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Abstract

The present study examines the relation between achievement goal orientations and psychological well-being and whether gender moderates this relation. A simple random sample of five hundred and eighty second-year university students (187 males and 393 females) responded to two scales (Achievement goal orientations scale, Psychological well-being scale). Results showed that students’ achievement goal orientations could be discriminated along three dimensions: mastery goal, performance-approach goal and performance-avoidance goal. The effect of the AGO on psychological well-being was moderated by gender. Finally, When the students of the current study sample were divided into seven groups; the unidirectional variance analysis showed that students with profile (high mastery / high performance) were the highest students in the level of PWB.

Keywords: Achievement goal orientations; Psychological well-being; Gender.

الملخص

بحثت هذه الدراسة العلاقة بين توجهات هدف الإنجاز وجودة الحياة النفسية وما إذا كان النوع يتوزع هذه العلاقة. أُجريت عينة عشوائية بسيطة مكونة من 580 طالباً جامعاً من مستوى السنة الثانية (187 ذكور، و 393 إناث) على مقياسين (مقاييس توجهات هدف الإنجاز، ومقياس جودة الحياة النفسية). وأظهرت النتائج أنه يمكن تمييز ثلاثة أبعاد لتوجهات هدف الإنجاز لدى الطلاب في هدف الإتقان، هدف الأداء-إقدام وهدف الأداء-إحجام. كما أضحى اختلاف تأثير توجهات هدف الإنجاز في جودة الحياة النفسية باختلاف النوع. وأخيرا، عندما تم تقسيم طلاب عينة الدراسة الحالية إلى سبع مجموعات؛ أظهر تحليل التباين أحادي الاتجاه أن الطلاب ذوي الطابع الشخصي المرتفع إتقان / مرتفع أداء-إقدام كانوا أعلى الطلاب في جودة الحياة النفسية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: توجهات هدف الإنجاز، جودة الحياة النفسية، النوع.
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1. Introduction

It is stated in the literature that motivation is one of the most important predictor variables in explaining the success and failure. Furthermore, the role that motive plays in shaping attitude, strength, and quality of behavior was studied widely in motivational research over the past decade (Ames, 1992; Anderman & Maehr, 1994; Urdan & Maehr, 1995). One of the major focus points of motivation theories used to explain achievement in recent years is the achievement goals theory (Elliot, Murayama & Pekrun, 2011). Achievement goals are defined as “a set of integrated patterns of behavior that are manifested by differing ways of approaching or engaging in various tasks and responding to achievement situations” (Ames, 1992, P. 261).

Achievement goals theory primarily focused on two major goals, which are learning and performance (Dweck, 1986). Later research of Elliot and Harackiewicz (1996) proposed that the conventional achievement goal dichotomy can be expanded to include independent performance-approach (the attempt to demonstrate competence) and performance-avoidance components (the attempt to avoid judgments of incompetence) within the performance goal orientation. Recently, (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Pintrich, 2000) suggested that also mastery goals could be divided into two components (approach and avoidance); in where avoidance-mastery orientation refers to avoiding misunderstanding and not mastering the task.

Given the results of previous researches it can be concluded that the adoption of mastery goal is associated with positive and adaptive consequences (Carpenter, 2007). For instance, studies have emphasized the positive relations between mastery goals and optimism, internal locus of control, self-efficacy, positive emotions (VandWalle, 1997; Button, Mathiew & Zajac, 1996; Greene, Miller, Crowson, Duke & Akey, 2004, McGregor & Elliot, 2002). While mastery-avoidance goals tend to correlate with a network of negative achievement related processes and outcomes, including maladaptive approaches to learning, self-handicapping, state anxiety and a motivation (Conroy, Kaye & Coatsworth, 2006; Cury, Da Fonseca, Rufo, & Sarrazin, 2002; Cury, Da Fonseca, Rufo, Peres &Sarrazin 2003; Ommundsen, 2004). As for Performance goal, researches showed inconsistent results as it is related to surface level learning strategies (Elliot, McGregor & Gable, 1999), but also with deep level learning strategies (Pintrich, 2000; Wolters, Yu, & Pintrich, 1996). Finally, adopting performance-avoidance goal has been related with making less use of deep level learning strategies, low level of academic achievement, and high level of test-anxiety (Elliot, McGregor & Gable, 1999; Elliot & Church, 1997; Middleton & Midgley, 1997).

The role of goals has been primarily illustrated in learning and achievement domains, there is a prior basis for suggesting that task and ego goals influence a wide range of action, thought and affect, including those associated with general well-being, general self-evaluations and patterns of behavior, coping, and emotion (Kaplan & Maehr 1999). Students' well-being is linked with their goals in achievement actions, that is, goals related to self-improvement and growth are linked with better socio-emotional functioning and more positive self-evaluations, while goals related to validating and demonstrating competence are more linked with adjustment problems and socio-emotional vulnerability (Kaplan & Maehr, 1999; Daniels, Haynes, Stupnisky, Perry, Newall, &Pekrun 2008; Tuominen-Soini, Salmela-Aro, & Niemivirta, 2008). Furthermore, in order to have an
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integrated view about the psychological well-being (PWB) should focus on the quality of the goals in life (Christopher, 1999).

PWB is one of the areas of psychology that is trying to understand the evaluation of individuals for their lives (Dejud, 2007). Ryff (1989) constructed six dimensions for PWB included: self-acceptance (i.e., holding positive feelings towards oneself and past); positive relations with others (i.e., maintaining loving and satisfactory interpersonal relations); purpose in life (i.e., feeling that life has meaning); environmental mastery (i.e., having a sense of control and competence within one's environment); autonomy (i.e., feelings of self-determination, personal self-evaluation standards and independence); and personal growth (i.e., experiencing a sense of continued self-improvement and development).

In the past, several correlates of PWB such as self-esteem, social support, and education have been identified and examined widely (Tran, 2013). Wood and Joseph (2010) found that lack of PWB represented a risk factor for depression. Furthermore, Kao (1999) and Phinny (1991) described self-esteem as a commonly used index of PWB for the adolescent experience.

Kaplan and Maehr (1999) investigated the role that achievement goals may play in facilitating the well-being among a sample of African American and European American students. They found that the adoption of mastery goals was positively associated with general indices of well-being, such as emotional tone, peer relation, and impulse control, and with school-related affect. On the other hand, the findings concerning performance goals have been more varied. Many studies suggested that adopting performance goals is associated with negative PWB when compared to adopting mastery goals (Kaplan & Maehr, 1999). For instance, performance-approach goals have been associated with negative self-evaluations (Dweck, 1986), test anxiety (Daniels et al., 2008) and stress (Tuominen-Soini et al., 2008). Other studies showed that performance-approach goals were not always maladaptive with respect to well-being; they have been associated positively with some positive outcomes (Dweck & Leggett, 1988), and negatively with anxiety and depression (Sideridis, 2005). Performance-avoidance goals were positively related to external regulation, self-handicapping, test anxiety, and negative effect (Daniels et al., 2008).

1.1 The role of gender

“Sex differences are neither fixed nor universal, but may vary with the task, social situation, and previous experiences” (Gill, 1986, p. 235). Furthermore, studies suggest that gender and activity type affect intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Frederick & Ryan, 1993). Al-Emadi (2003) suggested that males were more oriented towards performance-avoidance goals while females were more oriented towards mastery goals, and reached that there were no significant differences between males and females in the performance-approach goals. While, Lee, Tinsley, and Bobko (2003) found that female students in a Hong Kong sample had higher performance goal orientations than male students. On the other hand, Button, et al. (1996) found that gender was unrelated to both goal orientations in a United States sample. Also, Phan (2007, 2008) did not find significant differences among males and females in achievement goal orientations.

Also, previous researches had examined gender differences in PWB. On a study of Lindfors, Bernfsson and Lundberg (2006) conducted on a sample of males and females, they
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found differences due to gender in the dimensions of environmental mastery, purpose in life, and autonomy in favor of males, and positive relations with others in favor of females, while they did not find differences due to gender in personal growth. Roothman, Kirsten and Wissing (2003) indicated that there are some differences in the self-evaluated PWB of males and females. Where, males scored significantly higher on cognitive, physical and self-aspects, and females scored significantly higher on somatic symptoms. In a study aimed to detect gender differences between spouses in perceived PWB; Larson, Franze’n-Dahlin, Billing, Arbin, Murray, and Wredling (2008) found that female spouses were lower in quality of life and well-being than male spouses. Also, Perez (2012) reported that female participants had significantly higher scores in the aspects of positive relation with others and purpose in life. However, male participants reported higher in autonomy than females.

1.2. The present study

It’s interested to study undergraduate because of its special nature; university students have the largest area of freedom, autonomy and making decisions with affording greater responsibility towards his study and academic future. Furthermore, Schwartz, et al. (2012) have been pointed that PWB is essential to understand and study in college students as it reflects a self-directed ability to handle the tasks of life-something that is essential in making one’s way through the socially and academically challenging. Therefore, the continued examination of the relation between achievement goal orientations (AGO) and PWB at university students is an important objective.

Most of the studies that had investigated the relations between AGO and PWB limited in their generalizability, particularly because they had been conducted in Western samples, which known as individualistic societies. In these societies the ties between individuals are loose; everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family (Hofstede, 1991). So, this would mean that the relations shown by these studies might not be true in other contexts. Actually, the effect of cultural contexts on the relations of AGO and PWB to other variables has been documented in several studies (e.g., Singhal & Misra, 1994; Wissing & Temane, 2008; Karasawa, Curhan, Markus, Kitayama, Love, Radler, & Ryff, 2011). Therefore, these studies can be extended by examining whether the relations between AGO and PWB will hold in other cultural contexts.

The aim of the present study is to investigate the relation between AGO and PWB of the Egyptian university students representing one of the collectivistic societies. In these Eastern collectivistic societies, people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in groups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for loyalty (Hofstede, 1991).

Several previous studies presented inconsistent results about the gender differences in AGO (Al-Emadi, 2003; Lee, et al., 2003; Button, et al, 1996; Phan, 2007; 2008). Also, the results concerned to the gender differences in PWB weren’t congruent (Lindfors, et al., 2006; Roothman, et al., 2003; Larson, et al., 2008; Perez, 2012). Additionally, gender differences in the relations between goal orientations and PWB had never been researched. Thus, the present study suggests that students’ gender can play a role in the differential association of the three AGO (mastery, performance-approach, performance-avoidance goals) with PWB.

1.3. Hypotheses

In the present study our main hypothesis was that mastery goals would report greater PWB, whereas performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals would report
poorer PWB. Also to predict that there will be some gender differences in the relations of the three AGO to PWB but the direction of these differences is uncertain.

The prediction of a positive link of mastery goals to PWB was based on the acknowledgment that goal orientations refer to the personal frame, which affects the cognitive and emotional responses and behavioral learning situations (Dweck & Legett, 1988). These responses affect the students’ compatibility and incompatibility thus, on PWB (Midgley, Maehr, Hruda, Anderman, Anderman, Freeman, Gheen, Kaplan, Kumar, Middleton, Nelson, Roeser & Urdan, 2000). According to self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2008) autonomy, competence, and relatedness represent the basic needs required for high levels of motivation. Furthermore, Burnkrant (1999) reported that adopting mastery goals make students believe that they are able to control their abilities and acquire skills, thus they enjoy higher level of autonomy which is one of PWB components.

In contrast, It’s expected that students with an interest of demonstrating their efficiency (performance-approach goals) would show lower level of PWB than their growth seeking students (mastery goals). This is because students adopting performance-approach goals, their self-worth depend on their achievements (Crocker & Wolfe, 2001), so they would be more likely to report emotional exhaustion and stress with respect to their educational goals. Furthermore, Kaplan and Maehr (1999) confirmed that adopting performance goals were a significant negative predictor for emotional tone, impulse control, and affect at school. By extension, we expected that the lowest level of PWB would be more obvious among students adopting performance-avoidance goals. This is based on the acknowledgement that students with performance-avoidance focused motivational strivings appear to be most concerned about failure, and their self-worth is likely to be contingent on their academic success (Elliot & Church, 1997; Boekaerts & Niemivirta, 2000).

2. Method

2.1. Sample

Subjects of the present research included 266 of second year students; this simple random sample was selected from the Faculty of Education at Minia University, the first semester of the academic year 2015/2016, to participate in the pilot study. There were 180 females and 86 males. The final simple random sample consisted of 580 students. There were 187 male and 393 female students.

2.2. Instruments

2.2.1. Achievement goal orientations scale

Researchers prepared this measure in order to identify AGO of university students; 38-item self-report scale of three dimensions of perfectionism: (a) mastery goal (i.e., holding high goals and improving academic abilities), (b) performance goal (i.e., demonstrating self-competence comparing with others), and (c) performance-avoidance goal (i.e., avoid demonstrating incompetence for others). There are 17 items for the first dimension, 10 items for the second dimension, and 11 items for the third dimension of AGO scale. Respondents rate their agreement with each item of the AGO on a 5-point scale that ranged from 1 (Absolutely not applicable to me) to 5 (Absolutely applicable to me).
2.2.1.1. Psychometric properties of AGO scale

Exploratory factor analysis with principal components was conducted to identify a viable factor structure of 38 items of the AGO scale. It was intended that 17 items represent the mastery goal subscale, 10 items represent the performance goal subscale, and 11 items represent the performance-avoidance goal. The resulting factors were rotated to a simple structure using promax rotation. The number of factors retained was determined by using the following criteria: (1) Kaiser’s rule of retaining factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, (2) factor explains at least 10% of the total variance extracted, and (3) each factor had to have at least three items. Inclusion criteria for items on the retained factor were that they had loadings of at least .4 on that factor (Stevens, 2012). Items with high cross-loadings were deleted. The factors that were identified were named on the basis of their content. The analysis reported three factors; mastery goal (11 items, $\alpha = .75$), performance goal (8 items, $\alpha = .80$), and performance-avoidance goal (7 items, $\alpha = .70$). The three factors explained cumulatively 31.6% of the total variance extracted (12.27%, 12.63%, and 6.74%, respectively) and had eigenvalues of 3.19, 3.28, and 1.75 respectively. It was found that items 4, 11, 14, 28, 31, and 32 were discarded based on a rule of thumb to retain items with loading above .40 on their designated factor. In addition item 20 was deleted because of cross-loadings so as to maintain the purity of the factors. On the basis of logical fit, item 19 were discarded as it was not consistent with the meaning of the first factor. As for the second factor, item 20 were deleted because of cross-loadings on first and second factors. Items 12, 13, and 16 were discarded on the basis of logical fit as they were not consistent with the meaning of the third factor. The factor loadings for the AGO scale is described in table (1).

### Table (1): Factor loadings for the AGO Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>mastery goal</th>
<th>performance goal</th>
<th>performance-avoidance goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. I am trying to master the content of courses.</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I'm trying to learn the curriculum to the maximum of my abilities.</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am trying to achieve the best possible level of academic courses.</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I master understanding the content of the curriculum.</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I complete assignments to achieve a higher level of understanding.</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do my best to develop my academic abilities.</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I'm interested in completing college assignments tuition to learn new things.</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I avoid failure to accommodate</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I study for long hours out of fear of not achieving high levels of performance.</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I prefer studying difficult curricula that give rise to cognitive curiosity.</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I tend to do academic tasks that evoke my thinking.</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My purpose is to get grades higher than my colleagues.</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I’m interested in the performance of academic tasks that are difficult for my colleagues, to be the best.</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel successful in my studies when excel my peers.</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am trying to perform well to show my abilities for others.</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I’m trying to perform academic activities better than my colleagues.</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I enjoy the admiration of others with the quality of my performance.</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I care about the views of my teachers about my academic level.</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I love to appear characteristically among my colleagues</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I hesitate to participate in academic activities so as not to show a low level.</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I avoid asking my teachers not to think that I’m stupid.</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I hope the courses do not have degrees in order not to be compared with my colleagues.</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I worry about getting bad grades.</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I avoid performance worse than my colleagues.</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I stay away from academic tasks which increases the probability of failure.</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. To avoid appearing as an incompetent person is more important than learning new skills.</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N= 266. Factor loading were obtained using principal components extraction with promax rotation.*
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2.2.2. Psychological well-being scale

Students’ PWB was measured through 41-item self-report scale of five dimensions of PWB: (a) autonomy (i.e., the ability to control individual abilities), (b) environmental mastery (i.e., a feelings of competence within one’s environment), (c) personal growth (i.e., a sense of continued development), (d) purpose in life (i.e., having goals in one’s life), and (e) self-acceptance (i.e., being satisfied about oneself past life).

2.3. Procedure

Two questionnaires incorporating 38 items intended to represent AGO, and 41 items intended to represent PWB were administered to participant students during their psychology lab classes. Data concerning demographic information (i.e., gender and academic major) were also collected. Data collection took an average of less than fifteen minutes.

2.2.2.1. Psychometric properties of PWB scale

As for the PWB scale, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted with principal components to identify a viable factor structure of 41 items of the PWB scale. It was intended that 8 items represent the autonomy subscale, 9 items represent the environmental mastery subscale, 7 items represent the personal growth subscale, 8 items represent the purpose in life subscale, and 9 items represent the self-acceptance subscale. The resulting factors were rotated to a simple structure using promax rotation. The number of factors retained was determined by using the following criteria: (1) Kaiser’s rule of retaining factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, (2) factor explains at least 10% of the total variance extracted, and (3) each factor had to have at least three items. Inclusion criteria for items on the retained factor were that they had loadings of at least .4 on that factor. Items with high cross-loadings were deleted. The factors that were identified were named on the basis of their content.

The analysis reported four factors; autonomy (5 items, \( \alpha = .62 \)), environmental mastery (5 items, \( \alpha = .73 \)), purpose in life (4 items, \( \alpha = .60 \)), and self-acceptance (4 items, \( \alpha = .75 \)). The four factors explained cumulatively 44.788% of the total variance extracted (10.805%, 12.389%, and 8.50%, 13.094%, respectively) and had eigenvalues of 2.053, 2.354, 1.615, and 2.488, respectively. It was found that items 1, 7, 9, 12, 21, and 36 were discarded based on a rule of thumb to retain items with loading above .40 on their designated factor. In addition, items 2, 13, 18, 19, 20, 27, 31, 37 were deleted because of cross-loadings so as to maintain the purity of the factors. On the basis of logical fit, items 25, 35, 38 were discarded as they were not consistent with the meaning of the third factor (personal growth). So this factor became non-representative of a sufficient number of belonging items. Also, item 15 was deleted on the basis of logical fit as it was not consistent with the meaning of the fourth factor. Table (2) shows factor loadings for the PWB scale.
Table (2): Factor loadings for the PWB Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>environmental mastery</th>
<th>purpose in life</th>
<th>self-acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. I take my academic decisions regardless of social pressures.</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can easily make all academic decisions.</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I take responsibility for my academic choices.</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I chose the specialty I tend to.</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I express my views even if they contradict the views of my colleagues.</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I do well to implement the study plan that I make for myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I Complete the required study tasks from me on time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I can solve my learning problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I can overcome obstacles during my studies positively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have the ability to provide the appropriate learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I do not mind thinking about future academic life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 32. | I think setting academic goals is a waste of time. | .681 |
| 22. | I am trying to improve my academic abilities | .582 |
| 26. | I plan for my future studies. | .474 |
| 40. | I am satisfied with my academic performance. | .813 |
| 33. | I am happy with what I have accomplished so far. | .742 |
| 41. | I have accomplished what I wanted in my academic life. | .705 |
| 34. | By comparing myself to my colleagues, I am satisfied with what I am. | .656 |
| 39. | I think my current academic level is good. | .591 |

3. Results

3.1. Correlational analysis
Mastery goal correlated positively with performance goal \((r = .51, p < .001)\) and this relation did not differ significantly (Fisher’s \(Z = -0.3, \text{ns}\)) for males \((r = .50, p < .001)\) and females \((r = .52, p < .001)\) (Fisher, 1921). Also, mastery goal correlated positively with PWB \((r = .60, p < .001)\) and this relation did not differ significantly (Fisher’s \(Z = -0.6, \text{ns}\)) for males \((r = .56, p < .001)\) and females \((r = .60, p < .001)\). Similarly, performance goal correlated positively with performance-avoidance goal \((r = .21, p < .001)\) and this relation did not differ significantly (Fisher’s \(Z = 1.18, \text{ns}\)) for males \((r = .27, p < .001)\) and females \((r = .17, p < .001)\). Also, performance goal correlated positively with PWB \((r = .45, p < .001)\) and this relation did not differ significantly (Fisher’s \(Z = .28, \text{ns}\)) for males \((r = .46, p < .001)\) and females \((r = .44, p < .001)\). There were not significant relations among performance-avoidance goal and neither mastery goal \((r = .05, \text{ns})\) nor PWB \((r = -.03, \text{ns})\).

3.3 Moderation analysis
T-scores were used to divide students into high and low in the three achievement goal orientations, and for more distinct profiles were the following steps:
- Identifying students who are at higher grades than \((M + SD)\) and those who are at...
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lower grades than (M-SD) in the three goal orientations (mastery, performance, performance-avoidance), so students were grouped in two sets of high and low in every orientation.

- Determining the profile of each student in the AGO on the basis of high or low scores of any two types of goals. This can achieve the independence effects of these profiles, and allow knowing their characteristics precisely regard to the actual levels in the goal orientations. On the other hand, classifying individuals for high and below median in every orientation leads to the assumption profiles do not have actual presence.

Based on the categorization criteria 203 students from the total research sample (580 students), were grouped in seven achievement goal profiles, while five profiles were excluded as they didn’t include an appropriate number of students. The five profiles are (high mastery / low performance “7 students”, low mastery / high performance “2 students”, low mastery / high performance-avoidance “13 students”, low performance/ high performance-avoidance “10 students”, and a high performance / low performance-avoidance “0”).

Distribution of students on the seven goal orientation profiles is shown at table (3).

Table (3): Means and standard deviations of the PWB according to the AGO profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGO profiles</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high mastery / high performance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>227.32</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high mastery / high performance-avoidance</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>217.88</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high mastery / low performance-avoidance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>222.11</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low mastery / low performance</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>168.94</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low mastery / low performance-avoidance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>176.36</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high performance / high performance-avoidance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>206.54</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low performance / high performance-avoidance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>184.10</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, 7 (goal orientation profiles) x 2 (Gender) two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether gender, profiles of goal orientation, and/or an interaction effect between gender and profiles of goal orientation can influence PWB. The analysis showed that gender did not have a significant main effect on PWB, F (1, 195) = .01 ns. However, the analysis showed that goal orientation profiles had a significant main effect on PWB, F (6, 195) = 31.5, p < .001. Likewise, there was a significant interaction effect between goal orientation profiles and gender on PWB, F (7, 195) = 27.08, p < .001. In order to examine differences between groups with regard to PWB, post hoc analyses were performed using the Scheffe method. The Scheffe method has been found to be appropriate for equal or unequal sample sizes and with homogeneous variances (Kirk, 1995). Means and standard deviations of PWB across goal orientation profiles are reported in Table (4).

The analysis showed that:
- Students adopting profiles (high mastery / high performance), (high mastery/ low performance-avoidance), (high mastery/ high performance-avoidance), and (high performance /high performance - avoidance) had the highest levels of PWB.
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- Students adopting profiles (low mastery / low performance), (low mastery / low performance-avoidance), and (low performance / Low performance-avoidance) were less students in the PWB levels.

- There were no significant differences in PWB among students adopting (high mastery /high performance) and both profile (high mastery / high performance-avoidance) and profile (high mastery /low performance-avoidance).

- PWB differ significantly between students adopting profile (high mastery / high performance-avoidance) and all of the profile (high mastery /low performance-avoidance), and profile (high performance/ high- performance-avoidance).

- PWB does not differ significantly between students adopting profile (high mastery /low performance-avoidance) and (high- performance / high performance-avoidance).

- PWB does not differ significantly between students adopting profile (low mastery /low performance) and all of the profile (low mastery /low performance-avoidance), and profile (low performance /Low performance-avoidance).

- The level of PWB increases among the students adopting profile (high mastery / high performance) compared to each of the profiles (low mastery / low performance) and (low mastery / low performance-avoidance) and (high performance/ high performance-avoidance) and (low performance / low performance-avoidance).

- The level of PWB increases among the students adopting profile (high mastery / high performance-avoidance) compared to each of the profiles (low mastery / low performance) and (low mastery / low performance-avoidance) and (low performance / Low performance-avoidance).

- The level of PWB decreases among the students adopting profile (low mastery / low performance) compared to students adopting the profile (high performance / high performance-avoidance).

- The level of PWB increases among the students adopting profile (high performance/ high performance-avoidance) compared to students adopting the profile (low performance / Low performance-avoidance).
**Table (4):** Differences significance across groups of students in the means of PWB according to the AGO profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high mastery/high performance 227.32</td>
<td>227.32</td>
<td>217.88</td>
<td>222.11</td>
<td>168.94</td>
<td>176.36</td>
<td>206.54</td>
<td>184.10</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high mastery/high performance-avoidance 217.88</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>217.88</td>
<td>217.88</td>
<td>168.94</td>
<td>176.36</td>
<td>206.54</td>
<td>184.10</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high mastery/low performance-avoidance 222.11</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>222.11</td>
<td>168.94</td>
<td>176.36</td>
<td>206.54</td>
<td>184.10</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low mastery/low performance-avoidance 168.94</td>
<td>58.37***</td>
<td>48.94***</td>
<td>53.16***</td>
<td>168.94</td>
<td>176.36</td>
<td>206.54</td>
<td>184.10</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low mastery/low performance-avoidance 176.36</td>
<td>50.95***</td>
<td>41.52***</td>
<td>45.74***</td>
<td>168.94</td>
<td>176.36</td>
<td>206.54</td>
<td>184.10</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high performance/high performance-avoidance 206.54</td>
<td>20.77*</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>168.94</td>
<td>176.36</td>
<td>206.54</td>
<td>184.10</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low performance/high performance-avoidance 184.10</td>
<td>43.21***</td>
<td>33.78***</td>
<td>38.01***</td>
<td>168.94</td>
<td>176.36</td>
<td>206.54</td>
<td>184.10</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Discussion

This study intended to examine the relation among achievement goal orientations, PWB, and gender in a sample of Egyptian university students and whether gender moderates the relation between AGO and PWB.

The analysis revealed that students’ AGO could be discriminated along three dimensions: mastery goal, performance goal and performance avoidance goal. There was a positive relation between mastery goal and performance goal. In line with this finding was consistent with previous studies (Hofmann & Strickland, 1995) and (Nien & Duda, 2009). As such, an individual may seek to achieve his goals desiring to master the learning and at the same time get social approval and acceptance. Also, Performance goal had a positive relation with performance avoidance goal; this may be explained by the individual attempts to achieve goals to be socially accepted while avoiding the negative judgments of others. This finding is consistent with results of Burnkrant (1999) as he pointed out that student can adopt more than one goal orientation at the same time. Student may focus on learning and deep understanding, while at the same time seeking to show his competence for others. Human self has its own aspect of self-evaluation and it characterized by a general aspect that is influenced by the individual’s assessment of the individual and by the individual’s need for social acceptance and approval (Greenwald & Breckler, 1985). The common denominator between the mastery goal orientation and the performance goal orientation is in the pursuit of the individual to achieve high levels of performance.

Although previous studies (eg; Elliot & Church, 1997) confirmed at the discrimination between performance goal and performance-avoidance goal where the performance orientation is considered a positive motive to get the approval of others, while the performance-avoidance orientation is considered a negative motive to try to avoid failure and avoid appearing as an incompetent person. So the current result means that person can adopt performance goal and seeks to show his competence in front of others while at the same time trying to avoid the negative judgments of others, and this may be explained by the participation of both performance orientation and performance-avoidance in the attention of the individual of others views and evaluations of his performance. This result is consistent with previous studies (eg., Karabenick, 2004; Elliot&Murayama, 2008;Nien&Duda, 2009; Schwinger and Stiensmeier-Pelster, 2011).

In terms of gender effects, the analysis showed that there were no gender differences in the three dimensions of AGO. This finding replicates the findings of other studies that have reported no gender differences in these three dimensions (e. g., Phan, 2007; 2008). However, this finding is in contrast with the findings of other studies (eg., Roeser, Midgley & Urdan 1996; Al-Emadi, 2003). This result may be explained in the light of the similarity of environmental impacts and equal opportunity between males and females, and the unity of factors of socialization; which may lead to similar trends and beliefs of students of both sexes, and adopt the same achievement goals.

Similarly, the analysis showed that there were no gender differences in PWB. This finding is in agreement with the findings of Zhang and Norvilitis (2002). However, this finding is at odds with other studies (eg., Lindfors, et al., 2006) that have showed that they found gender differences in the dimensions of environmental mastery, purpose in life, autonomy in favor of males, and positive relations with others in favor of females.
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The analysis revealed that the effect of the AGO on PWB was moderated by gender. This means that the effect of AGO on PWB was different across male and female students. This finding might be explained by the gender socialization practices within the Egyptian society. Where Egyptian males enjoy a higher degree of autonomy and freedom of decision-making than females, allowing them to adopt the achievement goal orientation that suits them away from the pressure of others around them, and this can reflect positively on their sense of their PWB. Social pressure increases around Females in Egyptian society; their freedom and independence are less than males. They may also be preoccupied with trying to please parents and keep their social approval. These thoughts and circumstances can influence their adoption of their achievement goals, as well as their satisfaction with their lives and the perception of their PWB.

Finally, When the students of the current study sample were divided into seven groups (high mastery / high performance, high mastery / high performance-avoidance, High-mastery / low performance-avoidance, low mastery/ low performance, low mastery/ low performance- avoidance, high performance/ high performance-avoidance, and low performance/ low performance-avoidance); the unidirectional variance analysis showed that students with profiles (high mastery / high performance), (High-mastery / low performance-avoidance), (High-mastery / high performance-avoidance), and (high performance/ high performance- avoidance) Were the highest students in the level of PWB. Thus, it is possible to say that these four profiles of achievement goals orientations have a positive impact on the PWB.

This result is consistent with previous studies which have showed that mastery goal and performance goal are positively related the compatibility aspects (eg., Middleton & Midgley, 1997; Pajares, Britner & Valiente, 2000; VandeWalle, Surface & Bhavsar, 2007). Also, it is consistent with other studies (eg., Skaalvik, 1997; Kaplan & Maehr, 1999) that have showed that they found a positive relation between mastery goal and performance goal. While other studies (eg., VandeWalle, 1996; Hidi & Harackiewicz, 2000) showed that performance-avoidance goal is related to the non-compatibility aspects.

The superiority of profile (high mastery/ high performance) in achieving the highest level of PWB among students can be explained that when a learner adopts mastery goal with the performance goal, this leads him to seek obtaining the approval of others without sacrificing the opportunity for mastery of learning. Also, mastery goal if coupled with the performance goal represented by the student's desire to master his learning and acquire new experiences and skills in addition to thinking about the superiority of his peers and demonstrate the efficiency; it benefits from the positive impact of joint goals together and thus student achieve more positive results and feel good about himself.

For profile (high mastery / low performance-avoidance) the results showed a positive impact on the PWB. This can be explained in the light of the high level of mastery goal that leads individual to do his best to improve the performance of the task, and his belief that abilities are flexible and scalable, and that the low impact of performance-avoidance orientation may limit his participation in good activities or difficult tasks is likely to fail in its performance and may avoid him some negative experiences, thus, increasing the chances of success.

Despite the low chance of individual adoption of mastery orientation with performance-avoidance orientation as shown in Table (3), but the adoption of the student
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...to these two orientations together leads to adaptive results. This can be explained by the idea that the performance-avoidance goal can have a positive impact by directing the performance away from the tasks in which the individual performs poorly or shows low abilities. Also, the individual adoption of mastery orientation, perseverance and effort makes him not feel the risk of failure and lack of possibilities; he does not care about negative judgments, which leads to achieve his goals successfully and satisfying with his achievements.

The results of the present study also show that when an individual combines performance and performance-avoidance, he achieves a high level of PWB. Therefore, the negative impact of performance-avoidance orientation in the PWB may disappear when coupled with the performance orientation. This can be attributed to the quest of the individual adopting performance orientation to show his efficiency and to make every effort to be the best among his colleagues and the others approval, while adopting the individual for performance-avoidance to keep him from integration and participate in new experiences beyond his abilities and difficult tasks which he may fail to perform and be criticized by others, which may negatively affect his PWB.

To summarize, the current study extends previous research that has examined the AGO adopted by the context of university-aged students. Also, this study extends the research that has investigated the relation between AGO and PWB in individualist societies to the context of collectivist societies (i.e., Egypt). The reported findings provide further insight into the dynamics which underpin students’ achievement goal orientation. As an individual can adopt more than one achievement goal orientation as these goals are not contradictory but complementary.

Also, there was a moderating role of gender in the effect of AGO on PWB. Furthermore, the current findings suggest that students with profile high mastery/high performance have the highest level of PWB, while students with profile low mastery/low performance have the least level of PWB.

5. Recommendations

It is possible to provide some suggestions for future research. Further studies could examine the relation between achievement goal orientation and PWB across different educational levels and cultural contexts. In addition, the role of socialization practices in adopting different profiles of achievement goal orientation need to be explored in more qualitative ways.
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