ISSN-L: 2307-3713, ISSN: 2307-3721
Vol. 1 No. 2 April 2013

COMPARISONS OF SELF- REGULATION IN MIDDLE SCHOOL ATHLETE AND NON- ATHLETE BOYS STUDENTS

Mohammad Hojati[1], Mohammad Abbasi[2]

[1]Department of Education, Sahneh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sahneh, Kermanshah,
[2]Department of Education, Shahid Chmaran University, Ahwaz,
IRAN.

naser.h63@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study compared self-regulation in 80 middle school athlete and non- athlete boys students (seventh and eighth grade). An ex post facto design was used. Statistical population comprised of all students in middle schools in, harsin, Iran, during the 2012-2013 academic year. Students selected by randomly multi-cluster sampling. The student completed the Self-Regulation Scale (SRS). Data were analyzed using analysis of variance. Differences were found between the groups on the self-regulation.

Keywords: Self- regulation, middle school, learning, adolescent, Iran

INTRODUCTION

Self-regulation is a complex, multifaceted process that integrates key motivational variables and self-processes. Although different theories of self-regulation have been developed over the past 20 years, they all share many similar features and characteristics (Zeidner, Boekarts , & Pintrich, 2000). Self-regulated is the ability to control and influence one's learning processes positively: The learners take personal initiative, apply powerful strategies to attain individually valued learning goals and monitor their understanding in order to detect and eliminate possible comprehension problems (Paris & Paris, 2001). Zimmerman (1986, 1989, 2006) defined self-regulation as the degree to which learners are metacognitively, motivationally and behaviourally proactive participants in the learning process. As a result, metacognition is defined as awareness of and knowledge about one's own thinking and the skills of planning; self-monitoring, evaluation and reflection were adopted (Ertmer & Newby, 1996; Zimmerman, 1986, 2006).

Despite different orientations and trajectories, the five models of self-regulatory learning share several assumptions. First, learners actively construct their own meanings, goals, strategies based on information available from external environment and their own minds (i.e., the internal environment). Second, learners can potentially monitor, control and regulate certain aspects of their own cognitive, motivation, behaviors and some features of their environments.

However, this potential is constrained by contextual factors, and biological, developmental and individual differences, which may impede or interfere with an individual's ability and efforts at regulation. Third, learners' evaluative whether the learning process should continue as is or some changes are necessary. Last, learners mediate the complex interplay of their external environment, internal characteristics, and exercise self-regulatory strategies en-route to outcomes such as achievement and purpose (Pintrich, 2004).

On the other hand, Zimmerman and Pons (1986) also believe that self-regulation ability is the best predictor of students' learning performances. Many students fail to self-regulate effectively (Boekaerts, 1997). Furthermore, Self-regulatory skills are suggested to be domain-

general (Eccles & Feltovich, 2008; Kirschenbaum, 1984) and their importance has been emphasized in the academic setting. The importance of self-regulation also has been recognized in several domains including health (Creer, 2000) and athletics (Cleary & Zimmerman, 2001).

In addition, sport helps an individual to have a healthy physical structure and improve themselves mentally psychologically. Furthermore, sport plays a crucial role in making a human being healthy successful happy and having a solid psychology. The value of the use of self-regulatory skills was presented in learning a new motor skill (Kitsantas & Zimmerman, 1998), and can be used to discriminate between athletes at different competitive levels (experts, non-experts and novices; Cleary & Zimmerman, 2001). Cleary and Zimmerman (2001) reported the better ability of basketball experts to recognize their strengths and weaknesses, when compared to non-experts and novices as well. Furthermore, Expert athletes exhibit more self-regulatory skills than non-experts in sports (Kitsantas & Zimmerman, 2002).

In summary, researchers suggest that one way of promoting the acquisition of knowledge and skills is to help students regulate their learning; that is, to become more metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally responsible for their own learning (Boekaerts 1996; Zimmerman 1995, 2000, 2002). Indeed, Outcome research has shown that students Athlete often use self-regulation strategies. Different studies point to sport, main factor which may influence the self-regulation of children. Therefore, our aim was to examine the role of self-regulatory skills in youth athletes. This study compared self-regulation and hopes in 80 middle school athlete and non- athlete boys students. In other words,we hypothesized that students Athlete would score higher on the self- regulation.

METHOD

Participants and Procedures

Eighty middle school athlete and non- athlete boys students (seventh and eighth grade) were recruited from middle schools in, Harsin, Iran, during the 2012-2013 academic year. Students selected by randomly multi-cluster sampling. The sample included 40 athlete students, and 40 non- athlete boy's students. Within these groups, 41 students were in Grade 7, 39 students in Grade 8.).

Research Instruments

We measured this construct with 10 items from Self-Regulation Scale or SRS (Schwarzer, Diehl & Schmitz, 1999). The answers ranged from 1 (not at all true) to 4 (completely true).This scale refers to post-intentional self-regulation when individuals are in the phase of goal-pursuit, and face difficulties in maintaining their action. In such a maintenance situation it is required to focus attention on the task at hand and to keep a favorable emotional balance. Thus, attention-regulation and emotion-regulation are reflected in these scale items. In a sample of N = 442 Germans the scale has obtained an internal consistency of Cronbach's alpha = .76. In the other language versions the reliability is higher. In a sample of N = 239 Germans the scale yielded a retest stability of .62 after six weeks. There were associations found with general self-efficacy beliefs (r = .57), and with proactive coping (r = .55).

RESULTS

In this research, results were analyzed with a analysis of variance (ANOVA). One-Way ANOVA were performed to assess differences between group's scores on self- Regulation.

ISSN-L: 2307-3713, ISSN: 2307-3721
Vol. 1 No. 2 April 2013

Table 1. Means and standard deviations for self- Regulation

		N	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*	*Std. Error Mean*
Self- Regulation	athlete boys students	40	29.10	4.63	.73
	non- athlete boys students	40	31.50	5.78	.91

Table 2. Results of One-Way ANOVA Comparison of Means on the self- Regulation for Students

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Self-efficacy	Between Groups	115.20	1	115.20	4.19	.044
	Within Groups	2141.60	78	27.456		
	Total	2256.80	79			

Descriptive statistics for the Student self- Regulation are summarized in Table 1. Total self-Regulation Score averages for athlete boys students were 31.50 (SD= 5.78) and for non-athlete boys students were 29.10 (SD= 4.63).

One-way anova indicate that the scores are statistically significant (table 2). As can be seen in Table 2, significant differences emerge for self- Regulation between the two groups $F(1, 78) = 4.19$, $p < .05$.

DISCUSSION

According to Zimmerman (1989), self regulation is the self generated thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that are revisited and reevaluated according to the goals set by the individual. Zimmerman (1998) suggests that self regulated learners are able to tie their goals from one particular activity to a longer-term goal or aspiration. Self regulated learners are proactive and use self regulation processes with task strategies (e.g., help-seeking) and self motivational beliefs. Studies conducted by Schunk (1996) and Wood, Bandura, and Bailey (1990) suggest that high levels of achievement and motivation are related to a learner's ability to goal set, self monitor, and self assess.

The current study described and compared of Self- Regulation among Eighty middle school athlete and non- athlete boys students. Significant differences emerge in the self- Regulation between the two groups.

In summary, this research has indicated a distinctly higher level of self-regulation in athlete boys students. These results are consistent with Cleary & Zimmerman (2001). The findings have important implications for both practice and future research.

LIMITATIONS

It is important to consider the limitations of this study. The study was conducted on a relatively small sample, so generalization of results is limited.

Another limitation of this study was that, despite efforts to ensure that each participant responded to each item on the scales, there were occasional missing values. There are four ways to deal with missing data) :a) eliminating the participant's data altogether, (b) replacing the missing data with the investigator's guess of a likely response, based on prior knowledge

of how a given participant is likely to respond, (c) calculating the overall mean from the available data and replacing missing values with the mean across groups, or (d) inserting the group mean for a missing value (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Rather than eliminating the entire set of responses from participants who omitted items, we chose to replace missing values with mean score.

REFERENCES

Boekaerts, M. (1997). Self-regulated learning: A new concept embraced by researchers, policy makers, educators, teachers, and students. *Learning and Instruction*, 7, 161-186.

Cleary, T. J. & Zimmerman, B. J. (2001). Self-regulation differences during athletic practice by experts, non-experts, and novices. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 13, 185-206.

Creer, T. L. (2000). Self-management of chronic illness. In M. Boekarts, P. Pintrich, & M. Seidner (Eds.), Self-regulation: *Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 601– 629). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Kitsantas, A. & Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Comparing self-regulatory processes amongnovice, non-expert, and expert volleyball players: A microanalytic study. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 14, 91-105.

Paris, S. G., & Paris, A. H. (2001). Classroom applications of research on self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 36, 89e101.

Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and selfregulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16, 385-407.

Schunk, D. H. (1996). Goal and self-evaluative influences during children's cognitive skill learning. *American Educational Research Journal,* 33(2), 359-382.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Wood, R., Bandura, A. & Bailey, T. (1990). Mechanisms governing organizational performance in complex decision-making environments. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes,* 46(2), 181-201.

Zeidner, M., Boekarts, M. & Pintrich, P.R. (2000). Self-regulation: Directions and challenges for future research. In M. Boekaerts, P. Pintrich, &M. Seidner (Eds.), *Self-regulation: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 749–768). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2006). Development and adaptation of expertise: The role of self-regulatory processes and beliefs. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich, & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance,* (pp. 705-722). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation. A social cognitive perspective. In. M Boekarts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation*, (pp. 13-39). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J. & Martinez-Pons, M. (1986). Development of a structured interview for assessing students' use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23, 614-628.