INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

ISSN(print): 2643-9840, ISSN(online): 2643-9875

Volume 05 Issue 11 November 2022

DOI: 10.47191/ijmra/v5-i11-23, Impact Factor: 6.261

Page No. 3150-3160

Achievement Goal Orientation, and Self-Regulated Learning Strategy as Correlates of Students' Academic Achievement in English Language in Anambra State, Nigeria

Anyanwu Adeline Nne[1], EzenwosuNgozi Elizabeth[2], Emesi Kingsley Ekene[3]

[1,2,3]Department of Educational Foundations Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka Anambra State

ABSTRACT: Students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategies are strong indicators and facilitators of proactive learning. The study aimed to explore the relationship among students' achievement goal orientation, self-regulated learning strategies and academic achievement in Anambra State. Six research questions and six null hypotheses guided the study. The study adopted a correlation approach to provide answers to the research questions. The population of the study comprised of 21,204 SS II students from which a sample of 630 was drawn. Multi-stage procedure was used to select the sample. Two standardized research instruments namely; Achievement Goal Orientation Questionnaire (AGOQ), and Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ), as well as score from students' promotional examination were used for data collection. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of the items in the instruments. Reliability indices of 0.73, for mastery-approach, 0.71, for mastery-avoidance, 0.82, for performance-approach, 0.76, for performance-avoidance, 0.72 for work-avoidance, 0.64 for monitoring, 0.73 for planning, and 0.68 for self-regulating activity respectively. The overall reliability coefficient was 0.71 which shows that the instrument was reliable and good for the study. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to answer research questions 1 to 5 and hypotheses 1-5 while the research question 6 and null hypothesis 6 were answered with multiple correlation. Findings showed that students' recorded a very low positive and significant relationship between students' mastery-approach and their academic achievement in English language. Findings also revealed that the multiple correlations of these variables is positive and significant with academic achievement in English language. Finally, it was recommended based on the low relationship recorded between students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy that students should consider these variables as useful academic facilitators that could enable them achieve their core values in the learning exploration.

KEYWORDS: Achievement Goal Orientation, Self-Regulated Learning Strategy, and Academic Achievement.

INTRODUCTION

To succeed in education, students not only need to dispose of the unnecessary cognitive skills, but they also need to have the will or motivation to learn (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990). On this assumption; teachers, educational specialists and researchers recognized the usefulness of identifying effective pathways to promote students' adaptive motivation and achievement behaviours in classroom learning context. It will be acceptable to agree with the study of Kaplan and Maehr (2007) which emphasized that within the achievement goal theory, achievement goal orientation focuses less on what objectives individuals are trying to achieve in learning contexts, but places emphasis on why and how objectives are being achieved. Thus, the overarching emphasis is on the cognitive purposes students perceive for engaging in achievement-predicting or relating behaviour and the meanings they ascribe to that behaviour. In relation to this, achievement goal orientation represents the achievement-predicting behaviour that could determine the reasons to engage to achieve or not to engage to achieve academically. Scholars have conceptualized achievement goal orientation as a catalyst that directs energy for the realization of desired outcome (Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer, & Elliot, 2012). This shows that achievement goal orientation is a drive, i.e., an internal state, need, or condition that motivates individuals towards a desired behaviour.

Scholars believed that achievement goal orientation is partly rooted in achievement motivation, which can be conceptualized as personality predictors, facilitators and indicators of behavioural outcomes (Mottus, Baumert, & Back, 2020). Interestingly,

achievement goal orientation is an integrated pattern of beliefs that leads to different ways of approaching, engaging in, and responding to achievement situations (Ames, 1992). To put it differently, it is an individuals' general schema or theory for approaching the task, doing the task, and evaluating their performance on the task. This pattern is considered to be the base for successful academic performance. Mottus, Baumert, and Back, (2020) noted that the motivation students have towards engaging in academic activities is directed by a complex set of achievement goal orientation. Urdan and Maehr (1995) defined achievement goal orientation as cognitive representations of the different purposes students may adopt for their learning in achievement situation. Dweck and Leggett, (1988) defined achievement goal orientation as individually perceived reasons or purposes students have for wanting to achieve or not to achieve in any academic task. This type of goal orientation has been conceptualized as catalysts that direct energy for the realization of desired outcomes. It indicates that the pursuit of qualitatively different achievement goal orientation provides an interpretive framework that results in different patterns of emotional, behavioural and cognitive responses (Dweck& Leggett, 1988). That is to say that motivation in school can be understood by looking at the reasons or purposes students adopt while engaged in academic work.

This shows that achievement goal orientation is a comprehensive semantic system of situations or contexts which have cognitive, emotional and behavioural outcomes which learners could use to interpret their performances. For this reason, Dweck and Legget (1988) described achievement goal orientation to represent the purpose or cognitive-dynamic focus of competence relevant behaviour and the tradition of this goal orientation emphasized mostly on mastery goal and performance goal. This indicates that the purposes or reasons an individual has endorsed in pursuing an achievement task could be either for mastery effort purposes or for performance competence purposes.

Elliot and McGregor (2001) assert that achievement goal orientation would represent a structured knowledge, unit, or subjective personal conception, assumption/ schema about the purposes for an achievement task as well as other elements in terms of how success, competence, the role of effort, ability, errors and standards for evaluation are defined. These, usually refer to students' beliefs in involvement with schooling, academics activities, or learning that deals with bahaviour and emotions that encompasses effort and persistence in school work. It is on this assumption that Elliot and McGregor (2001) achievement goal orientation into four clusters; such as master-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance. According to the scholars, mastery-approach goal orientation focused on the development of competence through task mastery. Mastery-avoidance goal orientation deals with trying to avoid being incompetence relative to the task or personal standard. Performance-approach goal orientation deals with trying to attain competence relative to one's peers, while performance-avoidance goal orientation deals with trying to avoid being incompetent relative to one's peers. In addition to these four clusters of achievement goal orientation, Elliot and Harachkiewicz (2006) identified a fifth type of achievement goal orientation as work-avoidance goal orientation which describes a student that tries to do as little as is necessary to get his/her set goal. Students that endorse this goal orientation seek to complete their work with minimum effort. Mastery-avoidance and performance-avoidance differ from work-avoidance as it is also referred to as academic alienation in which failure is avoided without hard work and achievement is viewed as possible (Dweck, 2006).

Suffice it to say that these qualitatively different types of achievement goal orientation were expected to yield differential effects on students' learning and achievement, but this has failed to provide strong evidence in the Nigerian academic literature. The question is would students manipulate achievement goal orientation to have a link with their self-regulated learning strategy in the process of learning to relate with academic achievement? Though, achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy are personality constructs they conceptualized the meaningful pathways that promote students' motivation and achievement behaviour in the classroom.

Previously, Zimmerman and Schunk, (2008) emphasized that students should be sensitized on the significance of self-regulated learning strategies, which has been revealed as a learning process in which self-regulated thoughts, feelings, and actions are systematically oriented towards attainment of the students' academic desires. In the view of Mischel and Ayduk, (2004), self-regulation is a broad construct which includes a monitoring and action component that encompasses a complex array of interacting cognitive and emotional processes aimed at goal attainment. In accordance with the study of Zimmerman (1986) as cited in Zimmerman and Schunk, (2008), this construct can be referred to as the degree to which individuals become meta-cognitively, motivationally, and behaviourally active participants in their own learning processes.

Alternatively, as self-regulated learning strategies related to academic achievement and cognitive skills, it is clearly not synonymous with cognitive competence alone. This supported the study of Schunk (2001) which defined self-regulated learning strategy as learning approach that results from students' self-generated thoughts and behaviours that are systematically orientated toward the attainment of their learning goals. To become self-regulated learners, students should learn to regulate the use of information-processing modes, the learning process, and the self. Similarly, Pintrich (2000) noted that self-regulated

learning strategy involves activating and sustaining cognitions, behaviours, and emotions in a systematic way to attain learning goals. Accordingly, self-regulated learners are assumed to manage their behaviours and anxieties to facilitate learning, and actively avoid behaviours and cognitions detrimental to academic success (Stallwork-Clark, Cochran, Nolen, Tuggle, & Scott, 2000). Also, Zimmerman and Schunk, (2008) observed that self-regulated students understand the strategies and environments necessary for learning to occur, and feel capable of performing to their personal standards. For example, Schunk and Zimmerman (1994) opined that when challenged, self-regulated learners manage to understand when and how to utilize strategies that increase persistence and performance in the learning situation. Also, students purposefully use meta-cognitive strategies that incorporate self-monitoring and evaluative components that allow for self-observation and self-reaction in the context of learning.

Suffice it to say that self-regulated learning strategy is rooted in social cognitive theory of Bandura (1986) which described self-regulation in four components; such as self-observation, goal setting, self-judgment, and self-reaction. These are meta-cognitive strategies that represent the integral parts of learning strategies that are being referred to the controlling and self-regulating aspects of meta-cognition. These strategies represent useful skills for effective learning, for storage and for retrieval of information. In the present study, the clusters of self-regulated learning strategies such as; planning, monitoring, and regulating activities will be examined in relationship with the clusters of achievement goal orientation to see how these clusters could jointly relate with academic achievement. In the planning aspect, it represents the goal setting and task analysis. The monitoring aspect of this construct is referred to as regulating one's attention while reading, self-testing or questioning, helping the students to gain understanding and comprehension. And, also regulating the activities which represent the adjustment of cognitive resources in order to fulfill the tasks that help to improve performance by checking and correcting one's own performance while engaging in a task. This is an indication that the constructs such as achievement goal orientation, and self-regulating learning strategy could be salient indicators that effect students' academic achievement.

Academic achievement has been defined as scores obtained from examination that measure the extent to which a person has acquired certain information or mastered certain skills, usually as a result of specific instruction (Meherns & Lehman, 2016). These scores characterized the academic outcome obtained from achievement test assigned to assess a person's performance in a course of study which he/she has undergone. These can be regular performance feedback obtained by means of standardized test scores as presented by the approved examination board.Therefore, considering self-regulated learning strategy and achievement goal orientation as proactive processes which students should endorse as academic skills could enhance their classroom academic achievement. Thus, students can become better learners if they become more aware of their learning situation and then choose to act on that awareness. In other words, examining the assumption that students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy could jointly relate with their academic achievement is the major gap which the present study had sought to cover in the Nigerian academic literature.

Suffice it to say that many studies have examined the relationship that exists among these variables of studies. For example, the study of Matos, Lens, and Vansteenkiste (2007) reported that mastery-approach, was positive and significantly associated with academic achievement. The study of Niepel, Brunner, and Preckel (2014) indicated that performance-approach, performance-avoidance, mastery goals and performance-approach were positively related with academic achievement. The study of Emesi (2017) recorded that mastery-approach was low positively related with academic achievement, while mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance were very low positively related with academic achievement. In Emesi's study, the four clusters of achievement goal orientation were significantly related with academic achievement. In the study of Anyanwu and Emesi (2020) it was indicated mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance performance-approach, were low positively related to academic achievement, but performance-avoidance were low positively related with academic achievement, while work-avoidance was very low negatively related to academic achievement. In Anyanwu and Emesi's study, the five clusters of achievement goal orientation were positively and significantly related with academic achievement.Also, the study of Mohamed (2012) recorded that self-regulation was moderately correlated with the students' task in the classroom. Bakar, Shuaibu, and Bakar (2017) indicated that a strong relationship existed between self-regulated learning strategies and academic achievement. The study of Karagul (2013) indicated that there were significant positive correlations between the three dimensions of self-regulated learning strategies and learning Grade Point Average scores of the students. Therefore, the paucity of studies on how students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy jointly related with academic achievement in English language of the secondary school students necessitated for the present study. It is on this back drop that the researchers examined achievement goal orientation, and self-regulated learning strategy as correlates of academic achievement in English language in Anambra State, Nigeria.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their academic achievement in English language?

2. What is the relationship between students' self-regulated learning strategies and their academic achievement in English language?
3. What is the relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their planning component of self-regulated learning strategy?
4. What is the relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their monitoring component of self-regulated learning strategy?
5. What is the relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their regulating activity component of self-regulated learning strategy?
6. What is the relationship among students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy and academic achievement in English language?

HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their academic achievement in English language.
2. There is no significant relationship between students' self-regulated learning strategies and their academic achievement in English language.
3. There is no significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their planning component of self-regulated learning strategy.
4. There is no significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their monitoring component of self-regulated learning strategy.
5. There is no significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their regulating activity component of self-regulated learning strategy.
6. There is no significant relationship among students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy academic achievement in English language.

METHOD

The researchers used a correlational research design and questionnaires to collect data for the study. The population of the study consisted of 21,204 being the total number of students in senior secondary school class II in Anambra State. A sample size of 630 questionnaires were administered to respondents and collected for data analysis. Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select the respondents. The procedures for the selection were as follows: In stage one, three education zones were selected from the six education zones in the state by simple random sampling. Then in stage two, from each sampled education zone, one local government area (L.G.A) was selected through simple random sampling given a total of three (3) L.G.As. In stage three, from each sampled L.G.A, 10 schools were randomly selected giving a total of 30 schools. Then, from each of the schools, 21 SSII students were selected for the study using a table of simple random sampling. This gave a total number of 630 students used in the study

The study adapted two standardized research questionnaires namely, Achievement Goal Orientation Questionnaire (AGOQ, Elliot, Murayama & Pekrun, 2011) and Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ, Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, & Mckeachie, 1996). The students' achievement scores were obtained from the schools before the start of the administration of the other two instruments. The students' achievement scores in English language from the state wide senior secondary one (SS1) promotion examination were obtained from the schools before the administration of the instruments.

The methods used for validating the instruments were face and construct validity by the three experts from the Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka. Cronbach's alpha reliability method was used to determine the internal consistency of the items in the research questions such as; 0.73, for mastery-approach, 0,71, for mastery-avoidance, 0.82, for performance-approach, 0.76 for performance-avoidance, 0.72 for work-avoidance, 0.73 for planning, 0.64 for monitoring, 0.68 for self-regulating activity respectively. The overall reliability coefficient was 0.72 which shows that the instrument was reliable and good for the study. According to guide lines by Haradhan, (2017), a coefficient of 0.6 is considered to be poor, 0.7 is acceptable while over 0.8 is good. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used in answering research questions one to five and testing of hypotheses one to five. Multiple correlation was used to answer research question six and to test hypothesis six at 0.05 level of significance. The decision rule for null hypotheses was that P-value higher than 0.05 was not rejected, while the hypotheses with P-value lower than 0.05 was rejected. The rough guide developed by Okoye (2015) was adopted for guide and interpretation of correlation coefficient result values when a large number of pairs of scores have been correlated. The decision rules to interpret the research questions were presented as follows: r = .00, no relationship; r = ± 0.0 to ± 0.2, very low relationship;

r = ± 0.2 to ± 0.4, low relationship; r = ± 0.4 to ± 0.6, medium relationship; r = ± 0.6 to ± 0.8, high relationship; and r = ± 0.8 to ± 1.0, very high relationship.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and academic achievement in English language?

Table 1. Pearson Correlation for theRelationship between students' achievement goal orientation and academic achievement in English language.

(N= 630)

Variables	Academic achievement (r)	Remarks
Mastery-approach	.101	very low positive relationship
Mastery-avoidance	.111	very low positive relationship
Performance-approach	.064	very low positive relationship
Performance-avoidance	.106	very low positive relationship
Work-avoidance	.102	very low positive relationship

The results in table 1 reveal a very low positive relationship between students' achievement goal orientation components and their academic achievement in English language.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between students' self-regulated learning strategy and academic achievement in English language?

Table 2. Pearson Correlation for the Relationship between students' self-regulated learning strategies and academic achievement in English language.

(N= 630)

Variables	Academic achievement (r)	Remarks
Planning	.078	very low positive relationship
Monitoring	.066	very low positive relationship
Regulating activity	.098	very low positive relationship

The results in table 2 reveal a very low positive relationship between students' self-regulated learning strategy components and their academic achievement in English language.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their planning component of self-regulated learning strategy?

Table 3. Pearson Correlation for theRelationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their planning component of self-regulated learning strategy.

(N= 630)

Variables	Planning (r)	Remarks
Mastery-approach	.096	very low positive relationship very
Mastery-avoidance	.065	low positive relationship
Performance-approach	-.070	very low negative relationship
Performance-avoidance	.092	very low negative relationship
Work-avoidance	.046	very low positive relationship

The results in table 3 reveal a very low positive relationship among mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-avoidance, work-avoidance and students' planning. Also, a very low negative relationship was recorded between students' performance-approach, and planning.

Research Question 4: What is the relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their monitoring component of self-regulated learning strategy?

Table 4. Pearson Correlation for theRelationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their monitoring component of self-regulated learning strategy.

(N= 630)

Variables	Monitoring (r)	Remarks
Mastery-approach	-.056	very low negative relationship very
Mastery-avoidance	.040	low positive relationship
Performance-approach	.704	very low positive relationship
Performance-avoidance	-.044	very low negative relationship
Work-avoidance	.062	very low positive relationship

The results in table 4 reveal a very low negative relationship among mastery-approach, performance-avoidance and students' monitoring. Also, a very low positive relationship was recorded among students' mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, work-avoidance and monitoring.

Research Question 5: What is the relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their regulating activity component of self-regulated learning strategy?

Table 5. Pearson Correlation for theRelationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their regulating activity component of self-regulated learning strategy.

(N= 630)

Variables	Regulating activity (r)	Remarks
Mastery-approach	-.044	very low negative relationship very
Mastery-avoidance	.018	low positive relationship
Performance-approach	-.045	very low negative relationship
Performance-avoidance	-.007	very low negative relationship
Work-avoidance	.023	very low positive relationship

The results in table 5 reveal a very low negative relationship among mastery-approach, performance-approach, performance-avoidance and students' regulating activity. Also, a very low positive relationship was recorded among students' mastery-avoidance, work-avoidance and regulating activity.

Research Question 6: What is the relationship among students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy and academic achievement in English language?

Table 6: Pearson Correlation for the Pearson Correlation for the Relationship among Students' Achievement goal orientation, Self-regulated Learning Strategy and Academic
Achievement in English language.

(N= 630)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.202[a]	.041	.029	9.77921

Table 6 reveals that the relationship among students' achievement goal orientation, self-regulated learning strategy and academic achievement is .202[a]. The standard error of estimate is 9.77921. Also, students' achievement goal orientation, self-regulated learning strategy contributed 4.1% to the variation in their achievement in English language.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their academic achievement in English language.

Table 7. The test of significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their academic achievement in English language.

(N = 630)

Variable	English achievement (r)	P-value	Remark
Mastery approach	.101	.012	S
Mastery avoidance	.111	.005	S
Performance approach	.064	.110	NS
Performance-avoidance	.106	.008	S
Work-avoidance	.102	.010	S

NS-Non-Significant correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

The results in table 7 reveal that there is a significant relationship between students' mastery-approach and their academic achievement in English language (r = .101 > 0.05). There is a significant relationship between students' students' mastery-avoidance and their academic achievement in English language (r = .111> 0.05). There is no significant relationship between students' performance-approach and their academic achievement in English language (r = .064 < 0.05). There is also a significant relationship between students' performance-avoidance and their academic achievement in English language (r = .106> 0.05). There is also a significant relationship between students' work-avoidance and their academic achievement in English language (r = .102 > 0.05).

Hypothesis 2: There is nosignificant relationship between students' self-regulated learning strategy and their academic achievement in English language.

Table 8. The test of significant relationship between students'self-regulated learning strategy and their academic achievement in English language.

(N = 630)

Variable	English achievement (r)	P-value	Remark
Planning	.078	.050	S
Monitoring	.066	.099	NS
Regulating activity	.098	.014	S

NS-Non-Significant correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

The results in table 8 reveal that there is a significant relationship between students' planning and their academic achievement in English language (r = .078 > 0.05). There is a no significant relationship between students' students' monitoring and their academic achievement in English language (r = .066 < 0.05). There is a significant relationship between students' regulating activity and their academic achievement in English language (r = .098 > 0.05).

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their planning component of self-regulated learning strategy.

Table 9. The test of significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their planning component of self-regulated learning strategy.

(N = 630)

Variable	Planning (r)	P-value	Remark
Mastery approach	.096	.016	S
Mastery avoidance	.065	.105	NS
Performance approach	-.070	.081	NS
Performance avoidance	.092	.020	S
Work-avoidance	.046	.250	NS

NS-Non-Significant correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

The results in table 9reveal that there is a significant relationship between students' mastery-approach and their planning (r = .096> 0.05). There is a no significant relationship between students' students' mastery-avoidance and their planning (r = .065< 0.05). There is a no significant relationship between students' performance-approach and their planning (r = -.070< 0.05). There is also a significant relationship between students' performance-avoidance and their planning (r = .092> 0.05). There is also a no significant relationship between students' work-avoidance and their planning (r = .046 < 0.05).

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their monitoring component of self-regulated learning strategy.

Table 10. The test of significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their monitoring component of self-regulated learning strategy.

(N = 630)

Variable	Monitoring (r)	P-value	Remark
Mastery approach	-.059	.139	NS
Mastery avoidance	.040	.315	NS
Performance approach	.704	.000	S
Performance avoidance	.-.044	.275	NS
Work-avoidance			
	.062	.123	NS

NS-Non-Significant correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

The results in table 10 reveal that there is a no significant relationship between students' mastery-approach and their monitoring (r = -.059 < 0.05). There is a no significant relationship between students' students' mastery-avoidance and their monitoring (r = .040 < 0.05). There is a significant relationship between students' performance-approach and their monitoring (r = .704 > 0.05). There is also a no significant relationship between students' performance-avoidance and their planning (r = -.044 < 0.05). There is also a no significant relationship between students' work-avoidance and their planning (r = .062 < 0.05).

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their regulating activity component of self-regulated learning strategy.

Table 11. The test of significant relationship between students' achievement goal orientation and their regulating activity component of self-regulated learning strategy.

(N = 630)

Variable	Regulating activity (r)	P-value	Remark
Mastery approach	-.044	.266	NS
Mastery avoidance	.018	.649	NS
Performance approach	-.045	.262	NS
Performance avoidance	.-.007	.854	NS
Work-avoidance			
	.023	.560	NS

NS-Non-Significant correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

The results in table 11 reveal that there is a no significant relationship among the five components of achievement goal orientation and students' regulating activity (r = -.044< 0.05, r = .018 < 0.05, r = -. 045 < 0.05, r = -.007 < 0.05, and r = .023 < 0.05).

Hypothesis 6: The proportion of variance in academic achievement in English language that is explained by students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy is not significant.

Table 12. Multiple Correlation of Students' Achievement Goal Orientation, Self-regulated Learning Strategies and Academic Achievement in English Language.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R. Square Change	F.Change	df1	df2	Sig.F Change
1	.202[a]	.041	.029	9.77921	.041	3.315	8	621	.001

The table 12 shows a multiple correlation run to examine the relationship among students' achievement goal orientation, self-regulated learning strategy and academic achievement in English language. The result in the table also reveals that the relationship among these variables is positive and significant with academic achievement in English language (r = .202 < .001). Therefore, it was concluded that the relationship of students' achievement goal orientation, and self-regulated learning strategy can jointly relate with their academic achievement in English language

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Findings from table one reveal that the five clusters of achievement goal orientation recorded a very low positive relationship with students' academic achievement in English language. In table seven, the hypotheses testing indicated that mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-avoidance, and work avoidance recorded a significant relationship with their academic achievement in English language while students' performance-approach recorded a non-significant relationship with their academic achievement in English language. This supported the study of Matos, Lens, and Vansteenkiste (2007) which reported that mastery-approach, was positive and significantly associated with academic achievement. This supported the study of Niepel, Brunner, and Preckel (2014) which indicated that performance-approach, performance-avoidance, mastery goals, and performance-approach were positively related with academic achievement. This supported the study of Emesi (2017) which recorded that mastery-approach was low positively related with academic achievement, while mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance were very low positively related with academic achievement. In Emesi's study, the four clusters of achievement goal orientation were significantly related with academic achievement, though the performance-approach is not significant with academic achievement in the present study. The present findings supported the study of Anyanwu and Emesi (2020) which indicated the four of the achievement goal orientation were low positively related to academic achievement, while work-avoidance was very low negatively related to academic achievement. In Anyanwu and Emesi's study, the five clusters of achievement goal orientation were positively and significantly related with academic achievement, but in the present study only the performance-approach was not significant with academic achievement.

Findings from table two reveal that the clusters of self-directed learning strategy indicated a very low positive relationship with students' academic achievement in English language. In table eight the hypotheses testing indicated that planning and regulating activity were significantly related with their academic achievement in English language, while monitoring recorded a non-significant relationship with their academic achievement in English language. At the relationship level, these supported the study of Mohamed (2012) which recorded that self-regulation was moderately correlated with the students' task in the classroom, as well as the study of Bakar, Shuaibu, and Bakar (2017) which indicated that a strong relationship existed between self-regulated learning strategies and academic achievement. Then, in the hypothesis testing it supported the study of Karagul (2013) indicated that there were significant positive correlations between the three dimensions of self-regulated learning strategies and learning Grade Point Average scores of the students, tough in the present study monitoring strategy was not significantly related with academic achievement.

Finally, findings in table three reveal that the five clusters of achievement goal orientation recorded a very low positive relationship with students' planning strategy. Findings in table four indicated mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and work-avoidance were very low positively related with students' monitoring strategy. The mastery-avoidance and performance-avoidance recorded a very low negative relationship with students' monitoring strategy. The findings from table four recorded that mastery-approach, and performance-avoidance were negatively related with students' monitoring strategy, while mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and work-avoidance were very low positively related with students' monitoring strategy. Also, findings in table five indicated that mastery-avoidance and work-avoidance recorded a very low positive relationship with students' regulating activity, while mastery-approach, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance were negatively related to their regulating activity. The hypotheses testing in table nine indicated that mastery-approach and performance-avoidance were significantly related with students' planning strategy, while mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and work-avoidance were

not significantly related with students' planning strategy. In the hypotheses testing, findings in table ten reveal that all the four clusters of achievement goal orientation were not significantly related students' monitoring strategy, excluding performance-approach which recorded a significant relationship with monitoring strategy.In table eleven, it was indicated that the five clusters of achievement goal orientation were not significantly related with students' regulating activity. In table twelve, the tripartite relationship among the three variables which is the hypothesis testing of table six indicated that students' achievement goal orientation and their self-regulated learning strategy were positively and significantly related with their academic achievement in English language. Then, as a result of the paucity of study on achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategies in relation with academic achievement among the secondary school students in Anambra state, there is no relative study that could used to compare these last findings.

CONCLUSION

The results of the study reveal that very low positive relationship had existed between students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy. The proportion of variance in academic achievement that was explained by students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy is low in percentage rating. The multiple correlation run to examine how students' achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy jointly related with their academic achievement and statistically related with academic achievement in English language. Therefore, for any secondary institution in Nigeria to advance academically, the imperative issues that link to these personality constructs such as achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy as they normally contribute to the development of students' academic potentialities need to be thoroughly addressed, through collective orientation and motivational talks to enable students' to hold and endorse good achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy during the learning process.

RECOMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made:

1. It is recommended that constant investigation on the relationship between achievement goal orientation and self-regulated learning strategy should be encouraged for this will have a significant contribution to the students' academic vigor to achieve in academic context.
2. All actors involved in educational programme should join forces to raise hope concerning the beliefs students have manipulating their self-regulated learning strategy and achievement goal orientation as this will help them achieve more meaninngful results in their academic task.
3. Based on the low relationship recorded between students' achievement goal orientation, self-regulated learning strategy, students should consider these variables as useful academic facilitators that could enable them achieve their core values in the learning exploration.

REFERENCES

1) Ames, C. (1992). Classroom: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84,* 261-271.
2) Anyanwu, A. N., &Emesi, K. E. (2020). Secondary school students' self-esteem and achievement goal orientation as correlate of academic achievement in mathematics in Anambra state. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research, 2* (5) 218-226.
3) Baker, N.A., Shuaibu, A., & Baker, R.A. (2017). Correlation of self-regulated learning and academic achievement among university, Sultan Zainal Abidin undergraduate students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 7*(4).
4) Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundation of thought and action: A social; cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
5) Dweck, C. S. (2006). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist, 41,*1040-1048.
6) Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95* (2), 256-273.
7) Elliot, A. J., Murayama, K., &Pekrun, R. (2011). A 3 x 2 achievement goal model. Journal of *Educational Psychology, 103* (3), 632-648. doi: 10.1037/a0023952.
8) Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2x2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* (3), 501-519.
9) Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2006). Approach and avoidance achievement goal and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 70,* (3), 461-475.

10) Emesi K.E. (2017). Relationship among secondary school students' achievement goal orientation, academic self-concept and academic achievement in Anambra State. Unpublished master's thesis.
11) Harackiewicz, J. M. Barron, K. K, Tauer, J. P., & Elliot, A. J. (2012). Predicting success in college: A longitudinal study of achievement goals and ability measures as predictors of interest and performance from freshman year through graduation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94* (3), 562-645.
12) Haradhan, M. (2017). Two criteria for good measurements in research: Validity and reliability. *Annals of SpiruHaret University, 17*(3), 58-82.
13) Kaplan, A., & Maehr, M. (2007). Achievement goals and students' well-being. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 24,* 330-358.
14) Kanagul, B.I. (2015). The relationship between self-regulated learning strategies and academic achievement in a Turkish EFL setting. *Academic Journals, 8* (17), 1544-1550.
15) Matos, Lens, W., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2007). Achievement goals, learning strategies and language achievement among Peruvian, high school students. *PsychologicaBelgica, 47* (12)51-70.
16) Mehrens, W. A, & Lehmann, I. J. (2016). *Measurement and evaluation in education and psychology.* New York Holt, Rinhart and Winston.
17) Mischel, W. & Ayduk, O. (2004). Willpower in a cognitive-affective processing system. In R. E. Baumeister& K. D, Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 99-129). New York: Guilford Press.
18) Mohamed, A. H.H. (2012). The relationship between metacognition and self-regulation in young children. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Science, 69,* 477-486.
19) Mottus, R, Baumert, A., & Bank, M. D. (2020). Descriptive, predictive and explanatory personality research: Different goals, different approaches, but a shared need to move beyond the big few traits. *European Journal of Personality, 15* (6), 38-56.
20) Niepel, C. Brunner, M., &Preckel, F. (2014). Achievement goal, academic self-concept, and school grades in mathematics: longitudinal reciprocal relations in above average ability secondary school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 39,* 301-313.
21) Okoye, R. (2015). *Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation (second edition):* Awka, Erudition Publisher.
22) Pintrich, P. R, Smith, D. A. F, Garcia, T., &Mckeachie, W. J. (1976). *A manual for the use of motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ).* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan.
23) Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. in M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zendner (Eds). *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp.415-502). San Diago CA: Academic.
24) Pintrich, P.R., & DeGroot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* 33-40.
25) Schunk, D. H. (2001). Social cognitive theory and self-regulated learning. In B.J. Zimmerman & D.H., Schunk (Eds.). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspective,* (vol.2, pp. 125-152). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
26) Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1994). Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and education applications. Hilledale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
27) Stalwirth-Clark, R., Cochran, J., Nolen, M. T., Tuggle, D. L., & Scoff, J. S. (2000). Test anxiety and performance on reading competency test. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 17,* 39-47.
28) Urdan, T.C., &Maehr, M. L. (1995). Beyond a two-goal theory of motivation and achievement. A case for social goals. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(3),213-243.
29) Zimmerman, B. J. (1986). Development of self-regulated learning: Which are the key sub processes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 16,* 307-313.
30) Zimmerman, B. J., &Schunk, D. H. (2008). Motivation: An essential dimension of self-regulated learning. In D. H Schunk& and B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.). *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 1-30). New York: Laurance Erlbaum.