

Sense of Belonging, Achievement Goals and Student Engagement among University Students



Rifat

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

Center of Excellence

QUAID-I-AZAM UNIVERSITY

ISLAMABAD, PAKISTAN

2021

Sense of Belonging, Achievement Goals and Student Engagement among University Students

By
Rifat

A Research Report submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement of
the Degree of Master of Science in Psychology

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

Center of Excellence

Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad

2021

Certificate

This is to certify that M.Sc. research report on “**Sense of Belonging, Achievement Goals, and Student Engagement Among University Students**” prepared by **Rifat** has been approved for submission to Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.

Ms. Sara Imtaiz

Dedicated to my Parents

**Sense of Belonging, Achievement Goals and Student
Engagement among University Students**

CONTENTS

Titles	Pg. No
List of Tables	i
<i>List of Appendices</i>	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
<i>Abstract</i>	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Sense of Belonging	2
Sense of belonging to school	3
Sense of belonging to peers	4
Achievement Goals	6
The Dichotomous achievement goals model	9
The tri-dichotomous achievement goals model	9
The 2 x 2 achievement Goal model	11
The 3x2 achievement goals model	13
Student Engagement	15
Dimensions of student engagement	17
Campus engagement	17
Class engagement	18
Relationship between Variables	21
Relationship of demographics with Study measures	22
Rationale of the Study	23
CHAPTER 2: METHOD	25
Objective of the study	25
Hypotheses	25
Operational Definitions	25

Instruments	28
Sample	29
Procedure	30
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS	31
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION	46
Conclusion	50
Limitations and Suggestions	50
Implications	51
REFERENCES	52
ANNEXURES	

Sr No.	LIST OF TABLES	Pg. No
TABLE 1	Demographics characteristics of the sample (N =290)	29
TABLE 2	Reliabilities and Descriptive Statistics of the Measures (N =290)	31
TABLE 3	Correlation Matrix Between Study Variables and age (N = 290)	33
TABLE 4	Stepwise Regression and analysis to predict students Engagement from Mastery approach goals, Mastery avoidance Goals, Performance approach goals and performance avoidance goals (N= 290)	35
TABLE 5	Stepwise Regression and analysis to predicts student Engagement from Behavioral Engagement (N= 290)	36
TABLE 6	Stepwise Regression and analysis to predicts student Engagement from Cognitive Engagement (N= 290)	37
TABLE 7	Stepwise Regression and analysis to predicts student Engagement from agentic Engagement (N= 290)	37
TABLE 8	Stepwise Regression and analysis to predicts student Engagement from Emotional Engagement (N= 290)	38
TABLE 9	Stepwise Regression and analysis to predicts student Engagement from Sense of Belonging to school (N= 290)	39
TABLE 10	Stepwise Regression and analysis to predicts student Engagement from Sense of belonging to peer (N= 290)	39
TABLE 11	Independent Sample T test for gender differences on study variables (N=290)	40
TABLE 12	Independent sample T test for checking the marital status on Study Measure (N=290)	42
TABLE 13	Independent sample T test for Parental relationship status on study variables (N=290)	43
TABLE 14	Independent sample T test for Residence on Study variables (N=290)	44

LIST OF ANNEXURES

Annexure A	Informed Consent
Annexure B	Demographic Sheet
Annexure C	Student Sense of Connectedness Scale
Annexure D	Achievement Goals Questionnaire
Annexure E	Students Engagement Scale

Acknowledgement

First, praises and thanks to the Allah, the Almighty, for His showers of blessings throughout to complete my work successfully (الحمد لله رب العالمين).

I'd want to convey my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Ms. Sara Imtiaz , for allowing me to work under her leadership and offering invaluable assistance during this project. She has taught me how to conduct research in the most efficient manner possible. Working and studying under her direction was a great honor and privilege. I'd also like to express my gratitude to NIP's whole library, computer, and administrative staff for their support and assistance.

My sincerest gratitude goes to my family for shaping me into the person I am today. Thank you, Ammi Jan, and Baba Jan, for your unwavering love and care. I'd like to express my gratitude to friends for their support and encouragement. Last but not least I'd like to express my thanks to my siblings for always encouraging me. Thank you for being there for me, always.

Rifat

Abstract

The aim of present study was to examine the relationship between sense of belonging, achievement goals, and student engagement among university students. Moreover, these variables were also explored with reference to different demographic variables like gender, age, marital status, family system, residence, and parental status. A sample of 290 university students was selected belonging to different university of Islamabad and Rawalpindi. Sense of belonging, achievement goals, and student engagement were measured through Student Sense of Connectedness Scale (Brew et al., 2004), Achievement Goals Questionnaire (Elliot & Murayama, 2008), and Student Engagement Scale (Welborn, 1991) respectively. Alpha reliabilities were found to be acceptable for all the measures. Results indicated that sense of belonging (and its domains) had a positively relationship with student engagement. Similarly, achievement goals domains mastery approach goals, mastery avoidance goals, performance approach goals and performance avoidance goals had a positive relationship student engagement. It was seen that married students were higher than single students on student engagement. It was also depicted that student whose parents are living together scored higher on student engagement than whose parents are separated.

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Education is central to the success of a person. It is merely not a qualification or certificate. Education refers to the overall imparting of knowledge of personal, societal, cognitive, and physical development. Education helps one choose, define, and select their career path. Studies in education are necessary to understand and comprehend the learning patterns, interests, and tendencies of students. A cursory understanding of education bears no fruit. Learning concepts related to education and the factors that contribute to learning helps a lot on devising learning and for positive outcomes (Friedman (2007) and (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Student engagement is an important factor of learning process because it plays a crucial role in education of students it enables students to enhance knowledge and benefits students, the importance of how qualifying in education not only gives a sense of empowerment but also provides the capacity to furnish the skills. Experts says that student engagement improves the abilities of student in social and academic settings. student commitment additionally assembles better associations with different students, staff, and personnel's and assists the students with understanding administration inside the organization's schooling framework. Accordingly, it further develops student character and improves their abilities that are essential for driving change (Allen & Kern, 2017).

Many historians agree that student engagement is the quantity and quality of physical and psychological power that child exerts in learning in the learning experience. It refers to the degree of involvement and interest that appear among students during their learning process (Rick & Arend, 2011). Student engagement affects student performance. It is the better predictor of student academics and personal development. The increase in student engagement will enable students to learn more (Kuh, 2003). Engagement refers to active involvement, attention, concentration and commitment. The activities are complex to understand and can only be understood by the specific activity or social contexts (Fred, Gray, & Susie, 1992).

The reason to participate in any activity is the motivation of the outcome. The concept of learning is linked with many factors; it is also linked with achievement goals. Achievement goal is cognitive representation which is future focused that leads

performance to the end state of competence to which individual is dedicated and that can either be performed or avoid (Hulleman et al., 2010). Achievement goals are instrumental in understanding the concepts of learning. It helps to devise strategies to catalyze changes in student behavior and help them learn better. It stream lines the achievement of efficiency by measuring mastery approach and performance goals. It provides practical understanding of the learning process. It proves instrumental for enhancing teaching practices.

Like achievement goals, student sense of belonging is also important in learning framework. When a child feels a sense of being placed at school and experience cooperative bond with teachers and peers, they are intended to participate actively and confidently in the life of the school as compared those students who lack sense of belonging (Anderman & Anderman, 1999; Birch & Ladd, 1997; Skinner & Belmont, 1993). Sense of belonging allows students to actively participate in learning activities.

The student's ability to learn and acquire skills is also down to their engagement in the learning process. A student's engagement plays a great role in effecting the learning ability. A classroom environment conducive for learning is necessary for engaging students. The environment of school, student's relations with environment, and his motivation to achieve his/her goals, all these factors contribute the engagement of students in learning process.

Sense of Belonging

The literature on the construct of sense of belonging roots back to 1950s. Researchers through years have given various definitions for the construct of sense of belonging and described the same general idea of sense of belonging with various terms (Allen & Kern, 2017). From these various definitions a common theme for sense of belonging can be derived as 'the need to connect with others'. For example, Rogers (1951) defined sense of belonging in the sense of the need of an individual to be regarded positively by others. Sense of belonging defined by McClelland (1987) at the very basic level is that individuals have motivation to be affiliated with other people. Vallerand (1997) described sense of belonging as the individual's inborn desire to relate with other people. Relatedness being conceptually relevant to (sense of belonging) is included in the theory of self-determination as the fundamental need that individuals have (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Friedman (2007) called the same construct as one's self and

identity building as it is reliant on the perceptions of social interactions' quality. Therefore, researchers like Hagerty, Lynch-Sauer, Patusky, Bouwema, and Collier (1992) defined belonging as individual's perception of participation in their social system or environment. Baumeister and Leary (1995) defined general sense of belonging as instinctual psychological need to belong to others or groups and also participate in important social interactions and it can be regarded as being so vital as the need for food.

Researches show that belonging is important to children and adults but researches examining sense of belonging in college students are limited as compared to the researches in school students. One of possible shortcomings to be addressed is the focus of prior researches on the restricted conceptualization of the construct of sense of belonging (Won et al., 2017). Like researches conducted by Hurtado and Ponjuan (2005) and Johnson et al. (20017) focused on general sense of belonging of students to their respective institutions. This perspective reflects that sense of belonging of students reflects their feelings of being connected to institutes, schools, or any educational community they are members of. In comparison to this restricted conceptualization and operationalization of the construct of sense of belonging researchers like Goodenow and Grady (1993) examined dimensions of sense of belonging in their studies on early adolescents. These researchers particularly comprehended that a sense of connection to peer and support from their teachers are the factors that contribute to students' general sense of belonging. These researches particularly comprehended that a sense of belonging is the feeling of being accepted and respected by their peers and other individual of their academic environment. Student sense of belonging has been explained in terms of belonging to school and belonging to peers. Both of these domains have been explained below.

Sense of belonging to school. Belonging is a basic human need and particularly sense of belonging to the school supports young people's social and emotional needs. Various terms for sense of belonging such as bonding, attachment, connection, and engagement have been used in the literature (Allen & Kern, 2017). The most commonly used term regarding students is sense of belonging to school that is defined in the most agreed upon form by Goodenow and Grady (1993) as the level of feelings of being

accepted, respected by everyone, included in academic system as well as extracurricular activities and is supported by circles of social environment of school.

Won et al. (2017) states sense of belonging is very important to both school students and college students. Among students of college level, sense of belonging has appeared as a valued concept of understanding social outcomes as well as of outcomes related to academics of college students (Strayhorn, 2018). Researches on sense of belonging among college students indicate a positive association between their sense of belonging and persistence (Hausmann et al., 2017), students' adjustment in their institute and their academic achievement (Pittman & Richmond, 2008). The results from a research by Mounts (2004) further suggest that the higher the level of sense of belonging among college students the lower will be the level of depression and loneliness in them.

Mostly the research on the construct of sense of belonging has concentrated on college students who may be at a risk of having a lower sense of belonging within their respective school community (Won et al., 2017) a stream of research has focused on students of color (Hausmann et al., 2017; Strayhorn, 2018; Walton & Cohen, 2007). Others have focused on female students studying in fields related to science, technology, engineering, and math (Rattan, Good, & Dweek, 2012; Smith, Lewis, Hawthorne, & Hodges, 2013). Still other has focused on students of low socio-economic status (Ostrove & Long 2007).

Research indicates the correlation between sense of belonging and motivation related to academics among college students are limited as compared to studies on younger population (Won et al., 2017). The results from a study by Freeman et al. (2007) discovered that the sense of belonging is positively associated with students' intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy related to academics, and with the value of academic task among college students. Similarly Zumbunn et al. (2014) also reported that sense of belonging linked positively to self-efficacy and task value among college students.

Sense of belonging to peers. This occurs when an individual can be open to share thoughts, opinions, feelings, and the real self with peer group due to feeling of being welcomed and acknowledged as a significant group member by peers (Brew, Beatty & Watt 2004). Most of the researches have been documented on the influence of adults on children's academic achievements. With time the focus has been shifted

onto the examination of peers' influence (Wentzel, 1999). Findings from several researches show that peer influence play an important role in students' school's participation and completion (Connell, Spencer, & Aber, 1994). Researches show that students with feelings of being rejected by peers and those who isolated themselves are more likely to withdraw from academic activities and ultimately withdraw from school with respect to those who associate themselves with peers and school environment (Hymel, Comfort, Schonert, & McDougall, 1996; Wentzel 1999). Children's perception of peer support is an influential factor as a good number of studies has examined link between students perception of social and emotional help by peers, their academic goals, and engagement (Murdock, 1999; Wentzel, 1998).

A good number of studies on younger adolescents has acknowledged the important influence of sense of belonging to peers on the constructs like motivation of students, their involvement, and achievement (Buhs, Ladd, & Herald, 2006; Furrer & Skinner, 2003). There is limited research found on examining the construct of sense of belonging to peers among college students but the limited research present on this particular construct shows that sense of belonging to peers may have a curial role to play in the academic success of college students (Won et al., 2017). For example a study conducted by Hurtado and Ponjuan (2005) examined the relationship of the amount of time college students spend in socializing with friends and their social adjustment in the college context and found that the amount of time in socializing is associated positively with the social adjustment. Indicated by the quantitative analysis in the same study students of the first-year reported that their peers in the college provided them more support. Further from a study conducted by Dennis, Phinny, and Chuateco (2005) it was discovered that the lower level of peer support among college student is negatively associated with their achievement related to their academics and also with their adjustment. In the same way, in another study by Pittman and Richmond (2008) found that peer relationship among college students is negatively linked with problem behaviors.

Achievement Goals

Goals can be defined as the intellectual representation of future centered aims that an individual is committed either to approach or avoid (Elliot & Fryer, 2008). For more than two decades the research on academics paid noteworthy importance to the

class of achievement goals (Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011). Achievement goal theory proposed that achievement goals are the goals in which individual skill or competence is the main aim of the individual (Elliot & Dweck, 2005). So the definition of achievement goal is cognitive representation which is future focused that leads performance to the end state of competence to which individual is dedicated and that can either be approached or avoided (Hulleman, Schrager, Bodmann, & Harackiewicz, 2010). How and why people busy remain busy in setting achievement goals is referred to an underlying aim a person gets on within either academic (like preparation of test or class-assignments) or non-academic settings and others. Explanation of events is directed by these orientations in environment of achievement and the characteristic patterns of cognition, emotions, and behaviors (Kaplan & Maehr, 2007). Two comprehensive achievement goals, mastery and performance based goals are given as a result of early theory and research (Dweck & Leggett, 1980). A differentiation between approach and avoidance attitude beside mastery and performance bifurcate to form 2 x 2 model by the contribution of successive work (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance are the four goals which have been studied and tested empirically. It is found that different outcome patterns, of achievement, learning, perceptions, emotions, and behaviors both in laboratory and classroom are predicted by these four types of goals.

The development of skills and competence is the concern of mastery goals which also called as task-focused or learning goals. Students who target to enhance his/her abilities are mastery goals oriented. Increased topic interest more positive affect, profoundly managing programs, and better self-regulation have been found to be linked with acquisition of mastery goals. Harackiewicz et al. (2002) demonstration of skills is concerned with performance goals which are also called normative goals or ego focused goals. A student who targets to make sure a suitable demonstration of his performance is oriented towards performance goals. Superficially managing programs, negative affect, and off-task behaviors followed by failure are generally linked with performance goals (Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Kaplan & Maehr, 2007) Achievement scores like grades are affected in general and subject interest are less clearly related to performance goals. These outcomes sometimes also have negative relationship with performance goals and sometimes positive correlation is also observed (Harackiewicz et al., 2002, Kaplan, Midgley, & Middleton, 2001).

According to Elliot and Thrash (2001) both mastery and performance goals have two parts mastery-approach goals are linked with how to learn and master the task through skills, while second one is the mastery avoidance in which aim is to avoid losing skills which are not attained formally or to avoid not learning the task at hand thoroughly. The other is performance goals that are categorized as performance-and performance avoidance goals. Individual having this type of goals aiming to demonstrate his abilities to others while those having performance-avoidance goals aim to avoid performing worse than others/peers (Elliot & Thrash, 2004).

In the first definitions, mastery and performance goals were for the most part seen as far edges of a solitary continuum and students were considered as one or the other dominance or execution situated. What's more important is early trial research which utilized between-subjects plans where mastery and performance goals conditions were contrasted with each other to see their effect on student results. These sorts of plans did not take into consideration the results of the job of different objectives or their collaborations, as members are either in one objective condition or the other. Nonetheless, it very well might be that the classroom students can underwrite both mastery and performance goals and various degrees of both of these goals (Meece & Holt, 1993; Pintrich, 2000a, Pintrich, 2000b, Pintrich & Zusho, 2002; Pintrich & Garcia, 1991). Indeed, in some classroom work, mastery and performance goals are symmetrical or somewhat emphatically identified with one another (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Assuming the two goals are to some degree symmetrical, it raises the likelihood that students could support various degrees of the two goals simultaneously. In addition, various examples in the levels of the two goals might prompt differential results.

In the course of recent years, the achievement goal's way to deal with accomplishment inspiration has turned into the prevalent theoretical system used to concentrate on conduct in institution, game, and work areas. Achievement goals are characterized as the reason or intellectual powerful focal point of skill pertinent movement (Elliot, 1999; Maehr, 1984) and the particular objective embraced is set to impact how people decipher and feel accomplishment in different settings (Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1984). At first, achievement goals utilized an organizer's authority objective differences in representing skill based strivings; as of late, this dichotomous model has been reached out to a three-sided model including execution approach

performance–approach (focused on attaining normative competence), performance–avoidance (focused on avoiding normative incompetence), and mastery (focused on task mastery or improvement) goals (Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

Achievement goals developed for a long time have been fundamental for the investigation of inspiration identified with accomplishment. On the build of achievement goals, hypothetical and experimental work initially showed up during the 1980s. The work and mindfulness on achievement goals build had expanded in the 1990. Prior to characterizing achievement goals, it is important to talk about the expressions achievement and goals independently. In characterizing capability is the calculated center of achievement, is the generally settled upon by accomplishment objective scholars (Elliot & Dweck, 2005). Webster's changed definition that capability is the condition or nature of effectiveness, capacity, adequacy, or achievement. Goals have been characterized in various ways by the achievement goal scholars, yet the most settled upon objective is the motivation behind conduct (Dweck, 1986). Elliot and Thrash (2002) expressed that there are two unmistakable manners by which reason can be conceptualized. In one manner, object is the point or end state which directs a singular's conduct and the alternate manner by which reason can be conceptualized as the explanation for the commitment of a person in a conduct. Among various achievement goal scholars various perspectives on the conceptualization of the 'reason' exists. Some view reason as the point, some view them as goals, while some reason as the mix of both (Dweck, 1986; Elliot 2005; Kaplan & Maehr, 2007). Presently consolidating both achievement and goals achievement goals build might be characterized as the motivation behind taking part in a conduct that is pertinent to skill (Elliot, 2005).

Models of Achievement Goals.

Followings are different models of achievements goals.

The dichotomous achievement goals model (master-performance goals). In the initial achievement goals model had a dichotomous distinction of the achievement goals into mastery and performance goals (Dweck, 1986). The mastery and performance goals were different in regard that mastery goals focused on competence development and mastery in doing task while performance goals focuses on

demonstrating competence illegible as mastery and performance goals were both focused on success so both of these goals were conceived as approach goals (Ames 1992; Nicholls, 1989). Approach goals (both mastery and performance goals) were presumed to be applicable in school, sports, work, and vocational pursuits which are considered as domains relevant to competence.

Although the approach goals (including mastery and performance goals) were differentiated explicitly regarding their focus on competence only but the subsequent theorists (Elliot, 1999; Urdañ & Mestas, 2006) observed that each of the two goals have their focus on competence with focus on two different subcomponents of competence. Mastery goals refer to the development of the demonstration of competence on a task, Performance goals, on the other hand focuses on the demonstration of competence on a task and outperforming others on the task. Two subcomponents of the focus of competence were identified, one as one's standpoint on competence and the other one as standard of competence. The standpoint subcomponent of the focus of competence is whether one is viewing competence from the standpoint of developing it (mastery goal) or demonstrating it (performance goal) while the standard subcomponent of the focus of competence is that whether in evaluating one's competence one uses a task-based or self-based standard (mastery goal) or an other-based standard considered as performance goals (Elliot & McGregor, 2001).

The tri-chotomous achievement goal model. The dichotomous model of achievement goals overlooked the distinction between approach motivation and avoidance motivation existing in the long and rich history of achievement motivation literature (Elliot & Covington, 2001). The approach-avoidance distinction with regard to competence motivation identifies two types of goal pursuits, one striving to approach success while the other to avoid failure. As noted earlier in the dichotomous model of achievement goals, both mastery and performance goals were constructed as approach goals and there was no explicit representation of the avoidance goals. This approach-avoidance distinction represents the second component of competence. Beyond the focus of competence, namely the valence of competence the trichotomous model of achievement goals (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996) extended the dichotomous model by integrating the approach-avoidance goals distinction within performance goals. Rather than positing a single, omnibus performance goal, the trichotomous model bifurcated

performance goals into separate performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals. Performance-approach goals were conceptualized in terms of striving to avoid demonstrating incompetence relative to others. Mastery goals remained unchanged from dichotomous model, as they continued to be conceptualized in terms of striving to develop competence and task mastery.

Incorporation of the approach-avoidance distinction was not just conceptually important, it was also important because it offered an explanation for why performance goals in the dichotomous model produced relatively sporadic empirical yield. Performance-avoidance goals, with their use of a negative outcome (incompetence) as the hub of regulation, were posited to give rise to a negative, maladaptive pattern of affective, cognitive, and behavioral processes and outcomes. Performance-approach goals are more complex forms of regulation, in that they used a positive outcome (competence) as the hub of regulation, which should facilitate positive processes and outcomes, but they also focus on showing or demonstrating competence, which often has detrimental implications for processes and outcomes. Furthermore, performance-approach goals can emerge from appetitive based depositions (like need for achievement and approach temperament) and aversively based depositions (like fear of failure and avoidance temperament; Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & Thrash, 2002). Thus performance-approach goals were posited to be positive predictors of some outcomes but negative or null predictors of others. This bifurcation of omnibus performance goals into separate approach and avoidance forms of regulation helped provide additional precision regarding the implications of performance-based goal pursuit. Predictions for mastery goals remained the same as those articulated in the dichotomous model. They were posited to lead to a host of positive processes and outcomes. In the dichotomous model, perceived competence was construed as an antecedent rather than a moderator of achievement goal adoption. High perceptions of ability were posited to predict approach goals (mastery and performance-approach alike) and low perceptions of ability were posited to predict performance-avoidance goals.

The 2 x 2 achievement goals model. The trichotomous model associated the approach-avoidance concept with the performance goals but the mastery goals remained intact. This led to the initiation of the question of whether there is a

possibility to develop a 2x2 achievement goal model by utilizing the definition and related key components of competence. The model thus formed will be composed of three fundamental goals of the trichotomous (with mastery goals taking on an approach label, mastery-approach) plus a fourth, mastery-avoidance goal. This fully crosses 2 x 2 model is precisely what was proposed to extend the trichotomous model (Elliot 1999; Pintrich, 2000). Many achievement goals researchers and theorists initially had difficulty conceiving of a goal that combined mastery and avoidance, most likely because mastery goals had been portrayed in a purely positive light since the inception of the achievement goal approach. Conceptually, however, combining mastery and avoidance is straightforward, as mastery goals focus on a particular definition of competence and a particular valence of competence and these two components can easily be integrated. The 2 x 2 model made an explicit shift to defining competence entirely in terms of standards of competence, standpoints on competence were construed as more relevant to the reason than the aim of competence-based goal pursuit. Thus, for mastery-avoidance goals, competence defined in terms of a task-based reference or a person's intrapersonal trajectory and competence was valence in terms of incompetence. So, mastery-avoidance goals entail striving to avoid task-based or intrapersonal incompetence.

Pragmatically, it is easy to imagine examples of mastery-avoidance goal pursuit in everyday life like trying to avoid forgetting what can be learned in math class, trying not to miss a soccer penalty kick, and trying not to make fewer sales than one made last year. Perfectionism (implying to try not to do anything incorrectly) is a prototypical case of mastery-avoidance regulation; athletes toward the end of their career undoubtedly focus on mastery-avoidance goals as their performance asymptotes or heads downward and mastery avoidance goals may be particularly salient as individuals age and begin to notice a decline in their cognitive and motor skills (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Pintrich 2000).

Precise empirical predictions on the subject of the consequences of mastery-avoidance goals are not easy to proffer. Like performance-approach goals, mastery-avoidance goals are complex forms of regulation in that they represent a hybrid combination of both positive and negative components; that is, the focus on task-based and intrapersonal competencies commonly thought to promote aversive and self-

protective processes. In any given achievement situation, the mastery component of the goal may be more prominent than the avoidance component of the goal, thereby promoting more positive regulatory processes. However, the opposite may be the case in other achievement settings, leading to more negative regulatory processes. Given this variation, it is best to offer a more general predictive pattern. The pattern for mastery-avoidance goals is likely to be more positive than that for the performance-avoidance goals and more negatively than that for the mastery-approach goals.

Predictions for the other three goals of the 2 x 2 model; including performance-approach, mastery-approach, and performance-avoidance are comparable to those offered for these goals may be somewhat different given that these goals do not explicitly include a demonstration of competence component; a focus on demonstration is thought to have largely negative implications (Dykman, 1998; Hulleman, Schragar, Bodmann, & Harackiewicz, 2010). Therefore, performance-approach goals maybe somehow more beneficial and performance-avoidance goals may be somewhat less deleterious in the 2x2 model, relative to the trichotomous model (to the extent that operationalization follows conceptualization). In keeping with the trichotomous model, perceived type of competence was construed as a precursor of achievement goal adoption in the 2x2 model; the precise nature of the link between perceived competence and mastery-avoidance goal adoption would likely to depend on the salience of the mastery and avoidance-based components of the goal.

As with the prior models, researchers have used a number of different measures and manipulations of the goals of 2x2 model. These operationalization's vary in the degree to which they emphasize the standard of competence alone or also include the standpoint on competence (Baranik, Barron & Finney, 2007, Riou et al., 2012; Schiano-Lomriello, Cury, & Da Fonseca, 2005). Although, findings for performance-approach goals may vary depending on whether their operationalization focusses on standards, standpoints, or both. Systematic empirical work on this operationalization issue focuses on 2x2 achievement goals has yet to be conducted. The empirical pattern for mastery-avoidance goals tends to be negative, as they have been found to be positive predictors of anxiety, procrastination, and mal adaptive forms of perfectionism, and negative predictors of performance (Baranik, Stanley, Bynum, & Lance, 2010; Senko & Freud, 2015). However, the findings are mixed for some variables, such as help-seeking,

intrinsic motivation, and broad affective experience (Majdar, Kaplan, & Weinstock, 2011). Mastery-avoidance goals have been shown to be effective forms of regulation for older adults (Senko & Freud, 2015). The findings are also mixed for perceived competence as a predictor of mastery-avoidance goals (Chiang et al. 2011). These mixed findings for mastery-avoidance goals are anticipated due to their hybrid nature (they represent a combination of mastery and avoidance).

The 3 x 2 Achievement goals model. In explicitly defining achievement goals entirely in terms of standards of competence, the 2 x 2 achievement goal model made salient the dual nature of mastery-based goals. These goals focus on both an absolute standard of competence and on an intrapersonal standard of competence. Although absolute and intrapersonal standards often go together in goal pursuit (like, trying to do a task as well as it can be done, and trying to do better than one's prior performance in a mastery-approach goal), this need not be the case. Task based goals can be pursued independently of self-based goals, and vice versa. For example, one can try to make a number of math problems true (a task-approach goal) without trying to do better than one has done before on math problems (a self-based approach goal). Likewise, one can try to avoid performing worse on a math exam than one has performed before (a self-avoidance goal) without trying to avoid getting a lot of math problems wrong (a task-avoidance goal). As such, task-based goals focus on an absolute standard can be separated from self-based goals focused on an intrapersonal standard, and both of these can be differentiated from other-based goals focused on intrapersonal standard. Crossing each of these standards (the definition component of competence)—task, self, others—with approach-avoidance (the valence component of competence) yields a 3x2 model of the achievement goals (Elliot, Murayama, & Pekrun, 2011).

Six separate goals comprise the 3x2 model: a task-approach goal focused on approaching task-based competence, a task-avoidance goal focusing on avoiding task-based incompetence, a self-approach goal focusing on approaching self-based competence, a self-avoidance goal focusing on avoiding self-based incompetence, an other-approach goal focusing in approaching other-based competence, and another avoidance goal focusing on avoiding other-based incompetence. Other-approach and other-avoidance goals are identical to performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals respectively, in the 2x2 model. The new ("other") label is simply used

in the 3x2 model in order to fit with the “task” and ‘self’ labels that must be used to bifurcate the mastery-based goal construct. Task-based goals define competence in terms of the absolute demands of the task, such as getting a problem correct, understanding concept, or trying to hit a ball. Examples of task-approach goals are trying to get a problem correct, understanding a concept, or trying to hit a ball, whereas examples of task-avoidance goals are trying to avoid getting a problem incorrect, trying to avoid misunderstanding a concept, or trying to avoid missing a ball. Self-based goals define competence in terms of one’s own intrapersonal trajectory, such a show one has done in the past. Examples of self-approach goal are trying to get more problems correct than before, trying to understand a concept more quickly than before, and trying to hit a ball further than before.

Contrasting task-based and self-based standards of competence evaluation, task-based standards are more closely integrated with the task itself, and at least, under some circumstances, one can receive immediate and ongoing feedback directly from the task as one is working on it. That is, determining success or failure using a task-based standard can be simple, direct, and require minimal cognitive processing.

Self-based standards, on the other hand, are more separable from task engagement in that one must compare one’s current competence to a mental representation of one’s competence at another point in time, such as the past. Thus, although self-based standards inherently and ideographically are optimally challenging (each person is his or her own baseline), their use in regulation is more complex and requires more cognitive capacity. Based on these differences, one could posit that the task-approach goals are optimally suited to facilitate absorption in the task (like flow) and intrinsic motivation, whereas self-approach goals may be best suited to facilitate persistence and eagerness through optimal challenge. Task-avoidance and self-avoidance goals represent hybrid combinations of positive and negative components and, as with mastery-avoidance goals, it is difficult to anticipate their predictive pattern network accordingly (other than the broad statement of being more positive than other-avoidance goals and more negative than task-approach and self-approach goals). As noted earlier, performance-based and other-based goals are equivalent, so predictions for performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals in the 2 x 2 model would hold for other-approach and other-avoidance goals in the 3 x 2 model; likewise,

perceived competence would be construed as a precursor or fundamental unit of achievement goal adoption in the 3 x 2 model, and the nature of the link between perceived competence and the hybrid goal constructs would depend on the salience of the definition of the valence components of the goal (as described earlier regarding mastery-avoidance goals).

Student Engagement

Student engagement is defined as the extent to which student participate in academic and nonacademic activities and identify with and value the goals of educational institutions (Audas & Williams, 2001). Academic engagement is the extent to which student are motivated to learn and do well in school. Newman (1992) defines student as the student's psychological investment and effort directed towards learning, understanding or mastering the knowledge skills or craft that academic work is intended to promote.

The term engagement in the school context has used a variety of concepts since imitation of its genuine use 1980s (Appleton, Christenson, & Furlong, 2008; Fredricks & McColsky, 2012). In the beginning, scholars limited it to behavioural indicators (Finn, 1989). On the other hand, some scholars focused on its primary psychological aspects (Newmann, 1992). Furthermore, there has remained ambiguity in the usage of the term, since other used terms such as school engagement (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004), academic engagement (Libbey, 2004), student engagement (Willms, 2003), and engagement in schoolwork (National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2004) to explain different aspect engagement. It seems that the same term puts indifferently, for example, school engagement as positive feelings about school as compared to school engagement as participation in school activities). Harmonizing with Appleton et al. (2008) for student engagement, which allows for a more contextualized understanding that recognizes the essential distinctions among students' evaluations and experiences in the various sub-contexts of the school ecology. For bringing some conceptual clarity to the issue, Fredricks et al. (2004) argue that engagement should be viewed as a meta construct, comprising three highly interrelated but conceptually distinct dimensions: behavioural, cognitive, and emotional. Behavioural engagement refers to the various learning- and academic-oriented behaviours, actions, and involvements in which students engage in school. Examples of behavioural engagement

include participation in school-related activities, attending and contributing to classes, compliance with school rules, completing assignments, and the efforts put into study and focus on academic works. Cognitive engagement includes:

- A psychological investment in understanding and mastery of educational material
- The desire for the challenge
- Enacting metacognitive strategies such as planning
- Monitoring
- Evaluating one's thinking
- Self-regulation

Emotional engagement refers to students' relationships with others in the Teachers College Record, 116, 040302 (2014) 4 school environment (e.g., teachers, peers) and the general sense of belonging in the school context that often derives from such relationships. Additionally, emotional engagement involves students' understanding of connectedness to and interest in the academic content, supported by efficacy and confidence regarding their academic capability. This suggested tri-dimensionality has been empirically supported (Wang, Willet, & Eccles, 2011) and is commonly accepted among scholars in the field (Appleton et al., 2008, Christenson, Reschly, & Wylie, 2012).

Dimension of Student Engagement

Campus engagement. The concept of actively involvement in social activities, sense of placed and value to their educational and university have more significance in engaging students in educational activities and also for quality learning and desired results (Hausmann, Schofield, & Woods, 2007; Kember, Lee, and Li, 2001). It would be expressed that sense of belonging and valuing are the dimension which are related to their psychological engagement whereas the participation in social activities is the dimension related to social engagement. Conversely, the contemporary study has contrastive dimensions; the dimension of participation in social activities is related to campus engagement whereas class participation is related to class engagement. Due to this reason, the social and academic participation is considered as separate component of school engagement and class involvement simultaneously.

According to Willms (2003) engagement is defined as acceptance of being valued, active participation in activities of university and sense of belonging. Moreover, Voelki (1996) states that student engagement focuses on the topics of school engagement, valuing and sense of belonging. The ideas to have identification with college, having a place and valuing indicates the emotional and psychological engagement (Appleton et al., 2006). The participations in educational activities is related to behavioral engagement. The students feel pleased and quite in a situation when they are valuing and having a sense of belonging as a result they show participation in their social activities. Goodenow (1992) outlines sense of belonging as a feeling which student experiences when they are in social environment of school/university (teacher, students and so on), it also shows that other people have respected the students in social environment due to which student participate more with enthusiasm.

Social learning territories includes the environment of campus, life on campus and social interaction as a combination which makes advancement in development of belonging, student engagement and learning (Blimling, 2004; Bryson, Hardy, & Hand, 2009; Jimieson, 2003; Matthews, Andrews & Adams, 2011; Montgomery, 2008; Pike & Kuh, 2005; Pike, Kuh & Gonyea, 2003). Participation is defined as the participation in social activities as well as academic activities (Bensimon, 2007; Harper & Quayle, 2009). The undesired circumstances, such as no participation in campus and troublesome behavior, are thought to be introverted or antisocial (Flim, Pannozzo, & Achilles, 2003).

Class engagement. Class engagement includes intellectual power of students emotional as well as behavior of student in the class and outside the class while participating in educational or academic activities. Cognitive engagement is identified with student's ways to deal with their comprehension of their own learning. It includes learning engagement, learning motivation, planning and self-regulation, valuing learning and investments on learning (Appleton et al, 2006; Fredericks, Blumenfield, & Paris, 2004; Jimerson, Campos, & Grief, 2003; Sutherland 2010; Walker, Greene, & Mansell, 2006). Emotional engagement includes emotional responses of students including their interests, qualities and connections-to the teacher and staff, their peers, also course content in the class (Bryson & Hand, 2007; kahu, 2013; Kember& Li, 2001; Sutherland, 2010).

Furthermore, emotional engagement is a feeling of belonging to class, being a member of group or class and enjoying the class (Finn, Pannozzo, and Achillies, 2003; Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; Kahu, 2013; Kember, Lee, & Li, 2001). Emotional engagement is defined with feelings which are positively like interest of students and their happiness in class. On the other hand, emotional disengagement happens when the feelings are negative like weariness and nervousness of students. Behavioral engagement is recognized as the important indicator used in studies to measure certain behavior and it is considered as easy to be measured (Appleton, Christenson, & Furlong, 2008).

Behavioral engagement includes participation of student in their academic activities whether they are in class or outside the class. The important factors to be given consideration include their attendance in the class as well as their participation level (Appleton et al., 2005; Krause & Coates, 2008). On the other hand, the positive behavioral engagement is defined as when the student demonstrates such behavior where they ask questions, actively participating in the class, paying special attention by making effort in the class (Fredericks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; Handelsman et al., 2005; Jimerson, Campos, & Grief, 2003).

The self-determination theory recognizes the internal persuasive assets that all students have and it presents proposals concerning how instructors can include support and instate these assets during the progression of guidance to facilitate high student engagement (Niemiec and Ryan, 2009).

Student engagement, in general and across its various conceptualizations, has been seen to be insightful of a combination of profitable academic and life results. Specifically, different examinations have shown that the more students are busy with their schoolwork, the practically certain they are to perform well educationally, fusing getting higher grades in their classes, similarly as higher scores on government endorsed tests (Finn & Rock, 1997; Newmann, Wehlage, & Lamborn, 1992; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; for reviews, Appleton et al., 2008; Fredrick's et al., 2004, National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2004). Finn (2006) further finds that students who were busier with school in eighth grade will undoubtedly enlist into and finally graduated class from school, regardless, while controlling for levels of insightful achievement in optional school.

A couple of scientists have additionally recommended that propelling engagement should be particularly helpful in getting the achievement opening (Lee & Shute, 2009). Moreover, student engagement has been clearly associated with decreased dropout in optional school (Finn, 1993; Finn & Rock, 1997). Certainly, as shown by the National Research Council and Institute of Medicine (2004), "Leaving auxiliary school is for certain students that continue to development in a long association through which students become isolated from school" (p. 24).

Taking into account an illustration of focus school students, Suldo et al., (2009) shows that higher excited engagement explicitly (coming about as a result of teacher support) was perceptive of more conspicuous enthusiastic success. In a longitudinal illustration of focus school students, Lewis, Huebner, Malone, and Valois (2011) uncovers bidirectional relations between life satisfaction and scholarly responsibility but not direct or excited responsibility—controlling for the effects of sex, race, academic achievement, and monetary status. Various examinations have moreover suggested that student engagement can fill in as a cautious factor against negative pointers of success, such as bad behavior, substance abuse, and hazardous sexual direct (O'Farrell & Morrison, 2003). Taken together, there is a great deal of verification for the benefits of student responsibility toward positive current and future insightful and life results.

There are similarly additional likely gains to student engagement. Right when a review lobby is stacked up with students who are centering, drawn in, taking a premium, mentally stimulated, and living it up, the educator is a ton bound to like being there and, subsequently, inclined to be more contributed (and less leaned to wear out). In one school change effort in England, Covell, McNeil, and Howe (2009) finds that growing student social engagement provoked diminished teacher burnout. Additionally, when engagement is high and disciplinary issues are immaterial, a more prominent measure of the instructor's time and effort can be spent on propelling learning, and less on managing interferences. Student engagement thus assembles benefits for the students and educators, but the entire learning environment.

Achievement Goals and Student Engagement

Relationship between Achievement Goals and Student Engagement.

According to Self-adequacy theory (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1991) and different

speculations of self-view of capacity (e.g., Covington, 1992) keep up with that students' self-impression of capacity (i.e., viability convictions) are emphatically identified with their degree of cognitive engagement in a task. Schunk (1991) has contended that having intellectual procedures that have demonstrated compelling in the past can improve a student's impression of capacity. In like manner, students who feel more certain about their capacity in regards to an assignment are bound to connect with their collection of techniques and continue in their utilization than students questioning their abilities. Examination looking at this relationship has discovered positive connections between proportions of apparent capacity and different pointers of cognitive engagement (Ames & Archer, 1988; Meece et al., 2006., Miller et al., 1993., Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990., Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons, 1990). Furthermore, a few investigations utilized causal demonstrating to show the credibility of causal associations between impression of capacity and accomplishment (Pajares & Miller, 1994; Randhawa, Beamer, & Lundberg, 1993; Zimmerman and Bandura). Achievement goals hypothesis has been one of the most unmistakable hypothetical structures to comprehend student inspiration and instructive results in school settings, including actual training. Achievement goals are portrayed as the reasons students see for engaging in achievement related practices, the implications they attribute to those practices (Ames, 1992; Dweck, 1986; Steinkamp and Maehr, 1983; Nicholls, 1989), or intellectual unique focal point of skill significant conduct (Elliot, 1997). They impact students' ways to deal with learning, performance, and achievement in schools.

Sense of belonging and Student Engagement. Students' feeling of social relatedness at school is a critical build in contemporary speculations of scholarly inspiration and commitment (Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Eccles, Wigfield, & Schiefele, 1998; Stipek, 2002). At the point when students experience a feeling of having a place at school and steady associations with teachers and schoolmates, they are persuaded to take part effectively and fittingly in the existence of the classroom (Anderman & Anderman, 1999; Birch & Ladd, 1997; Skinner & Belmont, 1993). Students' feeling of having a place at school has been connected both to draw in versus repelled school characters and to learning results (Battistich, Solomon, Watson, & Schaps, 1997; Skinner, Zimmer-Gembeck, & Connell, 1998).

During the beyond twenty years, there has been an increment in research on the significance of emotional teacher student relationship (TSRs) for students' school change. The nature of TSRs has been shown fundamentally connected with students' social working (Ladd, Birch, & Buhs, 1999), conduct issues (Graziano, Reavis, Keane, & Calkins, 2007), commitment in learning exercises (e.g., Skinner, Wellborn, & Connell, 1990), and scholarly accomplishment (Valiente, Lemery-Chalfant, Swanson, and Reiser, 2008). The impact of TSRs on students' school change appears to be dependable, student who attached to the school environment perform better than who lake belonging to school.

Relationship Among Study Variables

Achievement goals, student teacher relationship and student engagement.

Self-Self-determination theory (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991; Ryan & Powelson, 1991) clarifies the relationship between every one of the three variables sense of belonging, achievement goals, and Student engagement. As indicated by this hypothesis, a child is propelled when his three essential mental requirements should be satisfied, the needs for relatedness, for competence, and for autonomy. The child fulfill these necessities by showing inclusion in school, peers and with educators. Teacher helps to uphold these necessities when child feels apart of school and when student shows involvement, teacher provide framework by giving design (setting clear principles and being ensuing), and supporting independence (giving students opportunity to settle on their own decisions and showing associations among homework and students' inclinations to assist student with accomplishing their objectives. The educator engages students in such assignment in which they take interest and they can dominate. In case child' fundamental requirements are met, their engagement in learning exercises will build (Skinner and Belmont, 1993). Thus, they will perform better on school tests and get higher grades (Skinner et al., 1990) and they will ready to meet goals for which they took a crack at learning measure. Student association addresses the emotional component of educator student between activities and is theoretically gotten from connection hypothesis (Connell & Wellborn, 1991). In like manner, relatedness is associated with the idea of passionate security. These three supporting practices appear to be the main indicator of engagement (Skinner & Belmont, 1993; Tucker et al., 2002).

Role of Demographic Variable

Gender and student engagement. Examination on sex contrasts in point directions doesn't offer clear results. Some exploration found that there was an incredible relationship among sex and the kind of progress point directions student held in particular scholastic settings just as under various conditions. For instance, concentrates on shows that, for in excess of 50 years, undergrad ladies have dwarfed their male partners at U.S. schools and colleges (U.S. Department of Education, 2001. Peter and Horn, 2005). Albeit the quantity of four-year college educations granted to men has expanded during this period (King, 2006), undergrad enlistment at most baccalaureate-allowing foundations is about 55% female and rising (Wilson, 2007). Indeed, for each 100 men, one hundred and 33 ladies get a four-year certification (U.S. Department of Education, 2001 & 2007).

Gender differences and sense of belonging. According to (U.S. Department of Education, 2001 & 2007), researchers indicated that the number of children encountering difficulties in school settings has increased due to disconnection from self and society, and boy's ratio is high, boys in the most severe trouble. Current research regarding gender differences in educational settings at all socioeconomic levels suggests that young males are at increased risk for developing academic, social, and emotional difficulties resulting from a lack of belonging with society (Pollack, 1998).

Gender differences and achievement goals. Different researches had done to find the relationship between gender differences and achievement goals, for instance, according to previous studies which reported that gender differences in mastery/learning goal orientation of students support and favors females as compare males. Meece & Holt (1993) found that girls were more likely to set learning as a primary goal, on the other hand boys were more minded to have extrinsic or performance goals. These findings support the research of Makri-Botsori (2006) that, across grades, boys are inclined or show a higher interest in the challenge than girls. However, it partially contradicts the research of Chan and Chan (2005) that there is no significant gender difference in achievement goals (learning and performance goals) of teacher education students within the institution's boundaries.

Some other research reported that Obioye (1987) asserted that male learners tend to achieve higher in Mathematics than their female students in Nigeria. Hanna and

Kuendiger (1999) contended that achievement results in mathematics reported that girls were more successful than boys in Belgium, Thailand, Finland, Hungary, but least in France, Nigeria, Israel and the Netherlands. The findings of gender differences in the English language and overall academic performance also favour the traditionally held belief and reports that females perform significantly better than males in English/language (Marsh, Relich & Smith, 1983., Armstrong & Leo, 1998). Other studies (Roger et al., 1998) reported in their research that males performed significantly better than females in Mathematics.

Rationale of Study

The aim of present research is to explore the association between achievement goals and sense of belonging on student engagement. Significance of these constructs have been noted in academic settings (Elliot & Murrayama, 2008; Wellborn, 1991). Education is central to the success of every person. It is not merely a qualification or certificate. Education refers to the overall imparting of knowledge of personal, societal, cognitive, and physical development. So it is important to understand every element of education keenly. Student engagement is considering one of important factor of learning process because it is central to enhancing performance and academic growth of university students. It is important to delve deep into this aspect as it polishes the innate qualities of the student which helps students in their professional life after their education.

Student engagement is a notion that tends to encompass all the ABC components of learning it covers the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral patterns of learning, which requires a sense of belonging among students with reference to an academic context. This tends to help students to enhance the knowledge actively and effectively.

The aspect of sense of belonging and goals are directly or indirectly related to the level engagement, understanding these relations can help us grasp a better idea and concept of learning mechanisms as shown by numerous studies when students feel a sense of belonging at school and experience cooperative relationships with teachers and classmates, they are motivated to participate actively and confidently in the life of classroom as compare to those students who lack sense of belonging (Anderman & Anderman, 1999; Birch & Ladd, 1997; Skinner & Belmont, 1993). The achievement

goal approach is one of the prominent and leading frameworks in motivational psychology. It implies that we should understand students' motivation and behaviors in achievement situations by examining their endorsement of qualitatively different achievement goals (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002, Elliot, 1999, Nicholls, 1984, Wigfield & Cambria, 2010). For the present study, these main variables play a significant role in relation to student engagement.

Previous studies majorly work on school students, contrary to this, university students are aimed in this study. University students in generally fall into knocking the doors of practical life, this research thus aims to study engagement of this group in the learning process so that they can get benefitted maximally in order to become effective members of the society after completion of their studies. The outcome of this study will enable the fresh graduate or senior students to shape their mindset for the upcoming challenges, this particular group of students is very vulnerable to the tough and harsh realities of the practical life. They are unaware of the challenges ahead. Therefore, they fall prey to ignorance of such key concepts.

METHOD

Method**Objectives**

Current study was conducted to fulfill following objectives.

1. To study the relationship between sense of belonging, achievement goals and student engagement among university students.
2. To explore the role of demographics variables in relation to achievement goals, student sense of belonging, and student engagement.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were proposed for the variables under investigation.

1. Sense of belonging, mastery approach goals, mastery avoidance goals, performance approach goals will have positive relationship with student engagement among university students.
2. Performance avoidance goals will have a negative relationship with student engagement.
3. Approach goals will have stronger relationship with sense of belonging and student engagement than with avoidance goals among university students.
4. Mastery goals will have stronger relationship with sense of belonging and student engagement than with performance goals among university students.
5. Student engagement will be higher in female university students than male university students.

Operational Definitions

Variables of the study have been defined conceptually along with their operational definition below.

Sense of belonging. Sense of belonging is the feeling of being important, accepted and supported by the members of school environment, Sense of belonging is measure of how socially integrated a person feels in a particular environment (Steinkamp & Kelly, 1987).

Students' sense of belonging measured through student's sense of connectedness scale. The greater the score on Student Sense of Connectedness scale the greater is the students sense of belongingness (Pintrich et al., 2004).

Sense of belonging to school (SOBS). Sense of belonging to school, denotes students perceived belongingness and connectiveness to the institution where they study (Goodenow, 1993).

This was measured through on scores obtained on “relatedness of self with school”, a subscale of Students Sense of Connectedness Scale. The higher the score on scale the higher is the sense of belonging to school (Brew et al., 2004).

Sense of belonging to peers (SOBP). Refers to students' psychological affiliation or faith that they are connected to other students, it includes having similar or complementary characteristics to others, which allow a person to connect with other students (Hagerty, Williams, Coyne, & Early, 1996).

This construct was measured through “sense of belonging with peers” a subscale of Students Sense of Connectedness Scale, the greater the score on scale the more is the sense of belonging to the peer groups (Brew et al., 2004).

Achievement goals, Achievement goals are defined as “a future-focused cognitive representation that guides behavior to a competence-related end state that the individual is committed to either approach or avoid (Covington, 2000; Elliot, 2005).

Mastery approach goals. It was defined as a goal that “focus on attaining task-based or intrapersonal competence” (Elliot & Murayama, 2008, p.614).

Mastery-avoidance goal. It was defined as a goal that “focused on avoiding task-based or intrapersonal incompetence” (Elliot & Murayama, 2008, p.614).

Performance-approach goal. It was define as a goal “focused on attaining normative competence” (Elliot & Murayama, 2008, p.614).

Performance-avoidance goal. It was defined as a goal “focused on avoiding normative competence” (Elliot & Murayama, 2008, p.614).

These subscales were operationalized using the mastery approach, mastery avoidance, performance approach and performance avoidance subscales of Achievement Goal Questionnaire-Revised. High scores on these subscales of Achievement Goals Questionnaire-Revised indicate higher incidence of respective goal domain.

Student engagement. Student engagement is the degree of involvement of a student in academic learning activities. The educational institution further provides aid to maintain learning of students. It also measures the extent to which how much time and energy is given by a learner in an academic situation(Wellborn, 1991).

Student engagement is a multidimensional construct. Student who scores high on Student Engagement Scale means that they highly engage in their educational activities.

Agenticengagement. The term agentic engagement is defined as the degree to which a learner contributes constructively to the learning process he/she receive.

Behavioral engagement. The term behavioral engagement is defined as the degree of different range of behaviors to which a learner participates in academic and nonacademic activities.

Emotional engagement. The term emotional engagement refers to efficient reaction and interaction between learner, peers, teachers, and classroom.

Cognitive engagement. The term cognitive engagement involves critical thinking and cognition in learning, self-regulation, planning, and learning goals.

Current study measured facets of student engagement through scores obtained on respective subscales, agentic engagement, behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement. Where high score indicates more of respective component of engagement.

Instruments

Three scales were used in the study, which are as follow:

Student Sense of Connectedness Scale. Student Sense of Connectedness Scale was developed by Brew in (2004) to measure student sense of belonging. The scale has two subscales of students sense of belonging with school and student sense of belonging with peers, 'Sense of belonging to school is measured with 7 items (5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) and the sense of belonging with peers is measured with 6 items (1,2,3,4,7, and 8), it has 7 point likert type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree) to respond on items. The word school was replaced with department in the scale to reflect focus on university student population for this study (See Appendix 4).

Achievement Goals Questionnaire. This scale was developed by Elliot and Murayama (2008) was used to measure achievement goals. It included 12 items which has four subscales of goals (mastery approach, mastery avoidance, and performance approach and performance avoidance). Mastery approach items include 1, 3, and 7. Mastery avoidance items include 5, 9, and 11. Performance approach items include 2, 4, and 8. While performance avoidance items include 6,10, and 12. the reliabilities of subscales are(mastery approach = .84, mastery avoidance = .88, and performance approach = .92 and performance avoidance = .83 (Elliot & Murayama, 2008). The measure gives 4 subscales. The total score total score range of each subscale is 3-15.

Student Engagement Scale. Student Engagement Scale was developed by Wellborn (1991) that was used in the study to measure engagement of students in their academic activities. This scale has 22 items. The items of this scale are responded through five point response scale, from never scored as 1 to always scored as 5. Scoring done by adding all items of the scale. This scale has 4 subscales as agentic engagement subscale, behavioral engagement subscale, emotional engagement subscale, and cognitive engagement subscale. Agentic engagement has 5 items including 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8. Behavioral engagement has 5 items including 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10. Cognitive engagement has 8 items including 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22. Emotional engagement has 4 items include 11, 12, 13, and 14. for this study one of item was removed from emotional engagement, after reducing one of its item it reported good reliability which was .71. Total score on the subscale is obtained by adding all items of respective subscales. The reliabity of Student Engagement Scale is .78 and for subscales

it was (behavioral engagement .78, agentic engagement .83, cognitive engagement .78, and emotional engagement .88, (wellborn 1991).

Sample

Sample consisted of 290 university students from Islamabad and Rawalpindi. Targeted universities included Quaid-i-Azam University, NUML, and PIDE. The sampling method used was convenient sampling. Both male and female university students were part of the study. University students were between age of 18 to 33years. ($M = 22.58$, $SD = 2.80$). Students enrolled in Bachelors, Masters, and MPhil, degree programs.

Table 1

Frequency Table for Demographics Variables ($N=290$)

Demographics	<i>f</i>	%
Gender		
Male	185	68.8%
Female	105	36.2%
Marital Status		
Married	9	3.1%
Single	281	96.9%
Parental Status		
Separated	34	11.7%
Together	256	88.3%
Family System		
Nuclear	155	53.4%
Joint	135	46.6%
Residential		

Hostel	248	85.5%
Home	40	13.5%

Table 1 illustrates the various demographics obtained from the sample ($N = 290$). The age range was found to be in between 18 to 33 from which 56% were male and 43% were female. The data shows 85% of the participants were residing in hostels while 15% were day scholars. Furthermore 53% had nuclear family system and 46% had joint family system. Similarly according to the marital status 3% were married and 96% were unmarried. The data shows 11% parents are separated and 88% were living together, respectively.

Procedure

Data was collected using both online ($n = 50$), and in person ($n = 240$), platforms, proper informed consent was taken through written form and written consent form created virtually. They were given proper instructions after their permission and inform consent. Confidentiality of their responses was assured. They were instructed to read each statement carefully and respond honestly to all items of the scale as per their agreement and disagreement moreover they were told that there is no concept of right and wrong answer, they had the right to withdraw from the research whenever they wanted, the participants were instructed about how to fill questionnaire and if they had any problem they could ask to researcher without hesitation. Instructions were given in both written and verbal form that helped the respondents to fill questionnaire properly. They were appreciated for their time and response at the end

RESULTS

Chapter 3

Results

The current study aimed to explore the relationship between student sense of belonging, achievement goals, and student engagement. The study also explored the relationship of study variables with demographic variables including gender, age, semester, family system, and parental status. Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Statistical Science (SPSS 24.0 for Windows) for quantitative analyses. Considering the objectives of the study, following results were compiled on following lines.

Descriptive statistics were computed including the means, standard deviation, kurtosis and skewness of the data. Alpha coefficient was computed to check the internal consistency of scales. To find the relationship between sense of belonging, achievement goals and student engagement Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient were computed. Then mean comparison was done on demographics variables by using t-test and ANOVA.

Table 2

Reliabilities and Descriptive Statistics of the Measures (N = 290)

Scales	N	α	M	SD	Range		Skew	kurt
					Min	Max		
SSB	13	.91	69.61	14.44	91.00	69.67	-1.01	.45
SBS	7	.85	37.03	8.11	7.00	49.00	-1.03	.80
SBP	6	.86	32.52	7.28	11.00	42.00	-1.064	.46
MAP	3	.56	11.73	2.05	3.00	15.00	-1.37	.29
MA	3	.69	10.44	2.52	4.00	15.00	-.192	-.47
PAP	3	.68	11.07	2.36	3.00	15.00	-.62	.201
PA	3	.68	10.66	2.56	3.00	15.00	-.45	-.01
SE	22	.89	78.34	13.71	37.00	108.00	-.36	-.27
AE	5	.73	16.35	4.15	8.00	25.00	.02	-.73
BE	5	.72	18.44	3.90	6.00	25.00	-.510	-.23
EE	3	.71	11.46	2.50	3.00	15.00	-.491	-.30
CE	8	.82	28.78	5.81	11.00	40.00	-.351	-.36

Note. SSB = Sense of belonging, SBS = Sense of belonging to school, SSP = Sense of belonging to peers, MAP = Mastery approach, MA = mastery avoidance, PAP = performance Approach & PA = Performance avoidance, SE = Student engagement, BE = Behavior engagement, AE = Agentic engagement, CE=Cognitive engagement, EE = Emotional engagement.

Table 2 illustrate descriptive statistics, alpha-coefficient, mean, standard deviation, range, skewness, and kurtosis for all the scales and subscales. The reliability analysis indicates that the alpha coefficient of Sense of Belonging is .91 and its subscales ranged between .86 to .85. For the present study, the reliability coefficient for mastery approach was .56, mastery avoidance was .69, performance approach goal was .68 and for performance avoidance was .68. Furthermore, the reliability of Student Engagement Scale for present study is .89 and its subscales ranged from .71 to 82. For present study one of item was removed from emotional engagement, after reducing one of its item it reported good reliability which was .71. Moreover, the mean and standard

deviation are also in normal range. Also it can be observed that all scales and subscales have skewness and kurtosis within the range of -2 to +2 (George & Mallery, 2016).

Table 3

Correlation Matrix between Study Variables, and Age. (N = 290)

VAR	SSC	SBS	SBP	MAP	MA	PAP	PA	SE	BE	AE	CE	EE	Age
SSB	-	.95**	.93**	.48**	.24**	.48**	.23**	.57**	.46**	.43**	.45**	.47**	-.03
SBS		-	.77**	.42**	.26**	.44**	.25**	.55**	.43**	.44**	.41**	.45**	.04
SBP			-	.49**	.19**	.46**	.18**	.52**	.42**	.35**	.45**	.43**	-.07
MAP	.			-	.36**	.54**	.33**	.50**	.38**	.31**	.46**	.48**	-.04
MA					-	.39**	.63**	.32**	.24**	.21**	.33**	.22**	-.02
PAP						-	.49**	.41**	.34**	.22**	.37**	.40**	-.09
PA							-	.24**	.18**	.09	.28**	.19**	-.05
SE								-	.82**	.76**	.85**	.78**	.07
BE									-	.50**	.56**	.71**	.01
CE										-	.48**	.47**	.14*
AE											-	.55**	.04
EE												-	.03
AGE													-

Note. SSB = Sense of belonging, SBS = Sense of belonging to school, SSP = Sense of belonging to peers, MAP = Mastery approach, MA = Mastery avoidance, PAP = Performance approach goals, and, PA = Performance avoidance, SE = Student engagement, BE = Behavior engagement, AE = Agentic engagement, CE = Cognitive engagement, EE = Emotional engagement.

Table 3 displays the correlation matrix for sense of belonging and its subscales, achievement goals subscales, and student engagement and its subscales. Results shows that sense of belonging and its subscales are positively correlated ($p < .01$) with student engagement. It also shows that there is significant positive correlation between sense of belonging and mastery approach goals, Sense of belonging and mastery avoidance goals, sense of belonging and performance approach goals, and sense of belonging and performance avoidance goals. Results also shows that mastery approach goals, mastery avoidance goals, performance approach goals and performance avoidance goals shows positive correlation with student engagement and its subscales. It is important to note that correlation coefficients for approach goals are greater than those for avoidance goals. Likewise, correlation coefficients for mastery goals are greater than performance goals. Results also indicate that age has a significant positive correlation with cognitive engagement.

Table 4

Stepwise Regression Analysis to Predict Student Engagement From Mastery Approach Goals, Mastery Avoidance Goals, Performance Approach Goals and Performance Avoidance Goals (N = 290)

Predictors	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	<i>F</i>	95 % <i>CI</i>	
							<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
STEP 1								
Constant	38.90	4.06					30.91	46.90
MAP	3.36	.341	.503	.25	25.3	97.17	2.69	4.03
STEP 2								
Constant	34.81	4.20					26.54	43.08
MAP	2.61	.40	.40				1.88	3.45
PAP	1.10	.34	.19		.025	55.17	.419	1.78
Step 3								
Constant	32.03	4.3					23.91	40.60
MAP	2.49	.40	.37				1.70	3.29
PAP	.90	.35	.15	.			.204	1.60
MA	.67	.30	.12		.013	38.94	.078	1.26

Note. MAP = mastery approach goals, PAP = performance approach goals, and MA = mastery avoidance.

Table 4 indicates predicative role of achievement goals domains for student engagement. It is clear that mastery approach goals, performance approach goals and mastery avoidance have emerged as significant predictors. In intrinsic order mastery approach goals explained 25.3% variance in student engagement scores. Then additional 2.5 variance was added by performance approach goals. Then mastery approach goals added further 1.3% variance in student engagement scores.

Table 5

Stepwise Regression Analysis to Predict Student Engagement From Behavioural Engagement (N = 290)

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	<i>F</i>	95%CL	
							<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
STEP 1								
Constant	9.94	1.23					7.51	12.38
MAP	.72	.10	.38	.14		48.69	.520	.929
STEP 2								
Constant	8.79	1.2					6.27	11.31
MAP	.52	.12	.27				.28	.769
PAP	.31	.10	.18		2.2	29.31	.10	.519

Note. MAP = mastery approach goals, PAP = performance approach goals.

Table 5 indicate predicative role of achievement goals domains for Behavioural engagement. It is clear that mastery approach goals, and performance approach goals have emerged as significant predictors. In intrinsic order mastery approach goals explained 14.2% variance in behavioural engagement score, and additional 2.2% variance was added by performance approach goals.

Table 6

Stepwise Regression Analysis to Predict Student Engagement from Cognitive Engagement (N = 290)

Predictors	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2	<i>F</i>	95 % <i>CI</i>	
							<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
STEP 1								
Constant	13.47	1.76					10.00	16.94
MAP	1.30	.14	.46	.212		77.52	1.01	1.59
STEP 2								
Constant	11.17	1.85					7.51	14.82
MAP	1.11	.15	.39				.803	1.59
MA	.44	.12	.19		3.2	46.22	.190	.690

Note. MAP = mastery approach goals, MA = mastery avoidance goals

Table 6 indicate predictive role of achievement goals domains for cognitive engagement. Results indicate that mastery approach goals, and performance approach goals have emerged as significant predictors. In step1 mastery approach goals explained 21.2% variance in cognitive engagement scores. Then in step 3.2 % variance was added by performance approach goals.

Table 7

Stepwise Regression analysis to predict student engagement from agentic engagement (N = 290)

Predictor	B	SE	B	R ²	ΔR ²	F	95 % CI	
							LL	UL
STEP1								
Constant	8.87	1.34					6.21	11.52
MAP	.63	.11	.31	.21	9.9	31.65	.415	.861

Note. MAP = mastery approach goals, PAP = performance approach goals.

Table 7 indicate predictive role of achievement goals domains for agentic engagement. Results indicate that mastery approach goals have emerged as significant predictor. Result shows that mastery approach goals explained 9.9% variance in agentic engagement scores.

Table 8

Stepwise Regression Analysis to Predict Student Engagement from Emotional Engagement (N = 290)

Predictors	B	SE	β	R ²	ΔR ²	F	95 % CI	
							LL	UL
STEP1								
Constant	4.63	.75					3.15	6.12
MAP	.58	.06	.47	.226	22.4	8.41	.456	.706
STEP 2								
Constant	3.86	.77					2.33	5.40
MAP	.45	.07	.36				.304	.596
PAP	.20	.06	.197		2.8	48.74	.082	.335

Note. MAP = mastery approach goals, PAP = performance approach goals.

Table 8 indicate predictive role of achievement goals domains for cognitive engagement. Results indicate that mastery approach goals, and performance approach have emerged as

significant predictors. In intrinsic order mastery approach goals explained 22.6% variance in cognitive engagement scores. Then additional 2.8% variance was added by performance approach goals.

Table 9

Stepwise Regression Analysis to Predict Student Engagement from Sense of Belonging to School (N = 290)

Predictor	B	SE	β	R ²	ΔR^2	F	95 % CI	
							LL	UL
STEP 1								
Constant	44.15	3.18					37.89	50.42
SBS	.92	.08	.54	.297	2.9	120.96	.76	1.09

Note. SE = student engagement, SBS = sense of belonging to school.

Table 9 indicate predictive role of sense of belonging to school for student engagement. Results indicate that sense of belonging to school has emerged as significant predictor. Result shows that sense of belonging to school explained 2.9% variance in student engagement scores.

Table 10

Stepwise Regression Analysis to Predict Student Engagement from Sense of Belonging to School (N = 290)

Predictor	B	SE	β	R ²	ΔR^2	F	95 % CI	
							LL	UL
STEP 1								
Constant	46.60	3.17					40.34	52.85
SBP	.97	.09	.51	.267	2.6	104.80	.788	1.16

Note. SE = student engagement, SBS = sense of belonging to peers.

Table 10 indicate predictive role of sense of belonging to peers for student engagement. Results indicate that sense of belonging to peers has emerged as significant predictor. Result shows that sense of belonging to peers explained 2.6% variance in student engagement scores.

Table 11

Independent Sample t-test for Gender Difference on Study Variables (N=290)

Variables	Gender				<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	95% <i>CI</i>		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	Men		Women				<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>					
SSB	68.89	14.92	70.88	13.5	-0.43	2.62	-5.37	1.40	-
SBS	36.58	8.26	37.80	7.79	-1.24	.22	-3.12	.708	-
SBP	32.30	7.65	32.88	6.59	-.676	.51	-2.26	1.10	-
MAP	11.64	2.10	11.86	1.94	-.89	.38	-.700	.264	-
MA	10.30	2.51	10.67	2.51	-1.19	.23	-.97	.237	-
PAP	10.88	2.45	11.40	2.16	-1.90	.06	-1.07	.019	-
PA	10.57	2.69	10.81	2.28	-.770	.42	-.85	.37	-
SE	77.31	13.35	80.18	14.2	-.733	.08	-6.23	.494	-
AE	15.99	4.07	16.98	4.23	-1.93	.04	-1.99	.019	.63
BE	18.39	3.92	18.52	3.87	-.27	.78	-1.06	.808	-
CE	28.36	5.78	29.53	5.79	-1.64	.10	-2.55	.233	-
EE	11.34	2.50	11.65	2.49	-1.01	.309	-.913	.290	-

Note. SSB = Sense of belonging, SBS = Sense of belonging to school, SSP = Sense of belonging to peers, MAP = Mastery approach, MA= mastery avoidance, PAP = performance Approach, PA = Performance avoidance, SE = Student engagement, BE = Behavior engagement, AE = Agentic engagement, CE = Cognitive engagement, EE = Emotional engagement.

Table 11 reflects the gender differences among university students on study variables. The gender differences were found to be significant only for agentic engagement ($p = .04$). With reference to agentic engagement women scored higher than men. Whereas gender differences were

non-significant for sense of belonging and for its domains and for domains of achievement goals.

Table 12

Independent Sample t-test for Parental Relationship Status on Study Variables (N=290)

Variable	Parental Status				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	95 % <i>CI</i>		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	Separated		Living Together				<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>					
SSB	64.32	17.06	70.31	13.94	-4.43	.32	-11.14	-.840	-
SBS	34.14	10.54	37.41	7.66	-2.22	.08	-3.26	1.46	-
SBP	30.17	8.55	32.82	7.05	-1.73	.84	-5.75	-.048	-
MAP	11.05	2.50	11.81	1.96	-1.69	.19	-1.66	.148	-
MA	10.38	2.33	10.44	2.54	-.155	.53	-.93	.801	-
PAP	10.20	2.66	11.18	2.30	-2.05	.31	-1.94	-.014	-
PA	10.00	2.90	10.75	2.49	-1.44	.54	-1.80	.300	-
SE	72.29	14.18	79.15	13.47	-4.32	.01	-12.05	-1.65	.49
AE	15.05	3.53	16.52	4.20	1.94	.04	-12.05	.019	.39
BE	17.44	4.15	18.57	3.85	-1.50	.53	-2.65	.387	-
CE	26.29	6.06	29.11	5.70	-2.56	.77	-5.04	-.597	-
EE	10.67	3.14	11.56	2.39	-1.94	.12	-2.01	24.5	-

Note. SSB = Sense of belonging, SBS = Sense of belonging to school, SSP = Sense of belonging to peers, MAP = Mastery approach, MA= mastery avoidance, PAP = performance Approach, PA = Performance avoidance, SE = Student engagement, BE = Behavior engagement, AE = Agentic engagement, CE = Cognitive engagement, EE = Emotional engagement.

Table 13 displays the mean differences regarding parental status on study variables among university students. The parental status differences were found to be significant only for student engagement ($p < .05$) and agentic engagement, It is depicted that students whose parents are living

together scored higher than those students whose parents are separated. Furthermore results show non-significant differences with domains of student engagement, sense of belonging and for its subscales. Results also indicate that parental status has nonsignificant mean differences on mastery approach goals, mastery avoidance goals, performance approach goals, and performance avoidance goals.

DISCUSSION

Chapter 4

Discussion

The aim of the present research was to study the relationship between student sense of belonging, student engagement, and achievement goals among university students. The sample consisted of 290 students of university including 185 male and 105 female students. The data was collected through convenience sampling technique. All the data was gathered from university with the age range of 18 to 33 years. Demographic variables of the study included age, gender, department, GPA, marital status, parental relationship status, family system, place of residence, family status. The study variables were assessed with Student Sense of Connectedness Scale (Brew et al., 2004), Student Engagement Scale (Wellborn, 1991) and Achievement Goals Questionnaire. The Chronbach's alpha reliability of Student Sense of Connectedness Scale reported in the present study was .91, for Achievement Goals Questionnaire it was reported .83, and for Student Engagement Scale it was .77 respectively.

The sample consisting of $N = 290$ students were taken from Islamabad and Rawalpindi. Demographic variables were analyzed along with study variables to understand the relationship deeply. Descriptive statistics were assessed for all scales and subscales of research. The skewness and kurtosis proposed that scores of Student Sense of Connectedness Scale, Achievement Goals Questionnaire, and Student Engagement Scale were normally distributed.

According to the first hypothesis of the study, sense of belonging, mastery approach goals mastery avoidance goals, performance approach goals will have positive relationship with student engagement among university students. The computed analysis of correlation indicated for a positive relationship between sense of belonging and student engagement (see table 3). Moreover, this assumption was also tested by using regression analysis on the domains of sense of belonging, Results favour the hypothesis as sense of belonging to school and sense of belonging to peers positively predicted student engagement (see table 9 & 10). Many of the recent work done on the function of belonging and perceived support between private and government schools. It is assumed that when pupils feel "out of place at school" they are less likely to engage in the behaviours or patterns advocated and encouraged by the institution (Battistich & Hom,

1997., Battistich Solomon, Kim Watson, & Schaps, 1995). This explains that student engagement is mostly dependent on student belongingness with his surroundings, as if he/she feels connected to his/her institution, this encourages student to engage in school activities actively. In school settings, researchers have noted that school belonging significantly and positively affect several motivational measures such as expectancy of success, valuation of schoolwork, and self-reported effort (Goodenow, 1993a). Enhancing school belonging can also have a positive effect on academic achievement and school engagement.

Some other researchers acknowledged that lack of contact with teachers and peers results in disengagement. It was suggested by a decline in students' interest in schoolwork and increased disciplinary issues (Eccles et al., 1993). Finding of the current study is also in line with previous studies which reported that sense of belonging of students is so contributing to effort, persistence, and engagement of student learning

According to first hypothesis mastery approach goals, mastery avoidance goals, performance approach goals and performance avoidance goals will have positive relationship with student engagement. The computed analysis of correlation indicated for a positive relationship between achievement goals domains including (mastery approach goals, mastery avoidance goals, and performance approach goals), and student engagement among university students (see table 3). Furthermore this assumption was tested by using regression analysis, Outcome favors hypothesis as achievement goals domains including (mastery approach goals, mastery avoidance goals, and performance approach goals) positively predict student engagement among university students (see table 4). Achievement goal theory has been the most influential frameworks to comprehend student motivation and educational outcomes in academic settings, including physical education. Achievement goals are defined as the aims or objectives students view or perceive for participating in achievement related activities and the meaning they give to it or the cognitive-dynamic aspect of competence relevant behaviour. These goals shape students' outlook on learning, performance or participation, and achievement in educational setting (Elliot 1997), This explains that engagement is contributed by goals, as they are future oriented, and students involve themselves in leaning to achieve their set

goals. It also means that it is very important to set goals so as to involve in learning environment (Ames, 1992., Dweck, 1986., Maehr, 1983., Nicholls, 1989).

This backs previous research that showed how mastery goals and performance goals work and also help in improving the attempts to engage students more by positive interventions (Harackiewicz et al. 2002. Hsieh et al. 2007, Locke & Latham, 2006).

Mastery-approach orientation was closely and repeatedly associated to student engagement for both sophomores and senior students alike across the different markers of engagement. This result is aligned with past research showing that the students who set learning goals to master work are more likely to receive better results and have command over topics and are likely to have higher GPAs than counterparts (Harackiewicz et al., 2002. Hsieh et al. 2007, Locke & Latham, 2006). Finding from this study are also in line with previous studies which reported that sense of belonging of students is so contributing to effort, persistence and engagement of student learning

According to second hypothesis performance avoidance will have negative relationship with student engagement among university students. Contrary to hypothesized negative relationship (hypothesis 2) there is also positive relationship has been observed between performance avoidance and student engagement in present study (see table 3). In the previous researches. Elliot and Reis (2003) found negative relationship between performance avoidance and student engagement as student who avoid to perform in school, automatically his/her involvement in school activities decreases as compare to those students who try to perform better. However, regarding positive relation in the present study are worth considering.

According to third hypothesis approach goals will have stronger relationship with sense of belonging and student engagement than with avoidance goals among university students. This assumption was tested by using correlation analysis, results favor hypothesis as approach goals have stronger relationship with student engagement than with avoidance goals among university student (see table 3). these findings have partial support in Elliot and Reis (2003) research, who have found that high approach type goals are positively related to the involvement of student and negatively related to the avoidance.

The distinction between approach and avoidance motivation was acknowledged by researchers and theorists early in the study of achievement behavior. The first experiment on the level of aspiration conducted by Hoppe (1930) in Kurt Lewin's laboratory proposed the two independent motivational orientations to account for achievement behavior, the desire for success and avoiding failure. Approach goals are related to success and avoidance goals are related to failure, so approach goals are better predictor of student engagement as compared to avoidance goals

Furthermore, approach goals are theorized to lead to positive achievement outcomes, while performance-avoidance goals result in a “helpless pattern of achievement outcomes” (Elliot & Church, 1997, p. 218). In school settings, however, some results suggest that performance-avoidance goals may have empty associations with achievement variables such as effort, Normative incompetence in a very public setting like school settings can embarrass and reduce a student's social status among peers. In basic terms, students may exert more significant levels of effort because they do not want their friends to see them perform poorly compared with others (Garn & Sun, 2009; Guan et al., 2006).

According to fourth hypothesis mastery goals will have stronger relationship with sense of belonging and student engagement than with performance goals among university students. This assumption was tested by using correlation analysis. Outcome favors hypothesis as mastery goals have stronger relationship with student engagement than performance goals among university students (see table 3). In the line with findings from previous research and from the perspective of achievement goal theory, students who adopt mastery goals are expected to persist in the face of difficult events, seek challenging activities, and have high intrinsic motivation (Ames, 1992b, Dweck, 1986., Nicholls, 1984) all of which contributes to bring involvement in studies. In comparison, students who adopt performance goals are expected to minimally persist in the face of difficult events, avoid challenging activities, and have low intrinsic motivation (Ames, 1992b., Dweck, 1986., Nicholls, 1984). Mastery goals have consistently been linked to a positive set of processes and outcomes such as deep processing of study materials, long term retention of information, adaptive attribution patterns of success and failure, and

appropriate help-seeking behaviors (Ames, 1992b., Elliot, 1999., Weiner, 1990, 1994, 2000). However, the effects of pursuing performance goals are less clear.

Some studies have found that adoption of performance goals has negative effects when accompanied by low perceived competence (Elliot & Church, 1997., Elliot & Dweck, 1988), whereas other studies have supported these effects (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996., Harackiewicz & Elliot, 1993). As a result, achievement goal theory has undergone a number of theoretical advances.

According to fifth hypothesis student engagement will be higher in female university student as compare to male university students, this assumption was tested by using t-test analysis, The results of the study found that there were no gender differences. Results were nonsignificant, which indicate that there were no differences between male and female students on student engagement, student sense of belonging and achievement goals among university students. The findings can be attributed to the target population for the study allows for equalent exposure to both male and female students.

According to Pace (1990), there are no substantial differences in the quality of effort put out by men and women. As a result, there were no significant differences in progress toward specific goals between men and women. Zhao, Kuh, and Carini (2005) found no apparent link between gender and student involvement, stating that male students scored higher in student engagement at times, while female students showed more attention at other times. When it comes to gender inequalities, Hu and Kuh (2002) discovered that male students were either disengaged or under-engaged when compared to female students, Female students, on the other hand, scored higher on average than male students, according to Kuh (2003).

Krause et al. (2003) pointed out nonsignificant gender differences between peers class interactions. Tison et al. (2011) reported that the relationship between gender and student engagement is related to the facets or indices of student engagement. In line with this a difference has been found in an affective engagement where female students scored higher.

Conclusion

This research has looked into the relationship between sense of belonging, achievement goals and students' engagement. Findings have indicated that sense of

belonging had a positive relationship with achievement goals and student engagement. Findings also indicated that sense of belonging and achievement goals positively affect student engagement. Moreover agentic engagement was found to be higher among men. Furthermore, it was seen that married students were higher than single students on student engagement. it is also depicted that students whose parents are living together scored higher on student engagement than whose parents are separated.

Limitation and Suggestion

The limitation of the present study includes sample size. The sample size is comparatively small, which might not represent the general population. Furthermore, the findings are limited to university students. As we investigated student sense of belonging and achievement goals only while there are also other essential variables which effect student engagement more than the study variables. So, we do not generalize the results to overall population. Hence, other essential variables may also be investigated and reported in further studies in order to get more information to enhance performance of students in variety of educational systems.

Another major limitation of the research study is that it is based on self-report information. Often people tend to reveal positive aspects of their personality but hide negative aspects such as lack of interest in studies and less involvement which does not reveals actual information. Moreover, the demographic sheet was quite lengthy because of this participant get bored. So, it is suggested that short demographic sheet should be made.

Implications

This study will lay foundation for further research on student engagement, to better understand the impact of student engagement on students' performance and academic activities during learning. Moreover, the research will reveal the importance of student engagement and their vital roles in developing sense of belonging and retention. The findings will increase awareness among people and educational institutions of how well student engagement play role in subjective wellbeing of students.

In addition, it will provide information for further literature. There are many research done on student engagement but in Pakistan researches, very little evidence is

found on student engagement. To bridge this gap, the research will provide great information to add into Pakistani literature.

This study will not only be useful for research but also for the teachers. It will guide teachers to know how student engagement can affect interactions and performance in learning settings. Similarly, the students will also take benefit from this finding; they would know the importance of their engagement and their influence on their performance and grades. It may also serve guidance for school psychologist who intends to manage problematic and unethical behaviors in learning settings.

REFERENCES

References

- Allen, K. A., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Waters, L. (2017). School values: A comparison of academic motivation, mental health promotion, and school belonging with student achievement. *The Educational and Developmental Psychologist, 34*(1), 31-47.
- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3), 261.
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(3), 260.
- Anderman, L. H., & Anderman, E. M. (1999). Social predictors of changes in students' achievement goal orientations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 24*(1), 21-37.
- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*(5), 369-386.
- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(5), 427-445.
- Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4*(3), 359-373.
- Baranik, L. E., Barron, K. E., & Finney, S. J. (2007). Measuring goal orientation in a work domain: Construct validity evidence for the 2× 2 framework. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 67*(4), 697-718.
- Baranik, L. E., Stanley, L. J., Bynum, B. H., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Examining the construct validity of mastery-avoidance achievement goals: A meta-analysis. *Human Performance, 23*(3), 265-282.
- Battistich, V., & Hom, A. (1997). The relationship between students' sense of their school as a community and their involvement in problem behaviors. *American Journal of Public Health, 87*(12), 1997-2001.

- Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Kim, D. I., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1995). Schools as communities, poverty levels of student populations, and students' attitudes, motives, and performance: A multilevel analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 627-658.
- Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1997). Caring school communities. *Educational Psychologist*, 32(3), 137-151.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497.
- Birch, S. H., & Ladd, G. W. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35(1), 61-79.
- Brew, C., Beatty, B., & Watt, A. (2004, December). Measuring students' sense of connectedness with school. In *Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Melbourne*.
- Brown, J. M., & Miller, W. R. (1993). Impact of motivational interviewing on participation and outcome in residential alcoholism treatment. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 7(4), 211.
- Bryson, C., & Hand, L. (2007). The role of engagement in inspiring teaching and learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44(4), 349-362.
- Buhs, E. S., Ladd, G. W., & Herald, S. L. (2006). Peer exclusion and victimization: Processes that mediate the relation between peer group rejection and children's classroom engagement and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 1.
- Christenson, S., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (2012). *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement* (Vol. 840). New York: Springer.
- Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system processes.
- Connell, J. P., Spencer, M. B., & Aber, J. L. (1994). Educational risk and resilience in African-American youth: Context, self, action, and outcomes in school. *Child Development*, 65(2), 493-506.

- Covell, K., McNeil, J. K., & Howe, R. B. (2009). Reducing teacher burnout by increasing student engagement: A children's rights approach. *School Psychology International, 30*(3), 282-290.
- Covington, M. V. (1992). *Making the grade: A Self-Worth Perspective on Motivation and School Reform*. Cambridge University Press.
- Covington, M. V. (2000). Goal theory, motivation, and school achievement: An integrative review. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*(1), 171-200.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268.
- Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist, 26*(3-4), 325-346.
- Dennis, J. M., Phinney, J. S., & Chuateco, L. I. (2005). The role of motivation, parental support, and peer support in the academic success of ethnic minority first-generation college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(3), 223-236.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist, 41*(10), 1040-1044.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*(2), 256-261.
- Dykman, B. M. (1998). Integrating cognitive and motivational factors in depression: initial tests of a goal-orientation approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(1), 139-142.
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 109-132.
- Eccles, J. S., Wigfield, A., & Schiefele, U. (1998). Motivation to succeed. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 1017-1095).
- Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist, 34*(3), 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). Guilford Publications.
- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(1), 218-219.
- Elliot, A. J., & Dweck, C. S. (2005). Competence and Motivation: Competence as the Core of Achievement Motivation. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 3–12).
- Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 461.
- Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 461.
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2×2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(3), 501.
- Elliot, A. J., & Murayama, K. (2008). On the measurement of achievement goals: critique, illustration, and application. *Journal of educational psychology*, 100(3), 613.
- Elliot, A. J., & Reis, H. T. (2003). Attachment and exploration in adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 317.
- Elliot, A. J., & Sheldon, K. M. (1997). Avoidance achievement motivation: a personal goals analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 171.
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, 82(5), 804.
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2004). The intergenerational transmission of fear of failure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(8), 957-971.

- Elliot, A. J., Murayama, K., & Pekrun, R. (2011). A 3 × 2 achievement goal model. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(3), 632-648.
- Finn, J. D., & Rock, D. A. (1997). Academic success among students at risk for school failure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(2), 221.
- Finn, J. D., & Voelkl, K. E. (1993). School characteristics related to student engagement. *The Journal of Negro Education, 62*(3), 249-268.
- Finn, J. D., Pannozzo, G. M., & Achilles, C. M. (2003). The “why’s” of class size: Student behavior in small classes. *Review of Educational Research, 73*(3), 321-368.
- Fredricks, J.A., & McColskey, W. (2012). The measurement of student engagement: A comparative analysis of various methods and student self-report instruments. In *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement* (pp. 763-782). Springer, Boston, MA.
- 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*(1), 59-109.
- Fryer, J. W., & Elliot, A. J. (2008). Self-regulation of achievement goal pursuit. *Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning: Theory, Research, and Applications, 53-75*.
- Furrer, C., & Skinner, E. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(1), 148-162.
- Galloway, D., Rogers, C., Armstrong, D., & Leo, E. (1998). Motivating the difficult to teach. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 46*(4), 479-480.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., Seltzer, K., & Valdés, G. (2017). *The translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, T., & Pintrich, P. R. (1991). Student Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning: A LISREL Model.
- Garn, A., & Sun, H. (2009). Approach-avoidance motivational profiles in early adolescents to the PACER fitness test. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 28*(4), 400-421.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2016). Frequencies. In *IBM SPSS Statistics 23 Step by Step* (pp. 115-125). New York Routledge.

- Goodenow, C. (1992). School motivation, engagement, and sense of belonging among urban adolescent students.
- Goodenow, C. (1993). Classroom belonging among early adolescent students: Relationships to motivation and achievement. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 13*(1), 21-43.
- Goodenow, C., & Grady, K. E. (1993). The relationship of school belonging and friends' values to academic motivation among urban adolescent students. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 62*(1), 60-71.
- Graziano, P. A., Reavis, R. D., Keane, S. P., & Calkins, S. D. (2007). The role of emotion regulation in children's early academic success. *Journal of School Psychology, 45*(1), 3-19.
- Hagerty, B. M., Lynch-Sauer, J., Patusky, K. L., Bouwsema, M., & Collier, P. (1992). Sense of belonging: A vital mental health concept. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 6*(3), 172-177.
- Hagerty, B. M., Williams, R. A., Coyne, J. C., & Early, M. R. (1996). Sense of belonging and indicators of social and psychological functioning. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 10*(4), 235-244.
- Handelsman, M. M., Briggs, W. L., Sullivan, N., & Towler, A. (2005). A measure of college student course engagement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 98*(3), 184-192.
- Harackiewicz, J.M., Barron, K.E., Pintrich, P.R., Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Revision of achievement goal theory: Necessary and illuminating. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(3), 638-645.
- Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Tauer, J. M., & Elliot, A. J. (2002). Predicting success in college: A longitudinal study of achievement goals and ability measures as predictors of interest and performance from freshman year through graduation. *Journal of Educational*

- Psychology*, 94(3), 562.
- Harper, S. R. (2009). Race-conscious student engagement practices and the equitable distribution of enriching educational experiences. *Liberal Education*, 95(4), 38-45.
- Harris III, F., & Bensimon, E. M. (2007). The equity scorecard: A collaborative approach to assess and respond to racial/ethnic disparities in student outcomes. *New Directions for Student Services*, (120), 77-84.
- Hausmann, L. R., Schofield, J. W., & Woods, R. L. (2007). Sense of belonging as a predictor of intentions to persist among African American and White first-year college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(7), 803-839.
- Hsieh, P., Sullivan, J. R., & Guerra, N. S. (2007). A closer look at college students: Self-efficacy and goal orientation. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 18(3), 454-476.
- Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Being (dis) engaged in educationally purposeful activities: The influences of student and institutional characteristics. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(5), 555-575.
- Hulleman, C.S., Schrager, S.M., Bodmann, S.M., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2010). A meta-analytic review of achievement goal measures: Different labels for the same constructs or different constructs with similar labels?. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(3), 422.
- Hurtado, S., & Ponjuan, L. (2005). Latino educational outcomes and the campus climate. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4(3), 235-251.
- Hymel, S., Comfort, C., Schonert-Reichl, K., & McDougall, P. (1996). Academic failure and school dropout: The influence of peers. In J. Juvonen & K. R. Wentzel (Eds.), *Social motivation: Understanding children's school adjustment* (pp. 313-345). Cambridge University Press.
- Jimerson, S. R., Campos, E., & Greif, J. L. (2003). Toward an understanding of definitions and measures of school engagement and related terms. *The California School Psychologist*, 8(1), 7-27.
- Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(5), 758-773.
- Kaplan, A., & Maehr, M. L. (2007). The contributions and prospects of goal orientation

- theory. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19(2), 141-184.
- Kaplan, S. A., Roehrborn, C. G., Rovner, E. S., Carlsson, M., Bavendam, T., & Guan, Z. (2006). Tolterodine and tamsulosin for treatment of men with lower urinary tract symptoms and overactive bladder: a randomized controlled trial. *Jama*, 296(19), 2319-2328.
- Kember, D., Lee, K., & Li, N. (2001). Cultivating a sense of belonging in part-time students. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20(4), 326-341.
- Kethineni, S., Blimling, L., Bozarth, J. M., & Gaines, C. (2004). Youth violence: An exploratory study of a treatment program in a central Illinois county. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 48(6), 697-720.
- King, L. A., Hicks, J. A., Krull, J. L., & Del Gaiso, A. K. (2006). Positive affect and the experience of meaning in life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(1), 179.
- Klasik, D., & Strayhorn, T. L. (2018). The complexity of college readiness: Differences by race and college selectivity. *Educational Researcher*, 47(6), 334-351.
- Krause, K. L., & Coates, H. (2008). Students' engagement in first-year university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 493-505.
- Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE: Benchmarks for effective educational practices. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 35(2), 24-32.
- Ladd, G. W., Birch, S. H., & Buhs, E. S. (1999). Children's social and scholastic lives in kindergarten: Related spheres of influence?. *Child Development*, 70(6), 1373-1400.
- Lamborn, S., Newmann, F., & Wehlage, G. (1992). The significance and sources of Student engagement. *Student Engagement and Achievement in American Secondary Schools*, 11-39.
- Lee, J., & Shute, V. J. (2009). The influence of noncognitive domains on academic achievement in k-12. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2009(2), 1-51.
- Lewis, A. D., Huebner, E. S., Malone, P. S., & Valois, R. F. (2011). Life satisfaction and student engagement in adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(3), 249-262.
- Libbey, H. P. (2004). Measuring student relationships to school: Attachment, bonding, connectedness, and engagement. *The Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 274-283.

- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Motivation as an enabler for academic success. *School Psychology Review, 31*(3), 313-327.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*(5), 265-268.
- Marsh, H. W., Relich, J. D., & Smith, I. D. (1983). Self-concept: The construct validity of interpretations based upon the SDQ. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*(1), 173-187.
- Matthews, K. E., Andrews, V., & Adams, P. (2011). Social learning spaces and student engagement. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30*(2), 105-120.
- Meece, J. L., & Holt, K. (1993). A pattern analysis of students' achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(4), 582-590.
- Meece, J. L., Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2006). Classroom goal structure, student motivation, and academic achievement. *Annu. Rev. Psychol., 57*, 487-503.
- Midgley, C., Kaplan, A., & Middleton, M. (2001). Performance-approach goals: Good for what, for whom, under what circumstances, and at what cost?. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*(1), 77-86.
- Mounts, N. S. (2004). Contributions of parenting and campus climate to freshmen adjustment in a multiethnic sample. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19*(4), 468-491.
- Murdock, T. B. (1999). The social context of risk: Status and motivational predictors of alienation in middle school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(1), 62-75.
- Newman, R. S., & Schwager, M. T. (1992). Student perceptions and academic help-seeking. *Student Perceptions in the Classroom, 123-146*.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review, 91*(3), 328-346.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1989). *The Competitive Ethos and Democratic Education*. Harvard University Press.

- Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom: Applying self-determination theory to educational practice. *Theory and Research in Education, 7*(2), 133-144.
- O'Farrell, S. L., & Morrison, G. M. (2003). A factor analysis exploring school bonding and related constructs among upper elementary students. *The California School Psychologist, 8*(1), 53-72.
- Ostrove, J. M., & Long, S. M. (2007). Social class and belonging: Implications for college adjustment. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*(4), 363-389.
- Pace, C. R. (1990). The Undergraduates: A Report of Their Activities and Progress in College in the 1980's.
- Pajares, F., & Miller, M. D. (1994). Role of self-efficacy and self-concept beliefs in mathematical problem solving: A path analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(2), 193-202.
- Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2005). First-and second-generation college students: A comparison of their engagement and intellectual development. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(3), 276-300.
- Pike, G. R., Kuh, G. D., & Gonyea, R. M. (2003). The relationship between institutional mission and students' involvement and educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(2), 241-261.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). An achievement goal theory perspective on issues in motivation terminology, theory, and research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 92-104.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Multiple goals, multiple pathways: The role of goal orientation in learning and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(3), 544.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 451-502). Academic Press.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review, 16*(4), 385-407.

- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 33.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Zusho, A. (2002). Student motivation and self-regulated learning in the college classroom. In *Higher education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (pp. 55-128). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Pittman, L. D., & Richmond, A. (2008). University belonging, friendship quality, and psychological adjustment during the transition to college. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 76*(4), 343-362.
- Pittman, L. D., & Richmond, A. (2008). University belonging, friendship quality, and psychological adjustment during the transition to college. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 76*(4), 343-362.
- Pollack, J. B., & Blair, A. D. (1998). Co-evolution in the successful learning of backgammon strategy. *Machine Learning, 32*(3), 225-240.
- Randhawa, B. S., Beamer, J. E., & Lundberg, I. (1993). Role of mathematics self-efficacy in the structural model of mathematics achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(1), 41.
- Rick, D. A., & Arend, F. (2011). Defining student engagement. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 38*-43.
- Rogers, C. R. (1951). Studies in client-centered psychotherapy III: the case of Mrs. Oak—a research analysis. *Psychological Service Center Journal, 3*(1-2), 47–165.
- Ryan, R. M., & Powelson, C. L. (1991). Autonomy and relatedness as fundamental to motivation and education. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 60*(1), 49-66.
- Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 26*(3-4), 207-231.
- Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 15–31). Academic Press.
- Senko, C., Hulleman, C. S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2011). Achievement goal theory at the

- crossroads: Old controversies, current challenges, and new directions. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(1), 26-47.
- Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(4), 571-581.
- Skinner, E. A., Wellborn, J. G., & Connell, J. P. (1990). What it takes to do well in school and whether I've got it: A process model of perceived control and children's engagement and achievement in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 22-32.
- Skinner, E. A., Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Connell, J. P., Eccles, J. S., & Wellborn, J. G. (1998). Individual differences and the development of perceived control. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1-231.
- Smith, J. L., Lewis, K. L., Hawthorne, L., & Hodges, S. D. (2013). When trying hard isn't natural: Women's belonging with and motivation for male-dominated STEM fields as a function of effort expenditure concerns. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(2), 131-143.
- Spellings, M., & Pubs, E. D. (2007). US Department of education. *Building on Results: A Blueprint for Strengthening the No Child Left Behind Act*, Washington, DC.
- Steinkamp, M. W., & Kelly, J. R. (1987). Social integration, leisure activity, and life satisfaction in older adults: Activity theory revisited. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 25(4), 293-307.
- Steinkamp, M. W., & Maehr, M. L. (1983). Affect, ability, and science achievement: A quantitative synthesis of correlational research. *Review of Educational Research*, 53(3), 369-396.
- Steinkamp, M. W., & Maehr, M. L. (1984). Gender differences in motivational orientations toward achievement in school science: A quantitative synthesis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21(1), 39-59.
- Stipek, D. (2002). Good instruction is motivating. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 309–332). Academic Press

- Suldo, S. M., Friedrich, A. A., White, T., Farmer, J., Minch, D., & Michalowski, J. (2009). Teacher support and adolescents' subjective well-being: A mixed-methods investigation. *School Psychology Review, 38*(1), 67-85.
- Sutherland, S. D. (2010). Student and teacher perceptions of student engagement (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). *University of Toronto, Ontario: CANSvanum, S., & Bigatti, S.(2009). Academic course engagement during one semester.*
- Tucker, C. M., Zayco, R. A., Herman, K. C., Reinke, W. M., Trujillo, M., Carraway, K., ... & Ivery, P. D. (2002). Teacher and child variables as predictors of academic engagement among low-income African American children. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*(4), 477-488.
- Valiente, C., Lemery-Chalfant, K., Swanson, J., & Reiser, M. (2008). Prediction of children's academic competence from their effortful control, relationships, and classroom participation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(1), 67-77.
- Vallerand, R. J., Fortier, M. S., & Guay, F. (1997). Self-determination and persistence in a real-life setting: toward a motivational model of high school dropout. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(5), 1161-1176.
- Voelkl, K. E. (1996). Measuring students' identification with school. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56*(5), 760-770.
- Wagner, M., Roger, A. J., Flax, J. L., Brusseau, G. A., & Stahl, D. A. (1998). Phylogeny of dissimilatory sulfite reductases supports an early origin of sulfate respiration. *Journal of Bacteriology, 180*(11), 2975-2982.
- Walker, C. O., Greene, B. A., & Mansell, R. A. (2006). Identification with academics, intrinsic/extrinsic motivation, and self-efficacy as predictors of cognitive engagement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 16*(1), 1-12.
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(1), 82-96.
- Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivational research in education. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(4), 616-622.

- Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social relationships and motivation in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(2), 202-209.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1999). Social-motivational processes and interpersonal relationships: Implications for understanding motivation at school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(1), 76.
- Wigfield, A., & Cambria, J. (2010). Students' achievement values, goal orientations, and interest: Definitions, development, and relations to achievement outcomes. *Developmental Review, 30*(1), 1-35.
- Willms, J. D. (2003). Student engagement at school. *A Sense of Belonging and Participation. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.*
- Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 31*(3), 387-406.
- Wood, P. A. (2001). The US Department of Education and Student Financial Aid for Distance Education: An Update. ERIC Digest.
- Zhao, C. M., Kuh, G. D., & Carini, R. M. (2005). A comparison of international student and American student engagement in effective educational practices. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(2), 209-231.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 51-59.
- Zumbrunn, S., McKim, C., Buhs, E., & Hawley, L. R. (2014). Support, belonging, motivation, and engagement in the college classroom: A mixed method study. *Instructional Science, 42*(5), 661-684.

APPENDICES

Informed Consent

I am Rifat Shah, MSc research student at National Institute of Psychology, Quaid e Azam University, Islamabad conducting a research according to prerequisite of degree. This research aims to explore the relationship between student sense of connectedness, achievement goals and student engagement among university student.. I request you to support my purpose and take interest in this research. I assure you that information provided will be kept confidential and will only be used for research purpose. You have full right to quit at any stage. Your assistance and participation will be profoundly valued. Cooperation in this research is totally based on your eagerness to take part.

If you consent to participate then please sign below.

Thank you!

Signature

Demographic Sheet

Please complete the following.

Age _____

Gender _____

Department _____

University _____

Marital Status Married Single

Parental status Separated Together

Family system Nuclear Joint

Residential status Hostel Day scholar

Scale I

INSTRUCTIONS: Read through each question phrased with reference to the department in which you are studying and respond with one of the possible answers that applies best to you.

Items	Strongly disagree	Disagree	A little disagree	Undecided	A little agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I feel like a real part of this department.							
2. It is important to participate in extra-curricular (virtual) department activities.							
3. I care about my department.							
4. What I learn in the department is relevant to my future.							
5. I feel welcome to participate in extra-curricular (virtual) department activities.							
6. This department offers learning opportunities that interest me.							
7. I can succeed in this department.							
8. In this department, I experience a sense of belonging.							
9. I make it a priority to contribute to my department in a positive way.							
10. My department is preparing me well for the world of work.							
11. At department, I feel comfortable sharing thoughts, opinions, and feelings with peers.							
12. People at this department notice when I am good at something.							

13. I can be myself at this department							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Scale II

Read each statement carefully and choose which one of five possible responses best reflects you by circling the corresponding numbers. There is no right or wrong answers. We are just interested in your views. Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by writing the number that corresponds to your opinion in the space next to each statement.

Never	Rarely	Often	Very Often	Always
1	2	3	4	5

		1	2	3	4	5
01.	During classes I ask questions.					
02.	I let my teacher know what I am interested in during learning.					
03.	During class, I express my preference and experience.					
04.	I offer often suggestions how to make the class better.					
05.	I listen carefully during class.					
06.	I try very hard in learning.					
07.	During class, I listen to new topic very carefully.					
08.	I tell teachers what I like and what I don't like during sessions.					
09.	I work hard when something new happens during class.					
10.	I pay proper attention during classes.					
11.	I enjoy learning new things during classes.					
12.	When we work on something during sessions, I feel interested.					
13.	During class I feel cautious about what we are learning.					
14.	Class is fun.					

15.	Before I begun to study, I think about what I want to get done.					
16.	When I study I try to connect what I am learning with my own experiences.					
17.	I make up my own examples to help me understand the important concepts during classes.					
18.	When I am working on my assignment, I stop once in a while and go over what I have being doing.					
19.	As I study, I keep track of how much I understand, not just if I am getting the right answer.					
20.	If what I am working is difficult to understand, I change the way I learn the material.					
21.	When doing assignment, I try to relate what I am learning to what I already know.					
22.	I try to make all the different ideas fit together and make sense when I study.					

Scale III

Using the scale below please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statement by writing the number that corresponds to your opinion in space next to each statement.




	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. My aim is completely master the material presented in the class?					
2. I am striving to do well compared to other students?					
3. My goal is to learn as much as possible?					
4. My aim is to perform well relative to other students?					
5. My aim to avoid learning less than I possibly could?					
6. My goal is to avoid performing poorly compared to others?					
7. I am striving to understand the content as thoroughly as possible?					
8. My goal is to perform better than the other students?					
9. My goal is to avoid learning less than it possibly to learn?					
10. I am striving to avoid performing worse than others?					
11. I am striving to avoid an incomplete understanding of the course material?					

12. My aim is to avoid doing worse than other students?

permission to use Student Engagement Scale



Rifat Mubarak <rifatmubarak74@gmail.com>

Mon, 26 Apr, 11:58   

to skinner ▾

Email to the Author of Student Engagement Scale,




Respected Maam!

I am a master's student at National Institute of Psychology, Quaid e Azam University, Pakistan, working on my research. I am writing to ask your permission to use the Student Engagement Scale in my research study. My research aims to find the relationship between achievement goals, and teaching effectiveness on student engagement, under my supervisor, Miss Sara Imtiaz profession. I will be very thankful, if I get the psychometric properties of the scale as well. I will use the scale only for my research study and I will not go for unethical conditions of selling or using the scale for other purposes. I would appreciate your response and indication to utilize your scale.

Sincerely

Rifat Mubarak

Ellen Skinner <skinner@pdx.edu>

Tue, 22 Jun, 01:02   

to me ▾

You are welcome to use the scales. Best of luck in your work.

permission to use Achievement Goal Questionnaire for research Inbox x



Rifat Mubarak <rifatmubarak74@gmail.com>

26 Apr 2021, 11:53



to endye ▾

Email to the Author of Achievement Goal Questionnaire,

Respected sirl

I am a master's student at National Institute of Psychology, Quaid e Azam University, Pakistan, working on my research. I am writing to ask your permission to use the Achievement Goal Questionnaire in my research study. My research aims to find the relationship between achievement goals, teaching effectiveness on student engagement, under my supervisor, Miss Sara Imtiaz profession. I will be very thankful, if I get the psychometric properties of the scale as well. I will use the scale only for my research study and I will not go for unethical conditions of selling or using the scale for other purposes. I would appreciate your response and indication to utilize your scale.

Sincerely

Rifat Mubarak

Elliot, Andrew <andrew.elliott@rochester.edu>

26 Apr 2021, 12:16



to me ▾

You have my permission.

Andrew