

Achievement Goals: Conceptual Models and Results of Researching the Outcomes

Azemina Durmić

Islamic Pedagogic Faculty, University of Zenica

Abstract

Achievement goal theory is one of many very significant motivational theories which is being questioned in the educational system in great measure. Achievement goals mostly relate to reasons that lie in the background of a student's desire for achievement and entail students' opinions about standards and criteria taken into consideration in assessing success (Urdan, 1997). In that sense, a student can be motivated by desire for personal growth and betterment or the desire to be better than others. Henceforth, the authors have identified two types of achievement goals. Firstly, there are mastery goals and, secondly, performance goals. At the same time, this represents a dichotomous model of achievement goals. The purpose of this work is to identify conceptual models of achievement goals through review of some researches and, in accordance with the presented, gain insight into the most common outcomes connected with various achievement goals. Theoretical and empirical results show the development of achievement goals from the initial dichotomous and trichotomous conceptual models, followed by the model with four goal types (2x2), and finally the model with six (3x2) goal types. In the frame of the stated conceptual models, mastery goals entail the greatest number of positive features and outcomes. The conclusion aims to accentuate the importance of mastery goals alongside the need for in-depth examination of factors that lead to acquiring these goals.

Key words: *mastery goals; avoidance orientation; performance goals; approach orientation.*

Introduction

Achievement goals represent a theoretical and research area being more and more developed in the last couple of decades. They basically belong to social-cognitive

approach to motivation that accentuates the role of interpretative processes in a certain behaviour (Dweck & Legget, 1988), and the ways a person reflects on oneself, tasks and performance (Midgley, Kaplan & Middleton, 2001). Accordingly, achievement goals in education represent a personal conception or theory about the reasons for performing a task and achieving (Pintrich, 2000a). The results of initial research diagnosed two general goals, namely mastery and performance goal. Mastery goal is connected to intrinsic motivation, and performance goal with extrinsic motivation (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996). Students with mastery goals attribute significance to developing new skills and for them the learning process has value in itself, while students with performance goals put significance in achievement and high ability alongside the desire to surpass others (Ames, 1992a). They ask questions such as what they will learn first, as opposed to the ones with performance goals who ask themselves if they are performing a task better than their friends or whether they will look smarter if they perform the task (Wigfield & Cambria, 2010).

The goal of this study is to present the results of more recent researches about achievement goals, therefore, studies that in recent decades attract the attention of researchers from educational psychology, educational sciences, sports and like. Reviewing the literature, we noticed different goals classifications which we in turn presented here through the so-called conceptual models of achievement goals. Then we directed our attention to some researches that questioned two initially identified and mostly examined goals in research (mastery and performance goal) with the intent of discerning the one with more advantages, at the same time keeping in mind the research consistency. We feel it is very important to have a shorter review of achievement goals in one place, especially because each of the identified conceptual models of achievement goals was examined separately in the works we know. The integrity of the account provides a fuller, more complex and in that applicably more significant approach to achievement goals.

Conceptual models of achievement goals

Dichotomous conceptual model of achievement goals

In initial research of achievement goals, the authors singled out two achievement goals, which means we can talk about dichotomous conceptual model of achievement goals. To label one goal, the authors used terms such as task goal (Nicholls, 1984), learning (Dweck, 1986) and mastery goal (Ames, 1992a, b; Ames & Archer, 1988), while they used terms such as ego directed goal (Nicholls, 1984) or performance goal (Dweck, 1986) to denote the other.

In differentiating the achievement goals, Nicholls (Nicholls, 1984) used the concept of ability in children and adolescents. According to this author, children use the concept of self-reference which entails self-comparison (current learning vs. past learning), while adolescents use the ability conception which is directed to others. Namely, they compare themselves to others in learning, tasks and achievement. In this regard, the

author identifies students with task goals who focus on development, learning new skills and demonstrating mastery of a task. Other student group is comprised of students with ego goals who put emphasis on demonstrating personal ability based on minimal effort alongside performance that exceeds others. In her research, as a representative of the dichotomous conceptual model, Dweck came to the results which showed students react differently to failure although they have the same abilities (Dweck, 1986). The author interpreted these differences with student varying beliefs about intelligence, i.e. there are beliefs about intelligence as a fixed, general entity and intelligence as a growing treasury of skills and knowledge. She states that students who believed intelligence to be fixed acquired a poor adaptive pattern, associated failure with lack of ability, had negative expectations and emotions, lacked in commitment and effort and avoided future challenges. On the other hand, students who believed it possible to better intelligence if they increased the effort and commitment didn't avoid challenges, but strived towards them. Along the lines of these results, Dweck (1986) found that students acquire different achievement goals, and the ones directed to performance. The goals directed to learning are associated with students who want to increase their competences, understand or learn new things, while students with performance goals seek acknowledgement of competence or want to avoid negative assessment of their competences. Alongside the term task and learning goals, Ames (1992a,b) as well as Elliot and Harackiewicz (1996) use the term mastery as a synonym. Students with mastery goals focus on the development of new skills, understanding and rising the level of competence, while students with performance goals focus on abilities noted in performance that exceeded the one of others or on achieving success with little effort (Ames, 1992a,b). First student group is interested in learning because of learning itself, they show positive emotions toward tasks and a general curiosity, even outside the educational context, whereas the other student group uses superficial learning strategies, does not engage in situations of problem solving, critical thinking or reflection, nor they think about what is learnt (Maehr & Anderman, 1993). The research by Anderman and Murdock (2007) shows that students characterised by performance goal orientation are more inclined to using cheating as an adaptive strategy for achieving success and avoiding failure, as opposed to students who render mastery goals.

The presented dichotomous model which recognises two forms of achievement goals belongs to the so-called normative or classical approach to achievement goals (Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer & Elliot, 2002). In further development of achievement goals, a differentiation of the dichotomous model occurred and, therefore, initially a trichotomous conceptual model of achievement goals was presented (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Elliot & Church, 1997), then the conceptual model with four goal types, the so-called 2x2 model (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Pintrich, 2000a), and finally the model with six goal types, the so-called 3x2 model (Elliot, Murayama & Pekrun, 2011). The continuation of this work brings a short review of the stated conceptual models of achievement goals.

Trichotomous conceptual model of achievement goals

Differentiation of the dichotomous division of achievement goals occurred due to research results which showed that performance goals do not influence intrinsic motivation, but are connected to high marks, whereas mastery goals do not lead to high marks, but influence intrinsic motivation (Grant & Dweck, 2003). These results served as a guideline for authors in dividing performance goals. Additional classifications of goals were performed on the basis of classical reflection on motivation that distinguishes between two motivational orientations: the so-called *approach* and *avoidance* (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996). First motivational orientation, approach, entails directedness toward positive outcomes, while the other, avoidance, means avoiding potentially negative outcomes. Leaning on the classical contributions of motivational theory, the researchers who designed the trichotomous conceptual model divided performance goals. Therefore, performance goals can be directed to achieving success (performance-approach goal) and to avoiding failure (performance-avoidance goal) (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Pintrich, 2000a). Students with performance goals directed to achieving success want to demonstrate they are more competent than the others, whereas students who avoid being incompetent display performance goals directed to avoiding failure (Elliot & Church, 1997).

Performance goals directed toward achieving success are positively linked to the effort a student puts into the task (learning, his/her persistence and marks) (Church et al., 2001; 2001; Elliot & Church, 1997). In the experiments done by Elliot and Harackiewicz (1996), students with performance goals directed to avoiding failure appreciate competence, invest the same effort and perform tasks equally well as students with performance goals directed to achieving success and students with mastery goals, but show less intrinsic motivation. Middleton and Midgley (1997) also contribute to trichotomous conceptual model of achievement goals in claiming that performance goals directed to avoiding failure indicate the student desire to avoid showing incompetence or stupidity. These authors attribute performance goals directed to achieving success to students who want to demonstrate they are more competent than other students. In further research examinations of the trichotomous conceptual model, performance goals directed to avoiding failure are in correlation with some negative consequences. Thus, in researches, these goals were associated with anxiety, self-hindering strategies, disorganised learning habits, avoiding to ask for help from others and poor academic success (Elliot & Church, 1997; Midgley & Urdan, 2001; Wolters, 2004). Furthermore, performance goals directed to avoiding failure are positively correlated with anxiety in exam situations and seeking help, and negatively linked to self-regulatory strategies and self-efficacy (Middleton & Midgley, 1997).

In the presented model, performance goals are divided along the lines of directedness either to achieving success or avoiding failure. The stated classification is a product of research which showed performative goals can have both positive and negative outcomes. Therefore, a more distinctive shape of achievement goals was designed by

separating these goals. This model did not differentiate mastery goals, for which a need occurred later, and we present it in the description of the next conceptual model of achievement goals.

Conceptual model with four types (2x2) of achievement goals

Further verification of research and examination of achievement goals led to division and mastery goals (Elliot, 1999; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Pintrich, 2000a) which created the basis for the conceptual model with four types of goals, the so-called 2x2 model of achievement goals. This model divides both performance goals (following the logic of the trichotomous conceptual model) and mastery goals. Mastery goals, as well as performance goals, diverge into two subtypes, i.e. achieving success and avoiding failure (Elliot, 1999). In goals division, the starting point is the way competence is defined and its valency determined (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Competence is defined as a standard used in evaluation of performance in which the absolute, intrapersonal, and normative standards are mentioned (Elliot, 1999). The absolute standard shows whether someone gained understanding and mastery of a task; the intrapersonal standard says if only partial betterment of performance occurred or complete development of skill or knowledge, while the normative standard shows if someone is better than the other. In determining the competence's valency, there is a positive, desired possibility (e.g. success), or negative, unwanted possibility (e.g. failure). With mastery goals, subtype achieving success, focus is on achieving a task directed to intrapersonal competence, whereas in avoiding failure subtype the focus is on avoiding the task directed to intrapersonal incompetence. Performance goals are directed towards achieving success and centred on gaining normative competence, whereas performance goals are focused on avoiding normative incompetence (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). In fact, mastery goals with avoiding failure subtype lead to somewhat mixed motivational patterns. Elliot (1999) states that achieving success subtype with mastery goals leads to positive consequences (perseverance, commitment and continuous effort), given that an individual can see negative phenomena both as obstacles and challenges, and not as an indicator of poor or limited abilities. On the other hand, for avoiding failure subtype, the author states it can lead to negative consequences when a person is led by fear of failure and inability to perceive possible negative phenomena as challenges, but rather as instances to be avoided due to fear of possibly feeling shame. To avoid the loss of personal skills and abilities and performing poorer than before is a feature of students with mastery goals of avoiding failure subtype (Elliot & Trash, 2001). Pintrich (2000b) says that students with mastery goals with achieving success subtype focus on learning, understanding and mastering the task. Students with mastery goals with avoiding failure subtype are centred on avoiding misunderstanding, lack of learning and not mastering the task. The standards of the firstly mentioned students are self-promotion, progress and in-depth task understanding, whereas the standards of the lastly mentioned are not to make mistakes nor be in the wrong. Performance goals

directed to achieving success puts emphasis on being superior, better, smarter than the others, the best in task performance, in which normative standards are getting the highest marks. Performance goals directed to avoiding failure focus on avoiding inferiority, normative standards being not to get the poorest marks nor be the worst in class (Pintrich, 2000b). Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2002) examined achievement goals with regards to specific student emotions. They yielded results which show that goals directed to achieving success, whether be it mastery or performance goals, are linked to exhilaration (when a person realises success) or sadness (when an individual doesn't achieve success). The goals directed to avoidance (both with mastery and performance goals) are connected with relief (when failure is avoided) or anxiety (not managing to avoid failure).

Conceptual model with six types (3x2) of achievement goals

One of the latest conceptual models of achievement goals is the model (3x2 model) that distinguishes six types of achievement goals (Elliot, Murayama & Pekrun, 2011). Same as the conceptual model with four goal types, this model also starts from competence's definition and valency in goals division. In doing so, authors (Elliot et al., 2011) state that competence can be defined with regards to three standards used in evaluation. The first standard entails the task within whose frame mastery competence is based on. The second, personal standard (self) relates to self-evaluation and the third to evaluation according to others (other). Competence's valency is set with positive (success) and negative (failure) aspect, as well as in previous conceptual models.

Intersecting three previously stated definition standards and two ways of competence's valency, these authors differentiate six achievement goals (Elliot et al., 2011, p. 634):

- 1 Task-approach goal with achieving success subtype. Focus is on achieving competence based on the task, e.g. perform the task properly.
- 2 Task-approach goal with task avoidance subtype. Focus is on avoiding incompetence based on the task, e.g. avoid performing the task wrongly.
- 3 Self-approach goal with achieving success subtype. Focus is on gaining competence based on self-evaluation, e.g. do better than before.
- 4 Self-approach goal with failure avoidance subtype. Focus is on avoiding incompetence based on self-evaluation, e.g. avoid doing worse than before.
- 5 Other-approach goal with success achievement subtype. Focus is on gaining competence based on evaluation with others, e.g. doing better than others.
- 6 Other-approach goal with failure avoidance subtype. Focus is on avoiding incompetence based on evaluation with others, e.g. avoid doing worse than others.

Namely, in this conceptual model mastery goals are divided into task goals and self-goals, while performance goals are renamed to other goals. Task goals put emphasis on how well an individual performs with regards to the absolute task or activity's requirements (the degree to which and individual has or hasn't done the task), while self-goals put emphasis on how well a person performs with regards to personal

paths (a degree to which a person is perfected or not) (Mascret et al., 2015). In the cross-curricular examination of the achievement goals model, Wu (2012) comes to the results which show the conceptual model with six types of achievement (3x2) as best suited for groups of elementary and secondary school pupils, in relation to the dichotomous, trichotomous and conceptual model with four types of achievement goals. Also, 3x2 model is reaffirmed in their work by authors (Mendez-Gimenez et al., 2018) who infer that, in education, we should motivate students with task goals of achieving success subtype and students with self-goals of achieving success subtype because these orientations are more adaptive and give more protection from the negative effects of normative contexts.

Results of researching the outcomes of achievement goals

Previously presented models of achievement goals, we would say, are part of a subtle refinement of two initially identified achievement goals: mastery goal and performance goal. Division within performance goals sprung from research results which showed that, alongside mastery goals, performance goals also have positive outcomes (Harackiewicz, Barron & Elliot, 1998). Senko, Hulleman and Harackiewicz (2011) will call this change of focus controversial since it divided the authors into the ones more inclined to perspective that accentuates mastery goals (Kaplan & Middleton, 2002) and the ones who emphasise the perspective of multiple goals more (Elliot, 1999). It is important to mention that multiple perspective derives from the idea that students can acquire more than one goal, and the combination of mastery and performance goals has more positive outcomes than a single mastery goal (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Pintrich, 2000b). The continuation of this work brings some of the researches that examined the outcomes of achievement goals with the intent of discerning which achievement goal correlates with more positive outcomes.

The initial examinations of goal outcomes recognised positive cognitive outcomes of mastery goals which included complex levels of acquired information's thought processing. In that sense, researchers Meece, Blumenfeld and Hoyle (1988) found that students who acquired mastery goals use higher levels of cognitive inclusion, metacognitive strategies and self-regulatory strategies such as attention monitoring, effort and commitment, linking new to existing information and active monitoring of understanding. On the other hand, students with performance goals use techniques that increase short-term memory, but do not focus on learning as an essential part of the assignment. In their research, Miškulin and Vrdoljak (2017) found a positive link between both mastery and performance goals and in-depth and strategic approach to learning. The outcomes of achievement goals are also examined from the perspective of students' relation to the task (Ames, 1992a, 1992b). Students with mastery goals, compared to students with performance goals, show more interest and are more focused on the task, invest greater effort and commitment into task completion, use cognitive and metacognitive strategies more and are much more efficient in task completion.

Alongside the outcomes which primarily indicate the relation which a student sets with the tasks, students with mastery goals show more positive emotions. Ames (1992b) especially emphasised the mastery goals' significance in the domain of inclusion into the learning process which entails active participation characterised by the application of effective learning and problem-solving strategies. As the author concludes, the use of the aforementioned strategies is surely the product of these students' beliefs that precisely effort leads to success and about the importance of knowing the appropriate strategies and their application. In such a way, students characterised by mastery goals will focus more on acquiring new knowledge, skills and abilities; on their own personal growth and development, and also be intrigued by challenging tasks because they ensure betterment. On the other hand, students with performance goals will always worry about being better than others; they will assess personal abilities, knowledge and skills in relation to abilities, knowledge and skills of others.

The outcomes of achievement goals can be seen on the *cognitive, affective and behavioural plane* (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). On the cognitive plane, students with mastery goals ask the question, 'What is the best way to increase ability and gain skill?' The final outcome represents the feedback about the quality of applied strategies in the course of learning. Failure becomes only a signal of a current learning strategy not being enough and requiring an upgrade or a change. On the *affective plane*, a satisfactory experience resulting in positive emotions is created, while, on the *behavioural plane*, these students choose the tasks which increase development of abilities. On the other hand, Dweck and Leggett (1988) claim that, on the *cognitive plane*, students with performance goals ask whether their ability is in/adequate. The outcome becomes the main source of information and failure leads to attributing helplessness and assessment about the ability's inadequacy. From the *affective plane*, it presents a threat to self-confidence, whereas, on the *behavioural plane*, students choose the tasks which improve positive marks and pride and at the same time lessen negative marks, anxiety and shame. Students with performance goals ask if they are doing the exercise better than their friends or whether they will look smarter if they complete the task. In opposition, students with mastery goals wonder what they will learn (Wigfield & Cambria, 2010). In their research, Grant and Dweck (2003) wanted to examine the effects achievement goals will have when an individual experiences great failure in a high stake task. These authors found that mastery goals have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation and performance, foresee better processing of the teaching material, better marks and general improvement over time, and a wide spectrum of using mastery directed indicators such as planning, persistence and sustainable intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, performance goals have predicted attribution of feedback about lessened ability, feeling less worthy, pondering over the obstacles to failure, loss of intrinsic motivation and poor marks. In the study by Linnenbrink (2005), students with mastery goals showed high level of academic self-efficacy, interests, positive emotions, use of adaptive strategies in asking for help, high levels of self-regulation, i.e. they persisted and participated in planning,

supervision and evaluation of their work on an assignment, and displayed low levels of negative emotions. Furthermore, performance goals are not linked to the nine measured outcomes (academic self-efficacy, interests, usefulness, anxiety, adaptive help seeking, purposeful help seeking, evasive help seeking, quantity and quality of self-regulation), and the results for other outcomes were mixed with regards to emotional gain and achievements. For example, they have shown great level of positive emotion, but also a high level of anxiety in the test. Students with mastery goals enjoy more and show lower levels of boredom in the course of learning, and students with performance goals experience more pride and anxiety (Hrkač and Pahljina-Reinić, 2016). Joy, hope and pride in the course of learning are connected with mastery goals, while pride is associated with performance goals (Pekrun, Elliot, & Maier 2006). In the research by Brdar and Bakarčić (2006), both mastery and performance goals proved to be significant predictors of the problem-centred coping with bad marks, with regards to problem solving and seeking parental help.

Previously presented researches gave insight into the outcomes of mastery and performance goals in the frame of the dichotomous conceptual model of achievement goals. According to the previously stated, we notice a positive and adaptive aspect of mastery goals with regards to students with these goals being constantly driven by desire to better their abilities, in which they perceive failure as a guideline for refinement, which in turn guides them towards positive emotions, whereas students with performance goals can experience negative emotions unless they show success. As opposed to this, researches of achievement goals that followed the other conceptual models show somewhat different and sometimes ambivalent results. Namely, for example, positive outcome operationalised as academic achievement displays positive correlation to performance goals (Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer, Carter & Elliot, 2000) and performance goals directed to achieving success (Senko & Harackiewicz, 2005). On the other hand, mastery goals do not show correlation to achievement (Harackiewicz, Barron & Elliot, 1998), and performance goals directed to avoiding failure show negative correlation to achievement (Midgley et al., 2001). However, in the second research, performance goals directed to achieving success were positively linked to performing tasks in a situation where the task was relatively easy, but not in the situation with difficult tasks (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001). Anyway, the highest degree of metacognitive self-regulation is represented in mastery goals, while performance goals directed to achieving success are connected to better metacognitive self-regulatory skills than performance goals directed to avoiding failure (Dekker et al., 2016). Likewise, performance goals directed to avoiding failure are linked with shame, helplessness (Pekrun et al., 2006), anxiety (Middleton & Midgley, 1997) and lessened curiosity (Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Performance goals directed to achieving success are a positive predictor of hope and show a positive trend with regards to pride, as opposed to performance goals directed to avoiding failure which are a positive predictor of anxiety, helplessness,

shame and relief. Mastery goals show a positive trend with regards to enjoyment as emotion, and a negative trend in view of anger (Pekrun, Cusack et al., 2014). Mastery goals with achieving success subtype are positively linked to the use of metacognitive strategies and in-depth processing in students, while mastery goals with avoiding failure subtype are not linked with these outcomes (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). In the context of prominent intrapersonal standards, mastery goals with failure avoidance subtype show negative influence on performance refinement in relation to mastery goals with achieving success subtype and performance goals directed to avoiding failure (Van Yperen et al., 2009). In their research, Kaplan and Maehr (1999) found that mastery goals are positively linked, and performance goals negatively linked, with psychological well-being (emotional tone, relation with peers and school, impulse control). From this account of the research, it is visible that the results which follow the trichotomous model and the model with four goal types show the orientation to achieving success as having more positive outcomes than orientation to avoiding success.

Conclusion

Insight into relevant theoretical and empirical approaches to achievement goals can yield several conclusions. Since the initial division into two kinds of achievement goals, a divergence into six types of achievement goals or four conceptual models of achievement goals occurred which testifies to all the more intense research into the focus field. In the presented research, achievement goals show various outcomes. If we follow the dichotomous goals division, mastery goals contain more positive features and outcomes when compared to performance goals. Mastery goals have been consistently linked with numerous positive outcomes such as highly adaptive learning patterns, intrinsic motivation, positive emotions, perseverance despite failure and alike (e.g. Ames, 1992a,b; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Grant & Dweck, 2003; Linnenbrink, 2005). In the frame of other conceptual models, which divide two general achievement goals further, various results were yielded in relation to the results from research of the dichotomous model. Therefore, performance goals directed to success achievement have shown positive outcomes (e.g. Church et al., 2001; Midgley & Urdan, 2001; Wolters, 2004), performance goals directed to failure avoidance displayed negative outcomes (e.g. Middleton & Midgley, 1997; Pekrun, Cusack et al., 2014; Pekrun, Elliot & Meier, 2006), mastery goals with success achievement subtype have shown positive outcomes (e.g. Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Pekrun, Cusack et al., 2014), and mastery goals with failure avoidance subtype have negative outcomes (e.g. Elliot & Trash, 2001; Van Yperen et al., 2009). In fact, on the basis of insight into presented research, we can state that orientation to achieving success has more positive outcomes in comparison with orientation to avoiding failure.

In general, we can confirm that "less controversy and more agreement" is associated with mastery goals, as Grant and Dweck also claim (2003, p. 542). Along the same lines, as clearly inferred by Elliot and Story (2017, p. 12) "mastery goals' significance remains

clear.” According to our perspective, mastery goals and their features are compatible with the constructivist perception of reality, which accentuates the construction and co-construction of knowledge through interaction and discussion with others (Bruner, 1986). Also, mastery goals are inclined to the child-centred approach, as opposed to the traditional didactical approach to pedagogy. Precisely the child-centred approach emphasises student’s autonomy and ability to construct knowledge, rather than it being transferred from the teacher as authority (Morrison, 2001).

We are at liberty to say mastery goals entail the fulfilment of the educational purpose which focuses on developing young people’s creative and productive ideas. Learning should lead to changes in all aspects of a student’s personality, not only in the cognitive sphere. The goal should be affirming the students who will in turn be able to create favourable living conditions in his/her community, i.e. environment. Students with performance goals achieve good results, however, nursing a culture satisfied with the final number evaluation results with does not provide safe foundations for improving the lives of all, and is at the same time far from creating new and original ideas. We could also associate this statement with the Kolberg’s (Kohlberg, 1976) theory of morality’s development which focuses on the reasons that lie in the background of moral behaviours (moral cognition). In this case, it means that moral behaviours can be driven by simple and instrumental reasons. Therefore, making the connection with performance goals, we could state that excellent marks hide the desire to show personal success and excel the others, which cannot by all means be a goal of a very subtle process such as education. This process has to prepare students for continuous questioning of oneself and the motives at the root of certain behaviours. Personal success and its demonstration can lead to glorifying oneself and demeaning others, and as soon as we cross the threshold of comparison with ”us-me-better” and ”them-he-she-worse”, a space for judgement is created and with it negative behaviour. Thereupon, with this work we give exceptional importance to mastery goals accentuating the need to create conditions that will improve and motivate these goals in students. One of the ways to realise this is organising classes directed to mastery. Using various and meaningful tasks, securing opportunities for every student to make choices and guide personal learning (Linnebrick, 2005) are demands for teachers who want to nourish the mastery approach.

Dweck warned us (1999), and rightly so, that performance goals will push out mastery goals. Midgley et.al. (2001, str. 83) later posed an even more pressing question, ‘What happened to understanding? Performance goals certainly seem to be pushing out mastery goals.’ These authors argument their concerns with the fact that all the stronger accent is put on standards of mass testing, standards based on facts and ”real answers”. Thereby, we feel that greater empirical attention should be given to mastery goals through examining the factors leading to acquisition of these goals.

Mastery goals theoretically identify the types of goals students acquire in the educational system and present the dominant state in practice. Namely, current research results indicate that the educational system no longer favours the acquisition of performance

goals. A space is opened to wonder about the results we would get if the educational systems themselves nurtured the culture of learning for learning, and not learning because of marks and competence. Would we, even in those circumstances, have a division of achievement goals to mastery and performance goals?

References

- Ames, C. (1992a). Achievement goals and the classroom motivational climate. In D. H. Schunk & J. Meece (Eds.), *Student perceptions in the classroom* (pp. 327-348). Hillsdale, New Jersey, NJ, USA: Erlbaum.
- Ames, C. (1992b). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 261-271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.84.3.261>
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation process. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(3), 260-267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.3.260>
- Anderman, E. M., & Murdock, T. (2007). *Psychological Perspectives on Academic Cheating*. San Diego: Elsevier.
- Barron, K. E., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2001). Achievement goals and optimal motivation: Testing multiple goal models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(5), 706-722. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.5.706>
- Brdar, I., & Bakarčić, S. (2006). Suočavanje s neuspjehom u školi: koliko su važni emocionalna kompetentnost, osobine ličnosti i ciljna orijentacija u učenju? *Psiholojske teme*, 15(1), 129-150.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Massachusetts.
- Church, M. A., Elliot, A. J., & Gable, S. L. (2001). Perceptions of classroom environment, achievement goals, and achievement outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93, 43-54. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.93.1.43>
- Dekker, S., Krabbendam, L., Lee, N., Boschloo, A., de Groot, R., & Jolles, J. (2016). Dominant Goal Orientations Predict Differences in Academic Achievement during Adolescence through Metacognitive Self-Regulation. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 6(1), 47-58. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jedp.v6n1p47>
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American psychologist*, 41, 1040-1048. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.10.1040>
- Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.256>
- Elliot, A. J. & Fryer, J. W. (2008). The Goal construct. In J. Shah, & W. Gardner (Eds.). *Handbook of Motivation Science* (pp. 235-250). New York, NY, USA: The Guilford Press.
- Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist*, 34, 169-189. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3403_3

- Elliot, A. J. & Trash, T. M. (2001). Achievement goals and the hierarchical model of achievement motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 13, 139-156.
- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 218-232. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.1.218>
- Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 461-475. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.461>
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 x 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80 501-519. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.3.501>
- Elliot, A. J., Murayama, K., & Pekrun, R. (2011). A 3 x 2 achievement goal model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(3), 632-648. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023952>
- Elliot, C.N., & Story, P.A. (2017). Motivational Effects of Goal Orientation. *The Kennesaw Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 5(1). Article 4.
- Grant, H., & Dweck, C. S. (2003). Clarifying achievement goals and their impact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 541-553. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.3.541>
- Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., & Elliot, A. J. (1998). Rethinking achievement goals: When are they adaptive for college students and why? *Educational Psychologist*, 33, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3301_1
- 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, 562-575. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.3.562>
- Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Tauer, J. M., Carter, S. M., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Short-term and long-term consequences of achievement goals: Predicting interest and performance over time. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92 316-330. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.2.316>
- Hrkač, T., & Pahljina-Reinić, R. (2016). Uloga ciljnih orijentacija u odnosu roditeljskog ponašanja i emocija postignuća kod adolescenata. *Društvena istraživanja*, 25(1), 85-105. <https://doi.org/10.5559/di.25.1.05>
- Kaplan, A., & Maehr, M. L. (1999). Achievement goals and student well-being. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 24, 330-358. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.0993>
- Kaplan, A., & Middleton, M. J. (2002). Should childhood be a journey or a race? A response to Harackiewicz et al. (2002). *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 646-648. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.3.646>
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues* (pp. 31-53). New York, NY, USA: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Linnenbrink, E. A. (2005). The Dilemma of Performance-Approach Goals: The Use of Multiple Goal Contexts to Promote Students' Motivation and Learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 197-213. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.197>

- Linnenbrink, E. A., & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Achievement goal theory and affect: An asymmetrical bidirectional model. *Educational Psychologist*, 37, 69-78. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3702_2
- Maehr, M. L., & Anderman, E. M. (1993). Reinventing schools for early adolescents: Emphasizing task goals. *Elementary School Journal*, 93, 593-610. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461742>
- Mascret, N., Elliot, A., & Cury, F. (2015). Extending the 3 x 2 achievement goal model to sport domain: The 3 x 2 Achievement Goal Questionnaire for Sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 17, 7-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.11.001>
- Meece, J. L., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Hoyle, R. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. *Journal Educational Psychology*, 80, 514-523. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.4.514>
- Mendez-Gimenez, A., Cecchini, J.A., Mendez-Alonso, D., Prieto, J.A., & Rio, J.F. (2018). Effect of 3x2 achievement goals and classroom goal structures on self-determined motivation: a multilevel analysis in secondary education. *Anales de psicología*, 34, 52-62. <https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.34.1.262131>
- Middleton, M., & Midgley, C. (1997). Avoiding the demonstration of lack of ability: An under-explored aspect of goal theory. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 710-718. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.89.4.710>
- 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*, 23, 77-86. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.93.1.77>
- Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. (2001). Academic self-handicapping and achievement goals? A further examination. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 26, 61-75. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.2000.1041>
- Miškulin, N., & Vrdoljak, G. (2017). Predviđanje akademskog uspjeha na temelju ciljnih orijentacija i pristupa učenju. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 19(3), 919-946. <https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v19i3.2178>
- Morrison, G.S. (2001). *Early childhood education today*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review*, 91(3), 328-346. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.91.3.328>
- Pekrun, R., Elliot, A. J., & Maier, M. A. (2006). Achievement goals and achievement emotions: A theoretical model and prospective test. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98, 583-597. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.3.583>
- Pekrun, R., Cusack, A., Murayama, K., Elliot, A. J., & Thomas, K. (2014). The power of anticipated feedback: Effects on students' achievement goals and achievement emotions. *Learning and Instruction*, 29, 115-124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.09.002>
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000a). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 451-502). San Diego, California, USA: Academic. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50043-3>
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000b). An Achievement Goal Theory Perspective on Issues in Motivation Terminology, Theory, and Research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 92-104. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1017>

- Senko, C.M., 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.538646>
- Senko, C. M., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2005). Achievement goals, performance and task interest: Why perceived difficulty matters. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1739-1753. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205281128>
- Urduan, T. (1997). Achievement goal theory: Past results, future directions. In M. L. Maehr, & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement*, 10, (pp. 99-141). Greenwich, CT, England: JAI Press.
- Van Yperen, N. W., Elliot, A. J., & Anseel, F. (2009). The influence of mastery-avoidance goals on performance improvement. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 932-943. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.590>
- Wigfield, A., & Cambria, J. (2010). Students' Achievement Values, Goal Orientations, and Interest: Definitions, Development, and Relations to Achievement Outcomes. *Developmental Review*, 30, 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2009.12.001>
- Wolters, C. A. (2004). Advancing achievement goal theory: Using goal structures and goal orientations to predict students' motivation, cognition, and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 236-250. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.96.2.236>
- Wu, C.C. (2012). The Cross-Cultural Examination of 3x2 Achievement Goal Model in Taiwan. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 422-427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.429>

Azemina Durmić

Department of Social Pedagogy

Islamic Pedagogical Faculty

University of Zenica

Urije 101A, 72000, Zenica, Bosnia i Hercegovina

azeminadurmic@yahoo.com

Ciljevi postignuća: konceptualni modeli i rezultati istraživanja ishoda

Sažetak

Teorija ciljeva postignuća jedna je od vrlo značajnih teorija motivacije koja se u velikoj mjeri propituje u odgojno-obrazovnom sustavu. Ciljevi postignuća najčešće se odnose na razloge koji stoje u pozadini želje učenika za postignućem, ali predstavljaju i mišljenje učenika o standardima i kriterijima koji se uzimaju u obzir prilikom procjene uspjeha (Urdan, 1997). U tom smislu, učenik može biti vođen željom za osobnim razvojem i unapređenjem ili željom da bude bolji od drugih. Tako su autori identificirali dvije vrste ciljeva postignuća. U prvom slučaju, riječ je o ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje, a u drugom slučaju, riječ je o performativnim ciljevima. Ovo ujedno predstavlja i dihotomni model ciljeva postignuća. Cilj je ovoga rada da se pregledom nekih istraživanja identificiraju konceptualni modeli ciljeva postignuća, te da se, shodno predstavljenom, stekne uvid u najčešće ishode s kojima su povezani različiti ciljevi postignuća. Teorijski i empirijski rezultati ukazuju da su se ciljevi postignuća razvijali od dihotomnoga, trihotomnoga konceptualnog modela, modela s četiri vrste ciljeva (2x2) do modela sa šest (3x2) vrsta ciljeva. U sklopu navedenih konceptualnih modela ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje sadrže najviše pozitivnih karakteristika i ishoda. U zaključku se ističe važnost ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje uz potrebu za dubljim propitivanjem čimbenika koji vode prema usvajanju ovih ciljeva.

Ključne riječi: ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje; izbjegavanje orijentacija; performativni ciljevi; pristup orijentacija.

Uvod

Ciljevi postignuća predstavljaju teorijsko i istraživačko područje koje se posljednjih nekoliko desetljeća sve više razvija. U osnovi pripadaju socijalno-kognitivnom pristupu motivacije koji ističe ulogu interpretativnih procesa za određeno ponašanje (Dweck i Legget, 1988), načina na koji osoba razmišlja o sebi, zadacima i izvedbi (Midgley, Kaplan i Middleton, 2001). Prema tome, ciljevi postignuća u odgoju i obrazovanju predstavljaju osobnu koncepciju ili teoriju o razlozima za izvršenje zadatka i postignućem (Pintrich, 2000a). Rezultati početnih istraživanja dijagnosticirali su dva opća cilja: cilj usmjeren na ovladavanje (Mastery Goal) i performativni cilj (engl. *Performance*

Goal). Ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje povezani su s intrinzičnom, a performativni ciljevi s ekstrinzičnom motivacijom (Elliot i Harackiewicz, 1996). Učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje važnost pridaju razvoju novih vještina i za njih je proces učenja vrijedan sam po sebi, dok učenici s performativnim ciljevima važnost pridaju postignuću i visokoj sposobnosti uz želju da se nadmaše drugi (Ames, 1992a). Prvi postavljaju pitanja kao što su „Što ću naučiti”, za razliku od učenika s performativnim ciljevima koji se pitaju „Radim li ovaj zadatak bolje nego moj prijatelj”, „Hoću li izgledati pametnije ako izvršim ovaj zadatak” (Wigfield i Cambria, 2010).

Cilj je ovoga rada predočiti rezultate recentnijih istraživanja o ciljevima postignuća, dakle istraživanja koja posljednjih desetljeća zaokupljaju istraživače iz edukacijske psihologije, obrazovnih znanosti, sporta i slično. Pregledom literature uočili smo različite klasifikacije ciljeva, koje smo ovdje predstavili kroz tzv. konceptualne modele ciljeva postignuća. Zatim smo pažnju usmjerili na neka istraživanja koja su propitivala ishode dva prvobitno identificirana i u istraživanjima najčešće propitivana cilja (cilj usmjeren na ovladavanje i performativni cilj) s namjerom da vidimo koji od njih sadrži više prednosti, uz istovremeno vođenje računa o konzistentnosti u istraživanjima. Smatramo da je jako važno da na jednom mjestu imamo kraći pregled istraživanja ciljeva postignuća, posebno jer je svaki od identificiranih konceptualnih modela ciljeva postignuća u radovima koji su nama poznati odvojeno razmatran. Cjelovitost prikaza omogućuje potpuniji, kompleksniji i time aplikativno značajniji pristup ciljevima postignuća.

Konceptualni modeli ciljeva postignuća

Dihotomni konceptualni model ciljeva postignuća

U počecima istraživanja ciljeva postignuća, autori su izdvojili dva cilja postignuća, što znači da možemo govoriti o dihotomnom konceptualnom modelu ciljeva postignuća. Autori su za označavanje jednoga cilja koristili termine kao što su: cilj usmjeren na zadatak (Nicholls, 1984), učenje (Dweck, 1986) i ovladavanje (Ames, 1992a,b; Ames i Archer, 1988), dok su za označavanje drugoga cilja koristili termine kao što su cilj usmjeren na ego (Nicholls, 1984) ili performativni cilj (Dweck, 1986).

Prilikom diferenciranja ciljeva postignuća, Nicholls (Nicholls, 1984) se koristio koncepcijom sposobnosti kod djece i adolescenata. Prema ovome autoru, djeca koriste samoreferentnu koncepciju sposobnosti koja podrazumijeva samosporedbu (trenutačno učenje vs. prošlo učenje), dok se adolescenti koriste koncepcijom sposobnosti koja je okrenuta prema drugima. Što znači da se oni u učenju, zadatcima i postignuću uspoređuju s drugima. S tim u vezi, autor identificira učenike s ciljevima usmjerenim na zadatak koji se fokusiraju na razvoj i učenje novih vještina i demonstraciju ovladavanja zadatkom. Drugu grupu učenika čine učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na ego koji težište stavljaju na demonstraciju osobne sposobnosti bazirane na minimalnom trudu i uz izvedbu koja nadmašuje druge. Autorica koja je pobornik dihotomnoga konceptualnog modela (Dweck, 1986) u istraživanjima je došla do rezultata koji su pokazali da učenici

različito reagiraju na neuspjeh iako imaju iste sposobnosti. Ove razlike autorica je tumačila razlikama u vjerovanjima učenika o inteligenciji. Odnosno, postoje vjerovanja o inteligenciji kao fiksiranom, općem entitetu i inteligenciji kao rastućoj riznici vještina i znanja. Ona navodi da su učenici koji su vjerovali da je inteligencija fiksirana, usvojili slabo adaptivan obrazac, neuspjeh su povezivali s pomanjkanjem sposobnosti, imali su negativna očekivanja i emocije, došlo je do smanjenja truda i zalaganja te su izbjegavali sljedeće izazove. S druge strane, učenici koji su vjerovali da je inteligenciju moguće poboljšati, neuspjeh su pormatrali kao signal nedovoljno uložena truda, bili su pozitivni, smatrali su da se mogu poboljšati ako povećaju trud i zalaganje, oni nisu izbjegavali izazove, već su težili njima. U skladu s ovim rezultatima, Dweck (1986) je ustanovila da učenici usvajaju različite ciljeve postignuća, i to ciljeve usmjerene na učenje i performativne ciljeve. Ciljevi usmjereni na učenje odlika su učenika koji žele povećati kompetencije, razumjeti ili naučiti nešto novo, dok učenici s performativnim ciljevima traže vrednovanje kompetencija ili žele izbjeći negativne ocjene za svoje kompetencije. Pored termina ciljeva usmjerenih na zadatak i učenje, Ames (1992a,b) kao i Elliot i Harackiewicz (1996) koriste kao sinonimski termin ovladavanje (Mastery). Učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje fokus stavljaju na razvoj novih vještina, razumijevanje, unapređenje razine kompetencije, dok učenici s performativnim ciljevima fokus stavljaju na sposobnosti koje su evidentirane kroz izvedbu koja je bolja od drugih ili postizanje uspjeha s malo truda (Ames, 1992a,b). Prva je grupa učenika za učenje zainteresirana zbog učenja, pokazuju pozitivne emocije prema zadacima i generalnu radoznalost čak i izvan konteksta odgoja i obrazovanja, dok druga grupa koristi površne strategije učenja, ne uključuju se u situacije rješavanja problema i kritičkoga razmišljanja, niti razmišljaju o naučenome (Maehr i Anderman, 1993). Istraživanje Anderman i Murdock (2007) pokazuje da su učenici koje karakterizira performativna ciljna orijentacija skloniji varanju kao adaptivnoj strategiji za postizanje uspjeha i izbjegavanje neuspjeha, za razliku od učenika koji iskazuju ciljeve usmjerene na ovladavanje.

Navedeni dihotomni model koji prepoznaje dva oblika ciljeva postignuća pripada tzv. normativnom ili klasičnom pristupu ciljevima postignuća (Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer i Elliot, 2002). U daljnjem razvoju ciljeva postignuća, došlo je do diferencijacije dihotomnoga modela ciljeva postignuća. Tako se prvobitno javlja trihotomni konceptualni model ciljeva postignuća (Elliot i Harackiewicz, 1996; Elliot i Church, 1997) zatim konceptualni model s četiri vrste ciljeva, tzv. 2 x 2 model (Elliot i McGregor, 2001; Pintrich, 2000a) i model sa šest vrsta ciljeva, tzv. 3 x 2 model (Elliot, Murayama i Pekrun, 2011). U nastavku ovoga rada donosimo kraći pregled navedenih konceptualnih modela ciljeva postignuća.

Trihotomni konceptualni model ciljeva postignuća

Razlog zbog kojeg je došlo do diferenciranja dihotomne podjele ciljeva postignuća jesu rezultati istraživanja koji su pokazali da performativni ciljevi ne utječu na intrinzičnu

motivaciju, ali su povezani s visokim ocjenama, dok ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje ne vode visokim ocjenama, ali utječu na intrinzičnu motivaciju (Grant i Dweck, 2003). Ovi rezultati autorima su poslužili kao smjernica za podjelu performativnih ciljeva. Dodatne klasifikacije ciljeva izvršene su na osnovi klasičnih razmatranja motivacije koji govore o dvije motivacijske orijentacije: tzv. *pristup* i *izbjegavanje* (Elliot i Harackiewicz, 1996). Prva motivacijska orijentacija, *pristup* (Approach), odnosi se na usmjerenost prema pozitivnim ishodima, dok druga, *izbjegavanje* (Avoidance) znači izbjegavanje potencijalnih negativnih ishoda. Oslanjajući se na klasične doprinose teorije motivacije, istraživači koji su osmislili trihotomni konceptualni model izvršili su podjelu unutar performativnih ciljeva. Tako performativni ciljevi mogu biti usmjereni na postizanje uspjeha (Performance-Approach Goal) i na izbjegavanje neuspjeha (Performance-Avoidance Goal) (Elliot i Harackiewicz, 1996; Pintrich, 2000a). Učenici s performativnim ciljevima usmjerenim na postizanje uspjeha žele demonstrirati da su kompetentniji od drugih, dok učenici koji izbjegavaju biti nekompetentni pokazuju performativne ciljeve usmjerene na izbjegavanje neuspjeha (Elliot i Church, 1997).

Performativni ciljevi usmjereni na postizanje uspjeha pozitivno su povezani s trudom koji učenik ulaže u zadatak/učenje, upornošću i s ocjenama (Church, Elliot, i Gable, 2001; Elliot i Church, 1997). U eksperimentima koje su proveli Elliot i Harackiewicz (1996) učenici s performativnim ciljevima usmjerenim na izbjegavanje neuspjeha cijene kompetenciju, ulažu isti napor i izvršavaju podjednako dobro zadatke kao i učenici s performativnim ciljevima usmjerenim na postizanje uspjeha i učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje, ali pokazuju smanjenu intrinzičnu motivaciju. Također, Middleton i Midgley (1997) doprinose trihotomnom konceptualnom modelu ciljeva postignuća, pri čemu za performativne ciljeve usmjerene na izbjegavanje neuspjeha kažu da ukazuju na želju učenika da izbjegne pokazivanje nekompetentnosti ili gluposti. Za performativne ciljeve usmjerene na postizanje uspjeha ovi autori navode da označavaju učenike koji žele pokazati da su kompetentniji od drugih učenika. U daljnjim istraživačkim propitivanjima trihotomnoga konceptualnog modela, performativni ciljevi usmjereni na izbjegavanje neuspjeha koreliraju s nekim negativnim posljedicama. Tako su u istraživanjima ovi ciljevi bili povezani s anksioznošću, samohendikepirajućim strategijama, dezorganiziranim navikama učenja, izbjegavanjem traženja pomoći od drugih i slabim akademskim uspjehom (Elliot i Church, 1997; Midgley i Urdan, 2001; Wolters, 2004). Dalje, performativni ciljevi usmjereni na izbjegavanje neuspjeha pozitivno su korelirali s anksioznošću u ispitnim situacijama, s traženjem pomoći, a negativno su korelirali sa strategijama samoregulacije i samoefikasnošću (Middleton i Midgley, 1997).

U prikazanom modelu, performativni su ciljevi podijeljeni sukladno usmjerenju na postizanje uspjeha i usmjerenju na izbjegavanje neuspjeha. Navedena je klasifikacija produkt istraživanja koja su ukazala na to da performativni ciljevi mogu imati pozitivne i negativne ishode, pa je razdvajanjem ovih ciljeva došlo do distinktivnijega oblikovanja ciljeva postignuća. U ovome modelu nije razvijeno diferenciranje ciljeva usmjerenih

na ovladavanje, za čime se kasnije ukazala potreba, što je prikazano u opisu sljedećega konceptualnog modela ciljeva postignuća.

Konceptualni model s četiri vrste (2 x 2) ciljeva postignuća

Daljnja istraživačka provjeravanja i propitivanja ciljeva postignuća dovela su do podjele i ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje (Elliot, 1999; Elliot i McGregor, 2001; Pintrich, 2000a) što je stvorilo osnovu za konceptualni model s četiri vrste cilja, tzv. 2 x 2 model ciljeva postignuća. Na osnovi ovoga modela moguće je podijeliti performativne ciljeve (prateći logiku trihotomnoga konceptualnog modela) i ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje. Ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje, kao i performativni ciljevi, dijele se na dva podusmjerenja, na postizanje uspjeha i izbjegavanje neuspjeha (Elliot, 1999). Pri podjeli ciljeva polazi se od načina na koji se definira kompetencija i određuje valentnost kompetencije (Elliot i McGregor, 2001). Kompetencija se definira kao standard koji se koristi u evaluaciji izvođenja nečeg, pri čemu se spominje apsolutni, intrapersonalni i normativni standard (Elliot, 1999). Apsolutni standard pokazuje je li netko postigao razumijevanje i ovladao zadatkom, intrapersonalni standard pokazuje je li došlo do poboljšanja u izvedbi ili potpunoga razvoja vještine ili znanja, dok normativni standard govori je li netko bolji od drugoga. Pri određenju valentnosti kompetencije govori se o pozitivnoj, željenoj mogućnosti (npr. uspjeh) ili negativnoj, neželjenoj (npr. neuspjeh) mogućnosti. Kod ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje, podusmjerenje postizanje uspjeha, fokus je na postizanju kompetencija usmjerenih na zadatak ili intrapersonalne kompetencije, dok je kod podusmjerenja izbjegavanje neuspjeha fokus na izbjegavanju na zadatak usmjerene ili intrapersonalne nekompetencije. Performativni ciljevi usmjereni na postizanje uspjeha usredotočeni su na postizanje normativne kompetencije, dok performativni ciljevi usmjereni na izbjegavanje neuspjeha usredotočeni su na izbjegavanje normativne nekompetencije (Elliot i McGregor, 2001). Ustvari, ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem izbjegavanje neuspjeha, dovode do pomalo miješanih motivacijskih obrazaca. Elliot (1999) navodi da podusmjerenje postizanje uspjeha kod ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje vodi prema pozitivnim posljedicama (ustrajnost, zalaganje i kontinuirani trud) pod uvjetom da pojedinac negativne pojave može vidjeti i kao prepreke, ali i izazove, a ne kao pokazatelje slabih i ograničenih sposobnosti. S druge strane, za podusmjerenje izbjegavanje neuspjeha, autor kaže da može dovesti do negativnih posljedica onda kada pojedinca vodi strah od neuspjeha te on moguće negativne pojave ne vidi kao izazove, već kao pojave koje treba izbjegavati zbog straha od mogućega osjećaja srama. Izbjeći gubljenje osobnih vještina i sposobnosti i ne učiniti nešto lošije od onoga kako je učinjeno u prošlosti, svojstvo je učenika s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem izbjegavanje neuspjeha (Elliot i Trash, 2001). Pintrich (2000b) za učenike s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem na postizanje uspjeha kaže da fokus stavljaju na učenje, razumijevanje i ovladavanje zadatkom. Učenici s ciljevima usmjereni na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem izbjegavanje neuspjeha usredotočeni su

na izbjegavanje nerazumijevanja, neučenja i neovladavanja zadatkom. Standardi prvih učenika su samounaprjeđenje, progres i dubinsko razumijevanje zadatka, a standardi drugih učenika su ne raditi pogrešno i ne biti u krivu. Performativni ciljevi usmjereni na postizanje uspjeha fokus stavljaju na to da se bude superiorniji, bolji, pametniji u odnosu na druge, najbolji pri izvršenju zadatka, pri čemu su normativni standardi postizanje najboljih ocjena. Performativni ciljevi usmjereni na izbjegavanje neuspjeha fokus stavljaju na izbjegavanje inferiornosti, pri čemu su normativni standardi ne postizati najslabije ocjene i ne biti najgori u razredu (Pintrich, 2000b). Linnenbrink i Pintrich (2002) istraživali su ciljeve postignuća s obzirom na specifične emocije učenika. Oni dolaze do rezultata koji pokazuju da su ciljevi koji su usmjereni na postizanje uspjeha, bilo da je riječ o ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje ili performativnim ciljevima, povezani s ushićenjem (kada osoba ostvari uspjeh) ili tugom (kada osoba ne ostvari uspjeh). Ciljevi s orijentacijom na izbjegavanje (i kod ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje i kod performativnih ciljeva) povezani su s olakšanjem (kada se neuspjeh izbjegne) ili anksioznošću (kada se ne uspije izbjeći neuspjeh).

Konceptualni model sa šest vrsta (3 x 2) ciljeva postignuća

Jedan od najnovijih konceptualnih modela ciljeva postignuća predstavlja model (3 x 2 model) koji prepoznaje šest vrsta ciljeva postignuća (Elliot, Murayama i Pekrun, 2011). Kao i konceptualni model s četiri vrste cilja i ovaj model pri podjeli ciljeva polazi od definicije i valentnosti kompetencije. Pri tom, autori (Elliot i sur., 2011) navode da se kompetencija može definirati s obzirom na tri standarda koja se koriste pri evaluaciji. Standard koji polazi od zadatka u okviru kojeg je kompetencija utemeljena na ovladavanje zadatkom. Drugi osobni (*Self*) standard odnosi se na osobnu evaluaciju i treći koji se odnosi na evaluaciju sukladnu s drugima (*Other*). Valentnost kompetencije određena je pomoću pozitivnoga (uspjeh) i negativnoga (neuspjeh) aspekta, kao i u prethodnim konceptualnim modelima.

Stapanjem triju prethodno navedenih standarda definicije i dva načina valentnosti kompetencije ovi autori dolaze do šest vrsta ciljeva postignuća (Elliot et al., 2011, str. 634):

1. Cilj usmjeren na zadatak, s podusmjerenjem postizanje uspjeha (*task-approach goal*). Fokus je na postizanju kompetencije koja je utemeljena na zadatku, npr. uraditi zadatak korektno.
2. Cilj usmjeren na zadatak, s podusmjerenjem izbjegavanje neuspjeha (*task-avoidance goal*). Fokus je na izbjegavanju nekompetencije koja je utemeljena na zadatku, npr. izbjeći da se zadatak pogrešno riješi.
3. Cilj usmjeren na sebe/osobno s podusmjerenjem postizanje uspjeha (*self-approach goal*). Fokus je na postizanju kompetencije zasnovane na osobnoj evaluaciji, npr. raditi nešto bolje nego prije.
4. Cilj usmjeren na sebe/osobno s podusmjerenjem izbjegavanje neuspjeha (*self-avoidance goal*). Fokus je na izbjegavanju nekompetencije zasnovane na osobnoj evaluaciji, npr. izbjeći raditi gore nego prije.

5. Cilj usmjeren na druge s podusmjerenjem postizanje uspjeha (*other-approach goal*). Fokus je na postizanju kompetencije utemeljene na evaluaciji s drugima, npr. uraditi bolje od drugih.
6. Cilj usmjeren na druge s podusmjerenjem izbjegavanje neuspjeha (*other-avoidance goal*). Fokus je na izbjegavanju nekompetencije utemeljene na evaluaciji s drugima, npr. izbjеći napraviti nešto gore od drugih.

Naime, u ovome konceptualnom modelu, ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje podijeljeni su na ciljeve usmjerene na zadatak i ciljeve usmjerene na sebe /osobno, dok su performativni ciljevi preimenovani na ciljeve usmjerene na druge. Ciljevi usmjereni na zadatak težište stavljaju na to koliko pojedinac dobro radi s obzirom na apsolutne zahtjeve zadatka ili aktivnosti (stupanj do kojeg pojedinac nije/je ispunio zadatak), dok ciljevi usmjereni na sebe/osobno težište stavljaju na to koliko pojedinac dobro radi s obzirom na osobne putanje (stupanj do kojeg se pojedinac (ne)usavršava) (Mascaret, Elliot i Cury, 2015). U kroskulturalnom propitivanju modela ciljeva postignuća, Wu (2012) dolazi do rezultata koji pokazuju da konceptualni model sa šest vrsta ciljeva postignuća (3 x 2 model) najbolje odgovara za grupe osnovnoškolaca i srednjoškolaca, u odnosu na dihotomni, trihotomni i konceptualni model s četiri vrste ciljeva postignuća. Također, 3 x 2 model u svojem radu reafirmirali su autori (Mendez-Gimenez, Cecchini, Mendez-Alonso, Prieto i Fernandez-Rio, 2018) koji zaključuju da bi se u procesu odgoja i obrazovanja trebali poticati učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na zadatak, s podusmjerenjem postizanje uspjeha i učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na sebe/osobno s podusmjerenjem postizanje uspjeha, zato što su ove orijentacije više adaptivne i više štite od negativnih efekata normativnoga konteksta.

Rezultati istraživanja ishoda ciljeva postignuća

Prethodno predstavljeni modeli ciljeva postignuća, može se reći, dio su suptilnih rafiniranja dva prvobitno identificirana cilja postignuća: cilj usmjeren na ovladavanje i performativni cilj. Podjela unutar performativnih ciljeva nastala je iz istraživačkih rezultata koji su pokazali da, pored ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje, i performativni ciljevi imaju pozitivne ishode (Harackiewicz, Barron i Eliot, 1998). Ovu promjenu fokusa Senko, Hulleman i Harackiewicz (2011) nazvaju kontroverznom, s obzirom na to da je time došlo do podjele na autore koji su više skloni perspektivi koja ističe ciljeve usmjerene na ovladavanje (Kaplan i Middleton, 2002) i na autore koji su više isticali multiplu perspektivu ciljeva (Elliot, 1999). Važno je spomenuti da multipla perspektiva polazi od ideje da učenici mogu usvojiti više od jednoga cilja te da kombinacija ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje i performativnih ciljeva ima pozitivnije ishode, nego pojedinačni cilj usmjeren na ovladavanje (Barron i Harackiewicz, 2001; Pintrich, 2000b). U nastavku ovoga rada donosimo neka od istraživanja ishoda ciljeva postignuća s intencijom da se uočii koji od ciljeva postignuća korelira s više pozitivnih ishoda.

U početcima propitivanja ishoda ciljeva, prepoznajemo pozitivne kognitivne ishode ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje koji su uključivali kompleksne razine misaone

obrade usvojenih informacija. U tom smislu, istraživači Meece, Blumenfeld i Hoyle (1988) dolaze do rezultata koji pokazuju da učenici, koji su usvojili ciljeve usmjerene na ovladavanje, koriste više razine kognitivnoga uključenja, metakognitivne strategije i samoregulacijske strategije kao što su *monitoring* pažnje, trud i zalaganje, povezivanje novih s postojećim informacijama i aktivno nadziranje razumijevanja. S druge strane, učenici s performativnim ciljevima koriste se tehnikama koje povećavaju kratkoročno pamćenje, ali se ne fokusiraju na učenje kao bitan dio zadatka. U istraživanju Miškulin i Vrdoljak (2017) pronađena je pozitivna povezanost oba cilja, ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje i performativnih ciljeva, s akademskim uspjehom, dubinskim i strateškim pristupom učenju. Ishodi ciljeva postignuća propitani su i iz perspektive odnosa učenika prema zadacima (Ames, 1992a, 1992b). Učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje, u usporedbi s učenicima s performativnim ciljevima, pokazuju više interesa i više su fokusirani na zadatak, ulažu veliki trud i napor u izvršenje zadatka, koriste kognitivne i metakognitivne strategije i mnogo su efikasniji u izvršenju zadatka. Pored ishoda koji primarno ukazuju na relaciju koju učenik uspostavlja sa zadacima, učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje pokazuju pozitivne emocije. Ames (1992b) je posebno isticala važnost ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje u području kvalitetnoga uključenja u proces učenja koji se odnosi na aktivno uključivanje koje karakterizira primjena efektivnih strategija učenja i efektivnih strategija rješavanja problema. Naravno, korištenje ovih strategija, zaključuje autorica, produkt je vjerovanja ovih učenika da upravo trud vodi do uspjeha te da je važno poznavati odgovarajuće strategije kao i način njihove primjene. Tako će se učenici koje karakteriziraju ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje više fokusirati na usvajanje novih znanja, vještina, sposobnosti, na svoj osobni rast i razvoj, intrigirat će ih izazovni zadatci jer oni osiguravaju rast, dok će se učenici s performativnim ciljevima uvijek brinuti da budu bolji od drugih procjenjujući osobne sposobnosti, znanja i vještine u odnosu na sposobnosti, znanja i vještine drugih.

Ishode ciljeva postignuća možemo pratiti na *kognitivnom, afektivnom i bihevioralnom planu* (Dweck i Leggett, 1988). Na kognitivnom planu, učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje postavljaju pitanje „Koji je najbolji način da povećam sposobnost ili usvojim vještinu”? Konačni ishod predstavlja povratnu informaciju o kvaliteti strategija koje su se primijenile prilikom učenja. Neuspjeh postaje samo signal da trenutačna strategija učenja nije dovoljna i da zahtijeva nadogradnju ili izmjenu. U *afektivnom pogledu* kreira se zadovoljavajuće iskustvo koje rezultira pozitivnim emocijama, dok u *bihevioralnom pogledu* ovi učenici izabiru one zadatke koji povećavaju rast i razvoj sposobnosti. S druge strane, za učenike s performativnim ciljevima Dweck i Leggett (1988) kažu da u *kognitivnom pogledu* postavljaju pitanje „Je li moja sposobnost (ne) adekvatna”? Ishod postaje glavni izvor informacija, a neuspjeh vodi prema atribuciji bespomoćnosti i procjeni o neadekvatnoj sposobnosti. U *afektivnom pogledu* to predstavlja prijatnu samopouzdanju, dok u *bihevioralnom* učenici biraju one zadatke koji povećavaju pozitivne ocjene i ponos te istovremeno umanjuje negativne ocjene, anksioznost i sram. Učenici s performativnim ciljevima postavljaju pitanja kao što su

„Radim li ovaj zadatak bolje nego moj prijatelj”, „Hoću li biti pametniji ako izvršim ovaj zadatak”, za razliku od učenika s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje koji se pitaju „Što ću naučiti” (Wigfield i Cambria, 2010). Grant i Dweck (2003) u svojem istraživanju ispitivale su učinke koje će ciljevi postignuća pokazati u situaciji kada pojedinac iskusi veliki neuspjeh pri visoko vrednovanom zadatku. Ove su autorice došle do rezultata koji pokazuju da ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje imaju pozitivne efekte na intrinzičnu motivaciju i izvedbu, predviđaju bolje procesiranje nastavnoga materijala, bolje ocjene i opće poboljšanje u izvjesnom periodu te širok spektar uporabe indikatora usmjerenih na ovladavanje kao što su: planiranje, ustrajnost, održiva intrinzična motivacija. S druge strane, performativni ciljevi predviđali su povratnu atribuciju o smanjenoj sposobnosti, osjećanju manje vrijednosti, ruminaciju o preprekama neuspjeha, gubitak intrinzične motivacije i niske ocjene. U studiji Linnenbrink (2005) učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje pokazali su visoku razinu akademske samoefikasnosti, interesa, pozitivnih emocija, korištenja adaptivnih strategija traženja pomoći, visoke razine samoregulacije, odnosno oni ustrajavaju i uključuju se u planiranje, nadzor i evaluaciju svojega rada na zadatku te pokazuju niske razine negativnih emocija. Nadalje, performativni ciljevi nisu bili povezani s devet mjerenih ishoda (akademska samoefikasnost, interesi, korisnost, anksioznost, adaptivno traženje pomoći, svrsishodno traženje pomoći, izbjegavajuće traženje pomoći, kvantitet samoregulacije, kvaliteta samoregulacije), a rezultati ostalih ishoda bili su neujednačeni u pogledu emocionalne dobroti i postignuća. Na primjer, oni su pokazali visoku razinu pozitivnih emocija, ali isto tako i visoku razinu anksioznosti pri testu. Učenici s ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje tijekom učenja više uživaju i pokazuju manje razine dosade, a učenici s performativnim ciljevima doživljavaju više ponosa i anksioznosti (Hrkač i Pahljina-Reinić, 2016). Radost, nada i ponos prilikom učenja vežu se za ciljeve usmjerene na ovladavanje, dok se ponos veže za performativne ciljeve (Pekrun, Elliot, i Maier 2006). U istraživanju Brdar i Bakarčić (2006) oba cilja, ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje i performativni ciljevi, pokazali su se kao značajni prediktori problemski usmjerenoga suočavanja s lošom ocjenom, koje se odnosilo na rješavanje problema i traženje roditeljske pomoći.

Prethodno navedena istraživanja pružila su uvid u ishode ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje i ishode performativnih ciljeva u okviru dihotomnoga konceptualnog modela ciljeva postignuća. Prema navedenom, primjećujemo pozitivni i adaptivni aspekt ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje s obzirom na to da su učenici s ovim ciljevima konstantno vođeni željom da unaprjeđuju svoje sposobnosti, pri čemu neuspjeh percipiraju kao smjernicu za usavršavanje, što ih vodi prema pozitivnim emocijama, dok učenici s performativnim ciljevima ako ne postignu uspjeh, mogu iskusiti negativne emocije. Za razliku od toga, istraživanja ishoda ciljeva postignuća koja su pratila ostale konceptualne modele pokazuju nešto drugačije i ponekad ambivalentne rezultate. Tako, na primjer, pozitivan ishod operacionaliziran kao akademsko postignuće pokazuje pozitivnu povezanost s performativnim ciljevima (Elliot i Church, 1997; Elliot i McGregor,

2001; Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer, Carter i Elliot, 2000), s performativnim ciljevima usmjerenim na postizanje uspjeha (Senko i Harackiewicz, 2005), ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje ne pokazuju povezanost (Harackiewicz et al., 1998), a performativni ciljevi usmjereni na izbjegavanje neuspjeha pokazuju negativnu povezanost s postignućem (Midgley et al., 2001). Međutim, u drugom istraživanju performativni ciljevi usmjereni na postizanje uspjeha bili su pozitivno povezani s izvedbom zadatka u situaciji kada je zadatak bio relativno lagan, ali ne i u situaciji s teškim zadacima (Barron i Harackiewicz, 2001). Inače, najviši stupanj metakognitivne samoregulacije zastupljen je kod ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje, dok su performativni ciljevi usmjereni na postizanje uspjeha povezani s boljim metakognitivnim samoregulacijskim vještinama od performativnih ciljeva usmjerenih na izbjegavanje neuspjeha (Dekker, Krabbendam, Lee, Boschloo, de Groot, i Jolles, 2016). Također, performativni ciljevi usmjereni na izbjegavanje neuspjeha povezani su sa stidom, bespomoćnošću (Pekrun et al., 2006), anksioznošću (Middleton i Midgley, 1997) i s manjom radoznalošću (Elliot i Church, 1997; Elliot i McGregor, 2001). Performativni ciljevi usmjereni na postizanje uspjeha pozitivan su prediktor nade i pokazuju pozitivan trend u odnosu na ponos za razliku od performativnih ciljeva usmjerenih na izbjegavanje neuspjeha koji su pozitivan prediktor anksioznosti, bespomoćnosti, stida i olakšanja. Ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje iskazuju pozitivan trend u odnosu na uživanje kao emociju, a negativan trend u odnosu na ljutnju (Pekrun, Cusack, Murayama, Elliot i Thomas, 2014). Ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem postizanje uspjeha pozitivno su povezani s uporabom metakognitivnih strategija i dubinskoga procesiranja kod studenata, dok ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem izbjegavanje neuspjeha nisu bili povezani s ovim ishodima (Elliot i McGregor, 2001). U kontekstu u kome se ističu intrapersonalni standardi, ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem izbjegavanje neuspjeha pokazuju negativan utjecaj na naprjeđenje izvedbe u odnosu na ciljeve usmjerene na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem postizanje uspjeha i performativnim ciljevima usmjerenim na izbjegavanje neuspjeha (Van Yperen, Elliot i Anseel, 2009). Kaplan i Maehr (1999) u istraživanju dolaze do rezultata koji pokazuju da su ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje pozitivno, a performativni ciljevi negativno povezani sa psihološkim blagostanjem (emocionalni ton, povezanost s vršnjacima i školom, kontrola impulsa). Ono što možemo uočiti iz ovoga prikaza rezultata istraživanja jest to da rezultati koji prate trihotomni model i model s četiri vrste ciljeva ukazuje da kod oba cilja, orijentacija na postizanje uspjeha, više korelira s pozitivnim ishodima u odnosu na orijentaciju izbjegavanje neuspjeha.

Zaključak

Uvidom u relevantne teorijske i empirijske pristupe ciljevima postignuća, možemo iznijeti nekoliko zaključaka. Od prvobitne podjele na dvije vrste ciljeva postignuća došlo je do podjele na šest vrsta ciljeva postignuća ili četiri konceptualna modela ciljeva postignuća što svjedoči o sve intenzivnijem istraživanju ovoga područja.

Ciljevi postignuća u predstavljenim istraživanjima pokazuju različite ishode. Ako se prati dihotomna podjela ciljeva postignuća, onda ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje sadrže više pozitivnih karakteristika i ishoda u odnosu na performativne ciljeve. Ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje bili su konzistentno povezani s nizom pozitivnih ishoda kao što su visoki adaptivni obrasci učenja, intrinzična motivacija, pozitivne emocije, ustrajnost usprkos neuspjehu i slično (npr. Ames, 1992a,b; Dweck i Leggett, 1988; Elliot i McGregor, 2001; Grant i Dweck, 2003; Linnenbrink, 2005). U sklopu ostalih konceptualnih modela koji dalje dijele dva opća cilja postignuća, došlo je do različitih rezultata u odnosu na rezultate dobivene istraživanjem dihotomnoga konceptualnog modela. Tako su performativni ciljevi koji su usmjereni na postizanje uspjeha pokazali pozitivne ishode (npr. Church i sur., 2001; Midgley i Urdan, 2001; Wolters, 2004), performativni ciljevi usmjereni na izbjegavanje neuspjeha pokazali su negativne ishode (npr. Middleton i Midgley, 1997; Pekrun i sur., 2014; Pekrun i sur., 2006), ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem postizanje uspjeha pokazali su pozitivne ishode (npr. Elliot i McGregor, 2001; Pekrun i sur., 2014), a ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje s podusmjerenjem izbjegavanje neuspjeha negativne ishode (npr. Elliot i Trash, 2001; Van Yperen i sur., 2009). Ustvari, na osnovi uvida u ovdje predstavljena istraživanja, možemo reći da orijentacija usmjerena na postizanje uspjeha ima više pozitivnih ishoda u odnosu na orijentaciju usmjerenu na izbjegavanje neuspjeha.

Općenito, ono što možemo potvrditi jest da je za ciljeve usmjerene na ovladavanje, kako i navode Grant i Dweck (2003, str. 542) vezano „manje kontroverze i više suglasnosti”. Ili kako jasno zaključuje Elliot i Story (2017, str. 12) „značaj ciljeva usmjerenih na ovladavanje ostaje jasan”. Prema našem viđenju, ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje po svojim obilježjima odgovaraju konstruktivističkoj percepciji stvarnosti, koja naglasak stavlja na konstruiranje i sukonstruiranje znanja kroz interakciju i diskusiju s drugima (Bruner, 1986). Također, ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje skloni su pristupu koji je usmjeren na dijete za razliku od tradicionalnoga didaktičkog pristupa pedagogiji. Pristup usmjeren na dijete, upravo naglašava autonomiju i sposobnost učenika da radije konstruira znanje, nego da mu znanje prenosi nastavnik autoritet (Morrison, 2001).

Slobodni smo reći da ciljevi usmjereni na ovladavanje nose sa sobom ispunjenje svrhe odgoja i obrazovanja koja u fokus mora staviti razvijanje stvaralačkih i kreativnih ideja mladih ljudi. Učenje treba dovesti do promjena u svim aspektima ličnosti učenika, a ne samo u kognitivnoj sferi. Cilj nam treba biti afirmiranje učenika koji će biti sposobni kreirati povoljne uvjete života u jednoj zajednici i okruženju. Učenici s performativnim ciljevima postižu dobre rezultate, međutim, njegovanje kulture koja će se zadovoljavati konačnom brojkom evaluacije, ne daje sigurne temelje za unaprjeđenje života svih, i istovremeno je daleko od stvaranja novih i originalnih ideja. Prethodno bismo mogli povezati i s Kolbergovom (Kohlberg, 1976) teorijom razvoja moralnosti koja fokus stavlja na razloge koji stoje u pozadini nečijega moralnog ponašanja (moralna kognicija). U ovome slučaju to znači da iza moralnoga ponašanja mogu stajati jednostavni i instrumentalni razlozi. Tako bismo povezujući s performativnim ciljevima mogli reći

da se iza odlične ocjene krije želja da se pokaže osobni uspjeh i nadmaše drugi, što nikako ne može biti cilj jednog vrlo suptilnoga procesa kakav je odgoj i obrazovanje. Ovaj proces mora pripremati učenike za kontinuirano propitivanje sebe i motiva koji stoje u pozadini određenoga ponašanja. Osobni uspjeh i demonstracija uspjeha može voditi glorificiranju sebe i ponižavanju drugih, a čim se uspostavi usporedba „mi-ja-bolji” i „oni-on-ona-lošiji” otvara se prostor za osuđivanje, pa i negativno ponašanje. Zato se ovim radom iznimna važnost daje ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje uz potrebu za kreiranjem uvjeta koji će unaprijediti i poticati usvajanje ovih ciljeva kod učenika. Jedan od načina kojim bi se ovo ostvarilo jest organiziranje nastave koja će biti usmjerena na ovladavanje. Koristiti različite i smislene zadatke, osigurati prilike za svakog učenika da bira i vodi osobno učenje (Linnebrick, 2005) zahtjevi su za nastavnika koji želi njegovati pristup usmjeren na ovladavanje.

S pravom je Dweck (1999) upozorila da će performativni ciljevi istisnuti ciljeve usmjerene na ovladavanje, da bi se kasnije Midgley i suradnici (2001, str. 83) još više zapitali „Što se dogodilo s razumijevanjem? Performativni ciljevi izgleda da sigurno potiskuju ciljeve usmjerene na ovladavanje.” Ovi autori svoju zabrinutost argumentiraju činjenicom da se sve veći naglasak stavlja na standarde masovnoga testiranja, standarde zasnovane na činjenicama i „pravim odgovorima”. S tim u vezi, smatramo da bi se ciljevima usmjerenim na ovladavanje trebala posvetiti veća empirijska pažnja kroz propitivanje čimbenika koji vode usvajanju ovih ciljeva.

Ciljevi postignuća teorijski identificiraju vrste ciljeva koje učenici usvajaju u odgojno-obrazovnom sustavu i predstavljaju stanje kakvo dominira u praksi. Naime, trenutačni istraživački rezultati ukazuju da odgojno-obrazovni sustav više pogoduje usvajanju performativnih ciljeva postignuća. Otvara se prostor za upit o tome kakve bismo rezultate dobili kada bi odgojno-obrazovni sustavi i sami njegovali kulturu učenja zbog učenja, a ne učenja zbog ocjene i kompeticije. Bismo li i u takvim okolnostima imali podjelu ciljeva postignuća na ciljeve usmjerene na ovladavanje i performativne ciljeve?