

October 2020

Effects of Achievement Goal Orientation Types on Subjective Wellbeing

Tasya Nafasya Putri

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, tasyanafasyaputri@gmail.com

Airin Yustikarini Saleh

Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, airinys@ui.ac.id

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/proust>

Recommended Citation

Putri, Tasya Nafasya and Saleh, Airin Yustikarini (2020) "Effects of Achievement Goal Orientation Types on Subjective Wellbeing," *Psychological Research on Urban Society*: Vol. 3 : No. 2 , Article 7.

DOI: 10.7454/proust.v3i2.62

Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/proust/vol3/iss2/7>

This Original Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychological Research on Urban Society by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Effects of Achievement Goal Orientation Types on Subjective Well-being

Psychological Research
on Urban Society
2020, Vol. 3(2): 65-75
© The Author(s) 2020
DOI: [10.7454/proust.v3i2.62](https://doi.org/10.7454/proust.v3i2.62)
proust.ui.ac.id

Tasya Nafasya Putri¹, Airin Yustikarini Saleh^{1*}

¹Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia

Received: August 19th, 2019
Revision Accepted: October 3rd, 2020

Abstract

In the midst of increasing academic pressure, the subjective well-being of high school students tends to decline as they undergo the school years. In this regard, measuring subjective well-being in specific contexts is necessary to ensure thorough and accurate information that better represents their situation. For this purpose, the study uses subjective well-being in school, which consists of school satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect. Out of the variables that correlate to subjective well-being in school, achievement goal orientation needs more attention. Thus, the study examines the effects of each type of goal orientation on subjective well-being in school using a 2 × 2 framework. Based on linear regression analysis, mastery-approach goal, performance-approach goal, and performance-avoidance goal have a significant effect on the subjective well-being of 11th-grade high school students in school. However, the opposite is true for the mastery-avoidance goal. The research supports previous research and provides broad information about achievement goal orientation as described by the 2 × 2 framework.

Keywords

Achievement goal orientation, adolescent, high school student, subjective well-being in school

In Indonesia, high school students face various academic demands throughout the academic year. At the beginning of the school year, they select between two majors, namely, natural or social sciences, and concentrate on specific subjects in their major throughout high school. Moreover, the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum (K-13) encourages students to be independent in terms of their studies and strike a balance between soft and hard skills (Asari, 2014). Furthermore, they must prepare for enrollment in college as early as the first year of high school with a focus on academic achievement. At the end of high school, students must undergo the National

Exam and public college admission exams, which require higher-order thinking skills and high levels of analytical thinking (Harususilo, 2019).

Amid the demands that high school students face, they must maintain constant academic achievement. Hence, they are under academic pressure placed by high curriculum standards and more frequent exams (Liu et al., 2016). Such pressure then leads to less school satisfaction and more negative affect toward school (Liu et al., 2016). School satisfaction and negative affect are two components of subjective well-being in school. Therefore, students with low levels of subjective well-being in school are unhappy and unsatisfied with the school.

Alternatively, according to a survey by the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) in 2012, high school students in Indonesia ranked first in terms of the level of happiness in school (Organisation for Economic

Corresponding Author:

Airin Yustikarini Saleh
Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia
Kampus Baru UI, Depok, Jawa Barat – 16424
Email: airinys@ui.ac.id

Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2014). In the 2015 PISA survey, Indonesian students also ranked high in life satisfaction (OECD, 2017). The surveys prove that the same condition, dependent on students' evaluation, can have varying effects on subjective well-being. In addition, certain internal factors influence subjective well-being. One of such factors is the manner in which students guide their behavior to pursue an achievement. This tendency is termed achievement goal orientation. Tian, Yu, and Huebner (2017) reported that the type of achievement goal orientation influences subjective well-being in school.

Achievement goal orientation pertains to personal goals that guide future behavior (Elliot & Murayama, 2008). Goal orientation theory posits that several thought processes and actions, whether encouraged by others or guided by individuals themselves, can be maintained to achieve high competence (Waskiewicz, 2012). The first orientation is mastery of goals, focus on the learning process, mastery of information, and competence development (Ames, 1992). Moreover, Ames (1992) pointed out performance goals as another form of goal orientation, in which individuals aim to demonstrate competence. Conversely, Elliot (1999) proposed a 2×2 model, which consists of mastery-approach goals, mastery-avoidance goals, performance-approach goals, and performance-avoidance goals. Mastery-approach goals emphasize learning and achieving, whereas mastery-avoidance goals focus on avoiding failure in learning and deterioration in abilities. Furthermore, performance-approach goals focus on demonstrating skills that are better than others, whereas the opposite is true for performance-avoidance goals (Elliot, 1999; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Senko & Freund, 2015).

Previous research demonstrated that the type of goal orientation correlates to various aspects, especially in terms of emotion (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Cron et al., 2005; Efklides & Dina, 2007; Huang, 2011; Pahljina-Reinić & Kolić-Vehovec, 2017). In contrast, the present study aims to examine the impact of goal orientation not only on affect but also on the cognitive aspect related to an individual's evaluation of school satisfaction. Past research demonstrated that mastery goal orientation has a more positive effect than performance goal

orientation; however, previous findings regarding performance goal orientation remain inconsistent (Kaplan & Maehr, 2006). Thus, the current study investigated the effects of the types of achievement goal orientation on subjective well-being in school. Although Tian et al. (2017) examined the effects of the types of goal orientation on subjective well-being in school, she and her research team used the trichotomic model proposed by Elliot and Harackiewicz (1996), which consists of mastery goals, performance-approach goals, and performance-avoidance goals. Tian uses the trichotomy theory from Elliot and Church (1997) which only differentiates performance goals into the approach and avoidance orientation. However, according to Elliot and McGregor (2001), it is not only performance goals that can be differentiated into approach and avoidance orientation but also applies to mastery orientation so that the model can be separated into a 2×2 model consisting of mastery-approach orientation, mastery-avoidance orientation, and performance approach and performance avoidance. Thus, according to Elliot and McGregor 2001, there is a different profile in each achievement goal where the motives of mastery-avoidance goals are more negative than mastery-approach goals and more positive than performance-avoidance goals. The existence of differences in mastery goals is also supported by a study conducted by Madjar, Kaplan and Weinstock (2011) which states that mastery-avoidance goals empirically have different motive orientation among junior high school and high school students. Hence, the present study investigates the effects of each type of goal orientation on school-related subjective well-being among high school students by utilizing a framework for achievement goal orientation that differentiates approach-avoidance from mastery and performance goals as proposed by Elliot (1999). In this case, in contrast to Tian et al. (2017), the study uses the more recent 2×2 achievement goal framework, which consists of mastery-approach orientation, performance-approach orientation, mastery-avoidance orientation, and performance-avoidance orientation. The framework was selected as a further development of previous research. Elliot and McGregor (2001) stated that the 2×2 framework is more comprehensive compared with the mastery-performance

dichotomy because it adds an essential variation of achievement goal orientation to enhance accuracy. Moreover, studies that examine the effects of the 2×2 framework for school-related subjective well-being remain lacking especially in Indonesia.

The current study focuses on high school students because research on subjective well-being in adolescents remains in the early phase and thus requires development (Long, Huebner, Wedell, & Hills, 2012). Furthermore, research on this field is limited (Tian, Wang, & Huebner, 2014). Moreover, high school students were selected because they are required to face more varied academic demands than junior high school and thus tend to perceive high levels of stress (Park et al., 2018). Furthermore, high school students reported being less satisfied with the school and experienced more negative affect in school (Liu et al., 2016).

The study aims to answer the following question: Does the type of achievement goal orientation (i.e., mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goals) influence the subjective well-being in the school of high school students?

Subjective Well-being in School

Tian et al. (2014) defined subjective well-being in school as a subjective evaluation by students that includes cognitive and emotional aspects experienced in school. Based on the authors' findings, subjective well-being in school consists of three components, namely, school satisfaction and positive and negative effects in school. School satisfaction is a student's subjective cognitive evaluation of a school using an internal standard that correlates to specific domains of importance in school life. Positive affect refers to positive emotions that emerge or are felt by students, whereas negative affect involves adverse sentiments that students experience in school (Tian et al., 2015).

Subjective well-being in school may differ dependent on the age of the students. Liu et al. (2016) reported that primary school students have high levels of school satisfaction and experience more positive than negative affect compared with secondary and high school students. Moreover, the authors proposed that this ten-

dency is caused by academic pressure, which increases as students advance to higher education. Moreover, high school students are required to meet higher curriculum standards and take frequent examinations. In addition, they have to prepare for entry into the workforce and master more specific skills (Zhang et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2016). Furthermore, adolescents can accurately evaluate the fulfillment of their needs in school, such that they tend to rank their satisfaction as lower (Bradley & Corwyn, 2004; Liu et al., 2016). Apart from age, achievement goal orientation is another factor that impacts subjective well-being in school (Tian et al., 2017).

Achievement Goal Orientation

Elliot and Murayama (2008) defined achievement goals as individual goals that guide future behavior. From this perspective, the authors conceptualized achievement goal orientations as ones that focus on competence and consist of two independent dimensions of competence. They proposed four types of achievement goal orientations, namely, mastery-approach, performance-approach, mastery-avoidance, and performance-avoidance.

Elliot and McGregor (2001) stated that competence is the central concept of achievement goal orientation, which is divided into two essential dimensions, namely, definition and valence. Competence is a standard used to evaluate performance. Based on this definition, achievement goal orientation is further categorized into three types, namely, absolute, intrapersonal, and normative. The absolute standard consists of the demands of the task itself. In contrast, the intrapersonal standard includes the maximum achievement that an individual has acquired in the past. Lastly, the normative standard is based on the performance of other people. Conversely, valence determines how individuals interpret competence. Based on valence, competence may be interpreted as positive (success) or negative (failure).

Moreover, Elliot and Church (1997) proposed that the mastery-approach orientation strives to achieve competence by learning as much as possible about a given topic. In this regard, external forces do not influence this definition of achievement. Alternatively, individuals with mastery-avoidance goals avoid situations

Figure 1*2 × 2 Achievement Goal Orientation Model*

		Definition	
		Absolute/intrapersonal (mastery)	Normative (performance)
Valence	Positive (approaching success)	<i>Mastery-approach goal</i>	<i>Performance-approach goal</i>
	Negative (avoiding failure)	<i>Mastery-avoidance goal</i>	<i>Performance-avoidance goal</i>

Source: Elliot and McGregor (2001)

in which an obstacle will affect their learning process. The performance-approach goal denotes an orientation in which individuals focus on the possibility of achieving success, whereas the performance-avoidance goal focuses on the possibility of failure and strives to avoid it (Elliot & Church, 1997). Individuals with performance-approach goals tend to become more involved in their tasks because they deem such tasks as opportunities for demonstrating high competence. However, the opposite is true for individuals with performance-avoidance goals because they assume that the results will fail to meet their expectations.

Each type of achievement goal orientation pertains to different perceptions of achievement. Individuals with mastery-approach goals define their performance without the influence of others. As such, individuals of this type define success by exerting effort to learn despite obstacles. For this reason, they are less likely to feel negative emotions in the school context. Instead, they feel more satisfied because they can achieve competence.

Individuals with mastery-avoidance goals avoid situations where obstacles may appear and influence their learning process. Furthermore, they tend to feel anxious and assume that mistakes are not part of the learning process, which results in more negative affect and low levels of school satisfaction. Individuals with performance-approach goals focus on their involvement in their work to demonstrate that they are more competent than others. This orien-

tation pushes them to compare themselves with other people. In other words, if students can demonstrate high ability, then they can feel satisfaction in school. However, they are prone to feeling more negative affect, which can influence how they perceive their school experience.

Lastly, students with performance-avoidance goals tend to avoid the impression that they are incompetent in terms of performance because they believe that they are likely to fail and obtain results beneath their expectations. Therefore, motivation decreases, and they become prone to negative affect.

Based on the discussion, the study hypothesizes that the four orientations, namely, (1) mastery-approach, (2) mastery-avoidance, (3) performance-approach, and (4) performance-avoidance predict subjective well-being in school.

Method

Research Design

The study is non-experimental in nature and based on a cross-sectional model. Data were derived from a single session without preferential treatment for any participant. The number of participants was determined through a priori power analysis in the G*Power program. Based on a priori power analysis that has been conducted using *g* power, the number of participants that are needed for regression research purposes with 0,05 significance, two-tailed, 0.3

effect size and 0,8 statistical power is 77. Therefore, based on that analysis, we decided to gather a higher number of data to 300 high school students participants.

Participants

The participants are eleventh-grade students from private and public schools in Jakarta, Bekasi, and Depok. The sample was selected as the researchers assume that the students have sufficiently adapted to and gained familiarity with their respective schools. Conversely, twelfth-grade students were undergoing an intense preparation period for the National Exam. Furthermore, tenth-grade students were excluded because they were considered within the adaptation phase.

Procedures

The study then surveyed several potential schools with distance as a consideration. The possible schools were contacted to obtain permission. Five schools in Depok, Jakarta, and Bekasi agreed to participate. Data collection started from November 2018 to January 2019, which was conducted for 1 h in each class as decided by the school board. The research team independently administered data collection sessions except for certain schools. In such cases, the research team was required to hold a briefing with teachers regarding the study protocol. The instrument used is a self-report questionnaire.

The parents provided written informed consent. Afterward, the students filled up the questionnaire. Students were allowed to ask the research administrators about items that require clarification within the questionnaire. Students who completed the questionnaire received notebooks and bookmarks as rewards.

Measures

Subjective well-being in school was measured using the Brief Adolescents' Subjective Well-being in School Scale (BASWBSS) (Tian, 2014). Prasetyawati, Rifameutia, and Newcombe (n.d.) translated the self-report scale into Bahasa Indonesia, which consists of eight items adapted from the Adolescents' Subjective Well-being in

School Scale (Tian, 2008; 2015). The first six items measured school satisfaction and were rated using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 6 = "strongly agree." Items 7 and 8 measured positive and negative affect and were rated using a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "never" to 6 = "always." Examples of these items are: "I perform well in school" and "My school provides good rules and facilitation."

Achievement goal orientation was measured using the Thai version of the Revised Achievement Goal Questionnaire (AGQ-R) compiled by L (2015) based on Elliot and Murayama (2008) and translated into Bahasa Indonesia by Febriyanti (2017). The AGQ-R is a self-report scale that consists of 12 items rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree." Examples of the items are as follows: "I avoid maximized learning." and "I work hard to understand this subject as deeply as possible." According to L (2015) in Febriyanti (2017), the mastery-approach goal subscale has the highest reliability of 0.72, whereas the mastery-avoidance goal subscale is 0.62. The performance-approach goal subscale is 0.65, whereas the performance-avoidance goal subscale is 0.70. Using Pearson's correlation and linear regression, results were analyzed to determine the effect of each goal orientation type on subjective well-being in school.

Results

Based on the linear regression test, mastery goal orientation significantly predicted subjective well-being in school ($F(1,279) = 8.790, R^2=0.031, p < .003$). The mastery-approach goal orientation explained 3.1% of the variance of subjective well-being in school, whereas other variables explained 97.3%. The mastery-approach goal orientation has a 0.175 contribution to subjective well-being in school. As a result, if the mastery-approach goal orientation increases by one point, then subjective well-being in school will also increase by 0.175.

Meanwhile, according to linear regression, the mastery-avoidance goal orientation does not significantly predict subjective well-being in school ($F(1,279) = .005, p < .994, R^2=0.00$) because the p -value does not exceed 0.05. Therefore, the mastery-avoidance goal orientation cannot

Table 1*Linear regression analysis with achievement goal orientations as predictors*

Achievement goal orientation	Constant				Result				
	B	SE	T	p	B	SE	β	t	p
Mastery-approach	3.59	.57	6.31	0.00	0.14	0.05	0.17	2.96	0.00*
Mastery-avoidance	5.12	.60	8.69	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.07	0.99
Performance-approach	3.59	.64	5.59	0.00	0.14	0.05	0.15	2.62	0.00*
Performance-avoidance	3.96	.62	6.34	0.00	0.11	0.05	0.12	2.09	0.03*

explain the variance of subjective well-being in school and only contributes 0.004 (less than 1%) to subjective well-being in school. Furthermore, if the mastery-avoidance goal orientation increases by one point, then subjective well-being in school will only increase by 0.004 points.

Linear regression analysis indicates that the performance-approach goal orientation significantly predicts subjective well-being in school ($F(1.279) = 6.894$, $R^2=0.024$, $p < .09$). The performance-approach goal orientation can explain 2.4% of the variance of subjective well-being in school, whereas other variables can explain 97.6%. Furthermore, this orientation contributes 0.155 to subjective well-being in school. Therefore, if it increases by one point, then subjective well-being in school will increase by 0.155 points.

Lastly, linear regression test reveals that the performance-avoidance goal orientation significantly predicts subjective well-being in school ($F(1.279) = 4.396$, $R^2=0.016$, $p < .037$), which can explain 1.6% variance of subjective well-being in school, whereas other variables can explain 98.4%. This orientation contributes 0.125 to subjective well-being in school, such that if performance-avoidance goal orientation increases by one point, then subjective well-being in school will increase by 0.125 points.

Discussion

The study aimed to examine whether achievement goal orientation impacts subjective well-being in school among high school students and whether the type of performance goal, specifi-

cally mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance, influences subjective well-being in the school of high school students.

First, the result demonstrates that the mastery-approach, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goal orientation can predict school-related subjective well-being in high school students. However, the opposite is true for the mastery-avoidance goal. This finding is in line with those of previous studies, such as Elliot (1994), Elliot and Church (1997), Linnenbrink (2005), and Pekrun, Elliot, and Maier (2009).

Second, the result indicates that students with mastery-approach goals tend to gain more positive experiences and greater school satisfaction. Elliot and McGregor (2001) defined the mastery-approach goal as aiming to master a task (absolute standard), improving one's performance (intrapersonal standard), and holding a positive perception of competence. Students who adopt mastery-approach goals perceive tasks as challenges and feel joy and immersion in their tasks, which consequently develops their interest (Elliot, 1994; Elliot & Church, 1997). Moreover, the mastery-approach goal influences their expectation of success, belief about their ability, usefulness, importance, and interest in a subject (Sekreter, 2006).

Another result is that students with mastery-approach goals exhibit increased positive affect, which is in agreement with Linnenbrink (2005), who demonstrated that the mastery-approach goal orientation is correlated to positive affect as a dimension of subjective well-being in school.

Moreover, mastery-approach goals can predict positive affect, which is one of the components of subjective well-being in school and supported by Pekrun, Elliot, and Maier (2009). The authors suggested that mastery goal orientation is a positive predictor of *enjoyment, hope, and pride*. In the same research, however, mastery goal orientation is also a negative predictor of anger. As such, the authors provided further evidence of another component of subjective well-being in school, namely, negative affect, which the authors defined as adverse emotional experiences and effects that may include anger, fear, and anxiety (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). In other words, if students adopt the mastery goal orientation, *then* they are predicted to feel happiness and experience less anger, both of which are affective components of subjective well-being in school. Moreover, if students adopt mastery goal orientation, then they are predicted to achieve higher subjective well-being in school (Tian, 2015). Although various studies attest to the effects of the mastery-approach goal, this variable only explains 3.1% of the variance of subjective well-being in school. As a result, other variables, such as educational background, social support, perception of family relations, personal goals, and coping strategies, can be used to predict subjective well-being in school.

Based on linear regression analysis, the mastery-approach goal orientation has the most significant effect on subjective well-being in school compared with the other types of achievement goal orientation. This result is supported by that of Pahljina-Reinić and Kolić-Vehovec (2017), who argued that mastery goal orientation has the most adaptive impact on the emotional and motivational aspects of students. Moreover, Prpa (2016) also supported the results of the current study by mentioning that the mastery-approach goal orientation has the highest variance among the indicators of well-being and, thus, the best predictor of subjective well-being. In conclusion, the mastery-approach goal orientation can predict subjective well-being not only in general but also in specific contexts, such as the school setting.

An important finding of the current study demonstrates that mastery-avoidance goals exert no effect on subjective well-being in school. According to Van Yperen (2006), students with mastery-avoidance goals are uninter-

ested in comparing themselves to others, nor do they display an ambition to develop themselves. Senko and Freund (2015) revealed that between mastery and avoidance, the negative effects of avoidance are typically more salient than the positive effects of mastery. Such negative effects may indicate a possible lack of correlation to subjective well-being in school. The small number of participants who adopted this form of goal orientation points to a similarity with the findings of Elliot and McGregor (2001), that is, this goal is pursued relatively less often compared with the three other goals. According to Senko and Freund (2015), mastery-avoidance goals are commonly identified in populations from specific backgrounds, such as late adulthood. In other words, individuals at the late adulthood stage perceive mastery-avoidance goals as easily applicable. Hence, they are uninfluenced by pressure and thus able to enjoy their tasks (Senko & Freund, 2015). In addition, individuals in late adulthood have to face decreases in many cognitive, physical, financial, and social abilities. Thus, these declines encourage them to orient their personal goals toward maintaining their resources, rather than acquiring new competencies (Senko & Freund, 2015).

Another finding of the current study illustrates that performance-approach goals significantly predict subjective well-being in school. This result implies that students who define their competence based on the performance of other people (normative standard) and view their competence in a positive light (Elliot & McGregor, 2001) have a positive evaluation of their school. Students with performance-approach goals focus on the possibility of success and show others that they have high competence (Elliot & Church, 1997). According to Pekrun et al. (2014), performance-approach goals predict feelings of happiness, hope, and pride in students. Happy feelings emerge as a form of positive affect, which constitutes a component of subjective well-being in school. Furthermore, Midgley, Kaplan, and Middleton (2001) explained that as students become involved in the higher education system, the environment that surrounds them becomes increasingly competitive. As a result, they adopt performance-approach goals to become more adaptive.

Furthermore, the competitive environment

to which students are subjected in the higher education system manifests in eleventh-grade as students need to take college admission exams, such as the Bahasa Indonesia: *Seleksi Nasional Masuk Perguruan Tinggi Negeri*, which requires the maintenance of high academic achievement since tenth grade. Thus, these requirements enable eleventh-grade students to set the goal of reaching maximum scores as a sign of their best performance in school.

Regression analysis points out that performance-avoidance goals predict subjective well-being in school. Nevertheless, the results of performance-avoidance goal orientation indicate differences from those associated with negative affect in other studies (Linnenbrink, 2005). Meanwhile, the current study proposes that performance-avoidance goals are positively correlated to subjective well-being in school. Students with performance-avoidance goals are characterized as capable of self-regulation based on the possibility of reaching an adverse outcome and being predisposed to avoid tasks. Consequently, feelings of anxiety and distraction arise when task performance leads to desperation (Elliot & Church, 1997). Therefore, in the context of the present research, the majority of students who adopt performance-avoidance goal orientation presume that they will obtain negative results. In response, they avoid the task entirely to prevent the perception that they are incompetent.

Focusing on avoiding perceptions of ineptitude frequently results in intrinsic motivation among students to achieve high competence (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1997). In addition, students with this type of orientation tend to have low expectations of their competence (Elliot & Church, 1997). Nevertheless, this cognition may enable students to encounter positive experiences in school and feel school satisfaction.

In a highly collectivist context, such as Indonesia (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005), students have high levels of attachment to teachers and families. Students of this orientation feel the need to fulfill their expectations because low academic achievement can affect such relationships (King, 2016). As a result, students are motivated to meet their family's expectations by setting performance-avoidance goals, which involve refraining from displaying incompe-

tence in front of others (Tao & Hong, 2013; King, 2016). The sample was taken from eleventh-grade students in Indonesia, which is mainly a collectivist culture (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). In this context, performance-avoidance goals can become more adaptive. However, the study does not measure the level of collectivism for each participant. Therefore, further studies are required to investigate the effects of collectivism on the types of achievement goal orientations.

Conclusions

Focusing on students who adopt a certain goal orientation, the study investigated the effects of each type of goal orientation on subjective well-being in school. *The findings* illustrate that mastery-approach, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goal orientations can significantly predict the subjective well-being in school of adolescents. However, the opposite is true for mastery-avoidance goals.

Limitations

The study has several limitations, one of which is the fact that it solely focuses on participants who adopt one type of achievement goal orientation. Therefore, it cannot explain the dynamics of adopting multiple goals in the case of several participants. The study is also constrained by the narrow scope of specific contexts and its reliance on correlation. Thus, it can only slightly explain the causal relationship between the two given variables.

Despite these limitations, the study nonetheless has its advantages because it employed the 2×2 frameworks of achievement goal orientation, which has yet to see widespread use, mainly when referring to the mastery-avoidance goal component. In addition, the study specifically measured the subjective well-being in the school of students in Indonesia, which is a different subject of research and contributes to the literature on subjective well-being in the school context, such that it can accurately represent the experiences of 11th-grade students.

Given these limitations, future studies may elaborate on the results of the current study. Moreover, further research can analyze multiple goals to explore the dynamics and interactions

between goal combinations to determine the effects of the types of achievement goal orientation on subjective well-being in school. *Measuring* achievement goal orientation also requires a broader context and more accessible tools independent of the context of particular school subjects. Moreover, future research can use the experimental method to provide further proof of causal relationships between the two variables.

Declaration of Conflicting Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in this research.

Acknowledgment

The authors gratefully acknowledge the reviewers for their very helpful comments and suggestions. The authors also gratefully acknowledge the assistance of schools, teaching staff, and students who participated in this study.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Airin Yustikarini Saleh, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, West Java, Indonesia. Email: airinys@ui.ac.id

References

- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3), 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.84.3.261>
- Asari, A. (2014). *Mengupayakan pembelajaran yang sesuai tuntutan kurikulum 2013*. [Paper presentation] Seminar Pendidikan, Pangkalan Bun, Kalimantan Tengah. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.1389.2644>
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2004). Life satisfaction among European, American, African American, Chinese, American, Mexican American, and Dominican American adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*(5), 385–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250444000072>
- Cron, W. L., Slocum, J. W. Jr., VandeWalle, D., & Fu, Q. (2005). The role of goal orientation on negative emotions and goal setting when initial performance falls short of one's performance goal. *Human Performance, 18*(1), 55–80. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1801_3
- Diener, E. (1994). Assessing subjective well-being: Progress and opportunities. *Social Indicators Research, 31*(2), 103–157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01207052>
- Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2002). Subjective well-being. The science of happiness and life satisfaction. In: C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 463–473). *Oxford University Press*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/b/9780195187243.013.0017>
- Efklides, A., & Dina, F. (2007). Is mastery orientation always beneficial for learning? Culture, motivation and learning: A multi-cultural perspective, 131–167.
- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(1), 218–232. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.1.218>
- Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 461–475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.461>
- Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist, 34*(3), 169–189. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3403_3
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 × 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*(3), 501–519. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.3.501>
- Elliot, A. J., & Murayama, K. (2008). On the measurement of achievement goals: Critique, illustration, and application. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(3), 613–628. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.3.613>
- Febriyanti, V. (2017). Hubungan antara jenis goal orientation dan gaya coping adaptif

- terhadap stres terkait sekolah. [Unpublished manuscript]. Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia.
- Harususilo, Y. E. (2019). Tidak hanya UNBK, ada soal HOTS di UTBK SBMPTN 2019. Kompas, Retrieved from <https://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2019/03/20/17423351/tidak-hanya-unbk-ada-soal-hots-di-utbk-sbmptn-2019>
- Hofstede, G. H. & Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill
- Huang, C. (2011). Achievement goals and achievement emotions: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 23(3), 359–388. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10648-011-9155-x>
- Kaplan, A., & Maehr, M. L. (2006). The contributions and prospects of goal orientation theory. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19(2), 141–184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9012-5>
- King, R. B. (2016). Is a performance-avoidance achievement goal always maladaptive? Not necessarily for collectivists. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 99, 190–195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.093>
- Linnenbrink, E. A. (2005). The dilemma of performance-approach goals: The use of multiple goal contexts to promote students' motivation and learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 197–213. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.197>
- Linnenbrink, E. A. & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Achievement goal theory and affect: An asymmetrical bidirectional model. *Educational Psychologist*, 37(2), 69–78. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3702_2
- Liu, W., Mei, J., Tian, L., & Huebner, E. S., (2016). Age and gender differences in the relation between school-related social support and subjective well-being in school among students. *Social Indicators Research*, 125(3), 1065–1083. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-0873-1>
- Long, R. F., Huebner, E. S., Wedell, D. H., & Hills, K. J. (2012). Measuring school-related subjective well-being in adolescents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 82(1), 50–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01130.x>
- Madjar, N., Kaplan, A., & Weinstock, M. (2011). Clarifying mastery-avoidance goals in high school: Distinguishing between intrapersonal and task-based standards of competence. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(4), 268–279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.03.003>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2014). PISA 2012 results in focus: What 15-year-olds know and what they can do with what they know. Retrieved March 28, 2019 from <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/keyfindings/pisa-2012-results-overview.pdf>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2017). PISA 2015 results (Volume III): Students' well-being life satisfaction among 15-year-old students: Percentage of students by level of life satisfaction. OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264273856-graph6-en>
- Pahljina-Reinić, R., & Kolić-Vehovec, S. (2017). Average personal goal pursuit profile and contextual achievement goals: Effects on students' motivation, achievement emotions, and achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences* 56, 167–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.01.020>
- Park, S., Jang, H., Lee, E. S. (2018). Major stressors among Korean adolescents according to gender, educational level, residential area, and socioeconomic status. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(10), 2080. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15102080>
- Pekrun, R., Elliot, A. J., & Maier, M. A. (2009). Achievement goals and achievement emotions: Testing a model of their joint relations with academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(1), 115–135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013383>
- Pekrun, R., Cusack, A., Murayama, K., Elliot, A. J., & Thomas, K. (2014). The power of anticipated feedback: Effects on students' achievement goals and achievement emotions. *Learning and Instruction*, 29, 115–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.09.002>
- Prasetyawati, W., Rifameutia, T., Newcombe, P. (2018). Adaptasi alat ukur kesejahteraan bersekolah siswa BASWBSS di Indonesia. [Unpublished manuscript].

- Prpa, N. (2016). Achievement goals as predictors of different subjective and psychological well-being measures. [Master's thesis, University of Thessaly]. University of Thessaly Institutional Repository.
- Sekreter, G. (2016). Mastery goal orientation promoting students' expectancies for success and self-efficacy. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 2(1), 93–106. <https://doi.org/10.31578/jeps.v2i1.33>
- Senko, C., & Freund, A. M. (2015). Are mastery-avoidance achievement goals always detrimental? An adult development perspective. *Motivation and Emotion*, 39(4), 477–488. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-015-9474-1>
- Tao, V., & Hong, Y. (2013). When academic achievement is an obligation: Perspectives from social-oriented achievement motivation. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 45, 110–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113490072>
- Tian, L., Wang, D. S., & Huebner, E. (2014). Development and validation of the Brief Adolescents' Subjective Well-being in School Scale (BASWBSS). *Social Indicators Research*, 120(2), 615–634. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0603-0>
- Tian, L., Zhao, J., Huebner, E. S. (2015). School-related social support and subjective well-being in school among adolescents: The role of self-system factors. *Journal of Adolescence*, 45, 138–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.09.003>
- Tian, L., Yu, T., & Huebner, E. S. (2017). Achievement goal orientations and adolescents' subjective well-being in school: The mediating roles of academic social comparison directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(37). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00037>
- Van Yperen, N. W. (2006). A novel approach to assessing achievement goals in the context of the 2 × 2 framework: Identifying distinct profiles of individuals with different dominant achievement goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(11), 1432–1445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206292093>
- Waskiewicz, R. A. (2012). Achievement goal orientation and situational motivation for a low-stakes test of content knowledge. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 76(4), 65. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe76465>
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063–1070. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>
- Zhang, R., Hsu, H., & Wang, S. (2010). Global literacy: Comparing Chinese and US high school students. *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal*, 4(2), 76–98. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17504971011052304>