



1-1-2012

Including social goals in achievement motivation research: Examples from the Philippines

Ronnel B. King

The University of Hong Kong, ronnel.king@gmail.com

Dennis M. McInerney

The Hong Kong Institute of Education

The authors would like to thank Prof. Allan B.I. Bernardo of De La Salle University, Dr. Fraide A. Ganotice, Jr. of Palawan State University, and Dr. Elmer dela Rosa of Central Luzon State University for allowing us to use their findings in the current paper.

Recommended Citation

King, R. B., & McInerney, D. M. (2012). Including social goals in achievement motivation research: Examples from the Philippines. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1104>

Including social goals in achievement motivation research: Examples from the Philippines

Abstract

Traditional theories of achievement motivation such as achievement goal theory mostly neglected its more social aspects. This paper focuses on social goal as a key construct and argues for the need to include social goals in the research agenda. This is especially important when conducting research among collectivist societies where the interdependent self-construal is more salient. Examples of social goal research done within one collectivist culture, the Philippines, are provided. Overall, social goal research in the Philippines supports the inclusion of social goals when examining students' motivational dynamics.

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Introduction

- a) "I do not want to fall short of my family's dreams for me; I owe them a heavy debt of gratitude." (15-year-old female student)
- b) "When I think of my family it motivates me to try to learn something." (14-year-old male student)
- c) "Our parents are breaking their backs to provide money for our education; and that is what motivates me." (15-year-old male student)
- d) [My motivation to study is] "to make our parents happy. For their sacrifices, we want to make them happy by studying hard and getting high grades." (15-year-old male student)
- e) "My friends are also diligent in their studies...they really inspire me to achieve." (18-year-old female student)

These were the responses of Filipino adolescent students to open-ended questions on what motivates them to study in a large-scale qualitative study conducted by Bernardo, Salanga, and Aguas (2008). It is evident in these quotes that the students' motivation for studying was socially oriented. Students seem to be heavily influenced by their social relationships such as those with their parents and peers. They also tend to mention social goals when asked about their reasons for studying. However, this social aspect of academic motivation has been mostly neglected by Western scholars whose focus has been on the more personal and individualistic aspects of achievement motivation such as self-efficacy (e.g. Bandura, 1997), self-concept (e.g. Marsh & Hau, 2004; Marsh, Trautwein, Lüdtke, Köller, & Baumert, 2005, 2006; Marsh & Yeung, 1997), self-worth (Covington, 1992), intrinsic motivation (e.g. Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2000), self-theories (e.g. Dweck, 1999), and self-esteem (e.g. Marsh, Hau, & Craven, 2004). Research on the social aspects of motivation has been scarce. This relative neglect is somewhat myopic especially when conducting research in collectivist cultures where people construe themselves as more embedded in a relational fabric (Triandis, 1989).

Therefore, the aim of this paper is to elucidate the importance of taking into account the social aspects of academic motivation especially when studying students from collectivist cultures. We focus on **social goals** as the key construct in this paper. We first review current research done within achievement goal theory, point out the need for including social goals in motivational research, and cite several studies done in the Philippine setting to show how social goals are salient predictors of various academic outcomes in a collectivist setting.

Achievement Goal Theory

One of the most prominent theories of achievement motivation in the school setting is achievement goal theory (see Elliot & McGregor, 2001 for a review). Traditional achievement goal theory claims that students bring different kinds of goals into the classrooms. There are two kinds of goals that achievement goal theory originally focused

on: mastery goals and performance goals (Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Students who pursue mastery goals in classrooms want to develop academic competence, while those who pursue performance goals want to demonstrate their competence to others through social comparisons (Elliot, 1999). Later, the trichotomous achievement goal framework emerged, which divided performance goals into performance approach and performance avoidance goals. Students pursuing performance approach goals want to demonstrate high competence and gain positive judgments from others, while those who pursue performance avoidance goals focus on avoiding the demonstration of incompetence and preventing negative judgments from others (Elliot & Church, 1997).

The 2 x 2 achievement goal framework is the most recent modification of the achievement goal theory where the approach-avoidance distinction is made for both mastery and performance goals, thus resulting in four different goals: mastery approach (e.g. "My goal is to learn as much as possible"), mastery avoidance (e.g. "My goal is to avoid learning less than I possibly could), performance approach (e.g. "My aim is to perform well relative to other students"), and performance avoidance (e.g. "My aim is to avoid doing worse than other students") (Elliot & Murayama, 2008, p. 617). Mastery avoidance goals entail a focus on avoiding misunderstanding or not learning the material (Elliot, 1999).

It should be noted that achievement goals are distinct from achievement motives, which are deemed to be underlying affect-laden needs or desires (McClelland, 1961; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953; Murray, 1938). Elliot and his colleagues (Elliot, 1999; 2005; Thrash & Elliot, 2001) developed the hierarchical model of achievement motivation which integrates motive and goal constructs in an integrative framework. Within this framework, achievement goals are seen as partly rooted in achievement motives, which can be conceptualized as "personality predictors of achievement goals" (Harackiewicz et al., 1997, p. 1285). Achievement motives are partially unconscious and deeply-rooted in a person's personality and temperament. Achievement goals, on the other hand are more suited for "the situation-specific level" (Elliot, 2005, p. 66). They exert a more proximal influence on achievement-related behavior and are defined as "the purpose for which one engages in a task" (Thrash & Elliot, 2001, p. 10). Thus, whereas measures of achievement motives are usually very general and not tied to a specific situation, achievement goal measures are usually tied to a specific achievement-related context such as school or sports domain (see also King, McInerney, & Watkins, in 2011).

Despite the inclusion of more types of goals, however, achievement goal theory continues to give primary importance to individualistic goals. Both mastery and performance goals can be construed as individualistic goals because they both neglect the social reasons for striving to achieve in the academic domain and focus instead on personally-endorsed reasons. The individualism-collectivism framework which has become a very useful paradigm in cross-cultural psychology could help illuminate the possible limitations of achievement goal theory when applying research to collectivist settings.

Individualism-Collectivism

Achievement may be defined in different ways in collectivist and individualist societies.

Individualism pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family. Collectivism as its opposite pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive ingroups which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty (Hofstede, 1991, p. 51).

Collectivism has important implications for achievement. In collectivistic cultures, family and group goals are given a higher priority and more importance than individual goals (Hui, 1988). People from individualistic cultures construe achievement differently from those in collectivistic cultures. For example, Tripathi and Cervone (2008) found that Indians who are collectivistic were more likely than other more individualistic Americans to include concerns for the well-being of their extended family, co-workers, and community members in their motivation for achievement at work. The Indians' experience of achievement in the workplace appeared to be qualitatively different from the experience of the Americans.

In collectivistic cultures, the whole family experiences a sense of pride and joy when a child achieves academic success. On the other hand, academic failure results in a perceived letting down of one's family (Stigler, Smith, & Mao, 1985). Research shows that studying is not just an individual activity done by the child but is a collectivistic enterprise among Asians. For example, in Stevenson and Lee's (1990) cross-cultural comparison of Japan, Taiwan, and the United States, it was found that collectivistic families attached great importance to their children's academic achievement. They "dedicate themselves to their child's school work" (p. 98). Parents in Japan and Taiwan devoted more funds and time for their children. They also played a major role supervising their children's academic work and in helping them with difficulties in school work. "The American families did not show the same commitment to academic achievement and they did not spend a large amount of time helping their children" (p. 98).

Whereas individualism and collectivism are often viewed as culture or society-level variables (Hofstede, 1980, 1991), Markus and Kitayama (1991) proposed the independent and interdependent self-construal as their parallels at the personal level. They claimed that individuals with an independent self-construal are: "egocentric, separate, autonomous, idiocentric, and self-contained" (p. 226), while individuals with an interdependent self-construal are "sociocentric, holistic, collective, allocentric, ensembled, constitutive, contextualist, and relational" (p. 227).

Research has shown that general motivational processes may vary for individuals with different self-construals. For individuals with an independent self-construal, being better than others in self-defining domains and standing out from the crowd contributes to enhanced self-esteem (Blaine & Crocker, 1993; Harter, 1993). On the other hand,

individuals with an interdependent self-construal, may depend more on cultivating positive relations with others to maintain their self-esteem (Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000). This is supported by research on women who were presumed to have a more interdependent self-construal where it was found that women's self-esteem depended more on positive feedback from others and harmonious relationships compared to men (Roberts & Nolen-Hoeksema, 1989, 1994; Schwalbe & Staples, 1991; Zuckerman, 1989).

More specifically, self-construals may also have differential effects on the adoption of goals. A possibility might be that people with a more interdependent self-construal would be more likely to pursue social goals compared to those with an independent self-construal. This is because studying is not just a personal affair for those with an interdependent self-construal. It is heavily influenced by social relationships and is directed to achieving social ends.

Social Goals

The achievement goal framework that dominates motivational research seems to be built on the implicit Western assumption that individuals strive for a unique identity separate from their social groups. This assumption may not hold true for more collectivist students whose identities are inextricably linked with their families and other social networks (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 1994, Triandis, 1989). Because of this implicit Western assumption in motivational psychology research, the potential salience of the social aspects of motivation has been neglected.

Social goals have been defined as "perceived social purposes of trying to achieve academically" (Urdan & Maehr, 1995, p. 232). Whereas mastery and performance goals have been construed as competence-linked goals because the focus is on the attainment of competence (either defined interpersonally or intrapersonally), social goals can be thought of as socially-driven. The motivation to achieve comes from various social forces. This definition of social goals makes it distinct from other conceptualizations of social goals such as those proposed by Wentzel (2000), Ford (1992), and Ryan and Shim (2006; 2008). Wentzel's (2000) definition of social goals focuses on the *social outcomes* students are trying to achieve in class. As such, she asks students to answer questions such as "How often do you try to share what you have learned with your classmates?" On the other hand, Ryan and Shim's (2008) definition of social-achievement goals emphasizes orientations towards social competence and not towards studying specifically (see also Elliot, Gable, & Mapes, 2006; Mouratidis & Michou, 2011; Rudolph, Abaied, Flynn, Sugimura, & Agoston, 2011). A sample item of their social achievement goal would be, "I like it when I learn better ways to get along with friends." Ford (1992) sees social goals as broader and more domain-general as they refer to goals that a person is pursuing in his/her life and are not confined to the classroom context.

Our definition of social goals is distinct from theirs. In this paper, social goals refer to the social reasons for studying (e.g. "I want to study because I want to please my parents."). This conceptualization of social goals confines it to the classroom context. We

adopted this working definition of social goals as perceived social reasons for studying because we wanted to examine social goals within the framework of achievement goal theory. Mastery goals and performance goals are both concerned with *why* students achieve in school. The reasons proposed are linked to competence (demonstrating normative competence for performance and developing self-referenced competence for mastery goals). Social goals, on the other hand, are also concerned with *why* students want to achieve in school (e.g. studying in order to be with friends, or studying in order to help others). Adopting this definition enabled us to examine the potential salience of various types of social goals relative to the more commonly researched mastery and performance goals.

Although social goals have not been investigated extensively, some scholars have claimed that they are powerful motivational constructs. Dowson and McInerney (2001) argued that

students' social orientations are not peripheral to...academic performance and achievement. Rather, these orientations may directly influence students' psychological processes as they strive toward academic achievement. (p. 40).

They claimed that the power of social goals in motivating students may even be greater than that of the traditionally explored mastery and performance goals given that students in high school and middle school are at an age when social networking is an important part of their lives.

Although research on social goals has not been as prolific as those done within achievement goal theory, there have been some studies incorporating social goals into their research agenda. In general, these studies show that social goals are related to adaptive outcomes across a variety of studies. In general, research on social goals has drawn on three different theoretical frameworks, which will be reviewed below:

1. Maehr and McInerney's (2004) Personal Investment Theory,
2. Yu and Yang's (1994) theorizing on socially-oriented achievement motivation, and
3. Dowson and McInerney's (2003, 2004) proposed five factor structure of social goals.

Personal Investment Theory Research

Personal Investment (PI) Theory is a multifaceted theory of achievement motivation focusing on three facets of meaning as central to determining why some students are engaged or disengaged in the classroom setting (Maehr & Braskamp, 1986; Maehr & McInerney, 2004). These key facets include:

1. Sense of self, which refers to the more or less organised collections of perceptions, beliefs, and feelings related to who one is. Sense of self is presumed to be

composed of a number of components, such as positive self-concept, negative self-concept, self-reliance, and sense of purpose; each of which contributes to the motivational orientation of the individual.

2. Facilitating conditions, which refer to the behavioural alternatives that a person perceives to be available and appropriate (in terms of sociocultural norms that exist for the individual) in a given situation
3. Achievement goals, which refer to the goals the students pursue in the particular achievement setting and constitute the motivational foci of the activity. PI theory proposes a wider range of achievement goals than that traditionally researched in the literature. Four types of goals are proposed to be important in understanding student motivation in school: mastery goals, performance goals, *social goals*, and extrinsic goals. The mastery and performance goals in PI Theory converge with the definitions proposed by achievement goal theory. Each of these goals, in turn, is comprised of two dimensions.

Table 1
Goals in Personal Investment Theory

Achievement goal	Facet	Definition	Sample items
1. Mastery goals	Task involvement	interest in the task	The more interesting the schoolwork the harder I try. I always try hard to understand something new in my schoolwork.
	Effort	willingness to expend effort for schoolwork	
2. Performance goals	Competition	competitiveness in learning	I like to compete with others in school.”
	Social power	seeking status through group leadership	I like being in charge of a group.
3. Social goals	Affiliation	belonging to a group when doing schoolwork	I can do my best work at school when I work with others.
	Concern	concern for other students	I like helping other students with their schoolwork.
4. Extrinsic goals	Token	seeking tangible rewards for schoolwork	Getting a reward for my good schoolwork is important to me.
	Praise	Seeking social recognition for schoolwork	I work best when I am praised in school.

(Adapted from McInerney & Liem, 2007)

Within the PI framework, there are two types of social goals: affiliation and concern. In contrast, extrinsic goals focus on the attainment of either material reward (token dimension) or praise (praise dimension) for doing schoolwork. Earlier research on goal theory has lumped social, performance, and extrinsic goals together which led to a lack of

definitional precision. For example, Meece and Holt (1993) had a construct called ego-social goal, defined as “a desire to demonstrate high ability or to please the teacher.” Meece, Blumenfeld, and Hoyle (1988) found that social approval goals and ego-oriented or performance goals were highly correlated and loaded on the same factor, thus they lumped it together into one factor. Similarly, Nicholls, Patashnick, and Nolen (1985) had an ego and social orientation scale where there were items like “I feel most successful if I work with friends,” “I feel most successful if I show people I’m smart,” and “I feel most successful if the teacher likes my work.” Research on Personal Investment Theory has posited a distinction between performance, social, and extrinsic goals which has led to greater construct specificity. Table 1 shows the types of goals posited in PI Theory.

In a study conducted by King, Ganotice, and Watkins (2011), they wanted to examine the cross-cultural validity of this multidimensional model of students’ goals in the Philippine setting. They performed a CFA on the responses of 709 Filipino high school adolescent students ($M_{age} = 14.56$ years, $SD = 0.89$ years, $Md_{age} = 14$ years) on the Inventory of School Motivation (ISM; McInerney & Ali, 2006), which aims to measure the endorsement of these four types of goals. They wanted to investigate whether conceptualizing goals in terms of social goals, extrinsic goals, mastery goals, and performance goals would exhibit a good fit to the data. Some researchers have argued




Figure 1. Confirmatory factor analysis of the 11 parcels of the Filipino version of Inventory of School Motivation with 4 factors. Inter-factorial correlations and factor loadings indicated are all significantly different from zero at $p < .001$

Note: Mast = mastery goals, Perf = performance goals, Soc = social goals, Ext = extrinsic goals, P = parcel, d = error or disturbance.

that social goals are not really distinct from other types of goals and can be subsumed under it (e.g. Nicholls et al., 1985; see also Watkins, McInerney, & Lee, 2002). The CFA results showed that these four types of goals are distinct from each other (see Figure 1). All the factor loadings and factor correlations were significant. Goodness-of-fit indices show that the responses to the questionnaire had a good fit (see Table 2).

Table 2
Summary of the Goodness-of-Fit Statistics

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	p	RMSEA	GFI	NFI	IFI	TLI	CFI
4-factor goal model	170.55	38	4.49	< .001	.070	.953	.949	.960	.942	.960

Note: df = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = root mean square error approximation; NFI= normed fit index; IFI=incremental fit index; TLI=Tucker-Lewis index; CFI=comparative fit index.

In Ganotice's (2010) study, he investigated the relationship of different types of goals (including social goals) to the other facets of meaning posited in PI Theory such as facilitating conditions and sense of self. His participants included 1,694 Filipino adolescent students. In this paper, however, we only included the results for the public school students (N = 823)¹. The correlations among facilitating conditions, sense of self, and achievement goals were analyzed. In terms of facilitating conditions, he examined how parental support (e.g. "My mother helps me to work hard at school."), teacher support (e.g. "My teachers help me with my schoolwork."), peer help (e.g. "My friends help me with my schoolwork."), negative peer influence (e.g. "Some of my friends want to leave school as soon as they can.") and negative parent influence (e.g. "My father doesn't pay any attention when I bring home report cards.") were related to the four types of goals. For the sense of self, he focused on how the four types of goals were related to sense of purpose (e.g. "I want to do well at school so that I can have a good future."), sense of reliance (e.g. "I often try new things on my own."), negative self-concept (e.g. "I'm not good at anything at school."), and positive self-concept (e.g. "I think that I can do quite well at school"). Only the results associated with social goals are presented for the sake of clarity.

Results indicated that social goals were positively related to adaptive facets of meaning in PI Theory. Social goals were positively related to adaptive facilitating conditions such as parental support, teacher support, and peer help, while being negatively correlated with negative parental influence and negative peer influence (see Table 3).

In terms of the relationships with sense of self constructs, social goals were found to be positively correlated with self-reliance, sense of purpose, and positive self-concept. Negative correlations were found between social goals and negative self-concept (see Tables 4).

¹ The results for private school students were more difficult to interpret due to multicollinearity. Readers are referred to the original paper of Ganotice (2010) for more details.

Table 3
Correlations Between Goals and Facilitating Conditions²

N = 823	Parental support	Teacher support	Peer help	Negative parental influence	Negative peer influence
1. Mastery goals	+	+	+	-	-
2. Performance goals	+	+	+	-	-
3. Social goals	.15*	.18*	.20*	-.11	-.14*
4. Extrinsic goals	+	+	+	-	-

* $p < .05$; Note: + significant positive correlation; - significant negative correlation.

Table 4
Correlations Between Goals and Sense of Self²

N = 823	Sense of purpose	Self-reliance	Negative self-concept	Positive self-concept
1. Mastery goals	+	+	-	+
2. Performance goals	+	+	-	+
3. Social goals	.16*	.15*	-.17*	.11*
4. Extrinsic goals	+	+	-	+

* $p < .05$; Note: + significant positive correlation; - significant negative correlation.

These two studies showed that social goals were positively related to adaptive outcomes, and that social goals were distinct from other types of goals. Contrary to what some scholars argue, it seems that social goals could not be subsumed under mastery, performance, or even extrinsic goals but form a distinct category of their own (see Watkins et al., 2002 for a different view). The positive relationship of social goals to adaptive constructs such as facilitating conditions and sense of self suggest that social goals are part of a positive motivational dynamic among students. A possible direction for future research would be to examine how the social goals conceptualized with PI Theory could predict relevant educational outcomes.

Although this type of research has not yet been conducted among Filipino students, a study done by King, McInerney, and Watkins (2010) among Chinese students show some interesting possibilities. Their study indicated that even after controlling for mastery and performance goals, which are the most commonly researched goals within the achievement goal framework, social goals such as social concern and social affiliation were still able to predict additional variance in outcomes such as deep learning, effort, and

² Interested readers can refer to Ganotice (2010) (Table 2a, p. 62) for the complete correlation table. The author can be contacted through the following email address: fraideganotc@yahoo.com.

motivational engagement. Another study among HK Chinese students, King, McInerney, and Watkins (2011, September) also showed that social goals are differentially related to various types of learning strategies.

Socially-Oriented Achievement Motivation

Aside from research in PI Theory, Chinese indigenous psychology has also recognized the need for a more socially-oriented conceptualization of achievement motivation, thus Yang and Yu (1988, August) differentiated between Individual-Oriented Achievement Motivation (IOAM) and Social-Oriented Achievement Motivation (SOAM). SOAM was defined as the desire to achieve goals defined by significant others (see also Yu & Yang, 1994). The standard of excellence and evaluation of outcomes are also defined by significant others. Students who endorse SOAM aim at gaining favorable judgment and approval from others. SOAM was measured with items like "I try my best to meet my parents' expectations so as not to disappoint them," "I work hard to reach the standards that my parents have set for me." They contrasted it with Individual-Oriented Achievement Motivation (IOAM), which refers to the desire to achieve goals that are defined by individuals themselves. The standard of excellence and evaluation of outcomes are also determined by the individuals themselves. Items for measuring IOAM include "I try to do my best if I consider it valuable for me" and "I evaluate my performance based on my own expectations and standards." Tao (2003) has documented the differential effects of IOAM and SOAM on cognitive, behavioral, and affective outcomes. The SOAM construct bears a lot of similarities to the social goal construct investigated in this paper, because SOAM presumes that the motivation for academic striving comes from social forces such as the desire to please one's parents/teachers and the desire to live up to their expectations.

Bernardo (2008) explored the structure of Filipino students' SOAM and IOAM. He found that SOAM could be further divided into two distinct types: parent-oriented motivation (refers to school motivation driven by the desire to please and gain the approval of parents; e.g. "I try my best to meet my parents' expectations so as not to disappoint them.") and teacher-oriented motivation (refers to motivation driven by the desire to live up to the teacher's expectations; e.g. "I study hard because teachers always praise diligent students."). On the other hand, IOAM could be divided into personal choice (being able to do what one wants; e.g. "I usually do what I want to do and not what others want me to do.") and personal performance standards (being able to define one's standards for the task; e.g. "I continue work on the task until I am satisfied."). A correlation analyses was conducted among college GPA, achievement goals, IOAM, and SOAM. Results showed that the two facets of SOAM (parent-oriented motivation and teacher-oriented motivation) were positively related to GPA. However, SOAM was also positively related to performance avoidance goals which may reflect a possible negative side-effect of pursuing SOAM (see Table 5).

Table 5
Correlations Among Motivation Dimensions and GPA

Variables	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. GPA	.22***	.20**	.16*	.11	.21**	.16*	.20**
2. Mastery-approach		.26***	.20**	.36***	.55***	.36***	.19**
3. Performance approach			.40***	.14*	.28***	.43***	.59***
4. Performance avoidance				.16*	.16*	.45***	.33***
5. IOAM (personal choice)					.53***	.15*	.09
6. IOAM (personal performance standard)						.39***	.17**
7. SOAM (parent-oriented motivation)							.44**
8. SOAM (teacher-oriented motivation)							

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$.

Table 6
Correlations among Goals, SOAM, and Academic Outcomes

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Performance goals	-					
2. Mastery goals	.49**	-				
3. SOAM	.60**	.48**	-			
4. Intrinsic motivation	.17**	.28**	.14**	-		
5. Effort	.18**	.29**	.25**	.51**	-	
6. Persistence	.06**	.15**	.06**	.33**	.33**	-
7. Deep strategies	.23**	.26**	.27**	.49**	.53**	.25**

N=1,142; ** $p < .01$ (from dela Rosa, 2010)

In another study, dela Rosa (2010) analyzed the relationships between SOAM and other relevant educational outcomes among Filipino high school students. He found that SOAM was positively related to adaptive outcomes such as intrinsic motivation (degree to which motivation in class is internally-driven as opposed to being externally-driven; e.g. "I think this class is interesting."), effort (working hard to complete tasks for the class; e.g. "I always work as hard as I can to finish my math assignments."), persistence (completing class work even when faced with distraction, difficulty or boredom; e.g. "Even if my math work is dull or boring, I keep at it until I am finished."), and deep learning strategies (using meaningful strategies such as elaboration for studying; "I find most new topics interesting

and often spend extra time trying to obtain more information about them.”) (see Table 6). However, he also found that SOAM was not significantly correlated with exam performance and GPA.

Together, these two studies suggest that SOAM is related to students' learning outcomes. Both studies indicate that SOAM seems to be related to adaptive constructs. For example, Bernardo's (2008) study showed that SOAM is related to GPA and mastery goals; however, he also noted the positive relationship of SOAM to a maladaptive goal such as performance avoidance. Dela Rosa (2010) also showed the positive relationship of SOAM to adaptive constructs such as mastery goals, effort, persistence, and deep learning strategies. Future studies can investigate the predictive power of SOAM in the Philippine setting and go beyond merely looking at correlations. Another direction for future research would be to examine the moderating effects of SOAM. Some researchers have suggested that SOAM could be a possible moderator of the relationship between the more traditionally researched achievement goals and other learning outcomes (see dela Rosa & Bernardo, 2011 for an example).

Five-Factor Theory of Social Goals

Another conceptualization of social goals in the literature is the five-factor theory of social goals proffered by Dowson and McInerney (2001, 2003), which was heavily influenced by Urdan and Maehr's (1995) landmark paper on social goals. Building upon a series of qualitative studies, they found that students' social goals could be grouped into five major types:

1. *Social affiliation goal*: wanting to achieve to enhance sense of belonging to a group and to maintain social relationships (e.g. “I want to do well at school so that I can feel close to my group of friends.”);
2. *Social approval goal*: wanting to achieve to gain the approval of peers, teachers, and parents (e.g. “I want to do well at school so that I can get praise from my teachers.”);
3. *Social concern goal*: wanting to achieve to be able to assist others in their academic or personal development (e.g. “I want to do well as school so that I can help other students with their work.”);
4. *Social responsibility goal*: wanting to achieve to meet social role obligations (e.g. “I want to do well at school to show that I am being a responsible student.”) and;
5. *Social status goal*: wanting to achieve to attain wealth/position in school or later in life (e.g. “I want to do well at school so that I can have lots of money later on.”).

They then developed the Goal Orientation and Learning Strategies Survey (GOALS-S; Dowson & McInerney, 2004) based on these qualitative studies in order to measure the five types of social goals. Aside from social goals, GOALS-S also measures students' mastery goals, performance goals, cognitive strategies, and meta-cognitive strategies. Their results showed that GOALS-S is a sound psychometric instrument. In the

Philippines, King and Watkins (2011b) examined the cross-cultural validity of the GOALS-S. Results were positive showing that GOALS-S can also be used in the Philippine setting to measure not just student's social goals but also their achievement goals, cognitive strategies, and meta-cognitive strategies.

Zeroing in on social goals, King and Watkins (2011a) examined whether this five-factor structure of social goals that Dowson and McInerney found among Australian students would also be applicable in the Philippine setting. Results of their studies found

Table 7
Goodness-of-fit Indices for the Five-factor Model and Other Alternative Models

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	RMS EA	RMS EA 90% CI	SR MR	TLI	CFI	AIC	BIC	$\Delta\chi^2$	df
5-factor model	1067.2	197	5.42***	.062	.058- .066	.077	.91	.92	1179.2	1461.7	---	--
4-factor model	2794.1	201	13.9***	.106	.103- .110	.109	.74	.77	2898.1	3160.4	1726.9***	4
3-factor model	3939.2	204	19.3***	.126	.123- .130	.132	.63	.67	4037.2	4039.3	2872.0***	7
1-factor model	5382.9	207	26.0***	.148	.144- .151	.121	.49	.55	5474.9	5706.9	4315.7***	10

Note: df = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index; CFI = comparative fit index; AIC = Akaike Information Criterion; BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion. All the models in this table were compared with the five-factor model because they can be considered as nested models.

support for the cross-cultural validity of this five-factor model. In a series of CFAs, they found that the five-factor model had a better fit to the data compared to alternative models such as a four-factor model, a three-factor model, and a one-factor model (see Table 7).

Results indicated that the five-factor model of social goals had the best fit to the data thus supporting the cross-cultural applicability of Dowson and McInerney's (2003) model to the Philippine setting. They also found that, in general, these social goals were positively correlated with adaptive outcomes such as behavioral engagement and emotional engagement in a sample of 1,147 high school students in the Philippines (see Table 8).

Drawing on from the same dataset as King and Watkins (2011a), King, McInerney, and Watkins (under review) investigated how these five types of social goals were correlated with various educational outcomes. A simple correlation analysis indicated that these five types of social goals and various educational outcomes also showed that these social goals were positively related to adaptive educational outcomes (see Table 9).

Moreover, the researchers also investigated whether these five types of social goals added any additional variance in predicting various educational outcomes. These outcomes included behavioral engagement which refers to energized behaviour in school (e.g. "I work very hard on my schoolwork."), emotional engagement which refers to positive emotions experienced in school (e.g. "I like working at school."), elaboration which refers

Table 8
Bivariate Correlations of Social Goals with Behavioral and Emotional Engagement

<i>Social goals</i>	Behavioral engagement	Emotional engagement
Social affiliation goals	.04	.16 ^{***}
Social approval goals	.18 ^{***}	.22 ^{***}
Social concern goals	.31 ^{***}	.39 ^{***}
Social responsibility goals	.33 ^{***}	.38 ^{***}
Social status goals	.30 ^{***}	.29 ^{***}

*** $p < .001$.

to making connections between present and previously learned information (e.g. “When learning things for school, I try to see how they fit together with other things.”), monitoring which refers to self-checking for understanding, self-testing, and organizing (e.g. “I often ask myself questions to see if I understand what I am learning.”), and regulating which involves using strategies to rectify deficits in learning like identifying mistakes in learning or seeking explanations from teachers (e.g. “If I don’t understand my schoolwork, I ask the teacher to help me.”) (Dowson & McInerney, 2004; Fredericks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; McInerney, Dowson, & Yeung, 2005; Wellborn & Connell, 1987). Results indicated that social goals do predict additional variance in the outcomes of interest even after controlling for the effects of mastery and performance goals among a large sample of high school Filipino students (see Table 10).

Table 9
Correlations Between Social Goals and Academic Engagement Indicators

Variables	Behavioral engagement	Emotional engagement	Elaboration	Monitoring	Regulating
1. Social affiliation	.04	.16 ^{***}	.32 ^{***}	.30 ^{***}	.23 ^{***}
2. Social approval	.17 ^{***}	.23 ^{***}	.37 ^{***}	.38 ^{***}	.30 ^{***}
3. Social concern	.29 ^{***}	.37 ^{***}	.49 ^{***}	.48 ^{***}	.41 ^{***}
4. Social responsibility	.35 ^{***}	.39 ^{***}	.50 ^{***}	.54 ^{***}	.46 ^{***}
5. Social status	.31 ^{***}	.29 ^{***}	.37 ^{***}	.38 ^{***}	.33 ^{***}

*** $p < .001$

These two studies show that social goals are positively related to various academic outcomes. Moreover, they can predict additional variance even after controlling for the effects of the more commonly examined mastery and performance goals. Social concern, social responsibility, and social status goals seem to be the most adaptive types of goals as they were shown to be positive predictors of beneficial outcomes. Social affiliation and social approval goals did not emerge as predictors of most of the outcomes examined.

This study represented an initial attempt to map out the nomological network associated with social goals. Future studies could also examine how social goals are related to achievement goals and to other outcome measures.

Table 10
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Achievement and Social Goals as Predictors of Academic Engagement

	Behavioral engagement	Emotional engagement	Elaboration	Monitoring	Regulating
	β	β	β	β	β
Step 1					
Year level	-.05	-.06*	-.03	-.02	.00
Gender	.19***	.12***	.08**	.12***	.06*
Step 2					
Year level	-.03	-.03	.01	.02	.04
Gender	.13***	.06	.00	.03	-.01
Mastery goals	.44***	.42***	.56***	.59***	.51***
Performance goals	.02	.13***	.17***	.15***	.12**
Step 3					
Year level	-.05+	-.03	.03	.04+	.05+
Gender	.09***	.02	-.02	.01	-.04
Mastery goals	.34***	.30***	.43***	.45***	.38***
Performance goals	-.01	.11**	.05+	.02	.02
Social affiliation	-.14***	-.06	.05	.04	-.00
Social approval	.00	-.04	.04	.07*	.02
Social concern	.09**	.16**	.18***	.14***	.14***
Social responsibility	.12***	.10**	.09**	.15***	.15***
Social status	.09**	.05+	.06*	.05*	.06+
Step 1 Change in R ²	.04***	.02***	.01*	.01***	.00
Step 2 Change in R ²	.19***	.24***	.42***	.43***	.32***
Step 3 Change in R ²	.03***	.03***	.05***	.05***	.04***
Total R ²	.26***	.28***	.47***	.50***	.37***

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; + $p < .10$

Some Caveats

The examples given above illustrate the importance of examining social goals in academic motivation research. However, since social goal research is still in its infancy there are still a lot of unresolved issues. First would be the approach-avoidance distinction (Elliot, 2008). The goal construct in psychology has profited much from the incorporation of the approach-avoidance distinction wherein approach motivation is defined as the energization toward positive stimuli, and avoidance motivation as the energization away from negative stimuli. Our understanding of achievement goals has moved forward by seeing that

performance approach goals are quite distinct from performance avoidance goals. This distinction helped to clarify the ambiguous findings associated with earlier research on the performance goals. However, in terms of social goals, there has still been no large-scale unified attempt to integrate the approach-avoidance distinction (see Ryan & Shim, 2008 for an exception). For example, Dowson and McInerney's (2001, 2003, 2004) social goals are all 'approach' forms of social goals. Within PI Theory, only approach goals such as social affiliation and social concern goals are included. Yang and Yu also failed to elaborate the potential of SOAM to have both approach and avoidance dimensions.

The same can be said for Wentzel (2000) and Ford's (1992) theorizing on social goals. A few researchers have started to incorporate this aspect. However, their definition of social goals is quite distinct from ours (e.g. Elliot et al, 2006; Ryan & Shim, 2006, 2008). For example, Ryan and Shim (2008) have systematically incorporated this approach-avoidance distinction in their work on social-achievement goals. They posited a social development goal, a social demonstration avoidance goal, and a social demonstration approach goal. Elliot et al. (2006) and Roussel, Elliot, and Feltman (2011) have also distinguished between friendship-approach and friendship avoidance goals. However, as we have clarified earlier, their definition of social goals is quite distinct from that adopted in this paper. Future researchers may want to consider integrating this distinction between approach and avoidant forms of social goals which may lead to better understanding of the effects of social goals on a variety of educational outcomes.

Another limitation of current work on social goals is the lack of research on its possible 'dark side.' Certain types of social goals may lead to negative consequences. A few studies have hinted at this possibility. For example, Tao (2003) found that having a socially-oriented achievement motivation can be beneficial in terms of facilitating effort and hard work, but it can also lead to feelings of guilt and anxiety. Another study conducted by Leondari and Gonida (2007) among Greek students have indicated that pursuing social approval goals could lead to self-handicapping strategies. Clearly, more research is needed to understand the 'dark' side of social goals. This may also dovetail with the need to distinguish approach from avoidance forms of social goals which was mentioned earlier.

In addition, all the examples in this paper were drawn from Filipino participants. Research in other contexts such as those conducted by King and Watkins (2011a) and King et al. (2010, 2011, September) in Hong Kong and that by Chang and Wong (2008) among Singaporean Chinese have shown the important influence of social goals on academic outcomes. Although it is frequently assumed that social goals are more salient in collectivist settings, research among Western participants have also indicated that Western students also endorse social goals, and that social goals also influence learning outcomes (e.g. Dowson & McInerney, 2001, 2003; Leondari & Gonida, 2007; Nelson & DeBacker, 2008; Urdan, 1994; Urdan & Maehr, 1995). Clearly, more research is needed to examine the generalizability of the social goal construct across different cultural groups.

Conclusion

Overall, the studies reviewed in this paper show that social goals are positively related to adaptive educational outcomes. They also showed that social goals are not just redundant with mastery and performance goals but are distinct goal constructs. As Eccles, Wigfield, and Schiefele (1998) claimed, “categorizing children’s goals as ego (performance) or task involved (mastery) oversimplifies the complexity of motivation” (p. 1032). In addition, Maehr (1984) argued that although gaining and demonstrating academic competence may be of concern to all individuals some of the time, it is not necessarily the central concern in any given setting or time. He argued that “other goals, other intentions, other attractions, continually intrude” (p. 116). This paper shows that it is also important to focus on social goals especially when researching on students from collectivist cultures

Despite the advances in social goal research depicted here, future research is still needed to clarify the construct of social goals and to map out its nomological network. Various researchers have defined social goals in different ways (see King & Watkins, 2011c for a review). There is still no consensus in the field with regard to how social goals should be defined and which types of social goals should be included in educational research. For social goal research to move forward, researchers should agree upon a working definition of social goals and reach a consensus on the types of social goals that should be investigated. Hopefully, the studies presented here can be a step towards that direction.

References

- Ames, C.A. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 261-271.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bernardo, A. B. I. (2008). Individual and social dimensions of Filipino students’ achievement goals. *International Journal of Psychology, 43*, 886-891.
- Bernardo, A. B. I., Salanga, M. G. C., & Aguas, K. M. C. (2008). Filipino adolescent students’ conceptions of learning goals. In O. S. Tan, D. M. McInerney, & G. A. D. Liem (Eds.), *What the West can learn from the East: Asian perspectives on the psychology of learning and motivation* (pp 169-190). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Blaine, B., & Crocker, J. (1993). Self-esteem and self-serving biases in reactions to positive and negative events: An integrative review. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard* (pp. 55-85). New York: Plenum Press.
- Chang, W. C., & Wong, K. (2008). Socially-oriented achievement goals of Chinese university students in Singapore: Structure and relationships with achievement motives, goals and affective outcomes. *International Journal of Psychology, 43*, 880-895.
- Covington, M. V. (1992). *Making the grade: A self-worth perspective on motivation and school reform*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 791-808.
- Dela Rosa, E. (2010). *Testing for the multiple goal effects: The role of social-oriented achievement motivation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, De La Salle University, Manila.
- Dela Rosa, E., & Bernardo, A. B. I. (2011). Unpublished manuscript. xx??
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychology Inquiry, 11*, 227-268.
- Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2001). Psychological parameters of students' social and work avoidance goals: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, 35-42.
- Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2003). What do students say about their motivational goals? Towards a more complex and dynamic perspective on student motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 28*, 91-113.
- Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2004). The development and validation of the Goal Orientation and Learning Strategies Survey (GOALS-S). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64*, 290-310.
- Dweck, C.S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor and Francis/Psychology Press.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256-273.
- Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A., & Schiefele, U. (1998). Motivation to succeed. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Volume Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. III, 5th ed.) (pp. 1017-1095). New York: Wiley.
- Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist, 34*, 169-189.
- Elliot, A. J. (2005). A conceptual history of the achievement goal construct. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 52-72). New York: Guilford Press.
- Elliot, A. J. (2008). Approach and avoidance motivation. In A. J. Elliot (Eds.), *Handbook of approach and avoidance motivation* (pp. 3-16). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 218-232.
- Elliot, A. J., Gable, S. L., & Mapes, R. R. (2006). Approach and avoidance motivation in the social domain. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 378-391.
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. (2001). A 2 x 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 218-232.
- Elliot, A., J. & Murayama, K. (2008). On the measurement of achievement goals: Critique, illustration, and application. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 613-628.

- Ford, M. E. (1992). *Motivating humans: Goals, emotions, and personal agency*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*, 59–109.
- Ganotice, F. A. (2010). *Personal investment and school achievement among adolescent students in public and private high schools in the Philippines*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, De La Salle University, Manila.
- Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Carter, S. M., Lehto, A. T., & Elliot, A. J. (1997). Predictors and consequences of achievement goals in the college classroom: Maintaining interest and making the grade. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1284-1295.
- Harter, S. (1993). Causes and consequences of low self-esteem in children and adolescents. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard* (pp. 87-116). New York: Plenum Press.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London, UK: McGraw Hill.
- Hui, C. H. (1988). Measurement of individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 22*, 17-36.
- King, R. B., Ganotice, F. A., & Watkins, D. A. (2011). Cross-cultural validation of the Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) in the Asian setting: Hong Kong and the Philippines. *Child Indicators Research*. Published Online First 10 June 2011. doi: 10.1007/s12187-011-9117-3.
- King, R. B., McInerney, D. M., & Watkins, D. A. (2010). Can social goals enrich our understanding of students' motivational goals? *Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies, 10*, 1-16.
- King, R. B., McInerney, D. M., & Watkins, D. A. (2011, September). *Social goals and learning strategies*. Paper presented at the 14th Biennial Conference of the European Association for Research in Learning and Instruction Conference, Exeter, United Kingdom.
- King, R. B., McInerney, D. M., & Watkins, D. A. (under review). Studying for the sake of others: The role of social goals on academic engagement. *Educational Psychology*.
- King, R. B., McInerney, D. M., & Watkins, D. A. (2011). Competitiveness is not that bad...at least in the East: Testing the hierarchical model of achievement motivation in the Asian setting. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. Published Online First 3 December 2011. Doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.10.003.
- King, R. B., & Watkins, D. A. (2011a). Cross-cultural validation of the five-factor structure of social goals: A Filipino investigation. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*. Published online before print. doi: 10.1177/0734282911412542.
- King, R. B., & Watkins, D. A. (2011b). The reliability and validity of the Goal Orientation and Learning Strategies Survey (GOALS-S): A Filipino investigation. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 20*, 579-594.

- King, R.B., & Watkins, D.A. (2011c). "Socializing" achievement goal theory: The case for social goals. *Psychological Studies*. Published Online First 23 December 2011. Doi: 10.1007/s12646-011-0140-8.
- Leondari, A., & Gonida, E. (2007). Predicting academic self-handicapping in different age groups: The role of personal achievement goals and social goals. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 595-611.
- Maehr, M. (1984). Meaning and motivation: Toward a theory of personal investment. In R. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education: Student motivation* (Vol. 1, pp. 115-207). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Maehr, M., & Braskamp, L. A. (1986). *The motivation factor: A theory of personal investment*. Toronto, Canada: Lexington Books.
- Maehr, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2004). Motivation as personal investment. In D. M. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Eds.), *Sociocultural influences on motivation and learning, Vol. 4 (Big Theories Revisited)* (pp. 61-90). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1994). The cultural construction of self and emotion: Implications for social behavior. In S. Kitayama & H. R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotions and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influences* (pp. 89-130). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Marsh, H. W. & Hau, K. T. (2004). Explaining paradoxical relations between academic self-concepts and achievements: Crosscultural generalizability of the internal-external frame of reference predictions across 26 countries. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 56-67.
- Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., & Craven, R. (2004). The big-fish-little-pond effect stands up to scrutiny. *American Psychologist*, 59, 269-271.
- Marsh, H. W., Trautwein, U., Lüdtke, O., Köller, O. & Baumert, J. (2005) Academic self-concept, interest, grades and standardized test scores: Reciprocal effects models of causal ordering. *Child Development*, 76, 297-416.
- Marsh, H. W., Trautwein, U., Lüdtke, O., Köller, O. & Baumert, J. (2006) Integration of multidimensional self-concept and core personality constructs: Construct validation and relations to well-being and achievement. *Journal of Personality*, 74, 403-455.
- Marsh & Yeung (1997). The causal effects of academic self-concept on academic achievement: Structural equation models of longitudinal data. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 41-54.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. New York: The Free Press.
- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (1953). *The achievement motive*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- McInerney, D. M., & Ali, J. (2006). Multidimensional and hierarchical assessment of school motivation: Cross-cultural validation. *Educational Psychology*, 26, 717-734.
- McInerney, D. M., & Liem, G. A. D. (2009). Achievement motivation in cross-cultural context: Application of personal investment theory in educational settings. In A.

- Kaplan, S. A. Karabenick, & E. De Groot (Eds.), *Culture, self, and motivation: Essays in honor of Martin L. Maehr* (pp. 213-241). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- McInerney, D. M., Dowson, M., & Yeung, A. S. (2005). Facilitating conditions for school motivation: Construct validity and applicability. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 65*, 1-21.
- McInerney, D. M., Marsh, H. W., & Yeung, A. S. (2003) Toward a hierarchical model of school motivation. *Journal of Applied Measurement, 4*, 335-357.
- Meece, J. L., Blumenfeld, P. C, & Hoyle, R. H. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 514-523.
- Meece, J. L., & Holt, K. (1993). A pattern analysis of students' achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*, 582-590.
- Mouratidis, A., & Michou, A. (2011). Self-determined motivation and social achievement goals in children's emotions. *Educational Psychology, 31*, 67-86.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nelson, R. M., & DeBacker, T. K. (2008). Achievement motivation in adolescents: The role of peer climate and best friends. *Journal of Experimental Education, 76*, 170-189.
- Nicholls, J. G., Patashnick, M., & Nolen, S. B. (1985). Adolescents' theories of education. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*, 683-692.
- Roberts, T., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1989). Sex differences in reactions to evaluative feedback. *Sex Roles, 21*, 725-747.
- Roberts, T., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1994). Gender comparisons in responsiveness to others' evaluations in achievement settings. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*, 221-240.
- Roussel, P., Elliot, A. J., & Feltman, R. (2011). The influence of achievement goals and social goals on help-seeking from peers in an academic context. *Learning and Instruction, 21*, 394-402.
- Rudolph, K. D., Abaied, J. L., Flynn, M., Sugimura, N., & Agoston, A. M. (2011). Developing relationships, being cool, and not looking like a loser: Social goal orientation predicts children's responses to peer aggression. *Child Development, 82*, 1518-1530.
- Ryan, A. M., & Shim, S. S. (2006). Social achievement goals: the nature and consequences of different orientations toward social competence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 1246-1263.
- Ryan, A. M. & Shim, S. S. (2008). An exploration of young adolescents' social achievement goals and social adjustment in middle school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 672-687.
- Schwalbe, M. L., & Staples, C. L. (1991). Gender differences in sources of self-esteem. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 54*, 158-168.
- Stevenson, H. W., & Lee, S. (1990). Context of achievement, *Monographs of the Society For Research in Child Development, Serial no. 221, Vol. 55, Nos.1-2*

- Stigler, J. W., Smith, S., & Mao, L. W. (1985). The self-perception of competence by Chinese children. *Child Development, 56*, 1259-1270.
- Tao, Y. C. (2003). *Hong Kong Chinese students' learning motivation: The role of social versus individual-oriented achievement motivation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.
- Thrash, T. M., & Elliot, A. J. (2001). Delimiting and integrating achievement motive and goal constructs. In A. Efklides, J. Kuhl, & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Trends and prospects in motivation research* (pp. 3-22). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). Collectivism vs. individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural social psychology. In G. K. Verma & C. Bagley (Eds.), *Cross-cultural studies of personality attitudes and cognition* (pp. 60-95). New York: St Martins.
- Tripathi, R., & Cervone, D. (2008). Cultural variations in achievement motivation despite equivalent motivational strength: Motivational concerns among Indian and American corporate professionals. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 456-464.
- Urdan, T. (1994). *Extending goal theory: Examining social goals and multiple goal profiles*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan.
- Urdan, T., & Maehr, M. L. (1995). Beyond a two-goal theory of motivation and achievement: A case for social goals. *Review of Educational Research, 65*, 213-243.
- Watkins, D., McInerney, D. M., & Lee, C. (2002). Assessing the school motivation of Hong Kong students. *Psychologia, 45*, 145-154.
- Watkins, D., McInerney, D. M., Lee, C., Akande, A., & Regmi, M. (2002). Motivation and learning strategies: A cross-cultural perspective. In D. M. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Eds.), *Research on sociocultural influences on motivation and learning, Vol 2: Sociocultural influences on motivation and learning* (pp. 329-343). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Wellborn, J. G., & Connell, J. P. (1987). *Student engagement and disaffection in school student report*. Rochester, NY: Rochester Assessment Package for Schools.
- Wentzel, K. R. (2000). What is it that I'm trying to achieve? Classroom goals from a content perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 105-115.
- Yang, K. S., & Yu, A. B. (1988, August). *Social-oriented and individual-oriented achievement motives: Conceptualization and measurement*. Paper presented at the XXIVth International Congress of Psychology in Sydney, Australia.
- Yu, A. B., & Yang, K. S. (1994). The nature of achievement motivation in collectivist societies. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp. 239-250). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zuckerman, D. M. (1989). Stress, self-esteem, and mental health: How does gender make a difference? *Sex Roles, 20*, 429-444.

About the authors

Ronnel B. King is a Ph.D. candidate in educational psychology in the Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong. His research interests are in the cross-cultural investigations of student motivation, engagement, and well-being. Ronnel has published in internationally-refereed journals such as the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *The Asia Pacific Education Review*, and *Child Indicators Research* among others.

Email: ronnel.king@gmail.com

Dennis M. McInerney is Chair Professor of Educational Psychology and Associate Vice President (Research and Development) at The Hong Kong Institute of Education where he is also Co-Director of the Assessment Research Centre. He has published over 200 research articles in refereed international journals, books and conferences. He edits two international research series, *Research on Sociocultural Influences on Motivation and Learning* (Vols 1-9) and *International Advances in Self Research* (Vols 1-3). His textbook 'Educational Psychology: Constructing Learning' (5th ed) is a top selling educational psychology textbook in Australia and is widely used as a standard text in Australian universities. His major research interests focus on multiethnic studies of motivation and cross-cultural studies in psychology and education.

Email: dennismm@ied.edu.hk.

Discussion Questions

1. What are your own reasons for studying in school? Do you also adopt social goals? If so, what types of social goals do you espouse?
2. Can you think of other types of goals aside from achievement and social goals that may be relevant for students and that can influence their learning outcomes?
3. In this paper, we saw how achievement goal theory can be informed by the investigation of more culturally-relevant goals such as social goals. In what ways can culture influence/enrich other motivation theories that are dominant in educational psychology (e.g. self-determination theory, attribution theory, expectancy-value theory)?
4. Do you expect that the findings shown here for the Philippines will be similar to findings in other cultures? What are the possible reasons for the similarities/differences?
6. In this paper, Hofstede's individualism-collectivism dimension was used to demonstrate the utility of social goal research. What other dimensions of culture (e.g. masculinity-femininity, long/short-term orientation, uncertainty avoidance, power distance) could possibly influence other motivation theories such as achievement goal theory?

7. Most of the studies summarized here used self-report surveys, which has its own limitations. What alternative methods could be used to measure social goals?
8. What are the educational implications of social goals? How can teachers harness the motivational energy of these goals to improve classroom learning?