

Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Achievement Goal Orientation among Secondary School Students.

Subhashini Akurathi* and M.V.R.Raju**

Abstract

This present study is designed to examine the correlation between self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation on demographic variables as gender, age, mode of instruction, medium of school. Motivational researchers have recognized two noteworthy goal orientations. A sample of 100 school students (equal number of male and female) selected on a convenience sampling basis from Visakhapatnam participated in the present study. Measures of achievement goal orientation and self-efficacy scales were administered to all of them. Data were analyzed using t-test and correlation. Results revealed that English medium secondary students had higher achievement goal orientation, mastery goal orientation, and performance approach than the Telugu medium students. It was also found that performance-avoidance was low in English medium students compared with Telugu medium. It is concluded that Telugu medium students have high-performance avoidance than English medium students.

Keywords: Keywords: Self-Efficacy, Achievement Goal Orientation. Demographic variables.

Self-efficacy is nothing but self-assessment. According to Bandura's definition, self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in executing the necessary to produce specific performance attainments. Self-efficacy is identified as a predictor of many aspects of behavioral choices, such as aspiring work persistence, positive or negative ways of thinking and feeling, and actual task performance (Bandura, 1997; Gist, 1992). According to Brown & Duguid (1991), individual skills and attitudes are developed through social processes like informal discussions and feedback from social interaction. Few studies have shown that group settings bring an individual's motivation, attitude-behavior (Brown, 1993). Over the past few decades, self-efficacy has proven to be a highly successful interpreter of student inspiration and knowledge. As a determinant of apparent potential based on performance, it differs hypothetically and psychologically from related motivational phases, such as outcome prospects, self-perception, and control location.

Orientation in the direction of a goal is supposed to be a part of situational constrictions because it manipulates the approaches students obtain to become skilled at and the strategies students employ in erudition goals accomplish". In the 2x2 achievement framework, Elliot and McGregor (2001) described that Achievement goals classify or measure motivation for competence-related behavior. Competence-related behavior. It distinguishes two fundamental dimensions. Substantially improves herself), and performance goals, for which a student uses a normative standard. An enormous deal of research because of its influence that goals are theorized to encompass on students' accomplishments. The term "goal" is best defined as "an aim or standard, because of its consistent prototypical use in the psychological literature" (e.g., Locke & Latham, 2002). Achievement goal orientation is an all-purpose motivation presumption, which refers

to the sort of goal on which individual functions as an implausible impact depending on how an individual achieves the goal. The theory was instigated near the 20th century but became an important hypothetical outline in academic motivation after 1985. Over the last two decades, a major segment of the hypothetical and experiential work done in the achievement motivation literature used the achievement goal perspective. Goal orientation is a comprehensive, individual-specific variable described as responding to Achievement situations" (Ames, 1992, p. 261); "an individual's general schema or theory for approaching the task, doing the task" (Pintrich, 2000). It might be interpreted that achievement goals are tantamount to the individuals' discernments about their achievement behaviors. They indicate the meaning that "individuals assign to an achievement situation, providing a cognitive structure and their subsequent behaviors" (Urdu, 1997). Therefore, considering students' goals opens the horizon into the psychosomatic process during which achievement behavior is formed. It can stimulate teachers to build up suitable classroom facilities to smooth the progress of learning.

Goal orientation is one of the most commonly assessed motivational variables. GO is based on the concepts of the extensive goals practiced by the individuals as a behavior dimension and recommends that individuals have to GO predilection in achievement settings. Where other motivational speculations observe students' viewpoints about their accomplishment and failure, goal orientation theory scrutinizes the reasons for students' engagement in their academic work. Though goal orientation theory is chiefly intended in education, it is also used in sports, health, and social psychology.

Goal orientation is the pedestal on existing "goal-as-motives" theory where it is speculated that "all actions are given meaning, direction, and purpose by the goals that individuals seek out, Goal orientation logician

*Research scholar, Department of psychology. Andhra University. Visakhapatnam, Email: akurathipsy23@gamil.com

**Prof. & Head, Department of Psychology, Andhra University. Visakhapatnam, Email:mvrjau@gmail.com

described achievement goals as the "reason which one engages in an achievement task." De la Fuente (2004) defined academic goal like "Motives of an academic nature the students use for guiding their classroom failure depend on their goal orientation, and they achieve a feeling of success when they attend their goals. The concept of "Goal Orientation" comes into play when individuals achieve a feeling of success and explain when and under what circumstances they feel successful. Goal orientation is that individual disparity variable that is important for laying its stress on individuals' thinking about erudition and response to feedback. Goal Orientation describes "how an individual construes and responds to tasks, ensuing in different patterns of cognition, affect and behaviour". Being developed in a social-cognitive scaffold, achievement theory suggests that students' stimulus and behaviors can be best understood by considering the causes or rationale adopted by them while engaging in their academic work. The spotlight is on how students imagine themselves, their errands, and their accomplishments.

The goal orientation outlook explains attainment behaviors in an assortment of erudition milieu with various approaches like mastery, performance, 26 traits. This approach reveals the reason for approaching, employing, and reacting to different achievement actions and behaviors (Ames, 1992a). Goal approaches are displayed as the accessible instructional strategies and measures surrounded by an academic situation, same as a classroom or school (Ames & Archer, 1988; Kaplan, Middleton, Urdan, & Midgley, 2002; Urdan, 1997; Wolters, 2004). Momentous research and a reliable pattern of results established that two different achievement silhouettes can exemplify an individual's achievement orientation in a particular sphere:

Mastery goal orientation approach and performance goal orientation approach

A mastery approach is related to a scholastic perspective that fosters students' espousal of mastery goals. A performance approach is related to practices, strategies and measures that promote students' performance goals. Goal approaches are engrossed as an influential construct because of their impact on students' inspiration and triumph. Also the widespread goal approach in a classroom or school is allied to students' personal motivational beliefs. Competence, whereas other people may seek to avoid incompetence in achievement contexts. However, the concept of avoidance goal orientation has received little attention in the later development of achievement theory. In general, there is very little argument about the nature and effects of mastery goals. Students with mastery goal orientation focus on the intrinsic value and interest of learning. They tend to master a task according to self-determined standards. Irrespective of their

confidence in their ability, they still have incentives to learn. There is a consensus among goal theorists that mastery goal orientation is an adaptive motivation orientation that facilitates learning. In contrast, the findings of previous studies on the nature and effects of performance goals have been mixed, leading to a call for a re-examination of the dichotomous framework of achievement goal orientation theory.

The goal-oriented point of view has emerged as the most current educational area under discussion in motivational studies. Psychologists have acknowledged two extensive classes of goal orientation that an individual practices in achievement situations (a) Mastery Goal Orientation (MGO) to build up aptitude by getting acquaintance to innovative skills and getting mastery over those skills (b) Performance Goal Orientation to exhibit and authenticate the satisfactoriness of one's competence by looking for constructive judgment and neglecting unconstructive judgments.

Research confirms that mastery-oriented students emphasize erudition, advancement, perfection, and perception by using more efficient learning approaches and taking more exigent tasks, where performance-oriented students emphasize performing in a better way compared to others by representing behavior to facilitate acknowledgment, eulogize, and self-confidence; they are more interested in taking trouble-free tasks and use not much efficient learning approaches (Ryan et al.,). Mastery goals encourage individuals to increase their competence or help in achieving task mastery. Performance-approach goals emphasize demonstrating students' ability related to others or directing them in proving their self-worth. Self-Efficacy and Goal Orientation Past research suggest that goal orientation may impact learning through its influence on self-efficacy. Individuals have had more mastery experiences which usually approach tasks through the lens of a mastery goal because they persevere more in challenging activities. When experiencing failure, Students who are permissible to adopt their own goal experiences have an increased level of self-efficacy as they observe their progress and note the skills being gained.

Students with performance goal orientation focus mainly on relative ability and how ability will be judged. In their eyes, learning is viewed only as a way to achieve the desired goal. Therefore, in the original goal orientation theory, performance goals are posited as maladaptive when compared with mastery goals academic self-concept, active engagement, and graded performance (Harackiewicz, Barron, & Elliot, 1998; Harackiewicz, Barron, Pintrich, Elliot, & Thrash, 2002; Pintrich & Garcia, 1991). In the revised goal orientation theory that Elliot and his colleagues (Elliot, 1997, 1999; Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996),

performance goals' approach and avoidance components are separated, and a dichotomous framework replaces the original performance-mastery dichotomous framework.

Elliot and his colleagues have posited that the relationships between mastery goals and these two types of performance goals are different, and these two lead to self-protective processes, helplessness, and poor academic outcomes. In contrast, students can be positively motivated to outperform others and demonstrate their competence and superiority concerning underperformance-approach goals. In this sense, performance-approach goals may have similar positive academic outcomes as students with mastery goals.

When validating the Goal Orientation Questionnaire based on a revised theory, Elliot and Church found that performance-approach goals were positively related to performance-avoidance goals and mastery goals, but performance-avoidance goals were not correlated with mastery goals. Recently, Elliot and his colleagues have further proposed a two \times two conceptualization comprising mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goals (Elliot & Thrash, 2001; Harackiewicz & Linnenbrink, 2005), but it would appear that the validity of mastery-avoidance goals has not been examined in empirical research.

The debate on the nature of performance goals continues. There is general agreement on the maladaptive consequences of adopting performance-avoidance goals (Elliot & Church, 1997; Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988; Pintrich et al., 2003; Urdan, 1997), but there is controversy over the nature of the performance-approach goal and its relationship to mastery goal and various learning-related outcomes.

Such as self-efficacy, cognitive engagement, and course grades (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001, 2003; Elliot & Church, 1997; Harackiewicz et al., 1998). Therefore, some achievement goal theorists have posited to move beyond the dichotomous mastery-performance framework to a multiple goal perspective, in which mastery and performance goals can work together to facilitate motivation and performance (Church, Elliot, & Gable, 2001; Harackiewicz & Linnenbrink, 2005; Harackiewicz et al., 1998; Pintrich, 2000). Others, however, have argued that the negative consequences of performance-approach goals are greater than the positive consequences (Kaplan & Middleton, 2002; Midgley, Kaplan, & Middleton, 2001) or have failed to find positive relationships between performance-approach goals and adaptive outcomes (Linnenbrink, 2005; Wolters, 2004). A plausible explanation for the inconsistent findings of performance-approach goal orientation is that it does

not operate uniformly for all students. Harackiewicz and her colleagues (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001, 2003; Harackiewicz et al., 1998) have proposed a 'matching hypothesis' suggesting that performance-approach goals may be more facilitative in an educational context where competition is salient than in a mastery-oriented learning environment. Midgley and her colleagues have suggested that whether performance-approach goals are adaptive may depend on the types of students, tasks, and learning environment. findings from the previous studies, there is some evidence that performance-approach goals are more adaptive for boys than girls, for older students than younger students, for students with higher self-efficacy than students with lower self-efficacy, in handling easy or rote learning tasks, in the competitive learning environment, and if mastery goals are also exposed (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001, 2003; Elliot, 1999; Harackiewicz et al., 1998, 2002; Midgley et al., 2001; Urdan, 1997)

The Rationale of the Study

Self-efficacy and performance goal orientation are two essential factors that contribute to success. Achieves self-efficacy and goal orientation individually. These factors can help to set goals that lead to motivation to achieve them in secondary school students.

AIM: The aim and objective of the present study are to find the correlation between self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation among second graders.

Objectives

The main objective of the present study is to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation among second graders.

Sub objectives

- To examine the effect of gender on self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation among second graders.
- To examine the effect of age on self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation among second graders.
- To examine the effect of class of study on self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation among second graders.
- To examine the effect of Medium of instruction on self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation among second graders.
- To examine the correlation coefficients between self-efficacy and goal orientation among senior secondary graders.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant difference between self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation in males and females.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant difference between self-efficacy achievement goal orientations and second-grade students' age.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant difference between self-efficacy, achievement goal orientations as in the Class of study among secondary grader students.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant difference between self-efficacy, achievement goal orientations as on mode of instruction among secondary grader students

Hypothesis 5: There will be a relationship between self-efficacy, achievement goal orientations on various demographical variables among secondary class students.

Method

Design

This researcher collected data in two consecutive phases within the study. The quantitative data were collected first and analyzed, followed by qualitative data collection and related to the outcomes from the quantitative phase (Creswell, 2014). The design was suitable to this current study in which the researcher wanted to explain significant, non-significant, and interesting quantitative findings. The researcher identified the quantitative findings which needed further exploration and used these results in the qualitative phase. **Locale of the Study** This study was carried out to collect data from a government and private school representing the selected population from Visakhapatnam in the Andhra Pradesh district. The other administered tool was a self-efficacy tool with a 10 item scale.

Sample

One hundred participants were selected on convenience basis from Vishakhapatnam city. The gender distribution of participants was: 50(50%) male and 50(50%) female. From the total sample, 60 (60%) of them belonged to fourteen and fifteen years age groups constitutes 40 (40%). Of the total sample, 52 (52%) belonged to the tenth Class, and the ninth Class constituted 48 (48%). Of the total sample, 52(52%) belonged to the English medium, and Telugu medium constituted 48 (48%).

Tools

The researcher used a self-administered questionnaire, self-efficacy, to measure self-efficacy; ten items questionnaire was adapted from Jerusalem &Schwarzer (1995). The questionnaire had a four scale rating 1=not at all true to 4=exactly true. Achievement goal orientation: to measure students' achievement goal orientation, 28 items questionnaire was adopted from was (2006). This questionnaire had three subscales of mastery, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance, from 28 items. (1-13) were used to measure mastery goals. (14-21) were used to measure the performance approach, and (22-28) were used to measure performance-avoidance. The questionnaire had a five scale rating 1=not at all true to 5=completely true.

Procedure

In the present study, the researcher opted for the survey method. **Data Collection** This researcher obtained a research authorization letter from Andhra University, obtained Permission from the administrative education officials at the madhurawada area in the Visakhapatnam district. The researcher sought informed consent from the participants and was the willingness to participate in the present study. The investigator used the tools developed by Jerusalem & Schwarzer (1995) and Was (2006). There was obtained Preliminary biographical information from the subjects, and they were administered the Achievement goal orientation questionnaire and self-efficacy questionnaire. The questionnaire was scored as per the instructions in the manual. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics, t-test and Pearson product-moment correlation were also applied.

Results and Discussion

This part of the paper reports the result of the study, which is organized according to the order of the research questions. As a result, the first part dealt with the composite and independent contributions of Self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation, as on

Table-1: Descriptive Statistics for self-efficacy and goal orientation as on gender

Study variables	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
self-efficacy	Male	50	1.2800	.45356	-1.469	.145
	Female	50	1.4200	.49857		
Mastery goal orientation	Male	50	1.4600	.50346	-.995	.322
	Female	50	1.5600	.50143		
Performance Goal Orientation	Male	50	1.6200	.49031	1.205	.231
	Female	50	1.5000	.50508		
Performance approach	Male	50	1.6200	.49031	1.205	.231
	Female	50	1.5000	.50508		
Performance avoidance	Male	50	1.6200	.49031	-.839	.404
	Female	50	1.7000	.46291		
		50				

*.p<0.05, **.p<0.01

demographic variables (gender, age, Class of study, mode of instruction). The second part dealt with the correlation among self –efficacy and goal orientation. Null Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant difference between self-efficacy and achievement goal orientation in males and females.

male (M =1.6200, SD =.49031.) and female (M =1.5000, SD =.50508.); t =1.205., p =.231.Regarding performance-avoidance: There was no significant difference in scores on gender. There was no significant difference in scores male (M =1.6200, SD =.49031) and female (M =1.7000, SD =.46291.); t =-.839, p =.404.

Table-2: Descriptive Statistics for self-efficacy and goal orientation as on respondent's age.

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
self-efficacy	15 years	40	1.3000	.46410	-0.860	0.392
	14 years	60	1.3833	.49030		
Mastery goal orientation	15 years	40	1.7000	.46410	3.232**	.002
	14 years	60	1.3833	.49030		
Performance Goal Orientation	15 years	40	1.5250	.50574	-.571	.569
	14 years	60	1.5833	.49717		
Performance approach	15 years	40	1.5250	.50574	-.571	.569
	14 years	60	1.5833	.49717		
Performance avoidance	15 years	40	1.7000	.46410	.684	.495
	14 years	60	1.6333	.48596		

*.p<0.05, **.p<0.01

The above table depicted the Descriptive Statistics for self-efficacy and goal orientation as on participant's gender. Regarding Self-efficacy: There was no significant difference in scores on gender. There was no significant difference in scores male (M =1.28001, SD =.45356.) and female (M =1.4200, SD =.49857.); t =-.995, p =.145.Regarding Mastery goal orientation: There was no significant difference in scores gender. There was no significant difference in scores male (M =1.46001, SD =.50346.) and female (M =1.5600, SD =.50143.); t =-.995, p =.322.Regarding performance approach: There was no significant difference in scores

Hence null hypothesis accepted that there was found no significant difference between males and females on Self-efficacy and Achievement goal orientation.Null Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant difference between self-efficacy achievement goal orientations and second-grade students' age.

The above table depicted that Descriptive Statistics for self-efficacy and goal orientation as on participant's age. Regarding Mastery goal orientation, there was a significant difference in scores on age groups. 15years (M=1.7000, SD=.46410) significantly differed with 14 years age group (M=1.3833, SD=.49030) at

Table3. Mean, SD and t values

Dependent Variables	Class of study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
self-efficacy	tenth Class	52	1.2692	.44789	-1.773	.079
	ninth Class	48	1.4375	.50133		
Mastery goal orientation	tenth Class	52	1.6154	.49125	2.226*	.028
	ninth Class	48	1.3958	.49420		
Performance Goal Orientation	tenth Class	52	1.6875	.46842	-2.521*	.013
	ninth Class	48	1.4423	.50151		
Performance approach	tenth Class	52	1.4423	.50151	-1.765	.081
	ninth Class	48	1.6875	.46842		
Performance avoidance	tenth Class	52	1.7115	.45747	1.128	.262
	ninth Class	48	1.6042	.49420		

*.p<0.05, **.p<0.01

on gender. There was no significant difference in scores

t=3.232<0.01. Here there was no significant difference

found between age groups as on self-efficacy. Because the Fifteen-year-old age group significantly differed from the fourteen-year-old age group on Mastery goal orientation. Hence partially rejected the null hypothesis. Null Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant difference between self-efficacy, achievement goal orientations as in the Class of study among secondary grader students. Class of study.

Null Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant difference between self-efficacy, achievement goal orientations as on mode of instruction among secondary grader students.

The above table depicted Descriptive Statistics for self-efficacy and goal orientation as on participant's mode of instruction. Regarding performance-avoidance, there was a significant difference in scores on Telugu

Table-4: Descriptive Statistics for self-efficacy and goal orientation as on participants Mode of instruction.

Dependent variables	Class of study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
self-efficacy	English medium	52	1.3077	.46604	-.918	.361
	Telugu medium	48	1.3958	.49420		
Mastery goal orientation	English medium	52	1.4423	.50151	-1.409	.162
	Telugu medium	48	1.5833	.49822		
Performance Goal Orientation	English medium	52	1.5385	.50338	-.448	.655
	Telugu medium	48	1.5833	.49822		
Performance approach	English medium	52	1.5385	.50338	-.448	.655
	Telugu medium	48	1.5833	.49822		
Performance avoidance	English medium	52	1.3125	.46842	9.835**	.000
	Telugu medium	48	1.9808	.13868		

*.p<0.05, **.p<0.01

The above table depicted that Descriptive Statistics for self-efficacy and goal orientation as on participant's age. Regarding Mastery goal orientation, there was a significant difference in scores on age groups. 15years (M=1.7000, SD=.46410) significantly differed with 14 years age group (M=1.3833, SD=.49030) at t=3.232<0.01. Here there was no significant difference found between age groups as on self-efficacy. Because the Fifteen-year-old age group significantly differed from the fourteen-year age group on Mastery goal orientation. Hence partially rejected the null hypothesis.

medium students (M=1.9808, SD=.13868) were significantly differed with English medium participants (M=1.3125, SD=.13868) at t=9.835**, P=0.000<0.01. Here there was a significant difference found between Telugu medium and English medium as on performance-avoidance. Here null hypothesis is partially rejected.

Null Hypothesis 5: There will be a relationship between self-efficacy, achievement goal orientations on various demographical variables among secondary class students.

Table 5: Coefficient of Correlation for Achievement Goal orientation and Self-efficacy on various demographical variables (n=100)

Dependent variables		self-efficacy	Age	gender	Class study	of Mode of instruction
self-efficacy	Pearson Correlation	1	.086	.47	.176	.092
Mastery goal orientation	Pearson Correlation	-.310**	.100	-.219*	.141	1
Performance approach	Pearson Correlation	.058	-.121	.247*	.045	.058
Performance avoidance	Pearson Correlation	-.069	.084	-.113	-.069	-.705**

*.p<0.05, **.p<0.01

The above table shows the results of Coefficient of Correlation for Achievement Goal orientation and Self-efficacy as on various demographical variables among secondary class students. Results were shown none significant coefficient of Correlation between Self-efficacy and Demographic variables as on Age, Gender, Class of study, and mode of instruction. Regarding mastery goal orientation, there was shown negative coefficient of Correlation with self-efficacy ($r = -.310$, $p < .002$) and gender ($r = -.219$, $p < .028$). Results indicated that significant positive coefficient of Correlation with the Performance approach and gender ($r = .247$, $p < .013$). The performance approach was shown none significant coefficient of Correlation with self-efficacy, age, class of study, and mode of instruction. Performance avoidance was shown negative coefficient of Correlation with the mode of instruction ($r = -.705$, $p < .000$). There was none significant coefficient of Correlation with the Performance avoidance with self-efficacy, age, gender, and mode of instruction. Hence null hypothesis partially accepted that there was a relationship between self-efficacy, achievement goal orientations as on various demographical variables among secondary class students.

Findings of the present study

The present study found no significant difference among gender on self-efficacy. There is no significant difference among gender group male and female on achievement goal orientation dimensions performance-avoidance whereas significant difference among gender group male and female on achievement goal orientation, mastery goal orientation, and performance approach.

It was found that there was no significant difference among age group 14 years and 15 years on self-efficacy, and there is no significant difference among the age group 14 years and 15 years on achievement and mastery goal orientation, performance approach, performance-avoidance.

It was found that there was a higher achievement and mastery goal orientation among 15 years students compared with 14 years students.

It was observed that there was no significant difference among the Class of study group 9th class and 10th class on self-efficacy. There was no significant difference among the course of study 9th class and 10th class on achievement and mastery goal orientation performance-avoidance whereas substantial difference among the type of study 9th class and 10th class on achievement goal orientation dimensions of performance approach.

It was found that there was a higher achievement and mastery goal orientation among 10th class students compared with 9th class students.

It was observed that there was no significant difference among the medium of instruction English medium and Telugu medium students on self-efficacy, and there is

no significant difference among the medium of instruction English medium and Telugu medium on achievement and mastery goal orientation, performance approach, performance-avoidance.

It was found that there was higher achievement and mastery goal orientation, performance-approach among English medium compared with Telugu medium students; achievement goal orientation dimensions performance-avoidance is low in English medium students compared with Telugu medium. Telugu medium students have shown performance-avoidance.

Conclusion: The present study concluded no significant difference in second-grade students' demographic variables (Gender, Age, Class of study, mode of instruction) on self-efficacy. The present study concluded that gender and medium of instruction showed a significant difference in achievement goal orientation. English medium respondents tend to have a high-performance approach and are low in performance-avoidance. Telugu medium respondents have shown more performance-avoidance rather than English medium respondents.

References

- Bonilla, L. (June 2017). Associations between Ethnic Identity, Academic Efficacy, Achievement Goals, and School Belonging among Early Adolescents University of South Florida, leahbonilla@mail.usf.edu.
- Çetinkalp, Zisan K., & Turksoy, A. (2011). Social behavior and personality. Publisher: Scientific. Journal Publishers, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690420>. PubMed: 00323737
- Cho, Y.J., Weinstein, C. E., & Wicker, F. (2011). Perceived competence and autonomy as moderators of the effects of achievement goal orientations. *Educational Psychology*, 31(4), 393–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2011.560597>
- Deniz, H. (2011). Examining changes in prospective elementary teachers' epistemological beliefs in science and exploring factors mediating that change. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 20(6), 750–760. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-010-9268-x>
- desalegn alemu, m.v.r. Raju. (2019). Procrastination as a factor influencing students' academic achievement: a case for Ethiopian higher education institutions. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews, Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, Volume 39, page no 7.
- Indu Bala, Ranjit Kaur, and Shamshir Singh (2017) Self-efficacy of Senior Secondary school students with respect to Demographic *International Journal of Advanced Research and Development* Volume 2, Issue 4, July 2017. ISSN: 2455-4030
- Janssen, O., & van der Vegt, G. S. (2011). Positivity bias in employees' self-ratings of performance relative to supervisor ratings: The roles of performance type, performance-approach goal orientation, and perceived

- influence. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(4), 524–552. [HTTPS://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2010.485736](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2010.485736)
- Kebed, H. G. (2020). Psychosocial factors associated with academic career choice process of Kotebe Metropolitan University first-year students in Addis Ababa [Thesis] Submitted to School of Psychology. College of Education and Behavioral Studies.
- Köseoğlu, Y. (2015). Self-efficacy and academic achievement—A case from Turkey. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(29), 131.
- Köseoğlu, Y. (2015). Self-efficacy and Academic Achievement—A Case from Turkey. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(29). PubMed: 2015131
- Lau, K.-L., & Lee, J. (2008). Examining Hong Kong students' achievement goals and their relations with students' perceived classroom environment and strategy use. *Educational Psychology*, 28(4), - Issue 4, 357–372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410701612008>
- Levpušček, M. P., & Zupančič, M. (2008). Math achievement in early adolescence: The role of parental involvement, teachers' behaviour, and students' motivational beliefs about math. <http://doi.org>, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431>, PubMed: 608324189
- Mägi, K., Lerkkanen, M.-K. Poikkeus, A.-M., Rasku-Puttonen, H., & Kikas, E. (2010). Relations Between Achievement Goal Orientations and Math Achievement in Primary Grades: A Follow-Up Study. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 54(3), 295–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831003764545>
- McMahon, M. S. D., & Keys, C. B. (2018). Self-efficacies, anxiety, and aggression among African American and Latino adolescents with disabilities. *Special education [Journal]*, 26(1), 20–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09362835.2016.1196449A>
- Odinga, K. S. J. O., & Pamela, A. (2015). Influence of Gender on Teachers' Self-Efficacy in Secondary Schools of Kisumu County. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 4(November 3), 189. <https://doi.org/10.5901/ajis.2015.v4n3p189>
- Murugan, K., and Mr. Justin Jebaraj, J. S. (2017). “a study of self-concept in relation to academic achievement among 9th standard student.” *International Journal of Research - Granthaalayah*, 5(6), 502-507. <https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v5.i6.2017.2062>
- Odinga, S. J. O., & Aloka, P. J. O. (2015). Influence of gender on teachers' self-efficacy in secondary Schools of Kisumu County. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary studies*, E-ISSN 2281-4612, ISSN 2281-3993 MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy 4 No 3.
- Rajeesh, T. C. (2012). Psychological wellbeing and self-efficacy: A study on Kudumbashree members in Kerala [The Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit Shodhganga Thesis].
- Rani, N. (2015). Factors affecting recruitment and career advancement of women in the hospitality industry [Maharshi Dayanand University Shodhganga Thesis].
- Saravanan, J. (2014). The Use of English Prepositions: An Empirical Study. *Journal of NELTA*, 19(1–2), 158–168. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v19i1-2.12089>
- Shumow, S. C. L. (2014). The relationships among writing self-efficacy, writing goal orientation, writing achievement Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL, USA language education in Asia, 5(2).
- SinsaWouter, P. H. M., & van Joolingenb Elwin, R. (2006). Motivation and performance within a collaborative computer-based modeling task: Relations between students' achievement goal orientation, self-efficacy, cognitive processing, and achievement. R.SavelsberghcBernadettevan hout-Woltersd. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. [Doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2006.12.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2006.12.004).
- Siti Salwa, S., Kazeem, B., & Norway, Bt. Mansor. (2013). Relations between Achievement Goal Orientations and Math Achievement in Primary Grades: A Follow-Up Study. *International Journal of Education and Research* Vol. 1 No. 12 December 2013.
- Subhashini, & Akurathi, C. H. (2020). Wellbeing Impacts on Suicidal Ideation among Farmers in Visakhapatnam. *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research (IAAR) Journal of Experimental Education*, 78(4), 440–463. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220970903548046>
- Tsai, H.-J. (2015). Exploring college students' motivational beliefs in ability-grouped English classes in Taiwan. A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctorate of Education School of Education Durham University, 2015.
- Tuan, H.-L., Chin, C.-C., & Shieh, S.-H. (2005). Goal orientation and self-efficacy as predictors of male adolescents. *International Journal of Science Education*, 27(6), 639–654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690420003237374030>, 2(4, July); Page No, 111–114

Received on 21-09-2021

Revised on 22-11-2021

Accepted on 25-11-2021