Güngör, C. (2021). The relationship between attitudes towards learning and success orientation in undergraduate students. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 8*(3). 1774-1796.

Received : 08.02.2021
Revised version received : 13.04.2021
Accepted : 14.04.2021

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING AND SUCCESS ORIENTATION IN UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Research article

Cumhur Güngör

Afyon Kocatepe University

cgungor@aku.edu.tr

Cumhur GÜNGÖR has been working as an assistant professor at Child Development Department of Afyon Kocatepe University Sandıklı School of Applied Disciplines. His research interest is mainly focused on curriculum and teaching, sociology and philosophy of education.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEARNING AND SUCCESS ORIENTATION IN UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Cumhur Güngör

cgungor@aku.edu.tr

Abstract

Rapid social, technological and cultural changes have brought along drastic changes in education, as well. Changing educational paradigms have required revising students' attitudes towards learning, which determine learning abilities and willingness. Within this context, it has been aimed, with this study, to analyse university students' attitudes towards learning in the context of success orientation and social learning setting. In line with this aim, with a view to collecting data, Personal Information Form, Scale of Attitude towards Learning (SAtL) and Success Orientation Scale (SOS) were used in this study, which was designed in the relational screening model. The research sample comprises 221 university students studying a state university during 2020-21 academic year. In conclusion, a strong positive correlation has been found between university students' attitudes towards learning and success orientations. It has been seen that university students' attitudes towards learning predict their success orientations to a considerable extent. This study has set forth that university students care about learning and have positive attitudes towards learning. This study has revealed that university students have a strong learning orientation and show performance in this respect. Students think that their teachers have the most influence on their learning process.

Keywords: Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientation, Social Learning Setting, University Student.

1. Introduction

Education, which is the process in which individuals acquire many facts and behaviours in different areas of life and obtain knowledge in all areas of life, is not only an activity consisting of cognitive processes, but a complex concept that includes psychomotor and affective areas. Education is an activity that covers the understanding, attitude, behaviour and thought of the individual affecting the past and future life, and that accustoms the new generations to the society with such characteristics, and aims to ensure that individuals acquire new skills, understanding, attitudes and behaviours (Biçer, 2019; Karslı, 2003; Kaya, 2017).

Rapid social, technological and cultural changes have brought along drastic changes in education, as well. Global developments, pandemic process starting in line with the outbreak of COVID-19 disease and social needs changing on a daily basis continue impacting education methods and learning settings (Saltürk & Güngör, 2020). It is not possible to state that the knowledge acquired by individuals at school suffices to keep up with such rapid changes, which compels individuals to acquire lifelong learning skills that will keep them active in life. As a matter of fact, lifelong learning skills were identified by the European Commission as "Literacy", "Multilingualism", "Numerical, scientific and digital and technology-based competences", "the ability to adopt new competences, "active citizenship", "entrepreneurship", "cultural awareness and expression" (Konakman & Yelken, 2014). Naturally, education is seen as the main actor in the acquisition of these competences. Students and teachers should be active as the main components of the education system so that an effective learning is achieved. However, effective learning can be possible primarily through an accurate identification and understanding of the nature of learning.

The concept of learning does not have a universally recognised definition by researchers, theoreticians and practitioners (Schunk, 2009). Domjan (2004, p.6) defines learning as the permanent change of a behaviour as a result of experience with environmental factors. Another definition was made by Özden (2003, p.21), who described learning as the change of perception, thought and behaviour as a result of the individual's interaction with the environment. Learning is a permanent change of behaviour occurring as a result of individuals' interactions with their environments to a certain extent. Discovering the most effective way of learning for learners is one of the main goals of the education studies. Therefore, some factors, which are believed to be effective in the learning process such as attitude, have become the subject of studies of the researchers (Akyol & Fer, 2010; Marton & Saljo, 1997; Özden, 2008).

Seen as an important predictor of human behaviours (Anderson, 1988), attitude, in a broad sense, means an individual's mental preparedness for or taking a particular stand against a certain object or person (Allport, 1935). Availability of numerous studies evidencing positive correlation between students' success and their attitudes towards learning has led many countries to adopt, in their education programmes, the strategy of developing students' attitudes towards learning as an important goal (Mullis, Martin, Goh & Cotter, 2016). Positive attitudes towards learning stimulate stronger desire to participate in the learning process (Marton & Saljo, 1997). Students' attitudes towards learning determine their ability and desire to learn. If negative attitudes do not change, students do not likely to continue their education beyond necessary. Changing students' negative attitudes towards learning is a process that includes determining the factor driving the attitude and using this information to create a change. There are many factors that cause students to develop positive or negative attitudes towards learning. Considering these factors in developing and maintaining positive attitudes toward learning and in increasing the learning quality has a great deal of impact in planning education programmes and learning activities based thereon. An education system to be organised in consideration of these factors will bring along quality, which will lead to formation of individuals that strive for participating in learning as well as enjoying learning.

In Today's world, the expectation from education of all segments has been increasing day by day. Not only being the key to development and human capital, education affects every aspect of human life, from individual and social development to socialisation. For the purposes of fulfillment of such expectations, the teachers should take place in the educational institutions because they enjoy teaching, learning and guiding students in this respect, not because they aim to serve a routine. Additionally, teachers should be facilitators of learning rather than making it difficult. The way to achieve this is through teachers who aim to learn and have positive attitudes in this sense. Measuring attitudes and knowing the degree of an attitude of people about a relevant object or situation are desirable in many areas because attitudes significantly affect human behaviours (Kan & Akbaş, 2005). In this sense, it is very important, during their pre-service education, to identify the attitudes of the teachers, especially who will help students develop positive attitudes towards learning and maintain this development, determine the current situation and understand their potential in relation to guiding students and setting an example to them.

The success orientations approach began with the studies of Dweck (1986), Nicholls (1984), Ames (1984) and Maehr (1983) examining the characteristics that the individuals who want to achieve their success goals should have. Success orientations do not only involve individuals' goal of pursuing achievement tasks, but also reflect a certain standard that people take as criteria when evaluating their success in achieving a goal (Ames, 1992). Success orientations have been conceptualised in different ways by different theoreticians. Elliot (1999) and Pintrich (2000) conceptualised them within the framework of learning and performance orientation sub-dimensions based on the purpose of the individual to internalize knowledge or to fulfil the

performance expectations of the individual. According to this approach, success goals are explained by the learner's determination of his/her own performance standard. These standards can be precise (based on the task's own requirements), internal (based on the individual's past attainment or maximum potential attainment) or normative (based on others' performance) (Elliot, 1999; Elliot & McGregor, 2001). In addition, success orientations arise from a personal orientation towards a competence (mastery or performance) and a relationship toward success (approach or avoidance). Success orientation model has been recently considered as a 2x2 framework that covers learning-approach, learning-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance dimensions (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). In this context, in order to organise the success goal literature, both Elliot and Pintrich proposed an overarching framework that classifies learning and performance goals with their approach and avoidance versions (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Pintrich, 2000).

The factors motivating students have been a frequently emphasised issue in the field of educational sciences. As a matter of fact, the research studies show that this issue does not stem from only one factor. Within this context, the theory of success goals draws an important framework for determining, maintaining, and increasing the quality of the elements that motivate students. Studies in the literature have provided an important perspective on the nature of success orientation, its correlation with similar variables, and how it affects learning and performance (Zweig & Webster, 2004). Studies in the literature have proved that learning orientation is positively correlated with many compatible variables such as perceived ability, using deep cognitive strategies, interest in the task, attributing success to individual effort, and perseverance in the face of difficult situations (Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Meece, Blumfeld, & Hoyle, 1988; Nicholls et al., 1985; Pintrich, 2000) while it is negatively correlated with the use of self-inhibiting strategies and inability (Midgley & Urdan, 2001). Koestner and Zuckerman (1994) stated that performance-oriented students make self-destructive attributions and excessive self-criticism. According to these students, the best achievement is being able to fulfill the learning tasks that others fail, or accomplish a task with minimal effort (Lemyre, Roberts, & Ommundsen, 2002). Performance orientation, on the other hand, reflects characteristics such as students' emphasis on social comparison, conducting their studies by referring to others and trying to do better than others, trying to seem more intelligent and talented, and avoidance from seeming incapable (Nichols, Jones, & Hancock, 2003). This orientation has been found to be positively associated with incompatible variables such as inability to make the necessary effort for learning, using superficial cognitive strategies, avoiding help-seeking behaviour, negative emotions and attributing failure to incapability (Meece et al., 1988).

Being in constant motion and transformation, education paradigms have caused students' attitudes towards learning and success goals to change in the process and to be shaped according to new needs. The two variables subject to the study are open to the effect of social learning environments, and the study examining the relevant variables in this context was not found at the time of this research. Within this context, it has been aimed to analyse university students' attitudes towards learning in the context of success orientation and social learning setting. In line with this aim, answers to below research questions were sought:

1. What are the university students' *attitudes towards learning?*
2. What are the university students' *success orientations*?
3. Do the university students' *attitudes towards learning and success orientations*

a. differ by the variable of "students' individual characteristics (gender, age, faculty, department, general point average, self-evaluated success)"?

b. differ by the variable of "social learning setting (influential people in the learning process, period when the desire to learn is the strongest, budget allocated for education, frequency of going to library, students' opinions on the educational opportunities offered by the university, the city they live in and their parents, the participation status in personal/vocational education)"?

4. Is there a statistically significant correlation between university students' attitudes towards learning and their success orientations?
5. To what extent do university students' *attitudes toward learning* predict their *success orientation*?

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

Analysing university students' attitudes towards learning in the context of success orientation and social learning setting is of importance in terms of foreseeing their learning setting and future academic achievements. In this study, relational screening model has been used to identify the correlation between university students' attitudes towards learning and success orientation as well as social learning setting. Relational screening model is a research model that aims to determine whether there is a change between two or more variables and the degree of change (Karasar, 2013) Before the research, the authorization of Sub-Committee of Ethics for Social Sciences in Afyon Kocatepe University was sought and granted (Decision: 27.04.2020/66).

2.2. Sample

The research sample was determined by convenience sampling. A total of 221 students,109 students from Sandıklı School of Applied Disciplines (SUBYO) and 112 students from Education Faculty in Afyon Kocatepe University, participated in the research study voluntarily. The data collection process was supported by the academic staff and took four weeks.

Examining the sample in terms of *demographic characteristics,* it was found out that the majority was female (77.4%); the rate of those being 20 years old is (25.3%); the rate of those studying in the education faculty is (50.7%); the rate of those studying in Child Development is (26.2%); the rate of those whose general point average is between 2,50 and 2,99 was (43%); the rate of the students perceiving themselves as moderately successful is (40.3%).

Examining the sample in terms of *social learning setting*, it has been established that the rate of those feeling the strongest desire to learn during university education is (31.2%); the rate of those spending 100 Turkish Liras and less on educational activities per month is (44.84); and the rate of those going to university library occasionally is (%48,4). While the rate of those finding the learning opportunities/learning setting offered by the university partially satisfactory is (33.9%), the rate of those finding the learning opportunities/learning setting offered by the city they live in partially satisfactory is (24.4%), and the rate of those finding the learning opportunities/learning setting offered by their parents substantially satisfactory is (38.0%). On the other hand, the rate of participants in any course, in the sample, for their personal/vocational development has been found to be (51.1%).

Examining the rates and frequency distribution of the participants' opinions on *the most influential person in their learning processes*, it has been identified that the rate of those thinking that the most influential person in their learning processes is their teachers is (79.6%), which is respectively followed by their mothers (62.4%) and friends (59.7%). Participants'

stating that their friends are more influential than their fathers (43%) in their learning processes is noteworthy.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

Personal Information Form, prepared by the researchers to collect university students' demographic information as well as information related to their learning setting, Scale of Attitude towards Learning (SAtL), developed by Çetin & Çetin (2019) to identify participants' attitudes towards learning, and Success Orientation Scale (SOS), developed by Midgley et al. (1998) and adapted to Turkish by Akın & Çetin (2007) to identify success orientations, were used. Information related to the applied assessment tools have been provided below.

2.3.1. Personal Information Form

Personal Information Form, which was prepared by the Researchers, include questions formed to obtain information related to participants' gender, age, educational background, learning settings and habits.

2.3.2. Scale of Attitude towards Learning

As a result of all the validity and reliability analyses, there are 34 items in the SAtL. 25 of the items in the scale are positive while 9 of them are negative. The scale, prepared as a five-point Likert type scale, includes "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Partially Agree", "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree" as grades. The highest attitude score that can be obtained from the scale is 170 while the lowest attitude score is 34. 9 negative items in the scale are scored in reverse. According to CFA results, the scale's model fit to data is on an an acceptable level. (RMSEA=.068; $\chi 2/df=1.9$; SRMR=76; NFI=.94; NNFI=.97; IFI=97; CFI=.97; RFI=.94). The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient for the scale has been identified as 0.94 for the overall scale, .92 for the I. Sub-factor, .86 for the II. Sub-factor, and .84 for the III. Sub-factor (Çetin & Çetin, 2019). The Cronbach`s alpha coefficients have been identified as .92 for Effort for learning sub-scale, .90 for Care about learning sub-scale, .74 for Avoidance from Learning subscale and .89 for the overall scale in this study.

2.3.3. Success Orientation Scale

Turkish form of SOS includes 17 items and 3 sub-dimensions. Therefore, the highest score that can be obtained from this five-point Likert-type scale is 85 while the lowest is 17. The scale, prepared as a five-point Likert type scale, includes "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Partially Agree", "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree" as grades. The high score obtained from each sub-dimension of the scale without reverse items indicates that the individual has the relevant success orientation. The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients were identified as .77 for Learning Orientation, .79 for Performance Approach Goal Orientation and .78 for Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation (Akın & Çetin, 2007). The Cronbach`s alpha coefficients have been identified as .88 for Learning orientation sub scale, .88 for Performance approach orientation sub-scale, .87 for Performance Avoidance Orientation and .84 for the overall scale in this study.

2.4. Data Analyses

The data have been analysed with IBM SPSS statistical software (version 21) and worked with 95% CI. Since kurtosis and skewness values obtained from the scales fall in the range of +3 and -3, it has been accepted that the data are normally distributed (De Carlo, 1997; Groeneveld & Meeden, 1984; Hopkins & Weeks, 1990; Moors, 1986) and parametric test techniques have been used. Within this scope, variation of the scores obtained from the scales according to demographic variables was analysed by t test and ANOVA test, which were two of the parametric test techniques. The correlation between the scores were identified with

Pearson correlation test and regression test was used for identification of the impacts among the scores. The normality assumption was met, and the entered model of multiple linear regression was used as the regression model. To avoid multicollinearity, the criterion of tolerance values greater than .10 and VIF values less than 10 were examined.

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics on the Scales and Their Sub-Dimensions*

	n	Minimum	Maximum	Average	sd	Skewness	Kurtosis
SAtL							
Effort for learning	221	1,42	4,79	3,64	0,69	-,561	,173
Care about learning	221	2,13	5,00	4,39	0,67	-1,142	,530
Avoidance from Learning	221	1,71	4,57	3,92	0,63	-1,466	1,901
SAtL	221	2,40	4,74	3,98	0,55	-,748	-,458
SOS							
Learning Orientation	221	1,33	5,00	3,91	0,80	-,523	-,403
Performance Approach Orientation	221	1,00	5,00	3,56	0,95	-,435	-,473
Performance Avoidance Orientation	221	1,00	4,60	2,22	0,92	,511	-,547
SOS	221	1,11	4,53	3,23	0,59	-,172	,791

According to Table 1, the fact that SAtL (3,92) and *Care about Learning* sub-dimension have the highest average (4,39) shows that university students care about learning and have a positive attitude towards learning.

Again, according to Table 1, *Learning Orientation* sub-dimension has the highest average (3,91) based on the scores obtained from *SOS* and sub-dimensions, which supports university students' attitude towards learning and knowledge. Additionally, average item score of Performance Approach Orientation sub-dimension (3,92) can be considered as a sign that university students show positive orientation towards learning.

3. Findings

3.1. Findings Regarding the Variations in The Scores Obtained from the Scales According to Demographic Characteristics

3.1.1. Gender

Examining the results of t test (*p<0,05), carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *gender*, the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (t=1,411,p=0,16), Care about Learning (t=1,766,p=0,079), Avoidance from Learning (t=1,08,p=0,281), SAtL (t=1,726,p=0,086), Learning Orientation (t=1,774,p=0,077), Performance Approach Orientation (t=0,591,p=0,555), Performance Avoidance Orientation (t=-0,156,p=,876), SOS (t=1,044,p=,298).

Between female and male participants, there are not any statistically significant discrepancies (p>0.05) in terms of *Attitude towards Learning* and its sub-dimensions as well as in terms of *Success Orientations* and its sub-dimensions.

3.1.2. Age

Examining the results of ANOVA test (*p<0,05), carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *age*, the following has

been found out: Effort for Learning (F=2,703,p=,015*), Care about Learning, (F=1,865,p=0,088), Avoidance from Learning (F=2,276,p=,038*), SAtL (F=2,041,p=0,062), Learning Orientation (F=2,632,p=,018*), Performance Approach Orientation (F=1,818,p=0,097), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=3,581,p=,002*), SOS (F=3,34,p=,004*).

Among different age groups: there are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Efforts for Learning.* Accordingly, while the average of those being 23 years old (X=3,98) is the highest, the average of those being 19 years old is the lowest (X=3,44). There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Avoidance from Learning*. Accordingly, while the average of those in 24-28 age group is the highest (X=4,10), the average of those being 22 years old is the lowest (X=3,61).

Among different age groups: There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Learning Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those being 23 years old is the highest (X=4,30), the average of those being 19 years old is the lowest (X=3,64). There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Performance Avoidance Orientation.* Accordingly, while the average of those being 22 years old is the highest (X=2,69), the average of those being 19 years old is the lowest (X=2,09). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of Success Orientations (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those being 22 years old is the highest (X=3,43), the average of those being 19 years old is the lowest (X=3,03).

3.1.3. Faculty/School of Education

Examining the results of t test (*p<0,05), carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *faculty/school of education,* the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (t=1,398,p=0,164), Care about Learning (t=1,549,p=0,123), Avoidance from Learning (t=0,79,p=0,431), SAtL (t=1,519,p=0,13), Learning Orientation (t=0,955,p=0,34), Performance Approach Orientation (t=2,85,p=005*), Performance Avoidance Orientation (t=-0,755,p=,0,451), SOS (t=1,486,p=,0,139).

Among those studying in Education Faculty and SUBYO: There are not any statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Attitude towards Learning* and its sub-dimensions (p>0,05). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Performance Approach Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those studying in the education faculty (X=3,74) is the highest.

3.1.4. Department of Education

Examining the results of ANOVA test (*p<0,05), carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *department of education*, the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=1,636,p=,0,152), Care about Learning, (F=3,52,p=004*), Avoidance from Learning (F=4,649,p=,000*), SAtL (F=3,969,p=002*), Learning Orientation (F=0,51,p=,0,769*), Performance Approach Orientation (F=1,983,p=0,082), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=3,119,p=,010*), SOS (F=1,622,p=,0,155).

Among those from different departments of education: There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Care about Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those studying Preschool Teaching is the highest (X=4,81) while the average of those studying Social Sciences Teaching is the lowest (X=4,12). There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Avoidance from Learning*. Accordingly, the average of those studying Turkish Language Teaching is the highest (X=4,17) while the average of those studying Social Sciences Teaching is the lowest (X=3,54). There are statistically significant discrepancies in

terms of *Attitude towards Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those studying Preschool Teaching is the highest (X=4,28) while the average of those studying Social Sciences Teaching is the lowest (X=3,73).

There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Performance Avoidance Orientation* among those from different departments of education. Accordingly, the average of those studying Social Sciences Teaching is the highest (X=2,58) while the average of those studying Primary School Teaching is the lowest (X=1,78).

3.1.5. General Point Average

Examining the results of ANOVA test (*p<0,05), carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *general point average*, the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=3,051,p=,029*), Care about Learning, (F=0,805,p=0,492*), Avoidance from Learning (F=1,218,p=,0,304), SAtL (F=1,963,p=0,121), Learning Orientation (F=4,502,p=,004*), Performance Approach Orientation (F=0,902,p=0,441), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=3,706,p=,012*), SOS (F=2,106,p=,0,1).

Among the groups with different general point averages: There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Efforts for Learning.* Accordingly, the average of those whose general point average is between 3,50 and 4,00 is the highest (X=3,89) while the average of those whose general point average is between 1,00 and 2,49 is the lowest (X=3,39). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Learning Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those whose general point average is between 3,50 and 4,00 is the highest (X=4,15) while the average of those whose general point average is between 1,00 and 2,49 is the lowest (X=3,50). There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Performance Avoidance Orientation.* Accordingly, the average of those whose general point average is between 1,00 and 2,49 is the highest (X=2,44) while the average of those whose general point average is between 3,00 and 3,49 is the lowest (X=1,92).

3.1.6. Self-Evaluation of Academic Achievement

Examining the results of ANOVA test (*p<0,05), carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *self-evaluation of academic achievement*, the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=3,582,p=,015*), Care about Learning, (F=1,266,p=0,287), Avoidance from Learning (F=0,236,p=,0,871), SAtL (F=1,514,p=0,212), Learning Orientation (F=6,646,p=,000*), Performance Approach Orientation (F=4,2,p=006*), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=0,244,p=,0,865*), SOS (F=4,236,p=,006*).

Among groups with different self-evaluations of academic achievement: There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Efforts for Learning.* Accordingly, while the average of those evaluating themselves as successful (X=3,78) is the highest, the average of those evaluating themselves as very unsuccessful or unsuccessful (X=3,24) is the lowest.

Among groups with different self-evaluations of academic achievement: There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Learning Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those evaluating themselves as successful (X=4,11) is the highest, the average of those evaluating themselves as very unsuccessful or unsuccessful (X=3,25) is the lowest. There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Performance Approach Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those evaluating themselves as successful (X=3,82) is the highest, the average of those evaluating themselves as moderately successful (X=3,33) is the lowest. There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of

Success Orientations (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those evaluating themselves as successful (X=3,39) is the highest, the average of those evaluating themselves as very unsuccessful or unsuccessful (X=3,00) is the lowest.

3.2. Findings Regarding the Variations in The Scores Obtained from the Scales According to Social Learning Setting

3.2.1. Period When Desire to Learn Is the Strongest

Examining the results of ANOVA test (*p<0,05), carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *period when desire to learn is the strongest*, the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=4,216,p=,003*), Care about Learning, (F=4,505,p=002*), Avoidance from Learning (F=4,174,p=,003*), SAtL (F=5,606,p=000*), Learning Orientation (F=5,016,p=,001*), Performance Approach Orientation (F=0,804,p=0,524), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=1,45,p=,0,219*), SOS (F=1,621,p=,0,17).

Among the groups who felt the strongest desire to learn in different periods: There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Efforts for Learning.* Accordingly, the average of those who feel strong desire to learn at all times is the highest (X=3,89) while the average of those who felt the desire to learn the strongest in the primary education period is the lowest (X=3,48). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Care about Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those who feel strong desire to learn at all times is (X=4,64) the highest while the average of those who felt the desire to learn the strongest in the primary education period is the lowest (X=4,16). There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Avoidance from Learning*. Accordingly, the average of those who feel strong desire to learn at all times is (X=4,11) the highest while the average of those who felt the desire to learn the strongest in the primary education period is the lowest (X=3,56). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Attitude towards Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those who feel strong desire to learn at all times is (X=4,21) the highest while the average of those who felt the desire to learn the strongest in the secondary education period is the lowest (X=3,86).

There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Learning Orientation* among the groups who felt the strongest desire to learn in different periods (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those who feel the desire to learn strongest during university education is (X=4,09) the highest while the average of those who felt the desire to learn the strongest in the primary education period is the lowest (X=3,63).

3.2.2. Monthly Budget Allocated for Educational Activities

Examining the results of ANOVA test (*p<0,05), carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *monthly budget allocated for educational activities*, the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=4,03,p=,008*), Care about Learning, (F=4,946,p=002*), Avoidance from Learning (F=3,741,p=,012*), SAtL (F=5,104,p=002*), Learning Orientation (F=4,438,p=,005*), Performance Approach Orientation (F=0,77,p=0,512), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=1,941,p=,0,124), SOS (F=3,366,p=,019*).

Among the groups with different monthly budget allocated for educational activities: There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Efforts for Learning.* Accordingly, while the average of those spending 101-200 Turkish Liras per month is the highest (X=3,77), the average of those who do not spend this amount of money is the lowest (X=3,08). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Care about Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those spending 101-200 Turkish Liras per month

is the highest (X=4,55), the average of those who do not spend this amount of money is the lowest (X=4,00). There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Avoidance from Learning*. Accordingly, while the average of those spending 100 Turkish Liras and less per month is the highest (X=4,02), the average of those who do not spend this amount of money is the lowest (X=3,58). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Attitude towards Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those spending 101-200 Turkish Liras per month is the highest (X=4,09), the average of those who do not spend this amount of money is the lowest (X=3,55).

Among the groups with different monthly budget allocated for educational activities: There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Learning Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those spending 101-200 Turkish Liras per month is the highest (X=4,07), the average of those who do not spend this amount of money is the lowest (X=3,32). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of Success Orientations (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those spending 200 Turkish Liras and more per month is the highest (X=3,41), the average of those who do not spend this amount of money is the lowest (X=3,02).

3.2.3. The Frequency of Going to University Library

Examining the results of ANOVA test (*p<0,05), carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *the frequency of going to university library*, the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=27,079,p=,000*), Care about Learning, (F=13,842,p=000*), Avoidance from Learning (F=3,408,p=,018*), SAtL (F=16,652,p=000*), Learning Orientation (F=7,247,p=,000*), Performance Approach Orientation (F=3,485,p=017*), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=1,953,p=,0,122), SOS (F=4,482,p=,004*).

Among the groups with different frequency of going to the university library: There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Efforts for Learning.* Accordingly, while the average of those going to university library "often" per month (X=4,29) is the highest, the average of those going to the university library during assignment/midterm weeks is the lowest (X=3,22). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Care about Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those going to university library "often" per month (X=4,79) is the highest, the average of those going to the university library during assignment/midterm weeks is the lowest (X=4,01). There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Avoidance from Learning*. Accordingly, while the average of those going to university library "never" in a month (X=4,21) is the highest, the average of those going to the university library during assignment/midterm weeks is the lowest (X=3,79). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Attitude towards Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those going to university library "often" per month (X=4,40) is the highest, the average of those going to the university library during assignment/midterm weeks is the lowest (X=3,67).

Among the groups with different frequency of going to the university library: There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Learning Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those going to university library "often" per month (X=4,38) is the highest, the average of those going to the university library during assignment/midterm weeks is the lowest (X=3,62). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Performance Approach Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those going to university's library "often" per month (X=3,84) is the highest, the average of those going to the university's library during assignment/midterm weeks is the lowest (X=3,27). There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Success Orientations* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the

average of those going to university library “often” per month (X=3,46) is the highest, the average of those going to the university library “never” in a month is the lowest (X=3,05).

3.2.4. Students’ Opinions on the Educational Opportunities/Learning Setting Offered by the University

Examining the results of ANOVA test, carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *students’ opinions on the educational opportunities/learning setting offered by the university,* the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=2,949,p=,021*), Care about Learning, F=1,152,p=0,333), Avoidance from Learning (F=2,003,p=0,095) , SAtL (F=1,559,p=0,186), Learning Orientation (F=4,054,p=,003*), Performance Approach Orientation (F=2,543,p=,041*), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=1,11,p=0,353), SOS (F=2,071,p=0,086).

Among the groups with different opinions on the educational opportunities/learning setting offered by the university: There are statistically significant discrepancies (p<0,05) in terms of *Efforts for Learning.* Accordingly, while the average of those finding them fully sufficient (X=3,96) is the highest, the average of those finding them partially sufficient (X=3,45) is the lowest. There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Learning Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those finding them fully sufficient (X=4,17) is the highest, the average of those finding them partially sufficient (X=3,62) is the lowest.

Among the groups with different opinions on the educational opportunities/learning setting offered by the university, there are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Performance Approach Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those finding them fully sufficient (X=4,19) is the highest, the average of those finding them substantially sufficient (X=3,36) is the lowest.

3.2.5. Students’ Opinions on the Educational Opportunities/Learning Setting Offered by the City They Live in

Examining the results of ANOVA test, carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *students’ opinions on the educational opportunities/learning setting offered by the city they live in,* the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=1,003,p=,0,407), Care about Learning, F=2,878,p=024*), Avoidance from Learning (F=0,817,p=0,515) , SAtL (F=1,553,p=0,188), Learning Orientation (F=1,672,p=,0,158), Performance Approach Orientation (F=3,709,p=,006*), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=0,519,p=0,722), SOS (F=2,298,p=0,06).

Among the groups with different opinions on the educational opportunities/learning setting offered by the city they live in: There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Care about Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those finding them substantially sufficient (X=4,55) is the highest, the average of those finding them fully sufficient (X=4,14) is the lowest.

Among the groups with different opinions on the educational opportunities/learning setting offered by the city they live in: There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Performance Approach Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, while the average of those finding them insufficient (X=3,81) is the highest, the average of those finding them fully insufficient (X=3,22) is the lowest.

3.2.6. Students’ Opinions on the Educational Opportunities/Learning Setting Offered by Their Parents

Examining the results of ANOVA test, carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *students' opinions on the educational opportunities/learning setting offered by the university,* the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=0,657,p=,0,579), Care about Learning, F=0,094,p=0,963), Avoidance from Learning (F=2,243,p=0,084) , SAtL (F=0,329,p=0,804), Learning Orientation (F=0,191,p=,0,903), Performance Approach Orientation (F=0,382,p=,0,766*), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=1,182,p=0,317), SOS (F=0,095,p=0,962).

Among the groups with different opinions on the educational opportunities/learning setting offered by their parents: There are not any statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Attitude towards Learning* and its sub-dimensions (p>0,05) as well as in terms of *Success Orientations* and its sub-dimensions.

3.2.7. Participation in Any Course for Personal/Vocational Development

Examining the results of t test, carried out to analyse Attitude towards Learning, Success Orientations and their sub-dimensions in terms of *Participation in Any Course for Personal/Vocational Development*, the following has been found out: Effort for Learning (F=1,689,p=0,093), Care about Learning, (F=2,057,p=,041*) , Avoidance from Learning (F=-0,351,p=0,726), SAtL (F=1,404,p=0,162), Learning Orientation (F=1,695,p=0,092), Performance Approach Orientation(F=2,182,p=,030*), Performance Avoidance Orientation (F=1,34,p=0,181) SOS (F=2,679,p=,008*).

Among the groups whose status of participation in any course for personal/vocational development are different: There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Care about Learning* (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those having participated in any course (X=4,48) is higher.

Among the groups whose status of participation in any course for personal/vocational development are different: There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of *Performance Approach Orientation* (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those having participated in any course (X=3,70) is higher. There are statistically significant discrepancies in terms of Success Orientations (p<0,05). Accordingly, the average of those having participated in any course (X=3,33) is higher.

3.3. The Correlation between Attitudes towards Learning and Success Orientations

The results of Pearson correlation test, carried out in order to analyse the correlation between attitudes towards learning and success orientations, have been provided in Table 2 below.

Table 2. *Analysis of The Correlation between Attitudes towards Learning and Success Orientations*

		Learning Orientation	Performance Approach Orientation	Performance Avoidance Orientation	SOS
Effort for learning	r	,738**	,220**	-,047	,431**
	p	,000	,001	,489	,000
Care about learning	r	,537**	,239**	-,288**	,224**
	p	,000	,000	,000	,001
Avoidance from Learning	r	,241**	-,021	-,561**	-,195**
	p	,000	,754	,000	,004
SAtL	r	,619**	,181**	-,351**	,197**

p	,000	,007	,000	,003

*p<0,05; **p<0,01

The correlation coefficients were accepted and interpreted according to these ranges: 0≤r≤0,25 very weak, 0,26≤r≤0,49 weak, 0,50≤r≤0,69 moderate, 0,70≤r≤0,89 strong, 0,90≤r≤1 very strong (Akgül & Cevik. 2003: 358).

There is a strong positive correlation between ***Effort for Learning*** and Learning Orientation; a very weak positive correlation between ***Effort for Learning*** and *Performance Approach Orientation*; and a weak positive correlation between ***Effort for Learning*** and *SOS*.

There is a moderate positive correlation between ***Care about Learning*** and *Learning Orientation;* a weak positive correlation between ***Care about Learning*** and *Performance Approach Orientation*; a weak negative correlation between ***Care about Learning*** and *Performance Avoidance Orientation;* and a very weak positive correlation between ***Care about Learning*** and *SOS*.

There is a weak positive correlation between ***Avoidance from Learning*** and *Learning Orientation*; a medium negative correlation between ***Avoidance from Learning*** and *Performance Avoidance Orientation;* and a very weak negative correlation between ***Avoidance from Learning*** and *SOS*.

There is a moderate positive correlation between ***Attitude towards Learning*** and *Learning Orientation*; a very weak positive correlation between ***Attitude towards Learning*** and *Performance Approach Orientation*; a weak negative correlation between ***Attitude towards Learning*** and *Performance Avoidance Orientation;* and a very weak positive correlation between ***Attitude towards Learning*** and *SOS*.

3.4. The situation as to whether university students' attitudes towards learning predict their success orientation

The results of regression test, performed to analyse the impact of the *Dimensions of the Attitudes towards Learning* on *the Learning Orientation,* have been provided in Table 3 below:

Table 3. *Analysis of the Impact of the Dimensions of the Attitudes toward Learning on the Learning Orientation*

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Beta	t	p	R2	Tolerance	VIF
Learning Orientation	Effort for learning	,760	10,996	.000*	,547	,437	2,289
	Care about learning	-,054	-,667	,506		,324	3,089
	Avoidance from Learning	,061	1,065	,288		,645	1,551
Model: F=87,255 p=,000							

*p<0,05

The regression model, established to analyse the impact, is significant (p<0,05). Examining the coefficients, *Effort for Learning* impacts *Learning Orientation* positively (Beta=,760 p<0,05). 55% of the variation in the Learning Orientation is explained by the Effort for Learning.

The results of regression test, performed to analyse the impact of the *Dimensions of the Attitudes toward Learning* on *Performance Approach Orientation,* have been provided in Table 4 below.

Table 4. *Analysis of the Impact of the Dimensions of the Attitudes toward Learning on Performance Approach Orientation*

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Beta	t	p	R2	Tolerance	VIF
Performance Approach Orientation	Effort for learning	,034	,343	,732	,093	,437	2,289
	Care about learning	,338	2,977	.003*		,324	3,089
	Avoidance from Learning	-,221	2,739	,007*		,645	1,551

Model: F=7,406 p=,000 *p<0,05

The regression model, established to analyse the impact, is significant (p<0,05). Examining the coefficients, while *Care about Learning* impacts *Performance Approach Orientation* positively (Beta=,338 p<0,05), *it impacts Avoidance from learning orientation* negatively (Beta=-,221 p<0,05). 9% of the variation in Performance Approach Orientation is explained by Care about Learning and Avoidance from Learning.

The results of regression test, performed to analyse the impact of the *Dimensions of the Attitudes toward Learning* on *Performance Avoidance Orientation,* have been provided in Table 5 below.

Table 5. *Analysis of the Impact of the Dimensions of the Attitudes toward Learning on Performance Avoidance Orientation*

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Beta	t	p	R2	Tolerance	VIF
Performance Avoidance Orientation	Effort for learning	,194	2,316	,021*	,332	,437	2,289
	Care about learning	-,124	-1,269	.206		,324	3,089
	Avoidance from Learning	-,545	7,887	.000*		,645	1,551

Model: F=35,952 p=,000 *p<0,05

The regression model, established to analyse the impact, is significant (p<0,05). Examining the coefficients, while *Effort for Learning* impacts *Performance Avoidance Orientation* positively (Beta=,194 p<0,05), *Avoidance from learning* impacts it negatively (Beta=-,545 p<0,05). 33% of the variation in Performance Avoidance Orientation is explained by Effort for Learning and Avoidance from Learning.

The results of regression test, performed to analyse the impact of the *Dimensions of the Attitudes toward Learning* on *Success Orientations,* have been provided in Table 5 below.

Table 6. *Analysis of the Impact of the Dimensions of the Attitudes toward Learning on Success Orientations*

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Beta	t	p	R2	Tolerance	VIF
SOS	Effort for learning	,466	5,412	.000*	,296	,437	2,289
	Care about learning	,094	,942	,347		,324	3,089
	Avoidance from Learning	-,377	-5,316	.000*		,645	1,551

Model: F=30,399 p=,000 *p<0,05

The regression model, established to analyse the impact, is significant (p<0,05). Examining the coefficients, while *Effort for Learning* impacts Success Orientations positively (Beta=,466 p<0,05), *Avoidance from learning* impacts it negatively (Beta=-,377 p<0,05). 30% of the variation in Success Orientations is explained by Effort for Learning and Avoidance from Learning.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

This study has aimed to analyse university students' attitudes towards learning in the context of success orientation and social learning setting. In line with this aim, university students' attitudes towards learning and success orientations have been analysed as well as the variations in their attitudes towards learning and success orientations according to their individual characteristics and social settings. In addition, whether there has been a statistically significant correlation between university students' attitudes towards learning and their success orientations as well as the extent to which their attitudes towards learning predict their success orientation have been studied.

According to the findings of the research study, a strong positive correlation has been found between university students' attitudes towards learning and success orientations. As for the sub-dimensions of these, generally medium or strong positive correlations have been identified. Only between avoidance from learning and performance avoidance, a negative correlation has been found. It has been seen that university students' attitudes towards learning impact their success orientations to a considerable extent. Effort for learning impacts learning orientation positively. Care about learning impacts performance approach orientation positively while it impacts avoidance from learning orientation negatively. Effort for learning impacts performance avoidance orientation positively while avoidance from learning impacts it negatively. Effort for learning impacts success orientations positively while avoidance from learning impacts it negatively.

It has been seen that university students' attitudes towards learning predict their success orientations to a considerable extent. 55% of the variation in the Learning Orientation is explained by the Effort for Learning. 33% of the variation in Performance Avoidance Orientation is explained by Effort for Learning and Avoidance from Learning. 30% of the variation in Success Orientations is explained by Effort for Learning and Avoidance from Learning. On the other hand, only 9% of the variation in Performance Approach Orientation is explained by Care about Learning and Avoidance from Learning.

University students' opinions on the most influential people on their learning processes have been identified to be respectively their teachers, mothers, friends, and fathers. In this regard, the fact that their friends precede their fathers in the influencing order is noteworthy. This finding is similar to the studies setting forth the impact (Baker, 2003; Nelson & DeBacker, 2008; Ülper, 2011; Wigfield & Wagner, 2005) of friends and peers on the learning processes of individuals. Teachers, the most important element in the system, are of great significance in students' developing positive attitudes towards learning because teachers influence students and learning setting not only with their cognitive equipment but also with their personalities. Attitudes, behaviours, interests and needs, values constitute the teacher's personality. The most important variable impacting success in learning - teaching setting is the teacher (Şişman, 2014). This critical role of the teachers in individuals' learning processes overlap with many other studies (Bağcı & Temizkan, 2006; Edmunds & Bauserman, 2006; Gömleksiz, 2004; Law, 2008; Özbay, 2010). Additionally, studies about parents' importance in their children's

learning processes (Baker, 2003; Carlson, 1999; Pomerantz, Grolnick & Price; 2005) support this study's findings related to the parents' importance in students' learning processes.

This study has set forth that university students care about learning and have positive attitudes towards learning. This study has revealed that university students have a strong learning orientation and show performance in this respect. Positive attitudes towards learning stimulate stronger desire to participate in the learning process (Marton & Saljo, 1997). In the learning process, while positive attitudes increase success, negative attitudes may result in failure (Kazazoğlu, 2013). Studies (cited by Dikmen, Tuncer & Şimşek, 2018) emphasise that individuals' attitudes towards lessons and learning are of importance in terms of academic achievement. It has been observed that studies related to academic achievement and attitudes towards learning setting (Karagiannopoulou & Christtodoulides; 2005), to the impact of positive attitude on the learning process (Rula, 2006; Bahn, 2007; Pierce, Stacey & Barkatsas, 2007), to the association between attitudes towards learning and level of knowledge (Prokop, Leskova, Kubiatko & Diran, 2007) support the findings obtained from this study.

It has been determined that university students' attitudes towards learning and success orientations do not differ by gender, which is similar to the studies (Kurbanoğlu & Takunyacı, 2012; Yenilmez & Özabacı, 2003; Kara & Uysal, 2015; Dikmen, Tuncer & Şimşek, 2018) which have revealed that there are not any significant discrepancies according to gender in terms of attitudes towards learning. On the other hand, Aydın (2016) and Akgün, Gönen & Aydın (2007) are in contradiction with this finding, with their studies setting forth that there are significant discrepancies in favour of male participants. It overlaps with the studies putting forth that students' success orientations do not differ by gender (Erman, Şahan & Can, 2004; İzci & Koç, 2012; Kaya, 2016; Odacı, Berber Çelik, & Çikrıkci, 2013; Toğluk, 2009; Cengiz & Kabakçı, 2014; Vahapoğlu,2013).

In terms of students' age, it has been observed that older students have more positive attitudes towards learning and success orientation than younger students. It may stem from the differences of older students or those in higher grades such as academic experience, expectations, learning settings. The study of Dikmen, Tuncer & Şimşek (2018), where they discuss attitudes towards learning, and the study of Kılıç (2014), where he examines prospective teachers' perception on lifelong learning, support this finding. Özden (2002) states that maturity is a prerequisite for the realisation of learning and this situation is directly related to age and intelligence. It can be stated that this situation affects the attitude towards learning positively.

It has been understood that students allocating more budget for educational activities have more positive attitudes towards learning and success orientations. It has been observed that students with higher general point average and evaluating themselves as successful have more positive attitudes towards learning and success orientations. It is remarkable that students in preschool teaching have higher averages in terms of attitudes towards learning and success orientations while students in social sciences teaching have lower averages in this regard. There are no studies related to this finding in the literature. On the other hand, the reason may be differences in terms of department of preschool teaching, students, curriculum and learning setting. It has been determined that university students' attitudes towards learning and success orientations do not differ by department of education, which contradicts the study of Kantaroğlu & Akbıyık' (2017), whose findings have revealed that the attitudes in question are in favour of the students in education faculty.

It has been seen that while the attitudes towards learning and success orientations of the students who feel strong desire to learn at all times are more positive, those of the students who feel the strongest desire to learn in primary and secondary education period are, in general,

negative. It is known that the individuals who have positive attitudes towards learning perform better in terms of learning and that individuals' attitudes towards learning affect learning outcomes, as well (Aktürk, 2012; Duarte, 2007; Kara, İzci & Ulutaş, 2011). Positive attitudes towards school and learning increase students' knowledge, skill development and motivation (Adıgüzel, 2014).

It has been observed that the more frequently the students go to the university library, the more positive their attitudes towards learning and success orientations are generally. Although there are no studies in the literature regarding the relevance of going to the library, the subject can be discussed based on the positive correlation between the habit of reading books and the frequency of using the library. Within this context, it overlaps partially with the studies setting forth that the correlation between the habit of reading books and success orientation (Ames & Archer, 1988; Applegate & Applegate, 2004; Koç & Arslan, 2015; Sucuoğlu, & Gökdağ Baltaoğlu, 2020) as well as attitudes towards learning (Bokhorst-Heng & Pereira, 2008).

It has been concluded that those finding the educational opportunities offered by their university and city they live in fully or substantially sufficient have more positive attitudes towards learning and success orientations. In this regard, there are no similar studies or findings in the literature. It has been observed that students having participated in any course for personal or vocational development have more positive attitudes towards learning and success orientations, which shows similarity with the study of Tenekeci (2009), whose findings have revealed that teachers attending courses have higher attitudes related to lifelong learning approach.

In conclusion, a strong positive correlation has been found between university students' attitudes towards learning and success orientations. It has been seen that university students' attitudes towards learning predict their success orientations to a considerable extent. This study has set forth that university students care about learning and have positive attitudes towards learning. This study has revealed that university students have a strong learning orientation and show performance in this respect. Students think that their teachers have the most influence on their learning process. Within this context, it is noteworthy that they see their friends as more influential than their fathers. The attitudes towards learning and success orientations of the students allocating more budget for educational activities, feeling a strong desire to learn at all times, finding educational opportunities offered by their university and setting sufficient, going to library more often and relatively older students are, in general, more positive.

Similar studies can be carried out in relation to university students' attitudes towards learning and success orientations based on different samples, educational background, and variables. It is recommended to conduct causal studies on the findings of this research study.

References

Adıgüzel, A. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının öğrenmeye ilişkin tutumları ile bilgi okuryazarlık becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi, 4*(7),13-24.

Akgül A. & Çevik O. (2003) İstatistiksel Analiz Teknikleri, Emek Ofset, Ankara.

Akgün, A., Gönen, S. & Aydın, M. (2007). İlköğretim fen ve matematik öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin kaygı düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 6(*20),283-299.

Aktürk, A.O. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının öğrenmeye ilişkin tutumlarının öğretmenlik mesleğini tercih etme nedenlerine ve akademik başarılarına göre incelenmesi, *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,13*(3),283-297.

Akın, A. & Çetin, B. (2007). Başarı Yönelimleri Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 7(*26),1-12.

Akyol, S., Fer, S. (2010) Sosyal Yapılandırmacı Öğrenme Ortamı Tasarımının Öğrenenlerin Akademik Başarılaırna ve Öğrenmenin Kalıcılığına Etkisi Nedir? International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications. 11(13).

Allport, G.W. (1935). *Attitudes*. In C. Murchison (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Worcester, Mass: Clark University Press

Ames, C. A. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84,* 261-2

Ames, C. A. (1984). *Competitive, cooperative, and individualistic goal structures: A motivational analysis*. In R. E. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education: Vol. 1. Student motivation (pp. 177-207). New York: Academic Press.

Ames, C. & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the clasroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*,260-267.

Applegate, A.J. & Applegate, M.D. (2004). The Peter Effect: Reading habits of preservice teachers, *The reading Teacher, 57(6),* 554-563.

Arslan, S, & Akın, A. (2015). 2x2 Başarı Yönelimleri Ölçeği (revize formu): Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Sakarya University Journal Of Education, 5*(1), 7-15.

Aydın, M. (2016). Fen bilgisi öğretmen adaylarının öğrenmeye ilişkin tutumlarının bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *The Journal of International Lingual Social and Educational Sciences,2*(2), 75-84.

Bağcı, H. & Temizkan, M. (2006). İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin Türkçe öğretmenlerinden beklentileri. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 4*(4), 477-498.

Bahn, D. (2007) Reasons for post registration learning: Impact of the learning experience. *Nurse Education Today,27,* 715-722.

Baker, L. (2003). The role of parents in motivating struggling readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly,19*, 87-106.

Biçer, H. (2019). E-öğrenmeye yönelik tutum: ölçek uyarlama çalışması. Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Bilgisayar ve Öğretim Teknolojileri Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Konya.

Bokhorst-Heng, W.D. & Pereira, D. (2008). Non-at-risk adolescents' attitudes towards reading in a Singapore secondary school. *Journal of Research in Reading, 31*(3),285–301.

Carlson, E. (1999). Early environtment support and elementary school adjustment in middle adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Research. 14*(1), 72-94.

Cengiz, R. & Kabakçı, A.C. (2014). Üniversiteler arası futsal müsabakalarına katılan sporcuların başarı yönelim ve motivasyon davranışlarının incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi. 13*(4), 59-71.

Çetin, Ş, & Çetin, F. (2019). Öğrenmeye Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği(ÖYTÖ) geliştirme çalışması. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi,17*(1),140-157.

De Carlo, L.T. (1997). On the meaning and use of kurtosis. *Psychological Methods,2*(3),292–307. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.2.3.292

Dikmen, M, Tuncer, M & Şimşek, M. (2018). Öğrenme stilleri ile öğrenmeye yönelik tutum arasındaki ilişki. *Journal of International Social Research 11*, 388–400. doi:10.17719/jisr.2018.2456

Domjan, M. (2004). Koşullanma ve öğrenmenin temelleri. [The essentials of learning and conditioning] (H. Çetinkaya, Çeviri.). Ankara, Turkey: Türk Psikologlar Derneği.

Duarte, A. M. (2007). Conceptions of learning and approaches to learning in Portuguese students. *Higher Education, 54*(6), 781-794.

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psycholo-gist, 41*, 1040-1

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256-273.

Edmunds, K. M., & Bauserman K. L. (2006). What teachers can learn about reading motivation through conversations with children. *The Reading Teacher, 59*(5), 414-424.

Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist, 34,* 169–189

Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2×2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*(3), 501–519. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.80.3.501

Erman, A. K., Şahan, A. & Can, S. (2004). Sporcu Bayan ve Erkeklerin Spora Özgü Başarı Motivasyonlarının Karşılaştırılması. 10th ICHPER Sd European Congress & TSSA 8th International Sport Science Congress,17-20 Kasım, Antalya.

Gömleksiz, N. (2004), *Öğretmenlik Mesleğinin Nitelikleri*, (Editör: Mehmet Taşpınar), Öğretmenlik Mesleği, Ankara: Üniversite Kitabevi.

Groeneveld, R. & Meeden, A.G. (1984) Measuring skewness and kurtosis, *The Statistician, 33*, 391-399.

Hopkins, K.D. & Weeks D.L. (1990) Tests for normality and measures of skewness and kurtosis: their place in research reporting. *Educational and Psychological Measurement. 50*(4):717-729. doi:10.1177/0013164490504001

İzci, E. & Koç, S. (2012). Pedagojik formasyon eğitimi alan öğrencilerin başarı yönelim düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 8*, 31-43.

Kan, A., & Akbaş, A. (2005). Lise Öğrencilerinin Kimya Dersine Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 1*(2), 227-237.

Kantaroğlu, T. & Akbıyık, A. (2017) İşletme fakültesi ve eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin mobil öğrenmeye yönelik tutumlarının karşılaştırılması. *İşletme Bilimi Dergisi 5*(2) doi: 10.22139/jobs.306735

Kara, A. & Uysal, G. (2015). Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin öğrenmeye ilişkin tutumlarının sınıf koşulları açısından incelenmesi. *International Journal of Social Science, 41*, 35-53.

Kara, A. İzci, E. & Ulutaş, A. (2011). Resmi ve özel ilköğretim birinci kademede öğrenim gören öğrencilerin öğrenmeye ilişkin tutumları. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, 6(*1), 988-1006.

Karagiannopoulou, E., Christtodoulides, P. (2005). The impact of Greek University students' perceptions of their learning environment on approaches to studying and academic outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research 43,* 329-350

Karasar, N, (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel yayıncılık

Karslı, M., D. (2003). Öğretmenliğin temel kavramları. öğretmenlik mesleğine giriş, (Editör: Karslı, M. D.) Pegem Yayıncılık, Ankara.

Kaya, B. (2017). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin eğitimde teknoloji kullanımına ilişkin tutum düzeyi ile mesleğe yönelik tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ahi Evran Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kırşehir.

Kaya, F. (2016). Sınıf öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin başarı yönelimi, kendini engelleme davranışları ve demografik özelliklerinin okula yabancılaşmayı yordama düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Kazazoğlu, S. (2013). Türkçe ve İngilizce derslerine yönelik tutumun akademik başarıya etkisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi, 38*(170),294-307.

Kılıç, Ç. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının yaşam boyu öğrenmeye yönelik algıları. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3*(4), 79-87.

Koç, C. & Arslan, A. (2015). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin başarı yönelimlerinin ve okuma stratejileri bilişüstü farkındalıklarının incelenmesi. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi, 5*(5), 485- 508. doi: 10.14527/C5S5

Koestner, R., & Zuckerman, M. (1994). Causality orientations, failure, and achievement. *Journal of Personality, 62*(3), 321–346 doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1994.tb00300.x

Konakman G. & Yelken T. (2014). Eğitim fakültesi öğretim elemanlarının yaşam boyu öğrenme yeterliklerine ilişkin algıları. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education) 29*(2), 267-281.

Kurbanoğlu, N.İ. & Takunyacı, M. (2012). Lise öğrencilerinin matematik dersine yönelik kaygı, tutum ve özyeterlik inançları bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 9(*1). 110-130.

Law, Y.K. (2008). The relationship between extrinsic motivation, home literacy, classroom instructional practices, and reading proficiency in second-grade Chinese children. *Research in Education, 80,* 37-51.

Lemyre, P. N., Roberts, G. C., & Ommundsen, Y. (2002). Achievement goal orientations, perceived ability, and sportspersonship in youth soccer. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 14*(2), 120-136

Maehr, M. L. (1974). Culture and achievement motivation. *American Psychologist, 29*, 887-896.

Marton, F. & Saljo, R. (1997). *Approaches to Learning.* In Marton, F., Hounsell, D., Entwistle, N. (ed.). The Experience of Learning. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Meece, J. L., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Hoyle, R. H. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 514-523

Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. (2001). Academic self-handicapping and achievement goals: A further examination. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26*(1), 61–75. doi: 10.1006/ceps.2000.1041

Midgley, C., Kaplan, A., Middleton, M., Maehr, M., Urdan, T., Anderman, L., Anderman, E., & Roeser, R. (1998). The development and validation of scales assessing students' achievement goal orientations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*,*23*,113-131.

Moors, J. (1988). A quantile alternative for kurtosis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series D The Statistician, 37*(1), 25-32. doi:10.2307/2348376

Mullis, I., Martin, M., Goh, S., & Cotter, K. (2016). TIMSS 2015 encyclopedia: education policy and curriculum in mathematics and science. TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College.

Nelson, R. M., & DeBacker, T. (2008). Achievement motivation in adolescents: The role of peer climate and best friends. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 76*(2),170-189.

Nicholls, J. G., Patashnick, M., & Nolen, S. B. (1985). Adolescents' theories of education. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*, 683-69

Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Conceptions of ability and achievement motivation. In R. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education: Vol. 1. Student motivation (pp. 39-73). New York: Academic

Odacı, H., Berber Çelik, Ç. & Çikrıkci, Ö. (2013). Psikolojik danışman adaylarının başarı yönelimlerinin bazı değişkenlere göre yordanması. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 4(39*), 95-105.

Özbay, M. (2006). Okuma eğitiminde çevre faktörü. *Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi,24*,161-170.

Özden, Y. (2008). *Öğrenme ve Öğretme*. Pegem Akademi, Ankara.

Özden, Y. (2002). *Eğitimde yeni değerler*. Pegem Akademi. Ankara.

Pierce, R., Stacey, K. & Barkatsas, A. (2007). A scale for monitoring students' attitudes to learning Mathematics with technology. *Computers and Education, 48,*285-300.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Multiple goals, multiple pathways: The role of goal orientation in learning and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*, 544–555.

Pomerantz, E. M., Grolnick, W. S., & Price, C. E. (2005). *The role of parents in how children approach achievement: A dynamic process perspective*. In A. J. Eliot, & C. S. Dweck(Eds.), Handbook of competence and motivation(pp. 259-278). New York: The Guilford Pres.

Prokop, P., Leskova, A., Kubiatko, M. & Diran, C. (2007). Slovakian students' knowledge of and attitudes toward Biotechnology. *International Journal of Science Education. Vol 29, no: 7,* 895-907.

Rula L. D. (2006). University students' beliefs about learning English and French in Lebanon. *System 34*, 80-96

Saltürk, A. & Güngör, C. (2020). Üniversite öğrencilerinin gözünden COVID-19 pandemisinde uzaktan eğitime geçiş deneyimi. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, (36)*, 137-174. doi: 10.14520/adyusbd.788716

Schunk, D. H. (2009). Öğrenme teorileri: Eğitimsel bir bakışla. (Trans. Ed. M. Şahin), Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Sucuoğlu, H & Gökdağ Baltaoğlu, M. (2020b). Başarı yönelimli öğrencilerin kullandıkları öğrenme stratejileri. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,(53),* 393-410. doi: 10.21764/maeuefd.532793

Şişman, M. (2014). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi* (8. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Tenekeci, F. (2019). Dershanede çalışan öğretmenlerin yaşam boyu öğrenme yaklaşımına ilişkin tutumları ile yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi. Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Ana Bilim Dalı.

Toğluk, E. (2009). Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin başarı yönelimleri. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Ülper, H. (2011). Öğrencilerin, okumaya isteklendirici etmenlerle karşılaşma durumu: öğretmen, aile, arkadaş ve kitap boyutları üzerinden bir araştırma. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (30),* 221-237.

Vahapoğlu, Z. (2013). Ön lisans öğrencilerinin umut düzeyleri ve başarı yönelimlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

Wigfield, A., & Wagner, A. L. (2005). *Competence, motivation, and identity development during adolescence*. In A. J. Eliot, & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), Handbook of competence and motivation (pp. 222-239). New York: The Guilford Pres.

Yenilmez K. & Özabacı Ş.N. (2003). Yatılı öğretmen okulu öğrencilerinin matematik ile ilgili tutumları ve matematik kaygı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir araştırma. Pamukkale *Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (14)* 132-146.

Zweig, D., & Webster, J. (2004). Validation of a multidimensional measure of goal orientation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 36*(3), 232–243. doi: 10.1037/h0087233