntarily attending and studying in the Department of Nursing and Midwifery at the Faculty of Health Sciences of a public university in Turkey. The data were collected with "Student Presentation Form" and "2x2 Achievement Orientation Scale". Mann Whitney-U test and Kruskal Wallis test were used with frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean and standard deviation in evaluating the data. Results: The students were found to have 3.39±0.76 in the performance-approach orientation sub-dimension, 3.27±0.75 in the learning-avoidance orientation sub-dimension, 2.73±0.76 in the performance-approach orientation sub-dimension and 2.74±0.74 points in the performance-avoidance orientation sub-dimension. A significant difference was found between the students' gender, their reasons for choosing a career, and the factors that led them to succeed and the mean of the learning-approach orientation score. On the other hand, there was no statistically significant difference between the achievement orientation of the students and the variables such as age, high school type they graduated, and department preference order. Conclusions: According to the results of the study, it was seen that nursing and midwifery students have predominantly learning-approach orientation. Moreover, it was determined that female students, who selected their profession because of their interest and who expressed that the factor motivate themselves for the achievement is themselves, had higher learning orientation.
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Introduction

The concept of achievement orientations used to express mental processes and activities resulting from the desire to achieve goals was proposed by Dweck and Leggett in 1988 [1]. This concept examines how much people are motivated and how they behave towards the goals they set for a certain task [2]. Achievement orientation is defined as the planning of cognitive processes with individual cognitive, emotional and kinetic consequences of the individuals, and motivational approaches that individuals will adopt upon to accomplish any task [3,4].

Today, the concept of achievement orientation comes into prominence more in an effective and efficient teaching-learning process. As a matter of fact, in the health education system, it is necessary for the students to carry out the researches and investigations by participating effectively in the teaching-learning process so that the students can carry out the care needs and care applications of the individuals in parallel with the continuously developing information and technology [5]. Considering this point, it is important to consider the achievement orientation in achieving the achievement of the teaching-learning process, which has an important place in the health education system. The results of this planned study will provide important information about the student's achievement orientation. It was also considered that it will contribute to review of the curriculum of education considering the students' achievement orientations and to the related literature due to limited research findings. Because studies for the achievement orientations in which the educational science academics have been working for a long time are quite new in our country.

This study was carried out to determine the achievement orientations of nursing and midwifery students and to examine some variables that may affect it.

Material and Method

The target population of this study conducted in the descriptive type was composed of the first-year students (n=266 students) who were educated in the Department of Nursing and Midwifery at the Faculty of Health Sciences of a public university in Turkey in the academic year of 2016-2017. It was aimed to reach the whole of target population and 209 students were reached for reasons such as absenteeism from school and reluctance to participate in the survey. Thus, the sample of this research was...
composed of 209 students and the participation rate was 78.5%.

The data were collected via the "Student Presentation Form" and the "2x2 Achievement Orientation Scale" developed by Elliot and McGregor (2001) [6] and adapted by Akın (2006) [7] in Turkey.

**Student Presentation Form**

This form, prepared by the researchers in accordance with the related literature, consists of questions such as age, gender, graduated high school type, reasons for choosing nursing-midwifery profession, preference order of departments and priority factors leading to achievement, which are thought to influence students' achievement orientations.

**2x2 Achievement Orientation Scale**

It is a 5 Likert scale with 26 items (1: absolutely disagree, 2: disagree, 3: undecided, 4: agree and 5: strongly agree). The scale consists of four sub-dimensions: learning-approach orientation, learning-avoidance orientation, performance-approach orientation and performance-avoidance orientation. The highest score from the subscales of the scale indicates the achievement orientation of the individual. Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the scale ranged from 0.92 to 0.97 and test retest reliability coefficients ranged from 0.77 to 0.86 for the subscales [7]. The internal consistency coefficient for the sample group of this study was found to be 0.82.

**Statistical Analysis**

The obtained data were evaluated using SPSS 16.0 program. Data are shown by frequency, arithmetic mean and percentage. The total score average of the scale was calculated and the normality test was applied to determine the normal distribution suitability of the scale scores. Since it was determined that scale scores did not show a normal distribution according to this analysis (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z=0.078, p>0.05), Kruskall Wallis Test and Mann Whitney U Test were used as nonparametric tests in order to examine the difference between scale total scores and subscale scores, and independent variables in the analysis of data. The results were given as mean±standard deviation, and p <0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

**Ethical Concerns**

In order to use the 2x2 Achievement Orientation Scale, written permission was first obtained from the writers via e-mail. Then, in order to be able to conduct the study, written permission was obtained from the relevant institution, and verbal permission was obtained from the students by informing them about the research and data collection tools. Before starting the question form, students were informed about the purpose of study and the study was based on voluntariness.

**Results**

The average age of the participants was 18.88±1.20 (min.17, max.26), and it was found that 92.3% of the students were female, 31.6% were in the midwifery department, 61.7% were Anatolian/Science High School graduates, 28.7% chose nursing-midwifery profession due to their interest, and 45.5% preferred their current department at the 3rd rank or more.

The average scores of the sub-scales of achievement orientations are; the learning approach orientation (LAO) was 3.83±0.60, the learning avoidance orientation (LAO) was 3.27±0.75, the performance approach orientation (PAO) was 2.73±0.76 and the performance avoidance orientation (PAO) was 2.74±0.74.

In the study, it was determined that the learning approach orientation subscale average score was higher in achievement orientation subscales (Table 1).

**Table 1. Subscale Score Averages of Students' Achievement Orientations**

| The Sub-Scales of Achievement Orientations | Number of items | Min. | Max. | X±SD* |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------|------|------|-------|
| Learning Approach Orientation             | 8               | 2.00 | 4.0  | 3.39±0.54 |
| Learning Avoidance Orientation            | 5               | 1.40 | 5.0  | 3.27±0.75 |
| Performance Approach Orientation          | 7               | 1.00 | 5.0  | 2.73±0.76 |
| Performance Avoidance Orientation         | 6               | 1.00 | 5.0  | 2.74±0.74 |

*Standart Deviation
It is seen that there is a significant difference between the average of the students' gender variables and the learning-approach orientation score \((p<0.05)\). According to this, it was determined that female students have higher learning approach orientation than male students. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the schools and department preference rankings of the students and schools from which the students graduated and achievement orientations sub-scale average scores \((p>0.05)\) (Table 2).

**Table 2. Comparison of Average Scores of Achievement Orientation by Some Variables of Students**

| Features                         | The Sub-Scales of Achievement Orientations | Learning Approach Orientation X±SD | Learning Avoidance Orientation X±SD | Performance Approach Orientation X±SD | Performance Avoidance Orientation X±SD |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| **Gender**                       |                                             |                                   |                                     |                                        |                                        |
| Female                           |                                             | 3.49±0.43                         | 3.30±0.73                           | 2.74±0.78                              | 2.73±0.75                              |
| Male                             |                                             | 2.41±0.70                         | 2.96±0.88                           | 2.65±0.57                              | 2.91±0.66                              |
| **Statistical Analysis\(^1\)**   |                                             | U:10087.000 \(p<0.05\)            | U:1529.500 \(p>0.05\)              | U:1464.000 \(p>0.05\)                 | U:1328.000 \(p>0.05\)                |
| **Graduate school**              |                                             |                                   |                                     |                                        |                                        |
| High School                      |                                             | 3.55±0.49                         | 3.59±0.75                           | 2.82±0.78                              | 2.77±0.65                              |
| Vocational High School           |                                             | 3.56±0.20                         | 2.57±0.52                           | 2.58±0.48                              | 2.64±0.82                              |
| Anatolian High School            |                                             | 3.34±0.56                         | 3.22±0.76                           | 2.68±0.73                              | 2.71±0.76                              |
| Other                            |                                             | 3.34±0.54                         | 3.39±0.72                           | 2.85±0.94                              | 2.88±0.78                              |
| **Statistical Analysis\(^2\)**   |                                             | KW:1.214                          | KW:0.334                            | KW:3.583                               | KW:0.193                               |
| **Department preference order**  |                                             | p>0.05                            | p>0.05                              | p>0.05                                 | p>0.05                                 |
| First preference                 |                                             | 3.42±0.50                         | 3.30±0.69                           | 2.82±0.78                              | 2.75±0.72                              |
| Second preference                |                                             | 3.45±0.52                         | 3.30±0.88                           | 2.77±0.75                              | 2.67±0.86                              |
| 3rd-10th preference              |                                             | 3.35±0.55                         | 3.32±0.76                           | 2.68±0.74                              | 2.82±0.73                              |
| 11th and over preference         |                                             | 3.40±0.57                         | 3.20±0.70                           | 2.71±0.83                              | 2.60±0.70                              |
| **Statistical Analysis\(^2\)**   |                                             | KW:1.000                          | KW:1.229                            | KW:1.151                               | KW:2.927                               |
| **Department Preference Reason** |                                             | p>0.05                            | p>0.05                              | p>0.05                                 | p>0.05                                 |
| Interest                         |                                             | 3.75±0.48                         | 3.15±0.78                           | 2.78±0.68                              | 2.69±0.76                              |
| Score status                     |                                             | 3.05±0.44                         | 3.33±0.67                           | 2.75±0.67                              | 2.72±0.39                              |
| Friends and family suggestion    |                                             | 3.25±0.59                         | 3.47±0.69                           | 2.56±0.84                              | 2.90±0.68                              |
| Easy job opportunity             |                                             | 3.24±0.56                         | 3.20±0.79                           | 2.86±0.65                              | 2.75±0.83                              |
| Helping people                   |                                             | 3.44±0.51                         | 3.35±0.73                           | 2.63±0.75                              | 2.73±0.77                              |
| **Statistical Analysis\(^2\)**   |                                             | KW:11.338                         | KW:4.857                            | KW:2.701                               | KW:1.695                               |
| **The Primary Factor Leading to Achievement** |                                       | p<0.05                            | p<0.05                              | p<0.05                                 | p>0.05                                 |
| Myself                           |                                             | 3.67±0.55                         | 3.25±0.77                           | 2.71±0.75                              | 2.70±0.79                              |
| Family                           |                                             | 3.04±0.49                         | 3.31±0.72                           | 2.74±0.76                              | 2.79±0.69                              |
| Friends                          |                                             | 3.01±0.64                         | 3.30±0.95                           | 2.50±0.70                              | 2.85±0.42                              |
| University                       |                                             | 3.18±0.45                         | 2.96±0.65                           | 2.68±0.96                              | 2.40±0.38                              |
| Society                          |                                             | 3.01±0.26                         | 3.56±0.51                           | 2.45±0.97                              | 2.36±0.69                              |
| **Statistical Analysis\(^2\)**   |                                             | KW:10.162                         | KW:2.521                            | KW:3.549                               | KW:5.608                               |
| **Mann-Whitney U Test, *Kruskall Wallis Test**|                    | p<0.05                            | p>0.05                              | p>0.05                                 | p>0.05                                 |
As shown in Table 2, it was found that there was a significant difference between reason of preference of the department and average subscale scores of learning approach orientation, and the average subscale scores of the learning-approach orientation of the students who selected their professions for their interest was significantly higher than the other students (p<0.05).

Average subscale score of learning-approach orientation of the students who stated that they are the primary factor leading to achievement was found to be significantly higher than the other groups (p<0.05).

Discussion

From the subscales of achievement orientation of the students who participated in the study, they were found to have learning approach at most and performance approach orientation at the least.

The result in this study is parallel to the results of other studies [3,8,1,9,10] Likewise, in a study in which Toğluk (2009) [4] identified the achievement orientation in nursing students, he emphasized that the students have predominantly a learning approach orientation. Based on these results, this finding in our study supports the knowledge in the literature.

In our study, it was determined that the levels of learning-approach achievement orientation of female students were higher compared to male students.

While it was concluded that female students adopted learning-approach achievement orientation than male students in some studies [1,3,4,11,12], it was determined that the male students adopted to learning approach orientation more than the female students in the study of Khalifa (2016) [13] which determined the achievement orientations in the nursing students.

On the other hand, there are also studies that reached the result that learning approach orientations in terms of gender do not differ [14,15].

Therefore, the differences in these results may be attributed to the characteristics of the students constituting the sample group.

In the study, it was determined that last graduated schools and preference rank of the students for the department did not affect the achievement orientations.

Therefore, this result was interpreted as the fact that the high schools which the students graduated and rank of school preference did not affect the achievement orientations.

Another remarkable finding obtained from this research is that the average score of the learning-approach orientation subscale of the students who selected profession of nursing / midwifery because of their interest is significantly higher than the other students.

Average score of learning-approach orientation subscale was detected as significantly higher in students who indicated themselves as the primary factor leading to achievement than the other groups.

These findings obtained from our study were found to be in parallel with the results of Toğluk's (2009) [4] study which determined the achievement orientations in nursing students. These results can be interpreted as the fact that reason of the preference for the profession and the factor which motivates for being successful affect the achievement orientations.

Conclusion

According to the results of the research, it has been determined that the learning-approach orientation of the nursing and midwifery students has an important effect and that the female students adopted the learning approach orientation better compared to the male students.

In addition, it was determined that average subscale score of learning approach orientation of the students who selected profession due to their interest and stated themselves as the factor pushing for the achievement was higher.

In the light of these findings, it may be suggested that the nursing and midwifery education curriculum should be screened to support the learning-approach orientation of the students and that the educators should construct the learning-teaching process with the opinion about achievement approaches of the students.

In addition, more detailed findings can be obtained using qualitative research designs by conducting studies which investigate the relationship between learning environment of the students and their achievement orientation.
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