INFLUENCE OF MARITAL STATUS ON APPROACHES TO LEARNING AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AMONG TERTIARY INSTITUTION STUDENTS IN ZAMFARA STATE, NIGERIA

BY

Aminat, AHMAD GUSAU

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND COUNSELING,

FACULTY OF EDUCATION,

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,

ZARIA, NIGERIA

APRIL, 2016.

INFLUENCE OF MARITAL STATUS ON APPROACHES TO LEARNING AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AMONG TERTIARY INSTITUTION STUDENTS IN ZAMFARA STATE, NIGERIA

BY

Aminat, AHMAD GUSAU

M.Ed/EDUC/38416/2012-2013

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD

OF A

MASTER DEGREE IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND COUNSELING,

FACULTY OF EDUCATION,

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,

ZARIA, NIGERIA

APRIL, 2016.

DECLARATION

I declare that dissertation titled influence of marital status on approaches to learning and academic achievement among tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State has been concluded by me in the department of Educational Psychology and Counselling under the supervision of Dr. Aisha A. Mohammed and Dr. Yunusa Umaru. All information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged and a list of references provided.

AMINAT, Ahmad Gusau   Date

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation titled influence of marital status on approaches to learning and academic achievement among tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State meets the requirements of the award of the degree of Masters in Educational Psychology and Counselling, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge.

______________________________	______________________________
Dr. Aisha I. Mohammed Chairperson, Supervising Committee	Date
______________________________	______________________________
Dr YunusaUmaru Member, Supervising Committee	Date
______________________________	______________________________
Dr. Aisha I. Mohammed Head of Department	Date
______________________________	______________________________
Prof. K. Bala School of Post Graduate Studies	Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my profound gratitude to Almighty Allah for making this research work a reality and success for me.

My heartily and profound appreciation goes to my diligent, understanding and hard working supervisors, Dr. A. I. Mohammed and Dr Y. Umaru, whose encouragement, academic guidance and constructive assessment and supervision during this research work greatly provided me with the needed commitment. Thank you so much, I am most grateful.

My sincere appreciation also goes to the Head of Department, Educational Psychology and Counseling, Prof. M. Balarabe for his immense contribution towards the successful completion of my study and this research work. I am extremely indebted to all my lectures; Prof K. Mahmoud, Prof. E. F. Adeniyi, Dr. H. Tukur, Dr M. I. Abdullahi, Prof S. Sambo, Dr. J.O. Bawa, Dr. O. Dominic, Late .Dr A. O. Ohiazuwa and Prof. R. M. Bello, without whom my entire course and this study will not have been a success. Thank you so much and God bless you all. Special thanks to my mother for her moral support and prayers towards the success of my study, May Allah reward her abundantly. Immeasurable and invaluable gratitude goes to my husband AbubakarJa’afar for his moral, financial and academic support, I really appreciate all your efforts with a hearty thanks. To my children Fatima, Zainab, Ja’afar and Sadiq, I owe heavy debt gratitude.

My acknowledge will not be complete if I forget to acknowledge some of my friends and colleagues, HabibaIsah, Haruna Mohammed and Sagir Sayyadi for their academic and moral support during our years of study and this research work, thank you so much.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my husband and children.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of marital status on approaches to learning and academic achievement of tertiary institutions students in Zamfara state, Nigeria. Five research objectives were postulated and five null research hypotheses in line with research questions were posed and tested. A sample of 379 students from three (3) institutions drawn from a population of 34,909 tertiary institutions students of the state. The expost facto design was adopted in carrying out the study. The revised two facto study process questionnaire and CGPA were used to collect data from students. The test-re-test and cronbach alpha method were used to estimate reliability of the research instruments. A coefficient of 0.73 and alpha value of 0.64 were obtained as reliability estimate for the instruments t – test and chi square was used to test null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance. Findings revealed no significant between married and unmarried in their academic achievement. ($t = 0.279$, $p – 0.781$). Significance difference does not exist between married and unmarried student in their approaches. ($X2 = 3.841$, $p = 0.551$). Significant difference exist between surface learners and deep learners in their academic achievement, ($t = 1.96$, $p = 0.000$). Significance difference exist between male and female students in the approaches to learning, ($X2 = 3.841$, $p = 0.000$). Significance difference does not exists between male and female students in their academic achievement, ($t = 0.437$, $p = 0.662$). It was recommended that school psychologist, teachers and counselors should be sensitized on the influence of marital status on approaches to learning in order to improve academic achievement in schools.

TABLE OF CONTENT

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Operational Definition of Terms

Academic Achievement: Academic achievement represents achievement outcomes that indicate the extent to which a person has accomplished specific goals that were the focus of activities in instructional environments, specifically in school, college, and university. Academic achievement is measured by students' cumulative grade point average (CGPA).

Approaches to Learning: refers to the foundation that affects how student learn in every other content area. It encompasses student's engagement, motivation, and participation in the classroom.

Gender: Is the state of being male or female (typically used with reference to social and cultural rather than biological perspective).

Marital Status: refers to the condition of being married or unmarried i.e. that is single or married.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Education is a dynamic force in the life of every individual in influencing their physical, mental, emotional, social and ethical development. It is obvious that, only through the forces of education (both formal and informal) human standards and ideas can be raised. The education values aid the social, political and personal adjustment of the married complex in any given society, Mimkolf (1965). Education is therefore vital for improved family life. Gerda and Dennis (1982) noted that the family depends largely on educational level and use of that education in day-to-day activities. An individual irrespective of their marital status or gender needs to be given the best education.

Marital status in this work refers to the state of being married or unmarried. The consequences of marital status on both male and female student on their education can be drawn from both negative and positive perspectives. It has become an issue of concern that the marital status of a students may influence their approaches to learning and that their approaches to learning also may influence their academic achievement either positively or negatively.Approaches to learningrefer to the foundation that affects how student learn in every other content area. It encompasses students'engagement, motivation, and participation in the classroom. There is general agreement that there are two fundamental approaches to learning-deep and surface. In the early 1970s, Swedish researches identified two qualitatively different approaches to learning adopted by students in response to their perceived learning environment (Marton and Saljo, 1977), these are deep and surface approaches. Deep learning involves the critical analysis of new ideas, linking them to already known concepts so that they can be used for problem solving in unfamiliar contexts. Deep learning promotes understanding and application to life. In contrast, surface learning is the acceptance of information and memorization of isolated and unlinked facts.

Academic achievement represents achievement outcomes that indicate the extent to which a person has accomplished specific goals that were the focus of activities in instructional environments, specifically in school, college, and university. School systems mostly define cognitive goals that either apply across multiple subject areas (e.g., critical thinking) or include the acquisition of knowledge and understanding in a specific intellectual domain (e.g., numeracy, literacy, science, history). Therefore, academic achievement should be considered to be a multifaceted construct that comprises different domains of learning(Steinmayr, Meibner, Weidinger, Wirthwein 2014).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The problems of academic achievement among students of tertiary institutions in Zamfara State are many and sometimes complicated. Some of the notable ones include; combining the roles of wives/husband or father/mother and that of a student. This problem may be a hindrance in the effective achievement of married students in school, because they are expected to properly take care of the home at the same time expected to perform well academically. On the other hand, some of the married students, despite their dual situation of combining both roles of care givers at home and being students, may perform better in school than the unmarried students.

It is also observed that some students who were unmarried earlier tend to perform lower after marriage while some tends to perform even better after their marriage. It is against this background that the researcher intends to find out the influence of marital status on Approaches to learning and academic achievement among students of tertiary institutions of Zamfara State.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objective of the study is to;

1. Find the influence of marital status on academic achievement of tertiary institution students in Zamfara State.
2. Examine the influence of marital status on approaches to learning of tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State.
3. To determine the influence of approaches to learning on academic achievement of tertiary institution students in Zamfara State.
4. To assessgender difference in approaches to learning of tertiary institution students in Zamfara State.
5. To assessgender difference in academic achievement of tertiary institution students in Zamfara State.

1.4 Research Questions

For the purpose of this research, the following research questions are raised.

1. What is the difference between academic achievement of married and unmarried tertiary institutions' students in Zamfara state.
2. What is the difference between approaches to learning of married and unmarried tertiary institutions students in ZamfaraState.
3. What is the difference between in academic achievement of deep and surface learners of tertiary institutions in Zamfarastate.

4. What is the difference between approaches to learning of male and female tertiary institutions students in Zamfarastate.
5. What is the difference between academic achievement of male and female tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State

1.5 Research Hypotheses

For the purpose of this research, the following hypotheses are stated.

1. There is no significant difference in academic achievement of married and unmarried tertiary institution students in Zamfara State.
2. There is no significant difference in approaches to learning of married and unmarried tertiary institutions students inZamfara state.
3. There is no significant difference in academic achievement of deep and surface learners of tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State
4. There is no significant difference in approaches to learning of male and female tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State.
5. There is no significant difference in academic achievement of male and female tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State

1.6 Basic Assumptions

The study was carried out based on the following assumptions:

1. Marital status may influence academic achievement of tertiary institution students in Zamfara State
2. Marital status may affect approaches to learning of tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State

3. Approaches to may affect academic achievement of tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State.
4. Gender may affect approaches to learning of tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State.
5. Gender may affect academic achievement of tertiary institution students in Zamfara State.

1.7 Significance of the Study

This study is significant in many ways. The students of tertiary institutions in Zamfara state and the ministry of education including all other stake holders would find the outcome interesting as they will appreciate the influence of approaches to learning on the student's academic achievement. This study will help to address the problems of approaches to learning and academic achievement among married and unmarried students of tertiary institutions in Zamfara State. It will also help the students to identify ways of developing good approaches to learning to enhance their academic achievement.

The study will be useful to teachers to understand why married and unmarried students have differ in their academic achievement and be able to help students device means of enhancing their approaches to learning and academic achievement at school.To educational psychologist and counselors, this study will assist them to prepare seminars and conferences to enlighten the students and provide them with knowledge on how to inculcate good approaches to learning so as to enhance their learning.

The study will also enlighten the general public on issues that hinders or promote academic achievement of married and unmarried students and draw their attention to understand that poor approaches to learning can lead to poor academic achievement.

To the guidance and counselors, it will enable them to organize seminars and conferences to enlighten and orient students and the general public on issue regarding approaches to learning and academic achievement of married and unmarried students; problems of marital adjustment and how to cope with studies.

1.8 Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study focused on approaches to learning, marital status and academic achievement as the major variables. It encompasses all tertiary institutions of Zamfara State, involving both male and female students. The study covered three (3) of the tertiary institutions as sample consisting of Diploma two (2) students selected from various departments of the selected institutions.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter as the name implies will review literature based on the variables of the study as follows:

- Introduction
- Conceptual Framework
- Marital status
- Approaches to learning
- Academic achievement
- Theoretical Framework
- Review of Empirical Studies
- Summary and Uniqueness of the Study

2.2 Conceptual Framework

2.2.1 The Concept of Marital Status.

Marital status is the state of being married or unmarried. According to the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, marital status refers to whether someone is married, single, divorced or widowed.

2.2.2. Concept of Approaches to Learning

Approaches to learning refer to the ways in which students go about their academic tasks. There is general agreement that there are two fundamental leaning deep and surface. In the early 1970s, Swedish researches identified two qualitatively different approaches to learning adopted by student in response to their perceived learning environment. These are, deep and surface approaches (Marton and Saljo, 1976).

Students' approach to leanings evoked by a combination of their previous experience and the perception of their learning context (Ramden 1992). The adopted approach is not necessarily a characteristic of the student and can be changed. There are two interpretations of approaches of learning by students. It can be the process adopted prior to the outcome of learning as originally pressed by Marton and Saljo (1976). It can refer to predisposition to adopt particular processes which is what is meant when students are asked by means of questioners how they usually go about learning.

2.2.3. Concept of Academic Achievement

Adediwura and Tayo (2001) in Bashir (2013) defines academic achievement as the display of knowledge attained or skills developed in school subjects designed by test and examination scored or marks assigned by subject teachers. They added that it could be any expression used to represent students' scholastic standard or average scored of students in an examination.

Adeyemi (2010) in Isah (2013) sees academic achievement as the scholastic standing of a student at a given moment. It refers to how an individual is able to demonstrate his or her intellectual abilities. This scholastic standing could be explained as the grades in a course or group of courses, and the way in which a student has attained the grades including the time he or she passed the second examination after the first examination.

According to Kilgori (2011), academic achievement is the outcome of education, the extent to which a student, teacher or institution achieved their educational goals. Academic achievement is commonly measured by examinations or continuous assessment but there is no general agreement on how it is tested or which aspects are most important.

2.3 Marital Status

Marital status is the state of being married or unmarried. According to the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, marital status refers to whether someone is married, single, divorced or widowed.

Marital status refers to the status of an individual in relation to marriage classified as follows:

Single: A person who has never been married, Married: couple living together as husband and wife, Divorced: person whose bond of matrimony has been dissolved legally therefore can remarry, Separated: A person separated legally or not from his/her spouse because of marital discard or misunderstanding, Widowed: A person whose bond of matrimony has been dissolved by death of his/her spouse NSCB resolution No11 series 2003).

2.3.1 Marriage.

Marriage is a special contract or union between a man and woman in accordance with the law which establishes conjugal and family life. It is the foundation whose nature consequences and incidents are governed by law and stipulation (Ochidi 2012).

Marriage is a relationship and bond, most commonly between a man and a woman that plays a key role in the definition of many families. Precise definition varies historically between and within cultures, but it has been an important concept as a socially sanctioned bond in a sexual relationship (Ochidi 2012)

Marriage is encouraged for people who have reached the age of physical and psychological maturity. It should not be unnecessary delayed if there is a suitable partner available and the means of establishing and sustaining a family. Divorced people and widows are also encouraged to re-marry (Quran: 2:187)

Marriage is the appeared social pattern where by two or more persons establish a family. It involves not only the right to conceive and rear children, but also a host of other obligation and privileges affecting many people, and the recognition of this new status by others. A legal marriage legitimizes a social status and creates a set of legally recognized duties. In Islam, marriage is a religious duty and is consequently a moral safeguard as well as a social necessity. It is a social necessity because through marriages, families are established and the family is a fundamental unit of our society. Furthermore, marriage is the only legitimate way to indulge in intimacy between a man and a woman.

2.3.2. Marital Adjustment.

Marital adjustment defined as the success and functionality of the partners in marriage is accepted as a broader concept that also involves the concepts of marital satisfaction and happiness. (Ersanlı&Kalkan, 2008).

Marital adjustment is the state in which there is an overall feeling in husband and wife of happiness and satisfaction with their marriage and with each other. Marital adjustment calls for dual-career for maturity that accepts and understands growth and development in the spouse. The phenomenon of marital adjustment involves adjustment to mate, sexual adjustment, emotional adjustment, adjustment towards in-laws, and the like. (Jaisri, M &Joseph, M. I. 2014).

Marital adjustment: Marital or dyadic adjustment may be conceptualized as a process and the outcome is determined by the amount of: "(1) troublesome dyadic differences; (2) interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety; (3) dyadic satisfaction; (4) dyadic cohesion; and (5) consensus on matters of importance to dyadic functioning" (Spanier, 1976, p. 17). These aspects of adjustment are applicable to both married and unmarried couples ((Spanier, 1976) (Suvarna Joshi &Nutankumar S. Thingujam 2009).

Importance and factors involved in marital adjustment

According to Alfred Adler (1978), marriage is part of the three tasks (i.e., work, friendship, and love) that the human community sets for every individual.

Relationship importance

Over the course of life, people learn to establish different relationships, with different values, expectations and commitments. One of those relationships is the marital relationship. For A good marital relationship marital adjustment is essential. Sinha&Mukerjee (1990) defines marital adjustment as "The state in which there is an overall feeling in husband and wife of happiness and satisfaction with their marriage and with each other".

Locke & Wallace (1959) defines marital adjustment as: "accommodation of husband and wife to each other at a given time"

According to Spanier and Cole (1976), marital adjustment is a process, the outcome of which is determined by the degree of: a) troublesome marital differences, b) interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety, c) marital satisfaction d) dyadic cohesion, e) consensus on matters of importance to marital functioning.

Factors involved in Marital Adjustment:

Wife employment and Marital Adjustment:

Blumstein and Schwartz (1983) had earlier found that individuals, particularly wives, reported increased levels of self-esteem, self-concept, and self-worth were positively correlated with employment. Previous research on the relationship between wife employment and marital adjustment has produced conflicting results: some investigations report a positive relationship between wife employment and marital adjustment (Burke & Weir, 1976; Hartley, 1978); others suggest a negative relationship (Bean, Curtis, & Marcum, 1977; Gover, 1963); other studies show no relationship (Bahr & Day, 1978; Blood & Wolfe, 1960).

Nathawat and Mathur (1993) did a study in India about marital adjustment and subjective well-being in Indian-educated housewives and working women. Their results indicated that working women had better marital adjustment and subjective well-being. Working women reported high scores on general health, life satisfaction and self-esteem measures & lower scores on hopelessness, insecurity and anxiety whereas the housewives had lower scores on negative affect than the working women.

Trust and marital adjustment:

Relationships are composed of trust, and sharing of intimate thoughts and feelings. They are built upon trust and sharing and they get stronger from these things (Finkenauer, Kerkhof, Righetti, &Branje, 2009). According to Regan, Kocan, and Whitlock (1998) Trust is one of the most important component of a loving relationship. Also international studies have found trust to be a critical factor in the success of long-term marriages (Roizblatt et al. 1999; Sharlin 1996).

In a longitudinal study, Kristina Moeller and HakanStattin (2001) report that adolescents with trustful parental relationships experienced greater satisfaction with their partner relationships in midlife.

Quality of life and marital adjustment.

Psychological Factors: Depression stress (psychological well being)

Lower psychological well-being is a major risk factor for relationship distress. Higher rates of relationship problems have been consistently linked to persons suffering from severe psychiatric disorders, including depression, substance abuse, and anxiety disorders (Bradbury, 1998). Many studies link marital conflict to depression (Beach, Arias, & O'Leary, 1987; O'Leary and Beach, 1990). Although the authors propose a bidirectional causal relationship between marital conflict and depression, they suggest that marital conflict is typically a more powerful contributing factor to depression.

Marital satisfaction appears to be an important factor of psychological well being. Marital distress has been linked with many psychological difficulties especially depression.

Belongingness and Marital Adjustment:

According to Baumeister& Leary (1995) Belongingness might have multiple and strong effects on emotional patterns and on cognitive processes. Lack of belongingness or attachments is linked to a variety of ill effects on health, adjustment, and well-being. In a close relationship there is a need to belong and if that need isn't fulfilled then problems may occur. One of the universal institutions is marriage which is accepted to satisfy the need for belongingness.

Economics and Marital Adjustment

Education and income have also been linked to marital satisfaction and marital conflict, with greater levels of education and income predicting greater marital satisfaction and less conflict. Economic stress has a negative effect on marital satisfaction and a positive influence on relationship dissolution (Johnson & Booth, 1990).

Economic strain is directly linked to increased couple disagreements and has direct impact on marital adjustment (Kinnunen and Feldt, 2004). Many researches haves been conducted on economic factor in relation to marital adjustment e.gZedlewski (2002) studied economic factor in relation to family well-being , he found that low family income and limited benefits have negative influences on child and family well-being. Voyandoff (1990) studied economic distress and family relations. Ross &Mirowsky (1992) and Yadollahi (2009) studied that employment of spouses and the sense of control in various types of stressors of marital life. Diener and Diener (2001) investigated that wealth is related to many positive outcomes in life. Gudmunson, Beutler, Israelsen, McCoy & Hill (2007) found that financial problems significantly contributed to lower reported marital satisfaction among married couples. In a study in Finland conducted by Kinnunen and Feldt (2004) concluded that husband's unemployment is strongly associated with his marital adjustment. Couples with better economic resources are martially adjusted as compared to those who have limited economic resources. Economic hard times increased rate of martial distress. (Blekesaune 2008)

Personality and Marital Adjustment

In a study by Bouchard, Sabourin, &Lussier, Y. (1999) the relationship of various personality traits with marital adjustment was studied. Personality traits studied were neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness. The scale used to measure marital adjustment was dyadic adjustment scale. The results showed that women high in agreeableness and openness were more adjusted. Also males that were high on openness and agreeableness were more martially adjusted. Husband's openness was positively related to their wives marital adjustment. Open individuals may tolerate and respect differences in behavior and thought of partner which would reduce the number of conflicts and increase the consensus between spouses.

Kim, Martin, and Martin (1989) and Levine and Henessy (1990) found that personality factors differentiated stable from unstable marriages. Stable marriages were more similar in intelligence, pretension, radicalism, tender-mindedness, mutual trust, acceptance, enthusiasm, and genuineness. Personality factors that reduce the likelihood of stability and satisfaction have included the lack of warmth and extraversion (Levine &Henessy); passive-aggression (Slavik, Carlson, & Sperry, 1998); borderline pathologies (Paris &Braverman, 1995); bipolar disorders (Peven& Schulman, 1998); feelings of insecurity, unfairness, depreciation, and powerlessness (Begin, Sabourin, Lussier, & Wright, 1997); disagreeableness, emotional instability, inconsiderateness, and physical abuse (Botwin et al., 1997; Kosek, 1996; Shackelford & Buss, 1997); depression (Cohan & Bradbury, 1997; Davila & Bradbury, 1997; Fals-Stewart, Birchler, Schafer, &Lucente, 1994); neuroticism (Karney& Bradbury, 1997; Russell & Wells, 1994a; Russell & Wells, 1994b); tension, anxiety, worry, and suspicion (Craig & Olson, 1995); hostility, defensiveness, and aggression (Heyman, O'Leary, &Jouriles, 1995; O'Leary, Malone,

& Tyree, 1994; Newton, Kiecolt-Glaser, Glaser, & Malarkey, 1995); and negative affectivity leading to negative attributions (Huston &Vangelistic, 1991; Karney, Bradbury, Fincham, & O'Sullivan, 1994).

Individual personality traits have also been linked to couples' relationship functioning for both men and women. Personality traits of neuroticism, anxiety, and emotional instability have been shown to impair relationship functioning and reduce relationship satisfaction (Watson & Clark, 1984). Additionally, personality characteristics of agreeableness and expressiveness have been referred to as individual protective factors, which may enhance marital satisfaction (Bradbury, Campbell, &Fincham, 1995).

Communication and Marital Adjustment:

Communication is necessary for human growth and development also it serves as the essential foundation for marital success and is the facilitating process for an enduring marriage that is satisfying (Robinson & Blanton, 1993). Communication within relationships is an important factor, if there isn't communication the relationship suffers. The relationship between marital communication and adjustment is a strong one (Murphy &Mendelson 2004). Gottman (1995) in his book indicated that communication could be both productive and destructive to relationships as unhappy couples tend to criticize, disagree, complain, put down, and use excuses and sarcasm. Unrewarding communication patterns lead to the development of relationship distress (Markman, 1979). In contrast, happy couples with marital stability and satisfaction are more likely to use active listening skills, agree, approve, assent, use laughter and humor (Fisher, Giblin, &Hoopes, 1982) and possess character virtues of self-restraint, courage, and friendship (Fowers& Olson, 1986). Gottman (1995) has suggested that satisfied couples maintain a five-to-one ratio of positive to negative exchanges in interactions.

Gender also plays an important role in couple communication as there are gender differences in verbal and nonverbal communication with men tending to be more dominant in their interactions and women being more submissive (Tannen, 1990).

Emmers-Sommer (2004) studied the effect of communication quality and quantity indicators on satisfaction in relationships. A key term in the study was quality time; this refers to focused, uninterrupted time spent with children, partners, friends, and significant others. Another key term used in the study was quantity time; this refers to frequency of communication or contact. For individuals to reach relationship satisfaction they have to examine the quantity and quality of their disclosures with their partners. Emmers-Sommer (2004) found that quality of communication predicts both relationship satisfaction and intimacy. The quantity of communication, however, was not a predictor for relationship satisfaction.

Concealment/Non- disclosure and marital adjustment:

Disclosure as a phenomenon was first investigated by Sidney Jourard (1971). The process was originally defined as telling others about the self. Rosenfeld (1979) explained self-disclosure as the personal information of self that is only available from himself and is not available from other sources. Jorgensen & Gaudy (1980) defines self disclosure as a process by which a marriage partner expresses feelings, perceptions, fears, and doubts of the inner self to the other partner, allowing relatively private and personal information to surface in the relationship that normally would not be revealed in the course of day-to-day interaction.

2.4 Approaches to Learning

Approaches to learning refer to the ways in which students go about their academic tasks. There is general agreement that there are two fundamental approaches to learning-deep and surface. In the early 1970s, Swedish researches identified two qualitatively different approaches to learning adopted by students in response to their perceived learning environment (Marton and Saljo, 1977), these are deep and surface approaches. Deep learning involves the critical analysis of new ideas, linking them to already known concepts so that they can be used for problem solving in unfamiliar contexts. Deep learning promotes understanding and application to life. In contrast, surface learning is the acceptance of information and memorization as isolated and unlinked facts.

According to Marton and Säljö's in a seminal paper described a fundamental distinction in the manner in which students approached reading an academic article. For that time, in their field of psychology, the nature of the study was unusual. Marton and Säljö did not conduct an artificial laboratory experiment in order to isolate one or other element of student learning. Instead, they set out to discover something about how university students approached the type of task they really engaged in on a day to day basis. The students were asked to read an academic article, and told that they would afterwards be required to answer questions on it.

In the course of the study it was found that some students experienced the text as a collection of discrete units of information that should be memorisedin order *to* answer the anticipated questions. Marton and Säljö termed this the ***'surface approach'***.

Other students treated the text as something that contained a structure of meaning. They searched for its underlying concerns, its implications, and its meaning to themselves. Marton and Säljö termed this the ***'deep approach'.*** Students who approached the task using a deep approach understood more of the article, were better able to answer a range of questions about it, and were also able to remember its message more effectively.

Marton and Säljö have a different perception. In their view, students' study activity is the outcome of interaction between the student and his or her environment. Their underlying conviction is that all human activity is an outcome of human perceptions of the world as it presents itself, and we behave according to how circumstances appear to us. This starting point should be kept in mind, as it underpins the claims that are made about the nature of student approaches to learning.

There are three key points in approaches to learning.

i) The deep and surface approaches are not personality traits or fixed learning styles. Students adopt an approach which is related to their perceptions of the task.

The same students can and do adopt either a deep approach or a surface approach to different tasks, and they may even swap between them in the same task. That the same students use different approaches to learning was demonstrated in Diana Laurillard's important work with mathematics and engineering students

She found that students changed their approach according to the different demands that they perceived to be imposed by their varied tasks.

ii) Memorisation can be a feature of both the surface and the deep approaches, but it plays a different role in each.

All learning assumes some process of remembering. A key distinction between deep and surface approaches to learning is the prominence that 'memory work' is accorded in each. To the learner adopting a deep approach, different forms of memorisation are a means to an important end - that of creating understanding. To the learner adopting a surface approach, memorisation is an end in itself. The student adopting a deep approach to their studies will be aware of the need to remember significant facts, principles, claims, and arguments and so on, if they are to stake a claim to a terrain of knowledge called their own. The law student must remember the facts of cases and key judicial pronouncements. The historian must remember significant events. The chemist must remember key formulae. The process of making knowledge one's own rests in part on being able to remember important information.

But it also implies being able to *make sense* and *make meaning* from that information. It implies discovering or creating structural relationships, understanding or transforming relations of significance, spotting gaps, recognising and formulating important questions.

To achieve this requires an active engagement with remembered information. It cannot be done by memorisation alone.

The student adopting a surface approach to their studies treats academic texts, lectures, lecture notes and so on, as a mass of data that has to be memorised for recall and reproduction. There are philosophical dangers in using computer analogies for human cognition, but scanning software perhaps provides us with a helpful point of comparison.

We can scan text from a book onto our computer hard disk, and then print it out. If we designed a more sophisticated programme, the computer could reorganise the text, reformat it, and produce appropriate gobbets when prompted. Few would be prepared to argue, however, that the computer has, in this case, 'understood' the text. What this computer could not do is use the information *creatively* in the way we would expect of a human who fully understood.

Although computers are imperfect analogues for the process of human learning, it is still instructive to consider what a computer adopting a ‘deep approach’ would be able to do. For our purposes, a computer that ‘understood’ would be a computer that was able to ‘make sense’ of the data that had been captured. A computer 'making sense' of data would analyse it according to its own different purposes, create meaningful new patterns in it, connect it in appropriate ways with other programmes and other data, use it to identify problems and use it to generate new solutions to problems. This computer would be able to identify gaps in its ‘knowledge’ and it would be able to communicate its data in a way which made sense to an ‘other’. It would be capable of using its knowledge playfully, making and appreciating jokes, puns and double entendres. If you are able to imagine a computer doing these things, you are able to imagine a computer adopting a 'deep approach' to learning.

iii) The deep approach and surface approach are a manifestation of the intention that the student possesses.

Engaging in the task, the student intends either to adopt a “knowledge-making” approach, or a “data-reproducing” approach. These intentions may change as the student works (for example, if the material is too difficult or if time runs short, the student may flip from knowledge-making into data-reproducing). But for any one task the student cannot hold both intentions simultaneously, and cannot therefore adopt both a surface and a deep approach at the same moment.

2.4.1 Deep Approach to Learning

Students who adopt a deep approach to learning are intrinsically motivated and search for meaning by integrating new information with existing knowledge. In adopting a deep approach to learning, students focus their attention on the overall meaning in a class session, text or situation. They attempt to relate ideas together and to construct their own meaning possibly in relation to their own experience. Students approach to subject in a meaningful way. When students adopt a deep approach to learning, they are more likely to have a higher quality outcome of learning. Stevenson (1977) reported that, students who consistently adopted a deep approach were more successful in passing examination than those students who consistently adopted a surface. The deep motive is based on intrinsic motivation or curiosity. In the deep approach, there is personally committed to learning which means the student relates the content to personally meaningful context or to the one existing before the knowledge, depending on the subject involved. Deep processing involves processes of a higher cognitive level than rote learning. Deep approaches involve searching for analogy about what is learnt, and the deriving extensions and exceptions.

Characteristics of Deep Approach to Learning

Students who take a deep approach have the intention of understanding, engaging with operating in and valuing the subject. Such students:

- Actively seek to understand the material / the subject
- Interact vigorously with the content
- Make use of evidence, inquiry and evaluation
- Take a broad view and relate ideas to one another
- Are motivated by interest
- Relate new ideas to previous knowledge
- Relate concepts to everyday experience
- Tend to read and; study beyond the course requirements.

2.4.2 Surface Approach to Learning

Surface learners are extrinsically motivated (mostly by marks) and have a reproductive conception of learning (Biggs, 1987) Entwistle and Ramsdon, 1983). Marton and Saljo, 1976). The motive here is extrinsic. It is to carry out the task because of either positively or negatively reinforcing consequences. The student is willing to engage in the task and pass minimally either because life will be worse if he does not pass or because he wishes to gain a paper qualification with minimal effort. Typical surface strategy is rote learning. Surface motivated students focus on what appears to be the most important topics, as defined by teachers and examinations, and reproduce them. As a result of this focus, these students do not see interconnections between elements or the meanings and implications of what is learned.

In adopting a surface approach to learning, students focus their attention on the details in the form they appear in the class or text or to list the features of the situation in order to pass their examinations. Many students adopt a surface approach as a way of coping or surviving when curriculum demands are perceived to be excessive.

Characteristic of Surface Approach to Learning

Students who take a surface approach tend not to have the primary intention of becoming interested in and of understanding the subject, but rather their motivation tends to be that of jumping through the necessary hoops in order to acquire the mark, orthe grade, or the qualification. When asked, staff deplores this approach but they frequently acknowledge that the majority of their students tend to take this approach .Students who takes a surface approach:

- Try to learn in order to repeat what they have learned
- Memorise information needed for assessments
- Make use of rote learning
- Take a narrow view and concentrate on detail
- Fail to distinguish principles from examples
- Tend to stick closely to the course requirements
- Are motivated by fear of failure

The main features of the deep and surface approaches are summarised in the table below.

Table 2.1 Characteristics and Factors that Encourage Deep and Surface Approaches to Learning.

	Deep Learning	**Surface Learning**
Definition	Examining new facts and ideas critically, and trying them into existing cognitive structures and making numerous links between ideas.	Accepting new facts and ideas uncritically, and attempting to store them as isolated unconnected ideas.
Characteristics	Looking for meaning Focusing on the central argument or concepts needed to solve a problem. Interacting actively. Distinguishing between arguments and evidence. Making connections between different models Relating new and previous Knowledge Linking course content to real life.	Relying on rote learning Focusing on outwards signs and the formulae needed to solve a problem Receiving information passively. Failure to distinguish principles from examples Treating parts of modules and programme as separate. Not recognizing new materials as building on previous work. Seeing course content simply as materials to be learnt for the exam.
Encourage by students	Having an intrinsic curiosity in the subject Being determined to do well by mentally engaging when doing academic work Having the appropriate background knowledge for a second foundation Having time to pursue interests through good time management. Positive experience of education	Studying a degree for the qualification and not being interested in the subject. Not focusing on academic areas, but emphasizing others (e.g social, sport) Lacking background knowledge and understanding necessary to understand material. Not enough time, too high a workload.

	leading to confidence n ability to understand and succeed.	Cynical view of education, believing that factual recall is what is required. High anxiety.
	Showing personal interest in the subject Bringing out the structure of the subject Concentrating on and ensuring plenty of time for key concepts Confronting students' misconceptions. Engaging students in active learning Using assessments that require though, and required ideas to be used together. Relating new materials to what students already know and understand. Allowing students to make mistakes without penalty and rewarding effort. Being consistent and fair in assessing declared intended learning outcomes, and hence establishing trust.	Conveying disinterest or even a negative attitude to the material. Presenting material so that it can be perceived as a series of unrelated facts and ideas. Allowing students to be passive. Assessing for independent facts (short answer question) Rushing to cover too much material. Emphasizing coverage at the expense of depth. Creating undue anxiety or low expectations of success by discouraging statements or excessive workload. Having a short assessment cycle.

Compiled from Biggs (1999), Entwistle (1998) and Ramsden (1992)

2.4.3 Achieving or strategic approaches to learning

It has long been known that students' success in learning depends in part on the effort they put into their work. In separate studies of deep and surface approaches, leading researchers

John Biggs v and Noel Entwistle independently identified an evidently strategic approach and noted that it is used in conjunction with a deep or surface approach to learning. Entwistle describes it and related approaches as follows:

The strategic approach derives from an intention to obtain thehighest possible grades and involves adopting well-organised and efficient study methods. Other students were found to have study pathologies, with negative attitudes and disorganised and dilatory study habits.

While the deep approach is focus on the process, the achieving or strategic approach like the surface approach is focus on the product. There is the ego trip that comes from obtaining high grade and winning prizes. The general strategy is to maximize the chances of getting high grade. Hopefully, this involves optimal engagement in the task like the deep approach, but sucg engagement is the means to an end and not an end unlike the deep approach. What matters most in the engagement depends on what ends the most grades.

The Characteristics of Strategic or Achieving Learning

The strategic or achieving approach is that approach which students are said to take when they wish to achieve positive outcomes in terms of obtaining a pass or better in the subject. Students taking this approach:

- Intend to obtain high grades
- Organise their time and distribute their effort to greatest effect
- Ensure that the conditions and materials for studying are appropriate
- Use previous exam papers to predict questions
- Are alert to cues about marking schemes.

2.4.4 Approaches to Learning and Academic Achievement.

According to Subasingh, and Wanniachchi (2003), there are different approaches that people adopt when learning. The quantity and quality of learning is determined by the approach to learning students adopt. The way that students approach learning plays an important role in determining the outcome of any educational endeavour. Surface/superficial, deep, and strategic are the three basic learning approaches adopted by students, as identified by researchers in medical education. Amongst them, deep and surface are the two main qualitatively different approaches, derived from original empirical research by Marton and Säljö and since elaborated by Entwistle, Ramsden and Biggs.

Students adopting a deep approach are motivated by an interest in the subject material and/or recognition of its vocational relevance. There is an intention to understand; to focus on the concepts applicable to problem solving. Students relate previous knowledge to new knowledge, theoretical ideas to everyday experience and the task is interpreted as an opportunity to gain new insight. In addition, the deep approach is found to facilitate the retention of factual details more effectively. Students adopting a surface approach are predominantly motivated either by a desire to complete the course or a fear of failure, thus fulfilling the requirements by memorizing and reproducing the material they believe is likely to come up in assessments, resulting in a superficial level of understanding. With regards to students adopting a strategic approach, the predominant motive is the achievement of high grades and they use either the surface or deep approach depending on what they feel would produce the most successful results. According to several researchers, measuring students' approaches to learning has been seen as the means of the following.

Helping students become better learners

- Assisting individual academics who are concerned in monitoring and improving the effectiveness of their teaching
- Identifying students at risk because of ineffective strategies
- Observing the outcomes and experience of learning

It has been shown that the approach to learning has a significant effect on the subsequent outcome of the specific learning process. Deep approaches have been associated with a higher quality of learning outcome whilst surface approaches have been associated with unsatisfactory learning outcomes. Research in higher education has repeatedly shown that approach to learning is related to the quality of learning outcomes. When evaluating the outcome of deep learning in medical education, it is considered far superior in achieving long term favourable results (*Subasingh, and Wanniachchi 2003)*

Trigwell& Prosser (1991) reported on the relationship between qualitative differences in learning outcomes, perceptions and evaluations of the learning environment and approaches to study. The results of their study support previous research in identifying relationships between perceptions/evaluations of the learning environment and approaches to study and between approach to study and the quality of the learning outcomes. The study reported also identifies a relationship between perceptions, approaches and the quality of the outcomes. The results suggest that environments perceived to encourage deep approaches to learning are more likely to facilitate higher quality learning.

Other studies examined whether approaches to learning were linked to the nature of a task for various academic disciplines. Here, Jones, Reichard and Mokhtari (2003) assessed the preferences of 105 college students in terms of approaches to learning in English, mathematics, science, and social sciences. Results indicated that students varied their approaches to learning depending on which of the four disciplines they were studying. Specifically, when studying science, students reported using active experimentation most, while concrete experience was mainly reported when studying English composition. For the social sciences, students reported using reflective observation and abstract conceptualization more often than when they were studying English, mathematics, or science. Differences in learning approaches between different disciplines were also reflected in the forming of the SPQ (Biggs, 1987b), where in comparison to arts students, students studying science had a higher raw score on items measuring surface approach. Likewise, science students attained a higher raw score for the achieving strategy. Significant differences in learning approaches between disciplines were also demonstrated by Smith and Miller (2005) who investigated the learning approaches of 248 students studying business and psychology. In this study, psychology students had significantly higher scores on the deep motive and deep strategy subscales than business students. In contrast, business students scored significantly higher on the surface motive and surface strategy subscales.

2.4.5. Approaches to Learning and Gender

With respect to gender, Picou, Gatlin-Watts and Packer (1998) found that female students preferred factual rather than abstract concepts. They also tended to break down problems into logical steps to a greater extent in comparison to male students. In addition, Rouse and Austin (2002) reported that high-achieving female students had higher scores than high-achieving male students across the academic domains measuring learning, homework effort, and information seeking behaviour. Cano (2005) showed that older female students tended to score higher on the deep and the achieving approaches to learning in comparison to younger male students. However, he noted that these results may have been tempered by academic demands such as dense curriculum and time limitations. A more differentiated picture was reported by Watkins and Hattie (1981) who found an interaction effect between gender, discipline area, and learning approaches. Here, the differences in learning approaches between disciplines were related to gender.

2.5 Academic achievement

Academic achievement represents performance outcomes that indicate the extent to which a person has accomplished specific goals that were the focus of activities in instructional environments, specifically in school, college, and university. School systems mostly define cognitive goals that either apply across multiple subject areas (e.g., critical thinking) or include the acquisition of knowledge and understanding in a specific intellectual domain (e.g., numeracy, literacy, science, history). Therefore, academic achievement should be considered to be a multifaceted construct that comprises different domains of learning. Because the field of academic achievement is very wide-ranging and covers a broad variety of educational outcomes, the definition of academic achievement depends on the indicators used to measure it. Among the many criteria that indicate academic achievement, there are very general indicators such as procedural and declarative knowledge acquired in an educational system, more curricular-based criteria such as grades or performance on an educational achievement test, and cumulative indicators of academic achievement such as educational degrees and certificates. All criteria have in common that they represent intellectual endeavors and thus, more or less, mirror the intellectual capacity of a person. In developed societies, academic achievement plays an important role in every person's life. Academic achievement as measured by the GPA (grade point average) or by standardized assessments designed for selection purpose such as the SAT (Scholastic Assessment Test) determines whether a student will have the opportunity to continue his or her education (e.g., to attend a university). Therefore, academic achievement defines whether one can take part in higher education, and based on the educational degrees one attains, influences one's vocational career after education. Besides the relevance for an individual, academic achievement is of utmost importance for the wealth of a nation and its prosperity. The strong association between a society's level of academic achievement and positive socioeconomic development is one reason for conducting international studies on academic achievement, such as PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment), administered by the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). The results of these studies provide information about different indicators of a nation's academic achievement; such information is used to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of a nation's educational system and to guide educational policy decisions. Given the individual and societal importance of academic achievement, it is not surprising that academic achievement is the research focus of many scientists; for example, in psychology or educational disciplines. This article focuses on the explanation, determination, enhancement, and assessment of academic achievement as investigated by educational psychologists. Academic Achievement,(Steinmayr, Meibner, Weidinger and Wirthwein 2015)

Academic achievement refers to how well students can accomplish the classroom tasks given to them by their teachers; it is the extent at which they cope with their studies in relation to the stipulated aims and objectives of the school. Academic achievement is usually reflected in learner's ability to be able to communicate the knowledge they have acquired within a given period of time verbally or most of the time, to put it down on paper and measured using test or any other valid instrument. It can also refer to the measure of students academic output which can be determined by the grades they obtained at the end of a programe (Bashir 2013).

As cited by Bashir (2013) in Calvin and Chumba (2011) academic achievement refers to same methods of expressing students' scholastic study usually in grades for a course. They refer to such achievements as average scores got from test which could either be termed good, average or poor.

Awoyemi (2004) sees academic achievement as the acquisition or more facts, concepts and problems solving skills that are reflected in achievement test scores and grades (Bashir 2013).

Academic achievement is a complex student behavior and underlies several abilities, e.g., memory, previous knowledge or aptitude as well as psychological factors such as motivation, interests, temperaments or emotions, to name a few (Deary, Whiteman, Starr, Whalley, & Fox, 2004). Educational psychologists and researchers have argued that there are many determinants of academic achievement (Chamorro-Permuzic&Furnham, 2003), in (Rana A. and Kausar R. 2011).

Danskin and Burnett (1952) found that students getting higher marks had more effective study habits as compared to students who had ineffective study habits and thus lagged behind in studies. Similarly, L. D. Crow and Crow (1963) found academically poor achievers to have less effective study habits as compared to academically high achievers. In the same context, Sorenson (1964) found that pupils who got more scholarships had better study habits than the pupils who did not achieve scholarships. For academic achievement, being smart is more important than being intelligent and hardworking and involves being practical, having common sense and using better organization and application of good study habits (Clark, 1996), in (Rana A. and Kausar R. 2011).

Robinson (2000) found that certain bad study habits result in poor academic achievement whereas certain good study habits result in high academic achievement. Creemers and Reynold (2000), on the basis of data of National Assessment of Educational Progress, demonstrated a positive relationship between good study habits and academic achievement of 8th and 9th Grade students. Similarly, Gilbert and Rollick (1996) suggested good study habits to significantly enhance academic achievement of the pupils (Rana A. and Kausar R. 2011)

Academic achievement is how student deal with their studies and how they cope with or accomplish deferent tasks given to them by their teachers it is also the ability to study and remember facts and being able to communicate the knowledge verbally or written down on papers (Siva, 2009) academic achievement is measured by cumulative grade points (C.G.P.A).

According to Sharm (2012) academic achievement is how well a student is accomplishing his/her take and studies but there are quite a number of factors that determined the level and qualities of students academic achievement, these facts include grades, attendance, and extracurricular activities.

According to Sharm (2012) grade are certainly the most well-known indicators of academic achievement, grades are the students "score" for their class and overall tenure. Grades are most often a tally or average of assignment and test scores.

Student academic achievement is monitored closely so as to identify easily any student whose achievement is likely to lead to academic failure. The Faculty of Department works with individual students to provide academic guidance so as to maximize the chances of all students succeeding. Two kind of academic achievement review take place, one at the end of the term or semester and another at the end of the new session. Both kinds of reviews evaluate recent academic achievement in the light of past achievement but cumulative average over more than one session is not assessed (Baba 2007).

However, whatever academic achievement that is need to be evaluated and depended on what system the institution is operating. It is interesting to note that, in Nigeria all academic institutions operated the American semester system in all its ramifications as opined Shallah (2007.) But the system has its own disadvantage as studies of this have showed that the inclusion of the system had decreased the academic achievement of students in our high institutions. Contrary to what is expected in the session system (Baba 2007). Students nowadays depended on the notes given to them by their lecturers, academic achievement is measured or determine within the stipulated period and period seems to be insufficient in determining academic achievement of student (Baba andKaura 2007).

The introduction of the semester system in determining academic achievement led to the introduction of what is called probation. Probation is a situation whereby a student is falls below 1 point and is expected to achieve an average of 1 point in a 15 or 18 credit unit to proceed the next level (Rabi 2009). Even this system is not standardized as not all high institutions operate the same number of credit unit or course load per semester or per session.

It should be noted that studies have shown that individual differences had continued to influence academic achievement of students. This is mostly linked to individual I.Q and personality (Von Stummet 2011). It is use to be very clear that student with higher mental ability as demonstrated by I.Q. test and those who are higher in conscientiousness tend to achieve high academic achievement.

A recent meta-analysis suggests that mental curiosity has an important influence in addition to intelligence conscientiousness. (Von Stummet 2011). Parent academic socialization is a term describing the way parents influence students academic achievement by shaping students skills, behaviours and attitudes towards school achievement (Magnusan K. 2007). Parents influence students through the environment and discourse parents have with their wards. Academic socialization can be influenced by parents' socio-economic status. Highly educated parents tend to have more stimulating learning environments. According to Katherine K. (2007), students' first few years of life are crucial to the development of language and social skills. School preparedness in these areas help students adjust to academic expectation.

Another very important enhancer of academic achievement is the presence of physical activity. Studies have shown that physical activity can increase the neural activity of the brain. Exercise specifically increases executive brain functions such as attention span and working memory (Tomporowski 2008).

2.5.1 Academic Achievement and Marital Status

Several International Studies reports better achievement for married undergraduates compared to their unmarried classmates. Smith and Naylor (2001) explored the data for all students graduating from all UK University in 1993. In their analysis, married students (men and women) do better than unmarried students. In a study conducted by Al-Mutairi (2010), at the Arab Open University (AOU) reported married students outperforming their unmarried counterparts, and concludes that marital status plays a significant role in determining student's achievement (Ranor and Al-Marzooqi, 2012).

In another study, ma, LI-Chen Wooster and Robert (1979) examines the effect of marital status of college students on their academic achievement. Data based on a sample of 374 students indicates that married students make higher grades than unmarried students; however, married students with children do not achieve higher GPA's than those without children.

2.5.2 Academic Achievement and Gender

Hedjazi and Omidi (2008) found that amongst undergraduate agricultural students at the University of Tehran in Iran, female students significantly outperformed their male counterparts. Similarly, Harb and El-Shaarawi (2007), found that female undergraduates studying within the college of business and economics at UAE University, significantly outperformed the female colleagues. In Kuwait Al-Otaibi (1996) reports Kuwaiti female as having significantly higher scores on a measure of academic achievement motivation compared to Kuwaiti males, although this study is silent about actual academic achievement. However, a more recent study undertaken in Kuwait, focusing on students at the Arab Open University (AOU), reports females as having higher CGPA's than males across the board (Al-Mutari, 2010). Furthermore, Al-Khader (1996) reports the same pattern of findings amongst psychology students at Kuwait University, with females again outperforming males. Only one Gulf based study reports males as outperforming females and this study was limited to focusing on the outcomes of a single introductory finance course (Al-Tamimi and Al-Shayeb 2002).

A study by Ballard and Johnson (2005) cited in Remali et al (2013) examined the differences between relationship of males and females and ability to cope with accounting subjects. The outcome from study has concluded that women were likely to perform less than men and the gender variable have shown significant relationship to the academic achievement (Ballard and Johnson, 20005). Based on the other studies from Norsida et al. (2010), it examined the academic achievement of the mathematics students according to their gender. The result showed that women achieve better academic achievement compared to the men in their CGPA where 0.5 % of first class degree receivers were 88% female and another 12% men. The same pattern goes for second class degree (Norsida et al., 2010).

On the other hand, referring to Koh and Koh (1999) study, they found that women performed well than men have significant relationship with the academic achievement. This result is supported by Garkaz et al. (2011) study, also found that there was a significant difference between woman and men regarding to their academic achievement. Besides that, they claimed that women showed better achievement in academic achievement compared to men. However, McDowall and Jackling (2011) found contradicting features citing that there is no significant relationship between genders towards accounting academic achievement, (Remaliet'al 2013).

Based on Norsidaet'al (2010), it showed that secondary education such as Malaysian Higher School Certificate (SjjilTinnggiPelajaran Malaysia) or STPM, pre-university or matriculation will affect their academic achievement in terms of which courses will they be taking in their tertiary education. In another study conducted by Gaekaz, et'al., (2011), it showed that having mathematics background for the students with mathematics background will achieve better achievement than those who are non-mathematics background. By the same area of study, Koh and Koh (1999) also found that mathematics background will allow student to perform better in an accounting degree program being one of highly demanding and stressful course for their undertaking. There is a positive relationship between prior academic achievement and background toward the student's academic achievement. In general, prior study from Koning, et'al (2012) seems likely to advocate more towards relationship between academic background and achievement in bachelor program. However, Duff et'al (2004) claimed that prior academic achievement does not have significant relationship with academic achievement. (Remaliet'al 2013.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

2.6.1 Role Expectation Theory on Marital Adjustment

Lewis and Spanier (1979) concluded that marital quality seems to be related to the congruence between the role expectations of one spouse and the role achievement of the other than to any specific pattern of roles.

This theory is basically concerned with the cognitive system of the individual. The most salient feature of this theory is that when an individual indulges himself in those activities which are according to the expectation of his fellowmen, the activities performed by him are considered acceptable and those, which are contradictory with the already existing systems, are rejected or gain less approval or sometimes strongly disliked.

The basic assumption of this theory is that marital happiness seems to be congruent between the role expectation of one spouse and the role achievement of the other spouse than to any specific patterns of roles.

It is not simply a matter of whether or not a woman is working outside the home that may have impacts on her marital adjustment but rather the extent to which that behavior violates role expectations, her own as well as those of significant others. Hoffman (as cited in Sarwar, 1994) proposed that, father son difficulty in a family might reflect a perception that maternal employment implies a failure on the part of the father.

It appears that role theory can be used to provide theoretical integration for the seemingly contradictory findings regarding the relationship between female employment and marital adjustment. According to this perspective, the social world is a network of variously interrelated positions, or statuses, within which individuals enact roles.

2.6.2 Psychodynamic Theory on Marital Adjustment

As one of the most venerable and influential traditions in the history of psychology, psychodynamics perspective on marriage is presented alongside behavioral and family-system theories in many widely cited surveys of the marital literature (Jacobson 1986; Paolino&MaxGardy, 1978). The psychodynamic orientation toward resolving marital conflict is by far the oldest and most widespread approach to treatment (Baucom& Hoffman, 1986; Gurman&Knisken, 1978). They examine research from areas directly and indirectly associated with the psychodynamic orientation.

The psychodynamic perspective holds that people consciously and unconsciously seek spouses, which gratify narcissistic needs and their interjection and projection into potential partners led people to prefer spouses who complement their needs. In other words, people select mates who best serve to substitute for some unattained age ideal. Couples are usually attracted by shared developmental failures (Skynner, 1976). Once established, marital partners have an implicit control to continue to gratify their needs throughout the marriage (Sager, 1976).

A number of studies have examined the association between complementarily and marital satisfaction (e.g. Heiss& Gordon 1964; Murstem, 1961; Murstem& Beak, 1972; Winch, 1958). One study conducted by Meyer and Pepper (1977) exemplifies the results of these studies. Using modified version of 12 scales from Jackson's Personality Research from (Jackson, 1967), they found no evidence of an association between need complementarily and marital adjustment as measured by a modified version of Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale (Locke & Wallace, 1959). They found similarity of spouses, needs for affiliation, aggression, autonomy, and nurturance to be associated with marital adjustment. Other explicit tests of Winch's type I and type II complementarily hypotheses have also proved negative (Deyoung& Fleischer, 1976). The association between spouse similarity and marital success is, in fact, highly replaceable (Levinger, 1964).

The examination of neuroticism has an admirable history in marital research, spawning an impressive set of longitudinal studies (Adams, 1946; Bentler& Newcomb, 1978; Burgess &Wallin, 19533; Kelley &Conleyy, 1987). Taken together the results of these studies support the psychodynamic contention that neuroticism, impulsivity, emotional instability, psychopathology, fearfulness, poor social adjustment, and similar constructs are associated with poor marital adjustment.

2.6.3 Students Approaches to Learning (SAL) Theory

Many inventories addressing learning processes are derived top-down from cognitive psychology, particularly information processing theories (Moreno &DiVesta, 1991; Schmeck, Geisler-Brenstein, &Cercy 1991; Weinstein, Schulte, & Palmer, 1987), with the deliberate intention that they address universal and "culture-fair" mechanisms (Moreno &DiVesta, 1991). Such a framework, however, seems particularly inappropriate for such a context-dependent issue as student learning, where student strategy use is dependent upon a host of factors, such as students' values and motives, their perceptions of task demands, teaching and assessment methods, classroom climate, and so on.

By studying how students perceived a particular reading task and then went about learning it, Marton and Säljö (1976 & 1976) came up with the powerful idea of "approach to learning", which became the point of departure for the emerging conceptual framework known generically as "student approaches to learning" (SAL) theory (Biggs, 1993; Entwistle& Waterston, 1988). SAL theory has in fact become a meta-theory for conceptualizing teaching and learning, which has gone in two major directions: phenomenography (Marton, 1981;

Prosser &Trigwell, 1998) and constructivism and systems theory (Biggs, 1999; Dart &Boulton-Lewis, 1998). However, the notion that students' perceptions and learning-related activities are central to teaching and learning is common to all SAL sub-theories (Biggs, 1993, 1999; Entwistle& Waterston, 1988).

The Study Process Questionnaire (SPQ) (Biggs, 1987, 1987) was developed from an earlier 10 scale Study Behaviour Questionnaire (SBQ), conceived within an information processing framework (Biggs, 1976). Higher order factor analysis suggested that the 10 scales could be interpreted in terms of three higher order factors. The most suitable interpretation of these factors, however, was in terms of the SAL conceptual framework, not the original IP theory, because the three factors were found to be comprised of two kinds of items, those relating to a motive, and those relating to a congruent strategy. In this, the factor analysis recalled Marton and Säljö's original point that a student handled a reading task according to his or her intentions prior to engaging the task. However, whereas those authors were concerned with two intentions or motives, to remember significant facts and details or to try to understand what the author was trying to say, we are here dealing with three such motives: to keep out of trouble with minimal effort, to engage the task appropriately, and to maximize grades. Each such motive was associated with a congruent strategy: selective memorizing, seeking for meaning, and optimal time and space management, respectively.

Given the differing methodologies and contexts, the similarity between the first two motives and strategies and the Swedish work on surface and deep approaches was remarkable, and to capture that similarity, the surface/deep terminology was adopted for the first two dimensions. Thus, the SPQ yielded three Approach scores, Surface, Deep, and achieving respectively and a component Motive and Strategy score for each Approach.

2.6.4 Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory on academic achievement.

Social cognitive theory refers to a psychological model of behavior that emerged primarily from the work of Albert Bandura, (1977; 1986). It was initially developed with an emphasis on the acquisition of social behaviours. The theory continues emphasizes that learning occurs in a social context and that much of what is learned is gain through observation. Social cognitive theory has applied extensively by these interested in classroom motivation, learning and achievement (Pajare, 1996; Schunk&Zimmermon, 19994; 1998), cited (Denler, Walters &Benzon 2014).

The basic concepts of this theory are observational learning or modeling; also described as vicarious learning because learning as a result of watching the behavior and consequences of models in the environment. Outcome expectation is another concept of the social cognitive theory which reflects individual's beliefs about what consequences are likely to ensure if particular behaviours are performed.

Another concept is perceived self-efficacy which reflects individuals' belief about whether they can achieve a given level of successful at a particular task, (Bandurs, 1997). Self efficacy has been proven useful for understanding students' motivation and for understanding student's motivation and achievement in academic context, (Pajares 1996).

Goal setting is also one of the concepts of social cognitive theory which reflects cognitive representation of anticipated, desired and preferred outcomes. Hence, goals exemplify the agency view within social cognitive theory that people not only learn, they use fare thought to envision the future, identify desired outcomes and generate plans of action. (Bandura 1986; Skenk, 1999) cited in (Denler, Walters and Benzen, 2014).

Another concept in social cognitive theory is self regulation which reflects student’s ability to monitor which reflects student’s ability to monitor their own behavior and outcomes, evaluate whether their actions are effective and allow them to make progress towards the goals and finally respond to evaluations they have made by modifying their behaviours, rewarding it or discontinuing it. (Denler, Walter and Benzen, 2014). With regards to this theory and concepts of the theory, the academic achievement of students of tertiary institutions in Zamfara State should enhance their academic achievement through observational learning, i.e. using vicarious learning to model people and have achieved academic success in their environment. Expectation of a good outcome of their achievement should also trigger their ability to perform well and successfully in their academics. They should also exhibit greater self efficacy to be more confident in their abilities when compared to their peers with lower self efficacy. This will enhance their academic achievement.Students should set goals they want to achieve so as to meet up the expected outcome and their perceived self efficacy. Goals are also important pre-requisite for self regulation because they provide objectives that students are trying to achieve and benchmark against which to judge.

2.7 Review of Empirical Studies

Many studies have been carried out with regards to effect of marital status on academic achievement. Ma, Li-chen Wooster and Robert (1979) examines the effect of marital status on college students and their academic achievement. Data based on a sample of 374 students indicate married students make higher grades than unmarried students. However, married with children do not achieve higher GPA's than those without children.

Thomas, Rayner and Al-marzooqi (2012) conducted a study on marital status and gender as predictors of undergraduates' academic achievement. Results showed that female outperformed their male counterparts showing females, ($m = 2.64$, $SD = 58$) and males, ($m=2.41$, $SD =71$). $f (1,3539) = 3.81$, $P<.001$.

In a study conducted by Remali A., Ghazali M., Kamaruddin M and Kee T. (2013) on understanding academic achievement based on demographic factors, motivation and learning styles, results shows that there was no signifiacant difference between gender and academic achievement (z value = -0.997, $p> 0.05$).

Smith and Naylor (2001) carried out a research on marital status and academic achievement with students graduating from all UK Universities and concluded that married students outperform their male counterparts, concluded that marital status plays a significant role in academic achievement.

Another comparative study of marital status on academic achievement of the female medical undergraduate in Nigeria Universities was carried out by Eguatu V.E., Umeora O.U (2007). Results showed that there was significance difference. Married female were older, had more re-sit examinations than their male and single female counterparts.

Mayya et at (2004) used locally developed Approaches to Learning Inventory (ALI) to explore the learning difficulties and learning approaches of undergraduate students of first to final year B.Pt (Bachelor of Physiotherapy), College of Allied Health Sciences, Manipal, India University Examination marks of the students were also collected.

The study showed that academic achievement has significant negative correlation with surface approach and various problems of learners like fear of failure and lack of confidence, non-academic distracters and poor English Language ability. The study also demonstrated significant positive association between surface approach and various problems of the learners.

The study by Vermunt (2005) clarified relations between the way students learn and personal, contextual and academic achievement. Students from seven different academic disciplines in Netherlands completed the Inventory of Learning Styles (ILS). Data was also gathered about their age, gender, academic displine, prior education and examination achievement. Regression and correlation analysis were used to analyze the data.

The study was also carried out by Sabzevari, Addazade and Borhani (2013) on assessment method and learning approaches in nursing students of Kernam University of Medical Sciences, Iran. Results showed no significant difference exist in learning approaches scores of the two genders, but found significant differences in surface learning approach and motivation scores of students with different marital status as the married students had higher average scores in surface learning approach.

2.8 Summary

From the literature reviewed, marital status is defined as state of being married or unmarried. Study habits are usually described as learning tendencies embark by students to ensure learning effectiveness. There are several factors that influence academic achievement of students in tertiary institutions of which marital status and approach to learning are inclusive. The present study focused on the relationship among marital status, approach to learning and academic achievement. Several researches have been reviewed out to investigate approach to learning and academic achievement of students.

The present study is unique from other researcher because several studies have been carried out, but none of its kind has been conducted in Zamfara State. One of the uniqueness of the present study is comparing marital status with approach to learning and academic achievement, another uniqueness of this study is conducting the research on not only a particular tertiary institution or secondary school but on tertiary institutions in Zamfara State.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter described the methodology by which the study was conducted. It consists of research design, population of the study, sample and sampling technique, instrumentation, procedure for data collection and procedure for data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

This research employed expost facto design in investigating the influence of marital status, on approaches to learning and academic achievement of students of tertiary institutions in Zamfara State. Expost facto is used in this work because of the large population covered.

According to Akuezuilo and Agu (2002), a expost facto research method is one in which a group of people or items is studied by collecting and analyzing data from only a few people or items considered to be representative of the entire group. However, in survey research, the sample selected is normally large while the variables studied are limited.

3.3 Population of the Study

The target area of this study is the entire tertiary institutions of Zamfara State which comprises of eight tertiary institutions and the number of students stands at thirty four thousand nine hundred and nine (34,909), with 19,106 males and 15,103 females (Zamfara State Ministries of Education, Ministry of Science and Technic al Education, Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Health, 2014).

Table: 3.3.1 Distribution of population of the study; Tertiary institutions in Zamfara State

S/N	Name of Institution	No of male student	No of Female student	Total
1	AbduGusau Polytechnic, TalataMafara (AGP)	5876	2120	**7996**
2	College of Education, Maru (COE)	2874	2767	**5641**
3	Fed. Polytechnic, KauraNamoda	3498	2567	**6065**
4	College of Arts & Science, Gusau (ZACAS)	1130	347	**1477**
5	Fed. College of Educ. (Technical) Gusau (FCET)	Nil	4370	**4370**
6	College of Agriculture, Bakura	1750	590	**2340**
7	School of Nursing & Midwifery, Gusau	118	172	**290**
8	School of Health Technology, Tsafe	3860	2870	**6730**
	Total	**19,106**	**15,803**	**34,909**

Source: Zamfara State Ministries of Education, Science and Technical Education, Agriculture and Ministry of Health, 2014).

3.4 Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample of this study is 379 students. This is based on the recommendation of Krecjie and Morgan (1970), and a purposive sampling technique was used in selecting the sample,because out of eight (8) tertiary institution in Zamfara State two (2) are Polytechnics, two

(2) are Colleges of Education, one (1) a College of Arts and Science, one (1) College of Agricultural Science, one (1) a School of Nursing and Midwifery and the last a School of Health Technology. The two (2) Polytechnics and College of Arts and Science were purposely selected for this study. This is so because the study focused on Diploma two (2) students; and only these three mentioned institutions have students at Diploma two levels and runs the same curriculum and semester system while others differ. Diploma 2 students are used for this research because students at this level have adjusted well in the school system.

Table: 3.4.1 Distribution of sample of the study of 3 departments in Abdu Gusau Polytechnic, TalataMafara inZamfara State

S/N	Name of institution	No of Depts.	No of Male students	No of Female Students	Total
1	AGP, T/Mafara	Linguistics	30	20	**50**
2	AGP, T/Mafara	Business Studies	30	20	**50**
3	AGP, T/Mafara	Legal studies	30	20	**50**
	Total		**90**	**60**	**150**

Table: 3.4.2 Distribution of sample of the study of 3 departments in KauraNamoda Federal Polytechnic, in Zamfara State

S/N	Name of Institution	No of Depts.	No of Male students	No of Female Students	Total
1	Fed. Polytechnic, K/Namoda	English	30	20	**50**
2	Fed. Polytechnic, K/Namoda	Business Studies	30	20	**50**
3	Fed. Polytechnic, K/Namoda	Legal studies	30	20	**50**
	Total		**90**	**60**	**150**

Table: 3.4.3 Distribution of sample of the study of 2 departments of Zamfara State College of Arts and Science, (ZACAS) Gusau, in Zamfara State

S/N	Name of Institution	No of Depts.	No of Male students	No of Female students	Total
1	ZACAS, Gusau	English, Hausa & Islamic Studies	25	19	**44**
2	ZACAS, Gusau	Computer Studies	25	10	**35**
	Total		**50**	**29**	**79**

3.5 Instrumentation

The instruments used for this study is the Revised Two Factor Study Process Questionnaire (R-SPQ-2F): This is a study process questionnaire developed by Bigg, Kember and Leung (2001). The study process questionnaire was developed from an earlier 10 scale behavior questionnaire (SBQ), which was suitable for evaluating students with deep and surface approaches only with fewer items were drawn up for the initial tests. These were derived from the original version of the SPQ modified items from the SPQ, and new items. The process of testing and refinement eventuated in deep and surface motives and strategy scales each with five (5) items, 10 items per approach scare. The revised SPQ has been developed into a simple questionnaire which teacher can use to evaluate their teaching and the learning approaches of their students. The scoring scales is a five-likert scale with strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree and strongly disagree.

Students Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA) was used to measure student academic achievement. The scoring of the CGPA was based on the actual scores of the students, where the CGPA is categorized as 1.00 – 2.49 = pass, 2.50 – 3.49 – merit, 3.50 4.00 = credit, 4.00 upwards – distinction.

3.5.1 Validity of the instrument

According to Bigg, Kember and Leung (2001), a number of investigation were carried out to investigate the validity of the SPQ, using a group of 229 students from the Health Science Faculty of a University in Hong Kong, and a sample of 495 undergraduates students from a variety of departments of the same university was used for the test of the final version. Results shows that the final version of the questionnaire had acceptable cronbatch alpha values for scales reliability, confirmatory analysis indicated a good fit into the intended two factors structure. Both deep and surface approach scales had well subscales thereby attending to the validity of the instrument.

3.5.2 Reliability of the Instrument

The study process questionnaire is a standardized questionnaire developed by Biggs, Kember and Leung (2008). Reliability of the instrument was established using the Test-re-test reliability, the Cronbach alpha values for each sub-scales in the instrument were computed and the values all reached acceptable levels indicating that the sub-scales are interpreted as internally consistent. The cron-bach alpha values are 0.73 for deep approach DA and 0.64 for surface approach (SA) in the sample, which are considered acceptable.

3.5.3 Procedure for Data Collection

The instrument was administered to the subjects who were randomly selected with the help of their teachers. Brief orientation on how to respond to the instruments wasgiven to students and they were allowed to complete the inventory at their own pace. The questionnaire was administered during the students' free period so as not to disrupt their lecture time table. CGPA of the same students was collected from their various examinations coordinators from various departments.

3.6 Procedure for Data Analysis

The bio data variables were analyzed using frequencies and percentages distribution. The research questions were analyzed using item frequencies, means, standard deviation and their cumulative means compared with decision mean 3.000 to determine agreement or disagreement with the research questions. The null hypotheses were tested with independent t – test and chi square statistics at 0.05 alpha level of significance.

CHAPTER FOUR:

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

The main objective of this study is to examine the influence of marital status on approaches to learning and academic achievement of tertiary institutions students of Zamfara state, Nigeria.

To achieve this objective, a total of 379 students were sampled for this study, whose response and CGPA academic achievement were recorded for the data analysis. The analysis was carried on in sections. The first section comprises of the bio data analysis in frequencies and percentages of sex, and marital status as well as the students name of institution. The second section answers the research hypotheses. The third section test and interprets the five null researches at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The fourth section presents the summary of major findings. The next section presents the discussions on findings.

4.2 Analysis of bio data variables in frequencies and percentages distribution

Institution	**Frequency**	**Percent**
AGP.TalataMafara	150	39.6
ZACAS, Gusau	79	20.8
Fed. Polytechnic, K/Namoda	150	39.6
Total	379	100.0
Department		
Linguistic	50	13.2
Buss. Studies	100	26.4
Legal Studies	100	26.4
English	50	3.2
English/Hausa/IRS	44	11.6
Computer Studies	35	9.2
Total	379	100.0
Sex		
Male	230	60.7
Female	149	39.3
Total	379	100.3
Marital Status		
Unmarried	348	91.8
Married	21	8.2

Details in the above table showed the distribution of respondents according to the institutions. A total of 150 or 39.0% of the sampled students for this study are from AGP TalataMafarawhile 79 others representing 20.8% are from ZACAS and the rest 150 representing 39.6% are from Federal Poly. This shows that a total of 379 students from three tertiary institutions of Zamfara state were used for this study; students were also classified according to their course of study. A total of 50 or 13.2% are in Linguistic departments while 100 or 26.4% are from B/Studies department while another 100 or 26.4% are students of legal studies as against another 50 or 13.2% that are of English departments while 44 or 11.6% are from English/Hausa/IRS departments and the rest 35 representing 9.2% are from Computer studies departments;according to the sex status of the respondents, while 230 of them representing 60.7% are male students the rest 149 representing 39.3% are females of the selected tertiary institutions in Zamfara State;and on therespondents marital status, they are classified basically into married or unmarried. The unmarried students accounted for 348 representing 91.8% of the total respondents w while the rest 31 representing 8.2% are married students.

4.3 Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis One: This null hypothesis state that there is no significant mean difference between married and unmarried students in their academic achievement.

Table 4.3:1: Independent t test statistics on the mean difference between married and unmarried students in their academic achievement.

Variable	Marital Status	N	Mean	Std.dev	Std. Err	Df	t calculated	Sig (p)
Academic achievement	Unmarried	348	1.9116	.8654	.0463	377	0.279	0.781
	Married	31	1.9565	.7726	.1387			

Outcome of the independent t-test statistics above showed that there is no significant mean difference between married and unmarried students in their AcademicAchievement. Reasons being that the calculated p value of 0.781 is higher than the 0.05 alpha level of significance while the t-calculated value of 0.279 is lower than the t-critical value of 1.96, at df 377. Their calculated meanAcademic Achievement are 1.9116 and 1.9565 by unmarried and married student respectively, indicating that the students marital status does not significantly have any influence on theirAcademic Achievement. Hence, the null hypothesis which state that there is no significant mean difference between married and unmarried students in their academic achievement is hereby accepted and retained.***(t = 0.229, p = 0.781).***

Hypothesis Two: This null hypothesis state that there is no significant mean difference between married and unmarried students in their approaches to learning.

Table 4.3.2: The Chi square statistics on the mean difference between married and unmarried students in their approach to learning

			Groups			Chi square value	Critical chi square	df	P
			Surface Learners	Deep learners	Total				
marital status	Unmarried	Count	42	306	348	.432[a]	**3.841**	1	0.511
		Expected Count	43.2	304.8	348.0				
	Married	Count	5	26	31				
		Expected Count	3.8	27.2	31.0				
Total		Count	47	332	379				
		Expected Count	47.0	332.0	379.0				

Results of the Chi square statistics showed that there is no significant relationship between marital status and the approaches to learning. This is because the calculated p value of 0.511 was found to be higher than the 0.05 alpha level of significance. It showed that marital status does not significantly influence their learning approaches. Therefore the null hypothesis is hereby accepted and retained. (X 2 = 3.841, P = 0.551).

Hypothesis Three: This null hypothesis state that there is no significant difference between deep and surface tertiary institutions learners in Zamfara state.

Table 4.3.3. Independent t-test statistics on the mean difference in the academic achievement of deep approach learners and surface approach learners

Variable	Learning approach groups	N	Mean	Std.dev	Std.Err	df	T calculate	T critical	p
Academic Achievement	Surface Learners	47	1.4134	.60788	.08867	377	14.638	1.96	0.000
	Deep learners	332	2.4443	.42569	.02336				

Outcome of the independent t test statistics showed that significant differences exist between surface approach learners and deep approaches learners in their academic performance. This is because the calculated p value of 0.000 was found to be lower than the 0.05 alpha value. Their calculated academic achievements are 1.4134 and 2.4443 by surface learners and deep learners respectively in favour of the deep learners. Consequently the null hypothesis is hereby rejected. (t = 1.96, p = 0.000)

Hypothesis Four: This null hypothesis states that there is no significant mean difference between approaches to learning of male and female tertiary institutions students in Zamfara State.

Table 4.3.4. Chi square statistics on the mean difference between male and female students in their approach to learning

			Approaches to learning Groups: Surface Learners	Approaches to learning Groups: Deep learners	Total	Chi square value	Critical chi square	df	P
sex	male	Count	13	217	230	24.529[a]	**3.841**	1	0.000
		Expected Count	28.5	201.5	230.0				
	female	Count	34	115	149				
		Expected Count	18.5	130.5	149.0				
Total		Count	47	332	379				
		Expected Count	47.0	332.0	379.0				

Results of the Chi square statistics showed that significant difference exist between male and female students in their approaches to learning. This is because the calculated p value of 0.000 was found to be lower than the 0.05 alpha level of significance. It showed that more femalesare into surface learning than males who are more into deep learning. Therefore the null hypothesis is hereby rejected. (X 2 =m3.841, p = 0.000)

Hypothesis Five: This null hypothesis state that there is no significant mean difference betweenAcademic Achievement of Male and Female tertiary institution students in Zamfara State.

Table 4.3:5: Independent t test statistics on the mean difference between Male and Female students in their Academic Achievement.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Std.dev	Std. Err	Df	t calculated	Sig (p)
Academic Achievement	Male	230	1.9308	.84761	.05589	377	0.437	0.662
	Female	149	1.8913	.87451	.07164			

Outcome of the independent t-test statistics above showed that there is no significant mean difference between Male and Female students in their academic achievement. Reasons being that the calculated p value of 0.662 is higher than the 0.05 alpha level of significance while the t-calculated value of 0.437 is lower than the t-critical value of 1.96, at df 377. Their calculated mean academic achievement are 1.9308 and 1.8913 by Male and Female students respectively, indicating that the students gender status does not significantly have any influence on their Academic Achievement. Hence, the null hypothesis which state that there is no significant mean difference between Male and Female students in their Academic Achievement is hereby accepted and retained.*(t = 0.0432, p = 0.662).*

4.4 Summary of the major findings

1. Significant difference does not exist between married and unmarried students in their Academic Achievement. ($t = 0.279$, $p = 0.781$). This indicates that the student marital status does not have any influence on their academic achievement.

2. Significant difference does not exist between married and unmarried students in their approaches to learning, ($X2 = 3.841$, $p = 0.551$) as result indicated that marital status does not have any influence on students approaches to learning.

3. Significant difference exist between surface approach learners and deep approach learners in their academic achievement ($t = 1.96$, $p = 0.000$) indicating that students academic achievement is influenced by their approaches to learning.

4. Significant difference exist between Male and Female students in their approaches to learning, ($X2 = 3.841$, $p = 0.000$) as indicated that female students are more into surface approach while male are more into deep approach.

5. Significant difference does not exist between Male and Female students in their Academic Achievement, ($t = 0.437$, $p = 0.662$), indicating that the student gender does not have any influence on their academic achievement.

4.5 Discussions on Findings

The discussions on findings are presented based on the findings from the research null hypotheses and their corresponding research questions.

According to the results of the independent t-test statistics that was used to test the first hypothesis at 0.05 alpha level of significance, there is no significant difference between married and unmarried students in their Academic Achievement. This indicated that the students marital status does not significantly have any influence on their academic achievement. This null hypothesis was therefore accepted and retained. The explanation for this outcome emanated from the fact that the married and unmarried students are exposed to the same type of teaching, curriculum, and are therefore expected to have the same level of academic achievement. However, this finding contradicts the finding of Ma,Li-chen Wooster and Robert (1979) where they examined the effect of marital status on college students' academic achievement and found that married students make higher grades than unmarried, indicating that differences exist in their academic achievement.

According to the result of hypothesis two, significant difference does not exist between married and unmarried students in their approaches to learning, leading to the acceptance of this null hypothesis. The explanation for this is that, even though the married students have more responsibilities that takes away their time to study, they still find time to catch up since most of them are more sensible and matured, will not spend their extra time on socializing especially through social media that most unmarried student does. This finding contradict the findings of Sabzevri, Abbaszade and Borhani (2013), who found that married students have higher average scores in surface learning approach.

The result of testing hypothesis three revealed that significant difference exist in Academic Achievement of surface and deep learners leading to the rejection of this null hypothesis. Reason for the difference is that is obvious that students who employ deep approach to learning are certain to have better academic achievement than those who employ surface approach, because deep learning yield more successful outcome that surface learning. This outcome confirms the assumption of the study that students academic achievement is directly influenced by their approaches to learning. Students who have positive approaches to learning will most likely have significant better academic achievement than students with negative or very low level of approaches to learning. Mayya et.al (2004) who explored the learning difficulties in learning approaches of undergraduates of first to final year B.Pt (Bachelor of Physiotherapy) College of Allied Health Science, Munipal, India University and the result showed that the academic achievement has significance negative correlation with surface approach. And the study also demonstrated significant positive association between surface approach and various problems of the learners.

The outcome of testing hypothesis four indicated that significant difference exist between Male and Female students in their approaches to learning., indicating that male students had higher mean for deep approach while female students had higher mean for surface approach. Consequently the null hypothesis was rejected. It is not entirely surprising or unexpected at this result. The male students are more exposed; make more friends than the female students. On the other hand the female students are more reserved; keep to their selves and their movements more controlled than the male students. Their approach to learning is therefore expected to be different. This finding also, is in line with the findings of Picou, Gatlin – Watts and Packer (1998) who found that significant difference exist in approaches to learning of male and female students where female students preferred factual rather than abstract. And also with that of Cano (2005), whose finally showed that after female students tendered to score higher on the deep and the achieving approaches to learning in comparison to younger male students.

It was concluded from the testing of hypothesis five using the independent t test statistics that there is no significant mean difference between Male and Female students in their Academic Achievement. This indicated that the students gender status does not significantly have any influence on their academic Achievement. This led to the acceptance and retaining the null hypothesis in this regards. This outcome confirms the fact that if students irrespective of sex are exposed to the same methods of teaching, under the same curriculum, their academic achievement is not going to be different significantly. This finding also supports the finding of the study of Remali A., Ghazali M. Kamarudden M. and Koet (2013) in academic achievement based on demographic factors, motivation and learning styles where their result showed that there was there was no significant difference between gender and academic achievement.

CHAPTER FIVE:

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presented the summary, conclusion and recommendations of the study. The main objective is to evaluate the influence of approaches to learning on Academic achievement of tertiary education students in Zamfara state, Nigeria.

5.2 Summary

This study's main objective is to find the influenced of marital status on approaches to learning and academic achievement of tertiary institutions students ion Zamafara State, Nigeria. To effectively carry out this research, the study is structured into five chapters. Chapter one presented the background to the study, statement of the problems, five objectives in line with the research questions, research hypothesis and basic assumptions. Findings of the study will be significant to psychologists, teachers, counselors, students and the general public by helping to address issue regarding approaches to learning and academic achievement with respect to marital status.

In chapter two literatures were reviewed where concept and theories relating to the variables were reviewed, previous study were also reviews in the same chapter. Chapter three presented the methodology. Expost- facto was used for the study where the sample of 379 students were selected from a population of 34,909 from three tertiary institution using diploma two students of the selected institutions. The 2- factors study process questionnaire was used to collect data from students and CGPA was used as major of academic achievement. Findings revealed that there is no significance difference between married and unmarried students in their academic achievement. There is no significant difference between married and unmarried in their approaches to learning. Significant difference exists between deep and surface learners in their academic achievement. Significance difference exists between male and female students in their approaches to learning. Significance difference exists between male and female students in their academic achievement.

5.3 Conclusions

Following the analysis and findings of this study, it is concluded that, marital status does not have any influence on academic achievement of students and that students marital status does not have any influence on their approaches to learning. It is also concluded that students' academic achievement is influenced by their approaches to learning. With respect to gender, female students are more into surface approaches to learning than their male indulged into deep approach, gender does not have any influence on academic achievement.

5.4 Recommendations.

The following recommendations are suggested as a result of the analysis of the study;

1. School psychologists, teachers and counselors should be sensitized on the influence of marital status on approaches to learning in order to improve academic achievement in schools.

2. Seminars, conferences, symposium should be organized with a view to educating teachers, students and the general public on how positive and negative approaches learning affects students' academic achievement.
3. Students should be exposed to different approaches to learning in order to enhance their academic achievement irrespective of gender.
4. Married students should be counseled on how to cope with and adopt appropriate learning approaches that will enhance academic achievement.

5.5 Suggestions for further studies

This study main objective was to evaluate the influence of approaches to learning on Academic achievement of tertiary education students in Zamfara state, Nigeria. In the course of this study, the researcher identified various areas where further research could be carried out in a related field. The following suggestions are therefore put forward for further academic work:

1. Effect of home background, and approaches to learning on the academic achievement of secondary school students of Zamfara state.
2. Influence of marital studies on approaches to learning and academic achievement of female undergraduates.
3. Relationship among marital status, gender and academic achievement of tertiary institutions students.
4. Effect of socio economic background and marital status on academic achievement of female tertiary institution student.
5. Influence of gender and approaches to learning on academic achievement of married students.

REFERENCES

Abdullahi Yusuf Ali (1934). *Roman Transliteration of the Holy Quran.* A.S.B. Publishers

Akinboye, J.O (1980). A Study of Self-Concept, Study Behavior and Health Attributes of Male and Female Nigerian Adolescents).*Journal of African child Studies* (2), 21-27.

Akinboye, J.O (1981). The Relationship Between the Sex of Nigeria Adolescents Pupils and their Study Habits, Study Attitudes, and Academic Achievement. *Ilorin Journal of education*: 1,45-55

Akuezuilo, E.O. &Agu, N. (2012). *Research and Statistics in Education and Social Sciences.*NuelCenti Publishers and Academic Press Ltd. Akwa, Nigeria.

Altamimi, H, &Alshayeb, A (2002) Factors Effecting Students Achievement in the Introductory Finance Course. *Journal of Economic I & Administrative Sciences:* 18(12) 76-86.

Aremu, A.O (2000). *Academic Achievement Factor Inventory, Ibadan Sterling – HorgenHorjer* publisher, Nigeria

Bandura, A. (1986) *Social Foundations of Thought and Actions.*A Social Cognitive Theory, Engleword Cliffs N.J Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997) *Social Learning Theory:*Engleword Cliffs, N.J Prentice Hall.

Bandura, (1997).*Self Efficacy, the Exercise of Control*. New York; WH Freeman.

Bashir A.M (2013). *Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Academic Achievement of Secondary Student in Sokoto*.(Unpublished M.ed thesis)

Biggs, J.B., Kember, D., & Leung, D.Y.P. (2001) The Revised Two Factor Study Process Questionnaire: R-SPQ-2F. *British Journal of Educational Psychology. 71,*133-149. Retrieved 28/03/15 http://www.johnbiggs.com.au/pdf/ex_2factor_spq.pdf

Biggs, J.B. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university.*Buckingham: The Open University Press. Retrieved 28/03/15 http://www.johnbiggs.com.au/pdf/ex_2factor_spq.pdf

Campbell, M.M (2007) Motivational Systems Theory and the Academic Achievement of College Students.*Journal of College Teaching and Learning (*2007): 4(7).

Child, D. (1978) *Psychology and The Teacher* 2nd edition hold Rinehart and WistonInc in New York.

Crow, R.O & Crow (1992). *Educational Psychology.* American Book Co. NY USA.

Ebenuwa –Okoh E, (2010), Influence of Age Financial Status, and Gender on Academic Achievement among Undergraduates. *Journal of Psychology*: (2). 99-103 (2010).

Eguatu V.E &Umeora OV (2001) A comparative of Marital Status on the Academic Achievement of Female Medical Undergraduates in a Nigerian University.Niger Postgraduate. *Medical Journal* (2007): 14(3), 175. 159.

Entwistle, N. & Waterston, S. (1988). Approaches to studying and levels of processing in university students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 58,* 258-265.
Gow, L. &Kember, D. (1990). Does higher education promote independent learning? *HigherEducation, 19,* 307-322. Retrieved 28/03/15 http://www.johnbiggs.com.au/pdf/ex_2factor_spq.pdf

Gardner W.I., (1978).*Children with Learning and Behavior Problems*.London. Allyn and Bocon Inc.

Hedjazi,&Omidi M. 2008. Factors Affecting the Academic Success of Agricultural Students at University of Tehran, Iran.*Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology:* 10,205-214.

Isah S.B (2013).*Predictory Validity in Entering Qualification in Academic Achievement,* among Secondary School Students in Sokoto State.(Unpublished M.Ed Thesis)

Kember, D. (1996). The intention to both memorise and understand: Another approach to learning? *Higher Education, 31,* 341-351. Retrieved 28/03/15 http://www.johnbiggs.com.au/pdf/ex_2factor_spq.pdf

Kilgori, U.A (2013). *Academic Achievement and in Relationship with Self Esteem and Parental Attitude Towards School Among Secondary School Students in Sokoto State,* Implication for Counseling. (Unpublished M.Ed Thesis)

Kember, D. & Leung, D.Y.P. (1998). The dimensionality of approaches to learning: an investigation with confirmatory factor analysis on the structure of the SPQ and LPQ. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 68,* 395-407. Retrieved 28/03/15 http://www.johnbiggs.com.au/pdf/ex_2factor_spq.pdf

Krezjie, R.V &Mogan, D.W (1970) Determining Sample Size for Research Activities, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*: 30, 607-610.

Lewis R. A. &Spanier G.B (1979). Theorizing the quality and stability of marriage, vol 2 ed. New York: Free press. www.wwh.com/sociology

Ma, Lichen, Wooster & Robert, (2011). Marital Status and Academic Achievement, *College Student. Journal V.13 sum 1979.*Retrieved 14/05/13 at http//eric.ed.gov/zidej 207776.

Magnusan, K. (2007.) *Maternal Education and Children's Academic Achievement During Middle Childhood Developmental Psychology*, 43, 1497-1512. Retrieved on 10/08/24 at https:// socwork.wisc.edu/files// Magnusson cvpdf.

Marton, F., &Saljo, R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning -- I: Outcome and process. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 46: 4-11. Retrieved 28/03/15 http://www.johnbiggs.com.au/pdf/ex_2factor_spq.pdf

Mimkolf, M.P (1965)Joint Family and Obstacle in Industrialization, *NationalJournal of Comparative Sociology*, Ibadan, University Press.

Ochidi, R.A (2012). *A comparative study of the problems encountered by married and unmarried female under-graduate students of the Faculty of Education and Extension Services of UsmanuDanfodio University, Sokoto:* Implication for counseling, M.Ed Thesis, UsmanuDanfodio University, Sokoto. (Unpublished M.Ed thesis)

Onyechere, I. (2004) *Amend Examination Malpractice Decree*. Daily Champion 2004.

Osah, G &AAhitu (2012)A Survey of Students Study Habits in Selected Secondary Schools Implication for Counseling. *Current research Journal of Social Science* 4(3) 228-2234, 12.

Rana, A. &Kausal, R. (2011) Comparison Study Habits and Academic Achievement of Pakistan British and White British Students.*Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* (2011), 9, 21-26.

Remali, M.A, Ghazali A.M,&Karuddin K.M. Kee YT. (2013).Understanding Academic Achievement Based on Demographic Factors.*International Journal of Asian Social Science (*2013), 3(9), 1983-1951. Retrieved on 14/4/14 at http// www.aessewb.comjournal-detail. Php? Id =5007.

Sabzevari S., Abbaszade A. &Borhani F. (2013).The assessment methods and learning approaches in nursing students of Kerman University of Medical Sciences in Iran. Creative Education, vol 14, no.2 published online 2013 in SciRes(http;//www.scirp.org/journal/ce

Santrock, (2006) &Kyoshaba (2009) Concept of Academic Achievement.Retrieved on 4/07/13 at www.jiepissn.com/concept of academic achievement html.

Shallah M. B. & Baba M.N (2007) *Concepts and Methods in Early Childhood Education.*1st Edition, 01 Faith Printers, Gusau, Zamfara.

Sharm, T.M. (2015) *Constructing Learning, using Technology to Support Teaching for Understanding.*Learning and Technology.

Steinmayr R., Meibner A., Weidinger A.F., &Wirthwin L.*Academic achievement*. Retrieved on 14/01/16 at http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199756810/obo- 9780199756810-0108.xml

Thomas, J.Raynor M &Almarzooq (2012).*Marital Status and Gender as Predictor of Undergraduate Academic Achievement*.United Arab Emirates *Context Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, Gulf perspectives 9(2) Retrieved on 21/02/14 at http//the.zu.ac.ae

Tomporowski, (2009) Achievement Among High School Students. *Journal of Innovation in Education and Psychology*. Retrieved on 10/08/14 at www.jiepissn.com /2013/Achievement Among High School students, html.

Watkins, D. & Biggs, J.B. (eds.) (1996).*The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences.* Melbourne and Hong Kong: Australian Council for Educational Research and the Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong. Retrieved 28/03/15 http://www.johnbiggs.com.au/pdf/ex_2factor_spq.pdf

Watkins, D.A, & Hattie, J. (1985). A longitudinal study of the approach to learning of Australian tertiary students.*Human Learning*, *4*(2), 127-142. Retrieved 28/03/15 http://www.johnbiggs.com.au/pdf/ex_2factor_spq.pdf

Whtite, S. &Onofrio A.D (1993).*Identifying Latent Variable Measure by the Study Activity,American educational research association.*Atlanta G.A April, 1993.

Appendix A

<u>LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO RESPONDENTS</u>

Department of Psychology and Counseling
Faculty of Education,
Ahmadu Bello University,
Zaria.

Dear Respondents,

I am a post graduate student of the above named University. This questionnaire is designed to access your attitudes towards studies and your usual way of studying.

You are provided with five (5) options:

1. Strongly Agreed (SA)
2. Agreed (A)
3. Not sure (NA)
4. Disagree (D)
5. Strongly disagree (SD)

You are requested to tick ( ) in the appropriate box that suits your usual way of studying.

Your information will be treated with strict confidentiality and be used purely for education purpose.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

AHMAD, Aminat Gusau

Researcher

Appendix B

REVISED STUDY PROCESS QUESTIONNAIRE (RSPQ – 2F)

This questionnaire has a number of questions about your attitudes towards your studies and your usual way of studying. Please tick in the appropriate box, the one most appropriate responses to each question. Your answers will be treated with confidentiality.

Thank you for your cooperation.

SECTION A

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name of Institution: ………………………………………………………………..

Department: ……………………………………………………………………….

Sex: ……………………………………………………………………………………

Marital status: …………………………………………………………………….

SECTION B

S/N	STATEMENTS	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Not sure (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
1.	I find that at times studying gives me a feeling of deep personal satisfaction.					
2.	I find that I have to do enough work on a topic so that I can form my own conclusions before I am satisfied.					
3.	My aim is to pass the course while doing as little work as possible.					

4.	I only study seriously what's given out in class or in the course outlines.					
5.	I feel that virtually any topic can be highly interesting once I get into it .					
6.	I find most new topics interesting and often spend extra time trying to obtain more information about them.					
7.	I do not find my course very interesting so I keep my work to the minimum.					
8.	I learn some things by rote, going over and over them until I know them by heart even if I do not understand them.					
9.	I find that studying academic topics can at times be as exciting as a good novel or movie.					
10.	I test myself on important topics until I understand them completely.					
11.	I find I can get by in most assessments by memorising key sections rather than trying to understand them.					
12	I generally restrict my study to what is specifically set as I think it is unnecessary to do anything extra.					
13.	I work hard at my studies because I find the material interesting.					
14.	I spend a lot of my free time finding out more about interesting topics which have been discussed in different classes.					

15.	I find it is not helpful to study topics in depth. It confuses and wastes time, when all you need is a passing acquaintance with topics.					
16.	I believe that lecturers shouldn't expect students to spend significant amounts of time studying material everyone knows won't be examined.					
17.	I come to most classes with questions in mind that I want answering.					
18.	I make a point of looking at most of the suggested readings that go with the lectures.					
19.	I see no point in learning material which is not likely to be in the examination.					
20	I find the best way to pass examinations is to try to remember answers to likely questions.					

Scoring: 1. Deep Motive, 2. Deep Strategy, 3. Surface Motive, 4. Surface Strategy 5. Etc

Biggs, J.B., Kember, D., & Leung, D.Y.P. (2001)

Appendix C: Output

Hypo1
T-Test

Group Statistics

	marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Academic Achievement	Unmarried	348	1.9116	.86542	.04639
	Married	31	1.9565	.77265	.13877

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Academic Achievement	Equal variances assumed	2.358	.126	-.279	377	.781	-.04484	.16089	-.36120	.27152
	Equal variances not assumed			-.306	37.040	.761	-.04484	.14632	-.34131	.25162

Hyp2
T-Test

Group Statistics

	marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Approaches to Learning	Unmarried	348	74.4339	6.67040	.35757
	Married	31	70.9355	3.97438	.71382

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Approaches to Learning	Equal variances assumed	7.467	.007	2.873	377	.004	3.49842	1.21775	1.10398	5.89286
	Equal variances not assumed			4.382	46.690	.000	3.49842	.79837	1.89203	5.10482

HYP3
Correlations

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Academic Achievement	1.9153	.85736	379
Approache to learning	74.1478	6.55900	379

Correlations

		Academic Achievement	APPROACHES_TO_LEARNING
Academic Achievement	Pearson Correlation	1	.725
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.003
	N	379	379
Approaches to Learning	Pearson Correlation	.725	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	
	N	379	379

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

HYP4

	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Approaches to Learing	Male	230	75.1435	5.77688	.38092
	Female	149	72.6107	7.37024	.60379

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Approaches to Learning	Equal variances assumed	3.910	.049	3.734	377	.000	2.53274	.67825	1.19912	3.86636
	Equal variances not assumed			3.548	262.389	.000	2.53274	.71391	1.12702	3.93846

```
T-TEST GROUPS=sex(1 2)
  /MISSING=ANALYSIS
  /VARIABLES=achievement
  /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
```

Hyp5

T-Test

Group Statistics

	sex	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Academic Achievement	male	230	1.9308	.84761	.05589
	female	149	1.8913	.87451	.07164

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Academic Achievement	Equal variances assumed	.545	.461	.437	377	.662	.03944	.09026	-.13803	.21691
	Equal variances not assumed			.434	308.994	.665	.03944	.09086	-.13935	.21823

Frequency Table

Name of Institution

Institution		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	AGP T/MAFARA	150	39.6	39.6	39.6
	ZACAS	79	20.8	20.8	60.4
	Fed Poly., KN	150	39.6	39.6	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

Department

Department		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Linguistic	50	13.2	13.2	13.2
	B/Studies	100	26.4	26.4	39.6
	Legal studies	100	26.4	26.4	66.0
	English	50	13.2	13.2	79.2
	English/Hausa/IRS	44	11.6	11.6	90.8
	Computer studies	35	9.2	9.2	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

Sex

Sex		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	230	60.7	60.7	60.7
	Female	149	3s9.3	39.3	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

Marital Status

Marital status		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unmarried	348	91.8	91.8	91.8
	Married	31	8.2	8.2	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

Frequencies

1. I find that at times studying gives me a feeling of deep personal satisfaction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	D	5	1.3	1.3	1.3
	NS	11	2.9	2.9	4.2
	A	159	42.0	42.0	46.2
	SA	204	53.8	53.8	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

2. I find that I have to do enough work on a topic so that I can form my own conclusions before I am satisfied

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	D	38	10.0	10.0	10.0
	NS	62	16.4	16.4	26.4
	A	226	59.6	59.6	86.0
	SA	53	14.0	14.0	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

3. My aim is to pass the course while doing as little work as possible

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	D	64	16.9	16.9	16.9
	NS	39	10.3	10.3	27.2
	A	130	34.3	34.3	61.5
	SA	146	38.5	38.5	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

4. I only study seriously what given out in the class or in the course outlines

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	21	5.5	5.5	5.5
	D	105	27.7	27.7	33.2
	NS	51	13.5	13.5	46.7
	A	102	26.9	26.9	73.6
	SA	100	26.4	26.4	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

5. I feel that virtually any topic can be highly interesting once I get into it

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	7	1.8	1.8	1.8
	D	18	4.7	4.7	6.6
	NS	32	8.4	8.4	15.0
	A	156	41.2	41.2	56.2
	SA	166	43.8	43.8	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

6. I find most new topics interesting and often spend extra time trying to obtain more 6 information about them

7.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	16	4.2	4.2	4.2
	D	55	14.5	14.5	18.7
	NS	13	3.4	3.4	22.2
	A	117	30.9	30.9	53.0
	SA	178	47.0	47.0	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

7.I don't find my course very interesting so I keep my work to the minimum

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	53	14.0	14.0	14.0
	D	92	24.3	24.3	38.3
	NS	110	29.0	29.0	67.3
	A	87	23.0	23.0	90.2
	SA	37	9.8	9.8	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

8. I learn something by not going over and over them until I know them by heart even if I do not understand them

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	30	7.9	7.9	7.9
	D	59	15.6	15.6	23.5
	NS	29	7.7	7.7	31.1
	A	183	48.3	48.3	79.4
	SA	78	20.6	20.6	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

9. I find that studying academic topics can at times be as exciting as a good novel or movie

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	17	4.5	4.5	4.5
	D	33	8.7	8.7	13.2
	NS	26	6.9	6.9	20.1
	A	138	36.4	36.4	56.5
	SA	165	43.5	43.5	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

10. I test myself on important topics until I understand them completely

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	3	.8	.8	.8
	D	32	8.4	8.4	9.2
	NS	12	3.2	3.2	12.4
	A	154	40.6	40.6	53.0
	SA	178	47.0	47.0	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

11. I find I can get by in most assessments by memorizing key sections rather than trying to understand them

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	56	14.8	14.8	14.8
	D	77	20.3	20.3	35.1
	NS	29	7.7	7.7	42.7
	A	138	36.4	36.4	79.2
	SA	79	20.8	20.8	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

12. I generally restrict my study to what is specifically set as I think it is necessary to do anything extra

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	24	6.3	6.3	6.3
	D	60	15.8	15.8	22.2
	NS	47	12.4	12.4	34.6
	A	140	36.9	36.9	71.5
	SA	108	28.5	28.5	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

13. I work hard at my studies because I find the material interesting

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	43	11.3	11.3	11.3
	D	26	6.9	6.9	18.2
	NS	22	5.8	5.8	24.0
	A	154	40.6	40.6	64.6
	SA	134	35.4	35.4	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

14. I spend a lot of my free time finding out more about interesting topics which have been discussed in different class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	8	2.1	2.1	2.1
	D	59	15.6	15.6	17.7
	NS	75	19.8	19.8	37.5
	A	176	46.4	46.4	83.9
	SA	61	16.1	16.1	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

15. I find it not helpful to study topics in depth it confuses and waste time when all you need is a passing acquaintance with topics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	12	3.2	3.2	3.2
	D	81	21.4	21.4	24.5
	NS	73	19.3	19.3	43.8
	A	123	32.5	32.5	76.3
	SA	90	23.7	23.7	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

16. I believe that lecturers shouldn't expect student to spend significant amount of time studying material everyone knows won't be examined

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	15	4.0	4.0	4.0
	D	49	12.9	12.9	16.9
	NS	30	7.9	7.9	24.8
	A	157	41.4	41.4	66.2
	SA	128	33.8	33.8	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

17. I come to most classes with questions in my mind that I want answering

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	26	6.9	6.9	6.9
	D	80	21.1	21.1	28.0
	NS	40	10.6	10.6	38.5
	A	145	38.3	38.3	76.8
	SA	88	23.2	23.2	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

18. I make a point in learning material which is not likely to be in the examination

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	39	10.3	10.3	10.3
	D	68	17.9	17.9	28.2
	NS	52	13.7	13.7	42.0
	A	172	45.4	45.4	87.3
	SA	48	12.7	12.7	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

19. I see no point in learning material which is not likely to be in the examination

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	58	15.3	15.3	15.3
	D	62	16.4	16.4	31.7
	NS	51	13.5	13.5	45.1
	A	143	37.7	37.7	82.8
	SA	65	17.2	17.2	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

20. I find the best way to pass examination is to try to remember answers to likely questions

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SD	7	1.8	1.8	1.8
	D	68	17.9	17.9	19.8
	NS	67	17.7	17.7	37.5
	A	123	32.5	32.5	69.9
	SA	114	30.1	30.1	100.0
	Total	379	100.0	100.0	

Appendix D: Reliability Output

Reliability
Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	40	100.0
	Excluded	0	.0
	Total	40	100.0

a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.774	.758	20

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I find that at times studying gives me a feeling of deep personal satisfaction	4.4000	.70892	40
I find that I have to do enough work on a topic so that I can form my own conclusions before I am satisfied	3.7250	.90547	40
my aim is to pass the course while doing as little work as possible	3.9750	1.04973	40
I only study seriously what given out in the class or in the course outlines	3.3250	1.32795	40
I feel that virtually any topic can be highly interesting once I get into it	4.2250	.97369	40
I find most new topics interesting and often spend extra time trying to obtain more information about them	4.0500	1.21845	40
I donot find my course very interesting so I keep my work to the minimum	2.8250	1.19588	40
I learn something by rote, going over and over them until I know them by heart even if I do not understand them	3.5000	1.24035	40
I find that studying academic topics can at times be as exciting as a good novel or movie	4.1500	1.14466	40
I test myself on important topics until I understand them completely	4.3250	.76418	40
I find I can get by in most assessments by memorizing key sections rather than trying to understand them	3.3000	1.38119	40
I generally restrict my study to what is specifically set as I think it is necessary to do anything extra	3.5250	1.32021	40
I work hard at my studies because I find the material interesting	3.8000	1.32433	40
I spend a lot of my free time finding out more about interesting topics which have been discussed in different class	3.4250	1.00989	40
I find it not helpful to study topics in depth it confuses and waste time when all you need is a passing acquaintance with topics	3.5250	1.10911	40
I believe that lecturers shouldn't expect student to spend significant amount of time studying material everyone knows won't be examined	3.9750	1.02501	40
I come to most classes with questions in my mind that I want answering	3.3250	1.24833	40
I make a point in learning material which is not likely to be in the examination	3.0500	1.25983	40
I See no point in learning material which is not likely to be in the examination	3.2750	1.28078	40
I find the best way to pass examination is to try to remember answers to likely questions	3.8000	1.20256	40

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance
Item Means	3.675	2.825	4.400	1.575	1.558	.191

APPENDIX E

Perception of respondents on Approaches to Learning

S/N	ITEMS	Response categories					MEAN	STD.DEV
		SA	A	NS	D	SD		
1	I find that at times studying gives me a feeling of deep personal satisfaction	204	159	11	5	0	4.482	0.622
2	I find that I have to do enough work on a topic so that I can form my own conclusions before I am satisfied	53	226	62	38	0	3.778	0.809
3	my aim is to pass the course while doing as little work as possible	146	130	39	64	0	3.944	1.078
4	I only study seriously what's given out in the class or in the course outlines	100	102	51	105	21	3.409	1.288
5	I feel that virtually any topic can be highly interesting once I get into it	166	156	32	18	7	4.203	0.916
6	I find most new topics interesting and often spend extra time trying to obtain more information about them	178	117	13	55	16	4.018	1.211
7	I do not find my course very interesting so I keep my work to the minimum	37	87	110	92	53	2.902	1.190
8	I learn something by rote, going over and over them until I know them by heart even if I do not understand them	78	183	29	59	30	3.580	1.202
9	I find that studying academic topics can at times be as exciting as a good novel or movie	165	138	26	33	17	4.058	1.120
10	I test myself on important topics until I understand them completely	178	154	12	32	3	4.245	0.923
11	I find I can get by in most assessments by memorizing key sections rather than trying to understand them	79	138	29	77	56	3.282	1.384

12	I generally restrict my study to what is specifically set as I think it is necessary to do anything extra	108	140	47	60	24	3.654	1.223
13	I work hard at my studies because I find the material interesting	134	154	22	26	43	3.817	1.295
14	I spend a lot of my free time finding out more about interesting topics which have been discussed in different class	61	176	75	59	8	3.588	1.002
15	I find it not helpful to study topics in depth it confuses and wastes time when all you need is a passing acquaintance with topics	90	123	73	81	12	3.522	1.159
16	I believe that lecturers shouldn't expect student to spend significant amount of time studying material everyone knows wont be examined	128	157	30	49	15	3.881	1.131
17	I come to most classes with questions in my mind that I want answering	88	145	40	80	26	3.498	1.245
18	I make a point in learning material which is not likely to be in the examination	48	172	52	68	39	3.321	1.204
19	I SEE no point in learning material which is not likely to be in the examination	65	143	51	62	58	3.250	1.334
20	I find the best way to pass examination is to try to remember answers to likely questions	114	123	67	68	7	3.709	1.131
	Cumulative mean						**3.7070**	

Decision mean =3.000

APPENDIX F

Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population

N	**S**	**N**	**S**	**N**	**S**
10	10	220	140	1200	291
15	14	230	144	1300	297
20	19	240	148	1400	302
25	24	250	152	1500	306
30	28	260	155	1600	310
35	32	270	159	1700	313
40	36	280	162	1800	317
45	40	290	165	1900	320
50	44	300	169	2000	322
55	48	320	175	2200	327
60	52	340	181	2400	331
65	56	360	186	2600	335
70	59	380	191	2800	338
75	63	400	196	3000	341
80	66	420	201	3500	346
85	70	440	205	4000	351
90	73	460	210	4500	354
95	76	480	214	5000	357
100	80	500	217	6000	361
110	86	550	226	7000	364
120	92	600	234	8000	367
130	97	650	242	9000	368
140	103	700	248	10000	370
150	108	750	254	15000	375
160	113	800	260	20000	377
170	118	850	265	30000	379
180	123	900	269	40000	380
190	127	950	274	50000	381
200	132	1000	278	75000	382
210	136	1100	285	1000000	384

Note.—*N* is population size.
S is sample size.

Source: Krejcie Robert V., Morgan, Daryle, W. (1971)