

## Evaluation Of Self-Efficacy, Self-Management and Achievement Motivation from The Perspective of Classroom Management

Remzi YILDIRIM<sup>1</sup>, Gülenaz SELÇUK<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

In this study, the effect of pre-service teachers' self-efficacy and self-management on their success motivation were discussed and evaluated from the classroom management perspective. The population of the study was the MCBU Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program in the 2022 – 2023 education year and 427 pre-service teachers participated as the sample of the study. SPSS 25 packet program was used for the analyses of the data. Pre-service teachers' self-efficacy, self – management and achievement motivation levels were examined with the help of descriptive statistics by using minimum, maximum, arithmetic mean, and standard deviation values. The effect of their self-efficacy perceptions and their self – management behaviors were separately analyzed with simple linear regression. The holistic effect of self-efficacy and self-management on achievement motivation was analyzed with multiple linear regression. According to the findings their self-efficacy, self – management and achievement motivation levels were observed at high levels. Also, the effect of self-efficacy and self-management on achievement motivation were found both separately and together. While self-efficacy and self – management affect achievement motivation at a normal level, they are affecting more strongly both together.

### Keywords

classroom  
management  
self-efficacy  
self-management,  
achievement  
motivation  
pre – service  
teachers

Received  
12.09.2023

Accepted  
08.12.2023

| Research Article |

### Suggested APA Citation:

Yıldırım, R. & Selçuk, G. (2023). Evaluation of self-efficacy, self-management and achievement motivation from the perspective of classroom management. *Manisa Celal Bayar University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 11(2), 139-152, <https://www.doi.org/10.52826/mcbuefd.1359069>.

<sup>1</sup> **Corresponding Author**, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences, Demirci, Manisa, TÜRKİYE;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6918-5416>

<sup>2</sup> Manisa Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Manisa, TÜRKİYE;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3578-6010>

## INTRODUCTION

People put targets themselves, try to reach them in their lives and they need support in the way carrying them to their targets. Clearly, when an individual is trying to make a progress in the way of his / her target, it will be good if the right way is shown. This way should be the one that move him / her to the achievement.

Achievement is the last step of the target and achievement motivation strongly supplies gaining the target. Motivation, which comes from “movere”, can be described as willingness to take action for the desired situation (Özbaşı et al., 2018). Taking action can be regarded as the beginning of achievement and it is so important that brings people to the conclusion. The most featured theoretical frameworks affecting motivation are: expectancy value theory (Eccles, 1983) which motivates people with the value of expectancies; self – concept (Rogers, 1959) which has three components named as self – image, self – esteem and ideal self; self – efficacy (Bandura, 1997) which means the belief of one’s capacity in the way of acting towards the target; ability beliefs (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002) which refers the beliefs about how well performing on future achievement tasks; self – determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) which comes from three basic psychological needs named as competence, relatedness, and autonomy; big fish little pond effect (Marsh et al., 2007) which points out comparing one’s own achievement through other three aspects as social, temporal and dimensional comparisons; self – management (Manz & Sims, 1980) which is based on the concept of self – control (Cautela, 1969). In this meaning Kırmızı (2015) has highlighted three factors as self – concept, self – efficacy, and self – regulation for the success in one’s life. Umemoto & Inagaki (2023) has studied the relationship between motivation instability and type of motivation level in university learning based on self – determination theory and they have found positive relation between them especially focusing on where motivation is decreasing and increasing. Kandemir (2010), Ercoşkun (2016), Sarıtepeci (2018) contributed to field by preparing scales about self – efficacy, self – management and achievement motivation. So, it can be said that motivation has an effective role on achievement and there are also some variables that affect motivation. This study has focused self – efficacy and self – management as the variables that affect achievement motivation and they have been evaluated them as the base of this study.

Bandura (1997) explained self – efficacy as the people’s thoughts about their ability to organize and perform while running their lives. First, he had seen the self – efficacy as an element of people’s social and cognitive structures and then he put self – efficacy in a more centered place. He believed that people continued their lives with their self – efficacies. Self – efficacy is a very important factor of human activity. Self – efficacy that a person has; it affects the behavior patterns that people will follow, the amount of effort they will put forth, how long they will endure against obstacles and failures, their resistance to difficulties, their struggle with environmental demands, stress and depression. The degree of perception of self – efficacy is as much as the degree of realization of the individual’s performance. Self – efficacy can easily be conceptualized as an influence on achievement motivation, which includes the onset of achievement behaviors (Farran, 2004). It can be said that achievement motivation will be affected from the sub – dimensions of academic self – efficacy scale (Kandemir, 2010) which are named as coping with academic problems, academic effort and academic planning. Especially during the educational processes students can supply their achievement motivation partially by feeling academic self – efficacy strongly. This efficacy feeling should be supplied with some educational processes like coping academic problems, academic effort and academic planning by their teachers during the classroom management.

As we said achievement motivation give taking actions towards their desired situations. Is self – efficacy enough by itself for taking action towards the desired situation? Of course, not. Another variable handled in this study is self – management. Even if you have a solid foundation of self – efficacy, if you don't have self – management, your motivation for success can be seen as decreased. Self – management gives individuals some strategies managing the behaviors related to decreasing the risks of inconsistencies. For this purpose, a model consists of three dimensions (self – monitoring, self – evaluating, and self – reinforcing) was developed by Mezo (2009) in the base of Kanfer (1970) and Bandura’s (1997) views. With self – monitoring stage, individual realize his / her own behaviors. Then with the

self – evaluating stage the individual compares internalized standard behaviors with the required behaviors in the way of his / her desired situation. At the last stage named as self – reinforcement, he / she gives judgements about continuing towards the desired situation by presenting required behaviors. So, it can be thought that having self – management is one of the important behaviors to be taught to the students during classroom management. And achievement motivation, which slightly opens the door for the success, is an important prerequisite that will enliven students and guide them towards their goals. But achievement motivation cannot be felt by just saying. It needs some backgrounds as mentioned with self – efficacy and self – management and others. Lumsden (1994) is relating the motivation with learners’ participation to the learning processes. According to Ryan & Deci (2000) motivated person shows desire, interest, patience and effort. Expressions such as desire, interest, patience and effort remind us of concepts such as self – efficacy and self – management as mentioned. Eccles et al. (1993), Wigfield & Eccles (2000) especially studied achievement motivation with their expectancy – value theory. Their theory is based on expectancy and value factor and belief towards the achievement factor. Individuals generally tend value the gaining of their efforts. And these efforts cause expectancy in their minds. They expect getting valuable gaining at the end of their efforts. That value and expectancy provide integrity with the belief towards achievement and breeds the achievement motivation. For this reason, these factors should be also fulfilled with some substructures.

In this meaning our hypothesis is showing learners the way of success by motivating them. But this motivation effort should not be an empty pursuit. Educators can contribute to this effort by improving learner’ self – efficacy perceptions and self – management attitudes. During the classroom management processes just giving knowledge is not enough in today’s world. It should be teaching learners to use what they have learned and getting them to be practical. In this purpose it is tried to evaluate classroom management processes and some recommendations are tried to be presented. But before achieving this purpose, there is need to see the levels of learners in self – efficacy perceptions, self – management behaviors and achievement motivation relationships. And also, there is need to see the relationships between these variables and their effects to each other in different combinations. In this direction, the problem statement and sub – problem statements were written as stated below, and it was aimed to contribute to the field and practitioners through the analysis of the data to be collected in this context.

Problem statement: “How do self – efficacy and self – management affect achievement motivation?” Within the scope of problem statement, how the self – efficacy and self – management have an effect on motivation for achievement, was tried to be identified with the sub – problem statements below.

Sub – problem statements

1. What is the level of pre – service teachers’ self-efficacy, self-management and achievement motivation?
2. Do pre – service teachers’ self – efficacy levels have a significant effect on their achievement motivation?
3. Do pre – service teachers’ self – management levels have a significant effect on their achievement motivations?
4. Do pre – service teachers’ self – efficacy and self – management levels have a significant effect on their achievement motivations together?

## METHOD

In the method part; model of the study, population and the sample of the study, data collection tools of the study, data collection process and data analysis of the study have been explained.

### Model of the Study

Research methods can be divided into two groups, which are named as quantitative and qualitative, in social sciences depending on the data whether quantitative or qualitative (Karakaya, 2014). By using quantitative research methods, the researchers reach the data with observations, interviews, questionnaires and tests. The data is analyzed with some statistical measurements and evaluation techniques (Arslanoğlu, 2016). This study has been applied

within the quantitative research methods which means observing and measuring the facts and revealing the cause – and – effect relationships between variables (Yıldız, 2019). General survey model, which reveals the reality as it is with whole population or with suitable sampling from the whole population, is one of the models of the quantitative research methods. The study is performed in quantitative research method and in general survey model which is identified by Kuzu (2013) as trying to see the subject of the study in its own conditions.

### Population and the Sample of the Study

The population of the study is MCBU Pedagogical Formation Certificate Program in 2022 – 2023 Education Year. With the study 475 participants has been reached, 48 outliers were removed and the study group was formed with 427 participants. There were 869 registered students in the program and with 95% confidence level and 3% error margin 427 participants has been reached as the sample of the study. The sample of the study has been formed by the help of stratified sampling method (Karakaya, 2014; Şahin, 2012) with their professional fields and genders and then random sampling method (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2018) has been applied with their voluntary attendances. Table 1 shows the population and the sample of the study as explained.

**Table 1.** Population and the Sample of the Study

| Professional Fields                      | Female (N) | Male (N) | Total (N) | Female (n) | Male (n) | Total (n) |
|--|------------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|
| Turkish & Mathematics (equally weighted) | 252        | 14       | 266       | 124        | 7        | 131       |
| Gifted                                   | 34         | 61       | 95        | 17         | 29       | 46        |
| Science                                  | 56         | 27       | 83        | 28         | 13       | 41        |
| Social Sciences                          | 288        | 56       | 344       | 141        | 28       | 169       |
| Language                                 | 53         | 28       | 81        | 26         | 14       | 40        |
| Total                                    | 683        | 186      | 869       | 336        | 91       | 427       |

### Data Collection Tools of the Study

In the study three data collection tools were used. They are Academic Self – Efficacy Scale (Kandemir, 2010), Self – Control and Self – Management Scale (Ercoşkun, 2016) and Achievement Motivation Scale (Sartepeci, 2018).

*Academic Self – Efficacy Scale* (Kandemir, 2010) was developed for determining individuals' perceptions on self – efficacy of their academic aspects. During the process firstly the relevant literature has been reviewed and 29 items has been written. Six experts reviewed those 29 items and they eliminated two of them by decreasing item numbers into 27 in the validity study part. Then the process was continued with pre – application part. The Kaiser Mayer Olkin (KMO) coefficient (.93) and Bartlett test result ( $X^2 = 3810.52$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) were significant according to the pre – application which was applied with the attendance of 468 university students. For determining the factor structure of the scale, exploratory factor analysis was applied with the Principal Components Analysis (PCA) and Varimax rotation and 3 factored structure was found. According to the exploratory factor analysis the variance was explained with the first factor as 27.739, with the second factor as 14.529 and with the third factor as 13.622. The total variance was explained as 55.891 with those three factors. Then the factors were named as coping with academic problems, academic effort and academic planning. Next with the confirmatory factor analysis, the chi – square value ( $X^2$ ) was found as 557.76 and the degree of freedom was found as 149. So, with these values it was decided that 3 factored structure had good fit values. It was seen that division of chi square to the degree of freedom ( $X^2/df.$ ) was found 3.74 which is less than 5. Also, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients was checked to evaluate the reliability of the scores obtained. The coefficients were found as .90 for the first factor, .78 for the second one, .77 for the last one, and .92 for the whole scale. The total item correlations for each dimension ranged from .36 to .67 and the scale was finalized for the usage of researchers.

*Self – Control and Self – Management Scale* (Ercoşkun, 2016) was adapted into Turkish from the original form developed by Mezo (2009). Firstly, the adaptation permission was taken from the author of the original scale. Then the translation process was completed also with back translation in two steps. Three language experts had guided in

translation process. Two Turkish language experts and two academicians reviewed and evaluated the translated form. After making some necessary corrections, the linguistic equivalence was obtained. For the reliability of the original and Turkish forms were applied with the attendance of 127 fourth year students from ELT Department with a week break. According to the application results both English and Turkish forms' correlation coefficients were supplied ( $r_{SCMS} = .91$ ,  $r_{SR} = .81$ ,  $r_{SE} = .79$  and  $r_{SM} = .84$ ). Then test – retest was applied for the Turkish form with 159 students a week later and again according to the results the reliability coefficients found revealed that the scale was reliable. Next exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was applied with the attendance of 1006 participant students and this step was followed with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Factor analyses gave three factored structures which has explained 54.09% of total variance and which had a good fit (RMSEA = .052, NFI = .97, CFI = .98, GFI = .96, AGFI = .94, RFI = .97). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency value was .87 for the whole of the scale, .81 for the sub – dimension "Self – Reinforcing", .73 for the sub – dimension "Self – Evaluating", and .80 for the sub – dimension "Self – Monitoring". So as the findings has shown that the scale can be used as measurement tool for determining the self – control and self – management aspects in the studies with its reliability and validity (KMO = .91, Bartlett's test  $X^2 = 5119.371$ ).

*Achievement Motivation Scale* (Saritepeci, 2018) was adopted into Turkish from the original scale developed by Eccles et al. (1993). It is based on expectancy – value theory which is explained by Wigfield & Eccles (2000). While original scale has eight items, three items were added and pre – application form was evaluated by two language experts. Some items were reordered and also two experts from the related field reviewed the pre – application form. Then exploratory factor analysis was applied with 320 participants, 18 of the collected data removed being as outliers and EFA was applied (KMO=.86,  $X^2=1916.60$ ,  $df= 55$ ,  $p=.00$ ). Because of two items were overlapped, two items were removed from the form and repeated EFA results gave two factored structures with nine items. According to EFA results the total variance was explained by the whole of the scale as 64.80%, by the first factor as 49.64% and by the second factor as 15.16%. It was seen that the first factor had eight items while the second one had two items. The first factor was named as expectancy and value while the second factor was named as belief towards the achievement. Then two factored and nine itemed structure was tested with confirmatory factor analysis. CFA results confirmed the EFA results with its good fit index values ( $X^2/df=2.51$ , RMSEA=.08, GFI=.95, CFI=.97, NFI=.96 NNFI=.96, IFI=.97, AGFI=.91). At the reliability step Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency value was .83 for the whole of the scale, .82 for expectancy and value factor and .93 for belief towards achievement factor. And also, according to the item analysis item total correlation values were observed between .51 and .71. In this meaning it can be said that they were valid and their distinctiveness was high for each of the items in the scale. With this process the scale was finalized and served for the usage of the researchers.

### Data Collection Process and Data Analysis of the Study

As said in a Turkish proverb, believing achievement is the half of achievement. The researchers, who believes that achievement can be obtained with strong achievement motivation, have also had the view that achievement motivation should have a reliable foundation. As known self – efficacy is one of these reliable foundations and also self – management can be added to them. In this meaning they have decided to test how affect both self – efficacy and self – management the achievement motivation. Then they searched choose the data collection tools, found the data collection tools and get the usage permissions from the responsive authors of the data collection tools by the help of e – mails.

Both self – efficacy and self – management was determined independent variable while achievement motivation was determined as dependent variable. The analyses were planned to be done by using simple linear regression and multiple linear regression. While looking to a variable role with regression analyses, the preconditions that removing outliers from the data, having variables in interval or ratio scale levels and continuous, having normal distributed data and having relationship between variables were supplied.

For supplying preconditions firstly 48 outliers were removed from the data and analyses were applied with 427 participant forms. Secondly variables were observed as continuous and in interval scale with the help of original scale explanations as they were prepared in 5 Likert's Type. Thirdly it was seen that whole data showed normal distribution. The normal distribution analyses have been performed with both Kolmogorov – Smirnov and Shapiro – Wilk Tests. According to the tests the data of the study has shown normal distribution with its skewness and kurtosis values (self – efficacy skewness value is -.222 and kurtosis value is -.552 / self – management skewness value is -.583 and kurtosis value is -.216 / achievement motivation skewness value is -.823 and kurtosis value is -.209). Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) says that observation of skewness and kurtosis values between -1.5 and +1.5 show normal distribution. Fourthly high relationships were found between variables. Table 2 shows the Pearson Correlation Coefficient that there are high relations between the variables.

**Table 2.** Pearson Correlation Coefficient Interval Between the Variables

| Variable Relations                         | n   | $r_s$ | $p$  |
|--|-----|-------|------|
| Self – Efficacy / Self – Management        | 427 | .678  | .000 |
| Self – Efficacy / Achievement Motivation   | 427 | .711  | .000 |
| Self – Management / Achievement Motivation | 427 | .667  | .000 |

As seen on Table 2, high relationships have been found between Self – Efficacy and Self – Management ( $r_s=.678$ ,  $p=.000$ ) / between Self – Efficacy and Achievement Motivation ( $r_s=.711$ ,  $p=.000$ ) / between Self – Management and Achievement Motivation ( $r_s=.667$ ,  $p=.000$ ) according to the Pearson Correlation Coefficient Interval.

The analysis of the data related to the sub – problems created within the framework of the problem statement was made with SPSS 25 packet program as explained. The first sub – problem is about the level of pre – service teachers' self – efficacies, self – managements and achievement motivations. According to the first sub – problem the data was analysed with the help of descriptive statistics by using arithmetic mean, minimum, maximum and standard deviation values. The second and third sub – problem statements are about the effect of self – efficacy and self – management on achievement motivation separately. These effects were analysed with simple linear regression which is used for measuring the amount of influence one variable (the independent or predictor variable) has on a second variable (the dependent or criterion variable) (George & Mallery, 2020). The fourth sub – problem statement is about the effect of both self – efficacy and self – management on achievement motivation together. This effect was analysed with multiple linear regression analyses which show the influence of two or more variables on a designated dependent variable (Howitt & Cramer, 2014).

MCBU Social Sciences Ethical Committee gave the ethic permission to this study with its 20.06.2022 decision date and 2022/06 – E--050.01.04-329015 decision number.

## FINDING

In this part the results have been given according to the sub – problem statements.

### Pre – Service Teachers' Self – Efficacy, Self – Management and Achievement Motivation Levels

The first sub – problem statement is "What is the level of pre – service teachers' self-efficacy, self-management and achievement motivation?", and with the help of descriptive statistics the data has been analyzed.

**Table 3.** Descriptive Statistics of Pre – Service Teachers' Self – Efficacy, Self – Management and Achievement Motivation Levels

| Scale                  | n   | Minimum | Maximum | $\bar{x}$ | $sd$   |
|------------------------|-----|---------|---------|-----------|--------|
| Self – Efficacy        | 427 | 19      | 95      | 72.82     | 12.539 |
| Self – Management      | 427 | 16      | 80      | 66.91     | 7.891  |
| Achievement Motivation | 427 | 9       | 45      | 38.44     | 5.340  |

As seen on Table 3, pre – service teachers got 72.82 (often) arithmetic mean points from evaluating themselves according to their self – efficacy perceptions, 66.91 (often) arithmetic mean points from evaluating themselves according to their self – management attitudes and 38.44 (always) arithmetic mean points from evaluating themselves according to their achievement motivations. While they have the highest points from achievement motivation, their self – efficacy perceptions and their self – management attitudes are remained lower than their achievement motivations. This situation brings to mind whether their motivation believes are unfounded or whether there is a need to fulfill the base of their motivation believes. The arithmetic mean points, obtained from items and dimensions of the scales, give the details.

**Table 4.** Descriptive Statistics of Sub – Dimensions of Self – Efficacy

| Dimension                     | n   | Minimum | Maximum | $\bar{x}$ | <i>sd</i> |
|-------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Coping with Academic Problems | 427 | 11      | 55      | 41.73     | 7.744     |
| Academic Effort               | 427 | 4       | 20      | 15.73     | 2.703     |
| Academic Planning             | 427 | 4       | 20      | 15.36     | 2.919     |

Self – efficacy has three sub – dimensions, named as coping with academic problems, academic effort and academic planning. Pre – service teachers' arithmetic mean points from coping with academic problems is 41.73 (often), from academic effort is 15.73 (often) and from academic planning is 15.36 (often). Their arithmetic mean points from all three sub – dimensions are in same levels. Their perceptions of whole scale and its sub – dimensions are one degree below the highest stage.

The highest arithmetic point of the items from the coping with academic problems is 4.06 (often). This item is about producing some solutions by themselves when having some problems with lessons. They see themselves enough to overcome the problems encountered, they feel most efficacy themselves in this point about coping with academic problems. In same sub – dimension the lowest arithmetic mean point is 3.23 (often). This item means having a position that being remarkable in terms of their academic abilities in the group. They don't feel themselves at the highest remarkable level with their academic abilities in the group, they think that they have some academic deficiencies.

The highest arithmetic mean point of the items from the academic effort is 4.25 (always). This item is about overcoming the problems associated with the lessons with personal efforts. They feel efficacy about overcoming with the lesson problems by themselves. In same sub – dimension the lowest arithmetic mean point is 3.39 (often). This item means having different skills than others of preparing in preparing or presenting assignments or projects. It can be said powerfully that the results of coping with academic problems and academic effort are almost similar. According to these two sub dimensions they feel themselves efficacy about overcoming the problems but they also feel that there are others can overcome the problems produce some studies better than themselves.

The last dimension is academic planning and the highest arithmetic mean point from this dimension is 3.98 (often). This item is about not thinking preparing homework or project preparation as a difficult situation for themselves. The lowest arithmetic mean point is 3.59 (often) in the same sub – dimension. It is about overcoming easily difficult issues.

So, the sub – dimensions of self – efficacy tell us that pre – service teachers feel enough efficient themselves but they also aware that there are others better than themselves.

**Table 5.** Descriptive Statistics of Sub – Dimensions of Self – Management

| Dimension          | n   | Minimum | Maximum | $\bar{x}$ | <i>sd</i> |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Self – Reinforcing | 427 | 6       | 30      | 24.73     | 3.969     |
| Self – Evaluating  | 427 | 5       | 25      | 21.53     | 3.175     |
| Self – Monitoring  | 427 | 5       | 25      | 20.65     | 3.694     |

Self – management has three sub – dimensions, named as self – reinforcing, self – evaluating, and self – monitoring. Pre – service teachers' arithmetic means points from self – reinforcing is 24.73 (often), from self – evaluating is 21.53 (always) and from self – monitoring is 20.65 (often). The highest arithmetic mean points are got from the self – evaluating sub – dimension.

The highest arithmetic point of the items from self – reinforcing is 4.45 (always). This item is about enjoying about it after done something right. We can say that they always know enjoying with their rightly completed duties. This is important as individuals should live versatile. In same sub – dimension the lowest arithmetic mean point is 3.46 (often). This item means getting into the hard work making plans to enjoy it later. The item with the highest arithmetic mean score and the item with the lowest arithmetic mean score shows consistency. It can be said that completing the duty first and then knowing how to enjoy it means self – reinforcing.

The highest arithmetic mean pointed item in self – evaluating dimension is 4.71 (always). This item is about thinking planning is useless. The fact that this situation is high can be seen as a somewhat negative situation in terms of self – management. In same sub – dimension the lowest arithmetic mean point is 3.66 (often). This item means not having the ability to make clear plans for most of the problems faced in the life. So, it can be said that these items indicate that they are a little far from living in a planned way.

The last dimension is self – monitoring and the highest arithmetic mean point from this dimension is 4.45 (always). This item is about being conscious while working for a cause. The lowest arithmetic mean point is 3.90 (often) in the same sub – dimension. It is about focusing on the tasks, even if not liked. So, it is clear that they carry their responsibilities and they can focus on their duties in the meaning of self – management.

So, the sub – dimensions of self – management tell us that pre – service teachers know reinforcing themselves, they have some deficiencies about planning despite they can easily focus on their charges.

**Table 6.** Descriptive Statistics of Sub – Dimensions of Achievement Motivation

| Dimension                      | n   | Minimum | Maximum | $\bar{x}$ | <i>sd</i> |
|--------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Expectancy and value           | 427 | 7       | 35      | 30.33     | 4.263     |
| Belief towards the achievement | 427 | 2       | 10      | 8.11      | 1.473     |

Achievement motivation has two sub – dimensions, named as expectancy and value, belief towards the achievement. Pre – service teachers' arithmetic means points from expectancy and value sub - dimension is 30.33 (always), from belief towards the achievement sub – dimension is 8.11 (always). Both two sub – dimension arithmetic means points show that pre – service teachers have high achievement motivations.

The highest arithmetic point of the items from expectancy and value sub - dimension is 4.52 (always). This item is about looking forward to learning new things in classes. That item is pointing out that students enjoy classes when they have faced to new learnings. Especially when new learnings are in their interests, they will tend towards the class contents easily. In same sub – dimension the lowest arithmetic mean point is 4.02 (often). This item means expecting to be very successful in the classes. So, they expect new learnings excitingly and they give it value however, when it comes to success, there is no discourse in the same tone.

The last sub – dimension is belief towards the achievement and it has just two items. One of them, which means believing more successful in some courses, has the highest arithmetic mean point as 4.43 (always). The other one, which means believing being among the best ones in general, has the lowest arithmetic mean point as 3.68 (often). So, it can be said that they have achievement motivation in some courses but not in whole.



### The Effect of Pre – Service Teachers’ Self – Efficacies on Their Achievement Motivations

The second sub – problem statement is “Do pre – service teachers’ self – efficacy levels have a significant effect on their achievement motivation?”, and with the help of simple linear regression the data has been analyzed. In this meaning simple linear regression was calculated to predict achievement motivation based on self – efficacy.

**Table 7.** Simple Linear Regression Results of Self – Efficacy Effect on Achievement Motivation

| Predictor       | <i>B</i> | <i>SH<sub>B</sub></i>       | $\beta$ | <i>t</i>                                   | <i>p</i> | <i>r</i> |
|-----------------|----------|-----------------------------|---------|--|----------|----------|
| (Constant)      | 16.392   | 1.073                       |         | 15.273                                     | .000     |          |
| Self – Efficacy | .303     | .015                        | .711    | 20.848                                     | .000     | .711     |
| <i>R</i> =.711  |          | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =.506 |         | <i>F</i> (1, 425) = 434.628 <i>p</i> =.000 |          |          |

As seen on Table 7, a significant regression equation was found ( $F_{(1, 425)} = 434.628, p < .000$ ) with an  $R^2$  of .506. Pre – service teachers’ achievement motivation is equal to 16.392 + .303 points when evaluated with self – efficacy. Pre – service teachers’ achievement motivation is increased .303 points for each value of self – efficacy.

### The Effect of Pre – Service Teachers’ Self – Managements on Their Achievement Motivations

The third sub – problem statement is “Do pre – service teachers’ self – management levels have a significant effect on their achievement motivations?”, and with the help of simple linear regression the data has been analyzed. In this meaning simple linear regression was calculated to predict achievement motivation based on self – management.

**Table 8.** Simple Linear Regression Results of Self – Management Effect on Achievement Motivation

| Predictor         | <i>B</i> | <i>SH<sub>B</sub></i>       | $\beta$ | <i>t</i>                                   | <i>p</i> | <i>r</i> |
|-------------------|----------|-----------------------------|---------|--|----------|----------|
| (Constant)        | 8.256    | 1.649                       |         | 5.008                                      | .000     |          |
| Self – Management | .451     | .024                        | .667    | 18.436                                     | .000     | .667     |
| <i>R</i> =.667    |          | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =.444 |         | <i>F</i> (1, 425) = 339.883 <i>p</i> =.000 |          |          |

As seen on Table 8, a significant regression equation was found ( $F_{(1, 425)} = 339.883, p < .000$ ) with an  $R^2$  of .444. Pre – service teachers’ achievement motivation is equal to 8.256 + .451 points when evaluated with self – management. Pre – service teachers’ achievement motivation is increased .451 points for each value of self – management.

### The Effect of Pre – Service Teachers’ Self – Efficacies and Self – Managements on Their Achievement Motivations Together

The fourth sub – problem statement is “Do pre – service teachers’ self – efficacy and self – management levels have a significant effect on their achievement motivations together?”, and with the help of multiple linear regression analyses the data has been analyzed. Multiple regression was calculated to see the effect of both self – efficacy and self – management on achievement motivation together.

**Table 9.** Multiple Linear Regression Results of Self – Efficacy and Self – Management Effect on Achievement Motivation

| Predictor         | <i>B</i> | <i>SH<sub>B</sub></i>       | $\beta$ | <i>t</i>                                   | <i>p</i> | Paired <i>r</i> | Partial |
|-------------------|----------|-----------------------------|---------|--|----------|-----------------|---------|
| (Constant)        | 8.105    | 1.454                       |         | 5.573                                      | .000     |                 |         |
| Self – Efficacy   | .204     | .018                        | .480    | 11.053                                     | .000     | .353            | .473    |
| Self – Management | .231     | .029                        | .342    | 7.872                                      | .000     | .251            | .357    |
| <i>R</i> =.754    |          | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> =.569 |         | <i>F</i> (1, 425) = 279.474 <i>p</i> =.000 |          |                 |         |

As seen on Table 9, a significant regression equation was found ( $F_{(1, 425)} = 279.474, p < .000$ ) with an  $R^2$  of .569. Pre – service teachers’ achievement motivation is equal to 8.105 + .204 (self – efficacy) + .231 (self – management)

points when evaluated with self – efficacy and self – management. Pre – service teachers’ achievement motivation is increased .204 points for each value of self – efficacy and .231 points for each value of self – management. Both self – efficacy and self – management are significant predictors of achievement motivation. The first important predictor is self – efficacy ( $\beta=.480$ ), and the second important predictor is self – management ( $\beta=.342$ ) on achievement motivation within the limitations of the study. According to the results of multiple linear regression, it can be said that self – efficacy and self – management explain together seventy – five percentage of ( $R=.754$ ) achievement motivation.

## DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the study we see that pre – service teachers’ self – efficacy, self – management and achievement motivations are at high level with the need of some interventions. As the descriptive findings say these interventions are about strengthening them about in some technical subjects during the classroom managements. Especially they see themselves enough successful about their professional fields but when the subject is rivalry, they feel some suspicious about their point of success. The difficulties can be summarized as about overcoming difficult issues in self – efficacy, about making study plans and being consistent on it in self – management and about getting the result in achievement motivation. In addition to these kinds of support needs, it is seen while both self – efficacy and self – managements have a normal effect on achievement motivation, they have stronger effect on achievement motivation together. It has been seen that when a student is supported with self – management whit his / her current self – efficacy perceptions, his / her achievement motivation rises in a positive way. So, these findings should be discussed in classroom management processes.

Classroom management can be handled int two aspects. One of them is establishing a quiet and calm atmosphere which help students having an ideal learning environment and the other one is contributing students’ social and moral developments (Doyle, 1986). Stronge et al. (2011) also highlight the teachers’ importance and effect on students’ gains as seen on remembering these kinds of teachers forever. These kinds of classical statements are of course true and still valid. But in today’s global world, the life conditions are getting harder day by day and youth have to face to more facing more competitive conditions in a getting more global world day by day. This situation enforcing education system towards giving attention into some details and enforce education stakeholders towards doing some changes. It can be said that more aggressive educational processes are needed for preparing pupils to the future. Especially as studied here, they need to have deep achievement motivations which will be the key that carries them to the success.

Akbaba (2006) says that there is a powerful relationship between motivation and success according to the researches and enumerates motivated student characteristics as;

- Having positive feelings to the school and finding school satisfactory,
- Persisting in difficult tasks and causing few problems, and
- Processing knowledge deeply.

Especially overcoming difficult tasks and processing knowledge show similarity with these determinations. In this study pre – service teachers also brought to the fore some shortcomings like overcoming difficult tasks and processing knowledge deeply as the barriers of achievement motivations. Students feel happy as take part in the classes. Of course, all students can’t show same success and attentions to all classes, but teachers should try to find their interests. That process, which means studying with concerned student, will contribute to the teachers’ job satisfaction, also. They can do this motivation with the help of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational tools while as should be known that intrinsic ones have more effects on the results. Shortly, finding pupils’ interests, which will rise their achievement motivation, can supply focusing on interests and demanding more detailed knowledge.

When a one catches a chance on dealing with his / her interest, he / she will not get bored and continue giving more effort on it. In this meaning imagine a child who is playing with toys, dealing with game console, enjoying with

friends or doing his / her own favorite activities, does he / she give up playing and come to the dinner easily? Not comes, moreover, he / she goes on trying to demand time to complete the play or to solve the problems he / she faced during those activities. If time is given from morning to evening to him / her, it isn't enough for him / her. Is it a dream for a teacher having a group that all students focusing or is it so hard managing this kind of a class? Just being a good teacher is enough when you have students full of this kind of a class.

Azer (2005) gives the good teacher characteristics in twelve items;

- Committed to the work,
- Encourages and appreciates diversity,
- Interacts and communicates respect,
- Motivates students and co – workers,
- Brings a wide range of skills and talents to teaching,
- Demonstrates leadership in teaching,
- Encourages an open and trusting learning environment,
- Fosters critical thinking,
- Encourages creative work,
- Emphasizes teamwork,
- Seeks continually to improve teaching skills, and
- Provides positive feedback.

Training or finding teachers in good characteristics as can be seen as both Azer's (2005) study or similarly in many other studies isn't so hard. The hard thing is bringing together good teachers with good students. İlgar (2015) underlines the difficulties of being a teacher relating students' daunting behaviors. These daunting behaviors are also attributed having some reasons actually except both teachers and students. In summary, some of them are; having education in crowded classes and arising some problems from this situation, students' not giving care to the educational processes, lack of enough materials, physical conditions of the classes etc.

Do those daunting behaviors make students bad learners or do unsuitable conditions cause to be presented daunting behaviors? If to generalize;

- exposing to intensive curriculum,
- not being able to turn to talents with anxiety about the future,
- being pushed into rote learning by exam pressure,
- having to learn in overcrowded classrooms,
- not having enough materials cause the most of the problems and affect both self – efficacy perceptions and self – management behaviors.

In fact, with a top view vocational orientation should be seen as the main problem about daunting behaviors. We can suppose that students have more success when they take place in the education system according to their own orientation programs. If they have no anxious about their future and employment, they will register to various educational programs which are more related with their capacities and talents. Many studies can be seen about education and employment especially underlining vocational orientation. For example; Özcan and Çalışkan (2020) gave some recommendations about vocational orientation, Çoruk (2019) evaluated the Decisions of National Education Councils with the educational objectives in Development Plans, Kavak (1997) handled education, employment and unemployment relations etc. Without getting too far off the topic, it can be said that less production level and employment cause some problems in education like limited education quality and educational resources, education employment mismatch, high competition and low motivation, brain drain, pressure on the education system due to lack of job opportunities.

If we back to our topic, self – efficacy and self – management can make strong impact on achievement motivation. While self – efficacy means the belief of individuals to their own talents, skills and knowledge, self – management means managing and regulating himself for reaching to his own targets. One, who has these qualities, can show more academic performance and success. In the meaning of classroom management, teachers can increase students’ achievement motivations by supporting these two qualities. This support can be given with some recommendations like that;

- giving positive feedbacks for increasing their self – efficacy,
- setting achievable goals for strengthening their self – efficacy,
- teaching learning strategies for supplying their self – efficacy,
- recognizing their achievements for encouraging their self – managements,
- giving responsibility and hence autonomy for developing their self – managements,
- coming up with course contents that will interest them for supporting their self – managements,
- teaching how to deal with difficulties for both their self – efficacy and self – managements.

These kinds of recommendations can support their self – efficacy perceptions and self – management behaviors and creates positive impact on their learning processes by increasing their academic achievements. Classroom management in that meaning can improve their confidence levels and can empower their behaviors towards the success.

In the light of findings, it is clear that both self – efficacy and self – management have impact on achievement motivation which is a key of success. It can be said that both self – efficacy and self – management affect achievement motivation both separately and together as the conclusion of the study. Especially together they have more powerful effect.

With self – efficacy, the student’s expectation of achieving success increases, he can turn to more challenging tasks, he exhibits more positive and successful attitudes, and he is motivated at the point of achieving success. With self – management, he finds the possibility of realizing his current self – efficacy. With self – management, students can control their behavior, make plans and implement these plans, focus on the target, use time effectively, procrastinate less, do not avoid taking responsibility, and their success is positively affected. By creating an environment that will support self – efficacy and self – management in classroom management processes and by providing positive feedback, teachers can increase students’ self – beliefs on a solid basis and contribute to their success.

## REFERENCES

- Akbaba, S. (2006). Eğitimde motivasyon [Motivation in education]. *Journal of Kazım Karabekir Education Faculty*, 2006 (13), 343 – 361. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/31512>
- Arsıanođlu, İ. (2016). *Bilimsel yöntem ve araştırma teknikleri ders notları* [Scientific method and research techniques lecture notes] (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.). Ankara: Gazi Kitapevi.
- Azer, S. A. (2005). The qualities of a good teacher: How can they be acquired and sustained? *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 98 (2), 67 – 69. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/014107680509800211>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self – efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Cautela, J.R. (1969). Behaviour therapy and self – control: Techniques and applications. In Franks, C.M. (Ed.), *Behavioural therapy: Appraisal and status* (pp. 323 – 340). New York: McGraw – Hill.
- Çoruk, A. (2019). Evaluation of the decisions of National Education Councils in the planned development period within the framework of educational objectives in Development Plans. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 15(4), 297 – 318. <https://doi.org/10.17244/eku.646042>
- Doyle, W. (1986) Classroom organization and management, in M. Wittrock (Ed.) *Handbook on research on teaching* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., pp. 392 – 431). New York: Macmillan.
- Eccles, J. (1983). Expectancies, values and academic behaviours. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives: Psychological and sociological approaches* (pp. 75 – 146). New York: Free man.
- Eccles, J., Wigfield, A., Harold, R., & Blumenfeld, P. (1993). Age and gender differences in children's self and task perceptions during elementary school. *Child Development*, 64(3), 830 – 847. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131221>
- Eccles, J., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 109 – 132. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153>
- Ercoskun, M. H. (2016). Adaptation of Self – Control and Self – Management Scale (SCMS) into Turkish culture: A study on reliability and validity. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 16, 1125 – 1145. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2016.4.2725>
- Farran, B. (2004). *Predictors of academic procrastination in college students* (Doctoral thesis, Fordham University). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/305185494>
- George, D. & Mallery, P. (2020). *IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step, a simple guide and reference* (16<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: Routledge – Taylor & Francis Group.
- Gürbüz, S. & Şahin, F. (2018). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri* [Research methods in social sciences] (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Howitt, D. & Cramer, D. (2014). *Introduction to SPSS in psychology, for version 22 and earlier* (6<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- İlgar, L. (2015). The point of views of classroom teachers who worked both at private and state schools on the differences in classroom management: A qualitative study. *HAYEF: Journal of Education*, 11(2), 259 – 285. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/93215>
- Kandemir, M., 2010. *Akademik erteleme davranışını açıklayıcı bir model* [A model explaining academic procrastination behaviour] (Doctoral thesis, Gazi University). <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Kanfer, F. H. (1970). Self – regulation: Research, issues, and speculations. In C. Neuringer & J. L. Michael (Ed.). *Behaviour modification in clinical psychology* (pp. 178 – 220). New York: Appleton – Century – Crofts.
- Karakaya, İ. (2014). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods]. In Tanrıođen, A. (Ed.), *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research methods] (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 57 – 86). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Kavak, Y. (1997), Eğitim, istihdam ve işsizlik ilişkileri [Education, employment and unemployment relations]. *Hacettepe University the Journal of Education*, 13(13), 21 – 26. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/88139>
- Kırmızı, Ö. (2015). The interplay among academic self – concept, self – efficacy, self – regulation and academic achievement of higher education L2 learners. *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, 5(1), 32 – 40. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1711559>

- Kuzu, A. (2013). Araştırmaların planlanması [Planning of studies]. In Kurt, A. A. (Ed.), *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research methods] (1<sup>st</sup> Ed., pp. 19 – 46). Ankara: Anadolu University Publications.
- Lumsden, L. S. (1994). *Student motivation to learn* (ERIC Digest, Number 92). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED370200.pdf>
- Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (1980). Self – management as a substitute for leadership: A social learning theory perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(3), 361 – 367. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257111>
- Marsh, H. W., Trautwein, U., Lüdtke, O., Baumert, J., & Köller, O. (2007). The big – fish – little – pond effect: Persistent negative effects of selective high schools on self – concept after graduation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 631 – 669. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207306728>
- Mezo, P. G. (2009). The self – control and self – management scale (SCMS): Development of an adaptive self – regulatory coping skills instrument. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioural Assessment*, 31(2), 83 – 93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-008-9104-2>
- Özbaşı, D., Cevahir, H. & Özdemir, M. (2018). Adaptation of online learning motivation scale into Turkish: Validity and reliability. *Trakya University Journal of Education Faculty*, 8(2), 352 – 368. <https://doi.org/10.24315/trkefd.331973>
- Özcan, C. & Çalışkan, İ. (2020). Orientation problems in education: Roadmap proposal for Turkey. *Manisa Celal Bayar University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 8(1), 46 – 58. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1124717>
- Rogers, C. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships as developed in the client – centred framework. In Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A Story of a Science*, (pp. 184 – 256). New York: McGraw – Hill.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54 – 56. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020>
- Sarıtepeci, M. (2018). Beklenti – değer teorisini temel alan başarı motivasyonu ölçeğini uyarlama çalışması [Adaptation study of the achievement motivation scale based on value – expectancy theory]. *International Journal of Education Science and Technology*, 4(1), 28 – 40. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/uebt/issue/37056/396404>
- Stronge, J.H., Ward, T.H. & Grant, L.W. (2011) What makes good teachers good? A cross – case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(4), 339 – 355. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022487111404241>
- Şahin, B. (2012). Metodoloji [Methodology]. In Tanrıoğen, A. (Ed.), *Scientific research methods* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 109 – 130). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6<sup>th</sup> Ed.). MA: Pearson.
- Umamoto T, Inagaki T. (2023). Relationship between motivation instability and type of motivation level in university learning based on self – determination theory: A cross – lagged panel model. *Psychological Reports*, 126(3), 1516 – 1530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003329412111067389>
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy–value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 68 – 81. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1015>
- Yıldız, A. (2019). *İşletme alanında nicel araştırma yöntemleri ve yayım etiği* [Quantitative research methods and publication ethics in business] (1<sup>st</sup> Ed). Ankara: Gazi Bookstore.