Original Article

External Support and Demographic Factors as Differentials of Achievement Goal Orientation among Adolescent Students in Resource-Limited Environments

Eunice Ndyareeba[1,2], Judith Biirah[2], Henry Kasawo Kibedi[1] & Zanna Clay[3]*

[1] Kyambogo University, P. O. Box 1, Kyambogo-Kampala, Uganda.

[2] Kabale University, P. O. Box 317, Kabale - Uganda.

[3] Durham University, Durham DH1 3LE, United Kingdom.

[*] Author for Correspondence ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3442-0826; Email: emurokore@kab.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

This study unveils demographic factors (age, gender, school type, compassion support, parental education, income) as correlates of achievement goal orientation. Using a convergent parallel mixed methods approach, the study investigated the influence of these demographic characteristics on achievement goal orientation among 510 adolescent students aged 12-21 (231 males, 279 females) in secondary schools in Southwestern Uganda. Using Achievement Goal Questionnaire (AGQ-R) Scale and key informant interview guide, achievement goal orientation preferences and the influence of external support were respectively measured. Qualitative findings revealed teacher-student relationships, goal-setting training, defined external rewards, and peer pressure as critical factors that influence achievement goal orientation choice. Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney U test results revealed that parents income and education level, students school type and external support influenced achievement goal orientation preference among adolescent students in southwestern Uganda. In conclusion, this research provides a comprehensive understanding of the intricate interconnectedness of these variables, offering valuable insights to enrich educational interventions especially in resource-limited learning environments. This study contributes to the ongoing efforts to increase adoption of achievement goal orientation that result in self-skill enhancement through targeted and effective educational interventions.

INTRODUCTION

Considerable research has been conducted on students' motivational factors in academic settings. Among the important motivational factors associated with students' academic engagement is their achievement goal orientations, which have been defined as an individual's set of beliefs that reflect the reasons why they approach and engage in academic tasks (Elliot et al., 2011). The aim of this study was to examine how external support and demographic variations influence achievement goal orientation among Ugandan secondary school students. Historically, researchers developed models to explain achievement goal orientation dimensions, including two, three, four, and six dimensional models to conceptualize the achievement goals of students. The present study focused on a four-dimensional model (a 2x2 model) to predict students' learning approaches depicted in Mastery Approach, Mastery Avoidance, Performance Approach and Performance Avoidance goals (Üztemur, 2020).

Mastery approach orientation individuals are motivated by their desire to learn, understand, develop competence, and acquire knowledge for self-skill enhancement (Harackiewicz & Elliot, 1993). Students inclined to mastery approach goal orientation strive for personal growth through skills enhancement and mastery of the task or subject matter. Performance approach orientation individuals are primarily motivated by the desire to demonstrate their competence through outperforming others. They focus on achieving positive evaluations, recognition, and social comparison with others. Their goal is to demonstrate their ability and receive favourable judgments from others (Elliot & McGregor, 2001).

Mastery avoidance orientation individuals are motivated to avoid demonstrating a lack of competence or inability thus avoiding academic tasks where they deem themselves less competent. They are concerned about failure and tend to focus on avoiding mistakes, criticism, or negative evaluations. They will choose what they deem as simpler academic tasks in which they can demonstrate competence. Performance avoidance orientation individuals are primarily motivated to avoid negative evaluations, criticism, or failure escalating from their inability to outperform their peers (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 2015). They are concerned about how others might negatively judge their performance, and their goal is to avoid appearing as academic failures compared to their peers.

Demographic Characteristics and Achievement Goal Orientation

Considerable research has been undertaken on the variations in achievement goal orientation among different demographics of study participants in diverse contexts. For instance, a study conducted among Turkish adolescents found that there were differences in achievement goal orientation based on age, where younger adolescents were more likely to adopt a mastery approach and performance approach achievement goal orientation compared to their older counterparts. However, the study did not find any differences in achievement goal orientation based on gender. (Şahin & Kürkçü, 2016). Results of a study done among Chinese adolescent students was inconsistent with the aforementioned findings; there was variation in achievement goal orientation by gender, in which case girls were more likely to adopt mastery avoidance achievement goal orientation and experienced high levels of learning anxiety (Kong et al., 2023).

Further studies have been conducted regarding socioeconomic variation in achievement goal orientation and different results have been established. For instance, a study done among Ugandan prisoners on formal and vocational

training revealed statistically non-significant variation in achievement goal orientation across all demographic characteristics (Aheisibwe & Rukundo, 2018). Similarly, Hussain Ch. et al. (2017) found out that there was statistically non-significant variation in achievement goal orientation and students' socioeconomic status in Pakistan.

The study on French Canadian adolescents showed that their perception of receiving emotional support from their teachers significantly influenced their endorsement of a mastery achievement goal orientation, especially when they viewed themselves as capable or competent. (Smith et al., 2022). In addition, research conducted among American high school students discovered that having a performance-approach achievement goal orientation was associated with their own strongly self-driven desire to outperform their peers. This motivation stemmed from expectations within their families and the internal pressure they felt to meet their parents' expectations(Kim et al., 2020).

Moreover, previous researchers have advanced that achievement goal orientations are adopted differently and have been linked to critical academic outcomes. For instance, Ng'ang'a (2018) found out that among Kenyan adolescents, majority 67.5% (630) adopted mastery approach goal orientation, 15% (630) adopted performance avoidance, 12.5% (630) adopted performance approach goal orientation and only 2.5 % (630) adopted mastery avoidance achievement goal orientation. Subaşi (2020) Subaşi contends that avoidance goals are positively associated with task value and academic efficacy in Turkish and Korean students. He emphasizes that Korean students, in particular, place a high value on avoiding negative consequences due to their collective cultural background. These students strive to prevent misunderstandings and avoid being judged by their society, which leads them to focus on academic tasks they believe they can accomplish while avoiding those they deem challenging. As a result, this mindset ultimately yields favorable learning outcomes. On the contrary, a longitudinal study conducted among French Canadian grade seven adolescent students found that high mastery goal orientation predicted high behavioral and cognitive

engagement (Duchesne et al., 2019). Elliot and Harackiewicz (2015) conducted an experimental study among Western undergraduate students in the University of Wisconsin-Madison and found out that students who adopted approach goal orientations were more academically engaged than their counterparts inclined to avoidance goal orientation. The contradictions in the previous study findings present practical gaps that call for effective context-specific interventions to enhance positive achievement goal orientation.

Uganda being the world's second nation having the youngest population living in poverty may have greater challenges regarding achievement goal orientation than those in other contexts as advanced by the past researchers since any goal that results into survival outcomes may be preferred. Moreover, in 2018, Uganda Bureau of Statistics' (UBOS) report indicated that 24% of of the adolescents who had joined secondary school failed to complete A-level and the subsequent reports showed that most adolescents did not like schooling and were interested in money making activities for survival (UBOS, 2018; UNICEF, 2019). The reports by UBOS and UNICEF imply significant academic disengagement among secondary schools in Uganda.

Important to note is the fact that achievement goal orientation preference within low resource education settings can be impacted by broader issues such as poverty and inadequate educational support. Compassion International lays particular emphasis on quality education, health, and holistic welfare to disrupt the perpetuation of poverty, especially among underprivileged children (Mugisha, 2021). Despite the existing Compassion International intervention in the region, a study by Nyakato et al. (2021) about adolescents' perceptions of growing up in rural Southwestern Uganda revealed that adolescents were likely to drop out of school due to adverse experiences associated with low resource family backgrounds. It is not known how the proneness to drop out varies with external support, demographic characteristics, and achievement goal orientations. Thus, this study addressed the existing gap by investigating how demographic factor differences such as gender, age,

parents education and income levels impacted adolescent students' achievement goal orientation, given their limited resource environment. The impact of external support on achievement goal orientation preference was also examined.

The study was underpinned by the Achievement Goal Theory (AGT) and the Expectancy-Value Theory (EVT). According to the AGT, students have distinctive orientations towards a certain type of goal (Monteiro et al., 2018). The EVT assumes that a student will likely persist on doing an academic task however challenging it may be as long as they attach value to it and expect to excel and master skills derived from the same task.

The following specific objectives guided the study;

- To examine demographic variations in achievement goal orientation among adolescents students in southwestern Uganda

- To investigate the achievement goal orientation variation in external support among adolescents in secondary schools southwestern Uganda

In line with the objectives, the following hypotheses were tested:

- There are statistically significant demographic variations in achievement goal orientation among adolescents students in southwestern Uganda

- There is a statistically significant association between achievement goal orientation and being an external support beneficiary or a non-beneficiary secondary school student by in southwestern Uganda.

Methods

Participants

Student participants were drawn from two high schools in south western region of Uganda. The two schools were similar in terms of their physical properties, school curriculum and socio-economic status since both admitted Compassion International-supported students at subsidised school fees to enable them access 'quality education' despite their resource constrained backgrounds. A proportionate sample of 510 participants was selected for quantitative data collection, 231(45.29%) males and 279(54.7%) females; 188(36.86%) were Compassion International-support beneficiaries and 322 (63.13%) were non-beneficiaries. The participants ranged from 13 to 21 years (M = 17.09 years, SD = 1.72 years). Qualitative data was collected from 14 key informants who included two compassion officers, two head teachers, four teachers and six adolescent students. This resulted in 524 participants for the study.

Measures

Section one of the questionnaire included personal information on age, class, gender, Compassion International-support, parental/guardian level of education, parents/guardians' income and parental/guardian marital status. These variables impact students' experiences, access to resources, and support systems, potentially influencing their academic motivation and success.

Section two was made up of the Achievement Goals Questionnaire (AGQ-R) revised version Elliot and Murayama (2008). The revised 2x2 Achievement Goal Orientation Scale has been adapted in the Kenyan context by Ng'ang'a (2018) to measure general achievement goal orientations among secondary school students. This scale measures general achievement goal orientations using Elliot and McGregor's (2001) theoretical framework and consists of 12 items and 4 subscales, namely mastery approach (MAP), mastery avoidance (MAV), performance approach (PAP), and performance-avoidance (PAV). Respondents indicate their answers on a five-point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly agree (5). Higher scores reflect greater endorsement of the related approach.

For example, 'My goal is to fully understand the contents taught in class'. 'My goal is to avoid learning less than my capability'. 'My goal is to avoid producing worse work than other students'

The AGQ-R has been used in the East African context and yielded good psychometric properties for example for the four subscales: MAP $\alpha = 0.88$, PAV $\alpha = 0.95$, MAV $\alpha = 0.83$, and PAV $\alpha = 0.75$ in a study done among Kenyan adolescents (Ng'ang'a, 2018). For this study, a pilot study was conducted among 89 adolescent students in southwestern

Uganda and Cronbach Alpha Coefficient result for Achievement Goal Orientation Questionnaire sub scales were; MAP = α .80, MAV = α .75, PAP α = .85 and PAV α = .70. So, it was suitable for data collection among secondary school adolescents in Southwestern Uganda.

To generate the qualitative data, a key informant interview guide was administered to gather qualitative information on factors influencing achievement goal orientation. The selection of key informants was based on their expertise and ability to provide valuable insights, with a sub-set of adolescents chosen for their direct experience with achievement goal orientation while they pursue their education. To ensure trustworthiness and reliability, the interview guides were pilot-tested, refined for clarity, and interviewers were trained to maintain consistency and neutrality in administering the questions.

Procedure

The study was conducted in the first term of schools in February and March 2023. A letter of introduction to the community was obtained from the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training at Kyambogo University. Data collection permits MUST-2022-620 and SS1562ES were obtained from Mbarara University of Science and Technology Research Ethics Committee (MUST-REC) and the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (UNCST) respectively. An introductory letter to schools administrators was obtained from the District Inspector of Schools (DIS) Kabale District. The researcher and two trained educational psychology graduate students collected the data from the selected students within their classrooms.

A verbal explanation on the aim of the study was given to the school administrators who then consented on behalf of students below eighteen. Adolescent students (eighteen years and above) signed an informed consent form as confirmation of their willingness to voluntarily participate in the study. Following the directions from school administrators, classes were visited for individual participant sampling. Students and other key informants were made aware that participation was voluntary, the responses would be kept confidential, data would not be used for any purposes other than research, and they could withdraw before, during, or after the study without any repercussions if they felt uncomfortable. Quantitative data were then collected using the self-report questionnaire administered by the researcher after participants had understood and had no queries concerning the study. Participants sat in a well-arranged classroom to ensure that every participant had enough space to enable them fill the questionnaire independently and the exercise lasted for 40 minutes. Qualitative interviews were done following appointments with individual participants and each interview lasted about 30 minutes.

Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted using Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 20. Descriptive statistics (frequency and percent) were determined for the sample characteristics. The distribution (frequency and percent) of participants across achievement goal orientation levels was determined using cross-tabulations.

In order to test the research hypotheses, Kruskal Wallis test was used to determine the differences in achievement goal orientation among three or more categories of demographic characteristics such as age and parents' education level, while Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine the score differences between two categories of demographic characteristics such as Compassion International-support, gender, and school type.

Qualitative data analysis was conducted following (Braun & Clarke, 2014) six procedures for thematic analysis. Manual analysis, in contrast to modern software, was chosen to facilitate familiarisation with the data (Maguire & Delahunt, 2017). All audio recordings were transcribed without preliminary editing to deeply engage with the data. Iterative revisions involved multiple readings and noting emerging insights. Scripts with noteworthy points received special codes for tracking. Markers and highlighters aided in emphasizing key points for easy reference.

Thematic points were developed through inductive open coding, creating a preliminary coding scheme. The actual coding process built upon this scheme while remaining open to new emerging codes. The researcher systematically went through all transcripts, highlighting relevant phrases and sentences corresponding to the codes. As coding progressed, existing codes were modified, collapsed, discarded, or merged to make sense. After coding, clustered texts were analysed to identify patterns and generate themes. Themes were constructed iteratively by grouping codes into typologies aligned with the research question and theoretical lens (Maguire & Delahunt, 2017). Main themes were reviewed, adjusted, and paraphrased to ensure coherence.

Referential adequacy was tested by comparing themes to raw data. Themes were defined, named, listed, and evaluated for their relationships within a thematic network, forming a coherent and persuasive narrative. Verbatim quotations were incorporated to give voice to the data.

Results

Demographic Variations in Achievement Goal Orientation

This section describes the levels of the overall and different achievement goal orientation dimensions vis-a-vis participant demographic characteristics

Table 1: Mastery Approach Achievement Goal Orientation and Demographic Characteristics of Participants (continued)

Demographic Characteristics		Kruskal Wallis Test															
		Mastery Approach Achievement Goal Orientation												Total			
		Low				Moderate				High							
		n (%)	M R	X^2	P	n (%)	M R	X^2	P	n (%)	M R	X^2	p	n	M R	X^2	P
Age Categories	Early (12-14 years)	4(12.1)	16.25	.899	.638	10(30.3)	57.25	.346	.841	19(57.6)	178.34	.817	.665	33	225.97	1.455	.483
	Middle (15-17)	20(7.6)	22.20			57(21.8)	61.32			185(70.6)	171.58			262	257.38		
	Late (18-21)	17(7.9)	20.71			51(23.7)	57.91			147(68.4)	181.26			215	257.74		
Participants Class	Senior One	11(8.4)	20.15	1.982	.576	25(19.1)	56.22	.979	.806	95(72.5)	181.84	2.366	.500	131	267.41	3.586	.310
	Senior Two	11(7.7)	19.23			32(22.4)	64.00			100(69.9)	178.30			143	260.5		
	Senior Three	8(6.8)	26.13			35(29.7)	57.63			75(63.6)	160.85			118	234.32		
	Senior Five	11(9.3)	20.00			26(22.0)	59.63			81(68.6)	180.34			118	256.97		
Parents/ Guardians' Marital Status	Married	33(8.1)	22.02	1.513	.679	97(24.0)	58.28	1.857	.603	275(67.9)	117.98	4.424	.219	405	254.38	1.611	.657
	Single	2(7.1)	13.75			7(25.0)	54.71			19(67.9)	115.50			28	238.34		
	Widowed	4(7.8)	18.38			10(19.6)	71.05			37(72.5)	190.88			51	277.35		
	Divorced	2(7.7)	16.75			4(15.4)	68.63			20(76.9)	140.78			26	248.75		
Parents/ Guardians' Education Level	No Education	7(8.5)	20.43	.740	.864	17(20.7)	49.79	4.301	.231	58(70.7)	160.76	2.944	.400	82	246.74	.851	.837
	Primary	12(8.5)	19.04			32(22.7)	57.09			97(68.8)	186.93			141	261.87		
	Secondary	16(8.8)	21.72			41(22.7)	58.63			124(68.5)	172.23			181	251.41		
	Tertiary Education	6(5.7)	23.67			28(26.4)	69.41			72(67.9)	180.03			106	260.79		
Parents/ Guardians' Income	0-100,000	2(4.8)	18.98	1.473	.1479	8(19.0)	60.80	1.993	.369	32(76.2)	171.55	1.188	.562	42	261.57	1.798	.407
	100,001 – 250,000	21(7.2)	24.08			67(22.9)	50.75			204(69.9)	179.49			292	248.47		
	250,0001 – 500,000	12(12.2)	21.39			20(20.4)	61.94			66(67.3)	186.56			98	240.14		

Table 1: Mastery Approach Achievement Goal Orientation and Demographic Characteristics of Participants (continued)

Demographic Characteristics		Low				Moderate				High				Total			
		n (%)	M R	U	p	n (%)	M R	U	P	n (%)	M R	U	p	n	M R	X^2	p
Gender	Male	20(8.7)	20.74	205.00	.893	65(28.1)	59.28	1708	.934	146(63.2)	180.68	14281.5	.445	231	244.70	29730	.127
	Female	21(7.5)	21.24			53(19.0)	59.77			205(73.5)	172.67			279	264.44		
Compassion Support	Nonbeneficiary	27(8.4)	18.19	491.00	**.031**	86(26.7)	59.58	1369.0	.965	209(64.9)	176.62	14710	.886	322	246.23	27282	**.059**
	Beneficiary	14(7.4)	26.43			32(17.0)	59.28			142(75.5)	195.09			188	271.38		
School Type	Private	27(8.2)	21.81	167.00	.559	81(24.7)	56.56	1260	.156	220(67.1)	175.11	14122	.823	328	250.50	28049	.293
	Government	14(7.4)	19.43			37(20.6)	65.95			131(72.0)	177.52			182	264.67		
Total		41(8.0)				118(23.1)				351(68.8)				510			

Note. MR = Mean Rank, Low level = 1- 1.33, Moderate =2.34-3.66, High = 3.67-5.0, the values in bold indicate significant effect of demographics on MAP,

Kruskal Wallis test results (Table 1) indicate that there was no statistically significant difference in mastery approach achievement goal orientation among the demographic characteristics. However, Mann-Whitney U test results indicate that there was a statistically significant difference in mastery approach achievement goal orientation (MAP) between Compassion International-support recipients and non-recipients (U = 491.00, p = .031) with the beneficiaries having a generally higher mean rank at low and moderate levels of MAP (MR = 26.43 & MR=271.38) respectively than non-beneficiaries (MR = 18.19 & 246.23) respectively. This implies that at low levels and when summed up, support by Compassion International significantly influenced MAP with the beneficiaries adopting higher levels of MAP than non-beneficiaries. These results indicate that learners adopt different levels of MAP irrespective of their differences in gender, age, class, parents/guardians' marital status, parents/ guardians' education level, and parents/guardian income levels.

The qualitative interview narratives explain why Compassion International-support beneficiaries were inclined to mastery approach achievement goal orientation than non-beneficiaries as depicted in the following statements;

Future Career and Employability

'Yes, compassion support beneficiaries work hard to master the taught content because they have no parents and come from poor and challenging backgrounds which force them to work hard and achieve their goals for a better future (IS/KI/NCB/01, adolescent, non-compassion support beneficiary).

'All my school fees are paid by Compassion International because I come from a very poor background. I engage in academic work to do a good course in future, get a job and look after our family in future' (IS/KI/NCB/05, adolescent, compassion support beneficiary).

***Goal setting training*;** One of the key participants said compassion support beneficiaries are trained to set goals which motivate them to adopt mastery approach achievement goal orientation.

> *'They are motivated by a tool they fill every once or twice a year called my life for tomorrow, we have now called it life planning tool. So, in this tool a student writes the future career he wishes to pursue and also objectives towards the future careers. But in this life planning tool, we don't emphasize career but also spiritual, socio emotional and physical aspects of a child's life. We also have child development progress report (CDPR… we assess a child's development in accordance with education attainment*

and the child knows that on my academics, I should be doing this at this age' (IS/KI/CW/01, compassion worker).

Mentorship was also found to be one of the most important aspects that influence students' endorsement of mastery approach achievement goals orientation as depicted by the following statement;

> *'We make sure that each child is attached to a mentor who keeps advising them. There is an alumni day, when we call the people who passed through compassion to come and visit project centres and tell the beneficiaries how they used to do things to inspire them. They meet multiple people of high profile who come to teach them about discipleship, sexual purity or a skill, these people inspire them (IS/KI/CW/02, compassion worker).*

Table 2: Performance Approach Goal Orientation and Demographic Characteristics (continued)

Demographic Characteristics		Performance Approach Achievement Goal Orientation Levels												Total		
		Low				Moderate				High							
		n (%)	M R	X^2	p	n (%)	M R	X^2	p	n (%)	M R	X^2	p	n	M R	X^2	p
Age Categories	Early (12-14 years)	6(18.2)	157.24	.875	.646	4(12.1)	73.38	1.396	.497	23(69.7)	157.24	.875	.646	33	249.76	.055	.973
	Middle 15-17)	17(6.5)	164.65			73(27.9)	72.22			172(65.6)	164.65			262	255.90		
	Late (18-21)	16(7.6)	172.72			60(27.9)	64.79			139(64.7)	172.72			215	255.89		
Participants Class	Senior One	16(12.2)	18.06	3.957	.266	28(21.4)	74.43	.782	.854	87(67.4)	178.59	3.594	.309	131	261.94	2.705	.439
	Senior Two	5(3.5)	16.70			39(27.3)	67.13			99(69.2)	156.51			143	259.72		
	Senior Three	10(8.5)	25.80			38(32.2)	68.24			70(59.3)	160.35			118	236.25		
	Senior Five	8(6.8)	18.69			32(27.1)	67.44			78(66.1)	175.50			118	262.48		
Parents/ Guardian's Marital Status	Married	32(7.9)	20.67	.882	.644	107(26.4)	68.08	3.014	.390	266(65.7)	169.96	1.379	.710	405	257.15	.281	.964
	Single	3(10.7)	14.83			8(28.6)	76.56			17(60.7)	171.12			28	245.36		
	Widowed	4(7.8)	18.50			12(23.5)	59.25			35(68.7)	154.34			51	251.27		
	Divorced	0(0)				10(38.5)	84.50			16(61.5)	151.50			26	249.04		
Parent's / Guardian's Level of Education	No Education	4(4.2)	15.40	1.497	.683	32(33.7)	62.23	1.325	.723	59(62.1)	**149.15**	**8.957**	**.030**	95	246.18		.530
	Primary	10(8.8)	19.06			33(28.9)	67.35			71(62.3)	190.91			114	270.79	2.211	
	Secondary	12(7.2)	21.97			43(25.7)	72.56			112(67.1)	163.86			167	251.22		
	Tertiary Education	13(9.8)	20.00			29(21.1)	70.63			92(69.2)	157.24			134	249.68		
Parent's/Guardian's Income	0-100,000	2(4.8)	18.65		.684	8(19.0)	69.78	.770	.680	32(76.2)	167.73	*.219*	.896	42	**267.12**	5.836	.054
	100,001 – 250,000	21(7.2)	22.25	*.761*		67(22.9)	64.72			204(69.9)	161.55			292	230.92		
	250,0001 – 500,000	12(12.2)	20.50			20(20.4)	72.56			66(67.3)	167.28			98	242.01		

Table 2: Performance Approach Goal Orientation and Demographic Characteristics (continued)

Demographic Characteristics		Low				Moderate				High				Total			
		n (%)	M R	U	p	n (%)	M R	U	p	n (%)	M R	U	p	n	M R	X^2	p
Gender	Male	20(8.7)	20.84	168.500	.581	65(28.1)	70.97	2213.0	.540	146(63.2)	173.34	12802	.325	231	248.63	30637	.333
	Female	21(7.5)	18.91			53(19.0)	67.11			205(73.5)	163.18			279	261.19		
Compassion Support	Nonbeneficiary	27(8.4)	20.00	145.000	>.05	86(26.7)	70.00	1900.0	.633	209(64.9)	161.29	12234	.142	322	241.36	25715.0	**.004**
	Beneficiary	14(7.4)	20.00			32(17.0)	66.74			142(75.5)	176.54			188	**279.72**		
School Type	Private	27(8.2)	18.36	97.500	.108	81(24.7)	68.98	2044.5	.994	220(67.1)	169.49	12690	.617	328	249.81	27821.5	.232
	Government	14(7.4)	24.75			37(20.6)	69.03			131(72.0)	164.22			182	265.94		
Total		41(8.0)				118(23.1)				351(68.8)				510			

Note. MR=Mean Rank, Low level= 1- 1.33, Moderate =2.34-3.66, High = 3.67-5.0, the values in bold indicate significant effect of demographics on PAP

The results in Table 2 indicate statistically significant demographic variation in performance approach achievement goal orientation with parent/guardian education (X^2 = 8.957, p = .030). Participants whose parents/guardians had primary education had higher mean rank than other education levels. Results indicate that there was no a statistically significant difference in PAP by parent/guardian income (X^2 5.836, p = .054), participants whose parents had the lowest monthly income (0-100,00) had a higher mean rank (MR = 267.12) than other income categories. Results further indicate a statically significant variation in PAP by external support (U= 25715.0, p = .004) with support beneficiaries having a higher mean rank (MR = 279.72) than non-beneficiaries (MR = 241.36). However, there was no statistically significant difference in PAP by age, class, gender, parents marital status and school type.

The qualitative findings relate with the quantitative results in that adolescent students from very poor backgrounds confirmed by the fact that they are singled out of their societies for compassion support, were more likely to embrace performance approach achievement goal orientation since they expected external rewards that would facilitate their higher education attainment and consequently enable them to come out of poverty. The following responses attest to this:

*'My classmates, mostly the Compassion supported, have been promised that if they perform well, they will be supported at the university and therefore they work hard to win others' (*IS/KI/NCB/01, adolescent, non-compassion support beneficiary).

Compassion support beneficiaries are inspired by the sponsors themselves, as they write letters seeking to know the students' performance. This makes them to work hard such that they put something good in the next letter… we make sure that we pay a hundred percent school fees for the best performers and they are motivated because they know that they can reach at any level education despite their poor backgrounds (IS/KI/CW/01). 'Compassion gives scholarships to the best academic performers, for example we have a beneficiary doing a bachelor of Laws at one of the accredited universities in southwestern Uganda region and he is determined to excel and get his family out of pervert. This inspires the young children to work hard and be the best performers in class' (IS/KI/CW/02, compassion worker).

Table 3: Mastery Avoidance Achievement Goal Orientation and Demographic Characteristics (Continued)

Kruskal Wallis Test

Demographic Characteristics		Low n (%)	MR	X^2	P	Moderate n (%)	MR	X^2	p	High n (%)	MR	X^2	p	Total n	MR	X^2	p
Age Categories	Early (12-14 years)	9(27.3)	95.39	2.458	.293	13(39.4)	99.81	.143	.931	11(33.3)	73.59	.355	.837	33	264.50		.871
	Middle (15-17)	78(29.8)	72.29			104(39.7)	102.45			80(30.5)	82.13			262	252.58		.275
	Late (18-21)	61(28.4)	74.25			84(39.1)	99.39			70(32.6)	80.87			215	257.68		
Participants Class	Senior Oner	38(29.0)	78.09		.647	49(37.4)	103.15	1.572	.666	44(33.6)	85.70	3.403	.334	131	262.60	4.621	.202
	Senior Two	39(27.3)	67.18			50(35.0)	94.67			54(37.8)	82.69			143	266.19		
	Senior Three	39(33.1)	76.21	1.657		51(43.2)	98.31			28(23.7)	67.09			118	230.38		
	Senior Five	32(27.1)	77.08			51(43.2)	107.82			35(29.7)	83.60			118	259.78		
Parents/ Guardian's Marital Status	Married	126(31.1)	73.77	3.742	.291	155(38.3)	101.27	.183	.980	124(30.6)	81.65	1.868	.600	405	250.20	3.924	.270
	Single	4(14.3)	100.13			12(42.9)	101.42			12(42.9)	67.54			28	299.71		
	Widowed	12(23.5)	63.58			19(37.3)	96.21			20(39.2)	80.73			51	274.46		
	Divorced	6(23.1)	94.67			15(57.7)	103.93			5(19.2)	98.30			26	253.21		
Parent's guardian's Education Level	/No Education	27(32.9)	77.11	.291	.961	27(32.9)	89.13	5.047	.168	28(34.1)	69.54	2.310	.511	82	246.38	1.449	.694
	Primary	41(29.1)	71.93			53(37.6)	104.38			47(33.3)	81.98			141	259.44		
	Secondary	53(29.3)	75.44			68(37.6)	110.74			60(33.1)	84.16			181	262.88		
	Tertiary Education	27(25.5)	73.94			53(50.0)	91.18			26(24.5)	84.29			106	244.70		
Parent's /guardian's Income	0-100,000	23(29.5)	70.95		.271	26(33.3)	106.32	3.187	.203	29(37.2)	82.63		.507	78	**281.26**	26.306	**<. 01**
	100,001 – 250,000	59(26.9)	82.71	2.614		84(38.4)	88.96			76(34.7)	70.96	1.359		219	221.31		
	250,0001 – 500,000	34(27.2)	68.88			52(41.6)	99.99			39(31.2)	83.11			125	204.70		

Table 3: Mastery Avoidance Achievement Goal Orientation and Demographic Characteristics (Continued)

Mann-Whitney U Test

Mastery Avoidance Achievement Goal Orientation

Demographic Characteristics		Low n (%)	MR	U	p	Moderate n (%)	MR	U	p	High n (%)	MR	U	p	Total n	MR	U	p
Gender of Participants	Male	69(29.9)	75.67	2644.5	.753	92(39.8)	93.05	**4283.0**	.072	70(30.3)	82.08	3109.5	.793	231	253.11	31673	.738
	Female	79(28.3)	73.47			109(39.1)	107.71			91(32.6)	80.17			279	257.47		
Compassion Support	Nonbeneficiary	101(31.4)	75.39	2284.5	.710	136(42.2)	97.16	3897.5	.171	85(26.4)	**72.55**	**2512.0**	**.013**	322	240.13	**25318**	**.002**
	Beneficiary	47(25.0)	72.60			65(34.6)	109.04			76(40.4)	90.45			188	281.83		
School Type	Private	104(31.7)	76.10	2121.5	.480	137(41.8)	99.89	4193.5	.685	87(26.5)	78.24	2969	.401	328	242.41	**25379**	**.006**
	Government	42(26.0)	70.72			64(35.4)	103.44			74(40.6)	84.33			182	279.50		
Total		148(29.0)				201(39.4)				161(31.6)				510			

Note. MR= Mean Rank, Low level = 1- 1.33, Moderate =2.34-3.66, High= 3.67-5.0, the value in bold indicate significant effect of demographics on MAV

Results in Table 3 indicate a statistically significant difference in overall mastery avoidance goal orientation (MAV) (X^2 = 26.306, p < .01) among categories of parental/guardian income level. Participants of parents whose level of income was at 0-100,00 (MR=267.12) had higher mean rank (MR= 281.26) than participants whose parents earned higher. Results further indicate a significant difference in MAV between recipients of Compassion International support (U= 25318, p = .002) with the beneficiaries having a higher mean rank (MR = 72.55) than the non-beneficiaries (MR = 240.13). Results further indicate that there was a statistically significant difference (U= 25379, p = .006) by school type on overall mastery avoidance achievement goal orientation whereby adolescent students in the government school had higher mean rank (MR=279.50) than those in the private school (MR=242.41). These results imply that socio economic status influences mastery avoidance achievement goal orientation whereby students from low economic backgrounds were likely to avoid being perceived as incompetent. There was also a marginally significant difference in MAV by gender with females having a higher mean rank value than males.

The following narratives revealed that teacher student relationship had an impact on mastery avoidance achievement goal orientation among compassion international support beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries as depicted in the following statements;

The challenge is not about the children, it is about the school. Some schools are believed to pass certain subjects like sciences and others Arts so some students don't take subjects because they are not motivated by school which may not be believed to be good at that subject. In addition, lack of direct mentors for example if learner has no a close person like a brother who did subjects of sciences then they also feel like they cannot manage taking them (IS/KI/CW/02, Compassion worker). *"... I always put my interest in the subject I prefer like geography and I avoid those which are hard for me to understand. Students avoid academic tasks taught by some teachers who are not engaged in helping students to master the content… haaam… there is one of the students who used to fail and he used not to regularly attend that very subject and the teacher punished him in front of the whole class, embarrassed him and called him incompetent. This made the student not only to avoid the subject, but he also dropped out of the school"* (IS/KI/NCB/05, adolescent, non-compassion support beneficiary).

Table 4: Performance Avoidance Achievement Goal Orientation and Adolescent Students Demographic Characteristics (Continued)

Kruskal Wallis Test

Demographic Characteristics		Performance Avoidance Achievement Goal Orientation Levels											Total			
		Low (%)				Moderate (%)				High (%)						
		n (%)	M R	X^2	P	n (%)	M R	X^2	p	n (%)	M R	X^2	p	n	M R	X^2	p
Age Categories	Early (12-14)	6(18.2)	27.50	2.409	.300	10(30.3)	87.50		.104	17(51.5)	172.47	2.268	.322	33	227.76	1.428	.490
	Middle (15-17)	19(7.3)	19.82			74(28.2)	63.49	4.520		169(64.5)	171.03			262	259.80		
	Late (18-21)	20(9.3)	24.68			53(24.7)	73.20			142(66.0)	155.77			215	254.52		
Participants Class	Senior One	10(7.6)	29.50	4.017	.260	38(29.0)	64.37	5.854	.119	83(63.4)	169.89	1.158	.763	131	256.93	2.630	.452
	Senior Two	12(8.4)	20.42			37(25.9)	67.85			94(65.7)	169.07			143	261.69		
	Senior Three	11(9.3)	19.77			38(32.2)	64.13			69(58.5)	160.19			118	237.08		
	Senior Five	12(10.2)	23.13			24(20.3)	85.81			82(69.5)	157.43			118	264.83		
	Married	34(8.4)	24.15	2.245	.523	112(27.7)	68.52	2.244	.523	259(64.0)	161.17	2.117	.548	405	252.88	4.968	.174
	Single	1(3.6)	19.50			8(28.6)	78.06			19(67.9)	181.29			28	282.38		

Kruskal Wallis Test

Demographic Characteristics		Low (%) n (%)	M R	X^2	P	Moderate (%) n (%)	M R	X^2	p	High (%) n (%)	M R	X^2	p	Total n	M R	X^2	p
Parent's/ Guardian's Marital Status	Widowed	2(3.9)	27.50			14(27.5)	73.61			35(68.6)	181.00			51	282.75		
	Divorced	8(30.8)	17.44			3(11.5)	41.33			15(57.7)	162.17			26	213.88		
Parent's/ Guardian's Education Level	No Education	7(7.4)	23.38		.949	30(31.6)	66.31	4.714	.194	58(61.1)	133.21	**8.963**	**.030**	95	248.76	2.141	.544
	Primary	10(8.8)	21.53	.357		30(26.3)	72.82			74(64.9)	**177.51**			114	261.85		
	Secondary	11(6.6)	23.47			41(24.6)	61.57			115(68.9)	165.01			167	245.76		
	Tertiary Education	17(12.8)	24.50			36(27.1)	79.91			81(60.2)	172.44			134	268.91		
Parent's/ Guardian's Income	0-100,000	2(4.8)	23.63	1.699	.428	10(23.8)	69.81		.802	30(71.4)	158.38	2.701	.259	42	261.36	2.277	.320
	100,001 – 250,000	23(7.9)	25.07			75(25.7)	65.42	.440		194(66)	177.74			292	236.80		
	250,0001 – 500,000	12(12.2)	18.65			31(31.6)	65.48			55(56.1)	173.21			98	254.87		

Table 4: Performance Avoidance Achievement Goal Orientation and Adolescent Students Demographic Characteristics (continued)

Mann-Whitney U Test

Performance Avoidance Achievement Goal Orientation Levels

Demographic Characteristics		Low n (%)	M R	U	P	Moderate n (%)	M R	U	p	High n (%)	M R	U	p	Total n	M R	U	p
Gender of Participants	Male	24(10.4)	25.33	196.00	.177	71(30.7)	73.37	2032.5	.165	136(58.9)	167.47	12651	.162	231	244.77	29745.	.131
	Female	21(7.5)	20.33			66(23.7)	64.30			192(68.8)	162.39			279	264.39		
Compassion Support	Nonbeneficiary	26(8.1)	19.88	**166.00**	**.049**	95(29.5)	69.44	1953	.841	201(62.4)	162.88	12438	.688	322	250.65	28706	.326
	Beneficiary	19(10.1)	**27.26**			42(22.3)	68.01			127(67.6)	167.06			188	263.81		
School Type	Private	29(8.8)	22.90	229.00	.964	96(29.3)	72.11	1669	.144	203(61.9)	160.62	11813	.321	328	248.92	27530	.168
	Government	16(9.1)	23.19			41(22.9)	61.71			125(68.0)	170.96			182	267.56		
Total		45(8.8)				137(26.9)				328(64.3)				510			

Note. MR= Mean Rank, Low level = 1- 1.33, Moderate =2.34-3.66, High = 3.67-5.0, the values in bold indicate significant effect of demographics on PAV

The results in Table 4 indicate that there was a statistically significant difference in performance avoidance achievement goal orientation (PAV) ($X^2 = 8.963$, $p = .030$) by parental/guardian education. Students whose parents/guardians had attained primary school education had a higher mean rank (MR = 177.51) than those whose parents/ guardians had not attained any education (MR = 133.21) or had either attained secondary (MR = 165.01) or tertiary education (MR = 172.44). Results further indicate that there was a statistically significant difference between recipients of Compassion International support and non-beneficiaries ($U = 166.00$, $p = .049$) at low levels of performance avoidance achievement goal orientation (PAV) with the beneficiaries having a higher mean rank (MR = 27.26) than non-beneficiaries (MR = 19.88). These results imply that while there is a difference in PAV (at low levels) between receiving Compassion Support and not receiving at low levels of PAV, it differs between Parents/Guardians education at high levels, with the beneficiaries adopting higher levels of PAV than non-beneficiaries. Adolescents whose parental/guardian education level was at primary school adopted higher levels of PAV. However, there was no statistically significant difference in PAV between the participants in the rest of the low, moderate and high levels as well as overall demographic characteristics. These results indicate that learners adopt different levels of PAV irrespective of their differences in gender, age, class, parents/guardians' marital status and parents/guardians' income levels.

The qualitative findings offered an explanation about what influences adoption of performance avoidance goals orientation among compassion support beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries despite its being linked to negative academic outcomes.

> *Yes, some teachers are not supportive and are unfriendly so students avoid them. Subjects that I fail most are avoided. There are some teachers who always abuse us and harass us. ...For example, some teachers are not engaged in helping students who fail certain subjects and they end up avoiding them. ... there is one of the students who used to fail and he used not to regularly attend that very subject and the teacher made the student to drop out of the school (IS/KI/NCB/01, adolescent, non- beneficiary).*

Discussion

Mastery Approach Achievement Goal Orientation (MAP) and Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Findings of this study revealed that there was no significant demographic variation by age, gender and socio-economic status in mastery approach achievement goal orientation achievement goal orientation. These findings are partially inconsistent with those in a study conducted among Turkish adolescents, it was discovered that younger adolescents were more inclined to adopt mastery and performance achievement goal orientations compared to older adolescents, despite there being no gender differences in these orientations (Şahin & Kürkçü, 2016). However, Kong et al.'s (2023) research findings among Chinese adolescent students were inconsistent with the aforementioned. Chines girls were more likely to adopt mastery avoidance achievement goal orientation and experienced high levels of learning anxiety.

Results of this study revealed a statistically significant difference in mastery approach achievement goal orientation between Compassion International-support beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Specifically, Compassion International-support beneficiaries were more likely to adopt mastery approach achievement goal orientation compared to non-beneficiaries, suggesting that social support positively influences students' adoption of achievement goal orientation. These study findings align with research conducted on French Canadian adolescents, which showed that their perception of emotional support from teachers had a significant effect on their adoption of mastery achievement goal orientation, especially when they viewed themselves as competent (Smith et al., 2022).

The adoption of mastery achievement goal orientation among Compassion International support beneficiaries can be attributed to the multifaceted nature of the support provided, which encompasses not only financial assistance but also mentorship programs, medical services, goal-setting skills and emotional support. The inclusion of mentorship programs, medical services, goal-setting skills, and emotional support appears to play a pivotal role in fostering a mindset focused on skill development and mastery, contributing to the overall success of individuals in pursuing educational goals. By providing a well-rounded support system, school stake holders and other organisations which support quality education access can empower students to develop mastery-oriented mindsets, ultimately fostering a conducive environment for academic success. The way the multifaceted support system provided by Compassion International is perceived by beneficiaries results in cultivating an environment conducive to academic success just as depicted by both Achievement Goal Theory (AGT) and the Expectancy-Value Theory (EVT). This ultimately facilitates the development of mastery achievement goal-oriented mindsets, thus overall success of individuals in pursuing their educational goals.

Performance Approach Achievement Goal Orientation and Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Results also indicated that parents/ guardians' education level, income and compassion support significantly influenced performance approach achievement goal orientation adoption. Specifically, adolescents whose parents/guardians had the lowest education and income levels had higher overall performance approach achievement goal orientation than their counterparts whose parents/guardians had attained secondary school education and above. In addition, Compassion support beneficiaries were more likely to adopt performance approach achievement goal orientation than their non-supported counterparts. These results are consistent with a study conducted among American high school students which found that performance approach achievement goal orientation was linked to students self-determined desire to outperform their peers, which originated from familial expectations and internal pressure to meet parental career goals for their children (Kim et al., 2020). In the Ugandan context, it was revealed through in-depth interviews that adolescent students were inspired by external rewards and working hard to meet their parents/guardians' expectations. However, results of this study are inconsistent with some of the previous study findings such as Hussain and colleagues who found out the socioeconomic status of students was not correlated with adolescent achievement goal orientation adoption (Hussain Ch. et al., 2017).

In this current study, variability in participant adoption of achievement goals based on parents' socio-economic status is complex. The results could be explained by the motivational strategies implemented by Compassion International whereby the best students (based on their performance in examinations) are given rewards to facilitate their wellbeing in education pursuit and sometimes scholarships. Considering the financial constraints experienced by adolescent students from low social economic status as indicated by their parents'/guardians' education level, income and being compassion support beneficiary, working hard to outperform their counterparts in order to receive rewards that can results in their achievement of educational goals and consequently breaking the poverty cycle.

However, despite the importance of external rewards, students should be made aware of the importance of achievement goals that lead to self-skill enhancement, other than focusing on individualised winning. Moreover, a study conducted by Zhao (2021) found out that whereas mastery approach achievement goal orientation positively influenced academic engagement, performance goals influenced it negatively. The contradictions in study results in relation with previous studies affirm the complexity of motivational goals in diverse contexts. These findings extend the understanding of context-

based demographic characteristics and achievement goals adoption among adolescent students. Context based interventions can be based on these study results to enhance adoption of positive achievement goal orientation.

Mastery Avoidance Achievement Goal Orientation and Demographic Characteristics

The study findings indicated that parent/ guardian income, Compassion support and school type significantly influenced the adoption of mastery avoidance achievement goal orientation. Precisely, whereas low family income and being in a government school influenced overall adoption of mastery avoidance achievement goal orientation, Compassion support influenced it at a high-level category. Belonging to a low-income earning family, a government school and being a Compassion support beneficiary was associated with greater likelihood of adopting mastery avoidance achievement goal orientation. This implies that adolescent students with low socioeconomic status backgrounds were likely to be more motivated by a desire to avoid demonstrating incompetence or preferred easier tasks where success is more certain, potentially hindering their overall learning and development. Similarly, a study conducted among Chinese adolescent students found that avoidance goals positively correlated with learning anxiety which implies performance avoidance achievement goal orientation (Kong et al., 2023). However, a different argument was advanced by Subasi who found out that avoidance goals were positively correlated with task value and academic efficacy among Turkish and Korean students (Subaşi, 2020). The findings among Korean students affirm the fact that in countries with collective cultures like Uganda, avoiding negative consequences is an important motivational factor towards achieving academic goals. Students avoid being branded incompetent by the society around them, so, they make effort to avoid academic tasks they deem difficult and concentrate on those they deem possible to avoid being ridiculed. As the social cognitive theory suggests, the feedback from teachers, peers and parents regarding academic outcome influences one's adoption of

an achievement goal type whether it results in positive results or not. The contradictions in the study findings present practical implications for interventions to enhance positive achievement goals among economically deprived communities.

Performance Avoidance Achievement Goal Orientation and Demographic Characteristics

Findings of the current study indicated that parent/guardian education and Compassion support significantly influenced the adoption of performance-avoidance achievement goal orientation. While at low levels, Compassion support significantly influences performance avoidance achievement goal orientation (fear of performing more poorly than others), it is influenced by parent/guardian education at high levels. Adolescent students whose parents/guardians had the lowest education level and Compassion support beneficiaries were more likely to adopt PAV than their counterparts whose parents'/guardians' education was above primary and non-beneficiaries. These results imply that adolescent students from low socio-economic status backgrounds are likely to avoid engaging in academic tasks that would prevent them from outperforming their counterparts with a considerable level of anxiety to avoid being identified as academically weak students. Being identified as a poorer performer than others may deny socially disadvantaged students an opportunity to receive external rewards as well as possible financial support to further their education. So, the fear of failure results in performance avoidance goal endorsement. These findings agree with those of Bruno and Darnon (2019) who found out that adolescent students from low social class were more likely to endorse performance avoidance goals than their counterparts from high economic status backgrounds. Moreover, an experimental study done among French university students found that performance avoidance goals were associated with poor academic performance (Pierre et al., 2007). Another study conducted among students in higher education institutions in Europe found

that avoidance achievement goals were associated with surface learning (Soyer & Kirikkanat, 2019).

Overall, the results of this study provide insights on performance avoidance achievement goal orientation adoption among students within low resource settings. Interventions focusing on promoting a culture that embraces resilience and improvement to mitigate the negative effects of performance avoidance goals could use information from this current study to implement context specific strategies. Consequently, adolescent students can be empowered to overcome fear of failure and focus on a more positive and fulfilling educational experience.

Achievement goal orientation remains a complex phenomenon across diverse samples and communities. Though there is scanty literature which suggest non-significant variation in achievement goal orientation across all demographic characteristics among Ugandan prisoners on formal and vocational and students in Pakistan (Aheisibwe & Rukundo, 2018; Hussain Ch. et al., 2017), considerable aforementioned research findings are in support of the variations.

Moreover, a considerable number of studies have stipulated the significance of achievement goal orientation dimensions in education. For instance, a study done in Turkey among students in Higher Institutions of Education (HEIs) found achievement goals orientation predicted both surface and deep learning (Soyer & Kirikkanat, 2019). Specifically, approach goals were associated with deep learning while performance avoidance goals were associated with surface learning. Similarly, findings advanced by Lin revealed that approach goals orientations were positively related with deep learning among International English second language learners in the United States of America (Lin, 2019). Similarly, Yeh and colleagues in their study on AGO and supportive online learning behaviors among undergraduate and graduate students in Texas, found out that achievement goals orientation had a direct pivotal impact on expected learning outcome (Yeh et al., 2019). Moreover, one of the studies done among

university students in the USA, found out that MAP goals orientation was positively associated with student academic performance (Alhadabi & Karpinski, 2020). In East African context, a study done among 385 Kenyan adolescent students in 10 public secondary schools found significant correlation between approach goals orientation and academic achievement (Ireri et al., 2021). Another study done among form three adolescent students in Kenya in twelve secondary schools revealed a significant relationship between achievement goals orientation and academic achievement (Ng'ang'a, 2018).

Interestingly, different achievement goal dimensions have been linked to critical academic outcomes. A case in point is a study by Subaşi (2020) who emphasized that the positive relationship between avoidance goals and academic outcomes is particularly significant among Korean students, owing to their collective culture. Korean students put in effort to successfully complete tasks that they consider possible and avoid those they deem difficult. This is to prevent being misunderstood by their society and to avoid being ridiculed. As a result, this perception leads to positive learning outcomes for them.

Conclusion

The results of this study presented empirical evidence of differences in achievement goal orientations by demographic characteristics of adolescent students in secondary schools in southwestern Uganda. When analysed against the four sub-scales of achievement goal orientation it was found that Compassion International support, school type, parents'/guardians' education and income accounted for variances in students' achievement goal orientation adoption. Compassion support beneficiaries were more likely to adopt approach goals (mastery and performance) than their non-beneficiary counterparts. Adolescents in government schools and those whose parents' incomes and education levels were low endorsed approach achievement goals (mastery and performance). The analysis of qualitative data revealed that the external support

offered by Compassion International is not limited to the provision of financial support but includes mentorship programs, goal setting skills, medical services and offer motivational rewards which significantly influences variations in achievement goals adoption and academic engagement among the study samples.

Conflict of Interest

All authors declared no conflict of interest.

REFERENCE

Aheisibwe, I., & Rukundo, A. (2018). Demographic variations in achievement goal orientations among prisoners on formal and vocational training in Uganda. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, *5*(1), 83–96. http://proxy.library.vcu.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/demographic-variations-achievement-goal/docview/2461141950/se-2?accountid=14780%

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2014). Using thematic analysis in psychology. January. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bruno, A., & Darnon, C. (2019). Facing the risk of upward mobility: Performance- avoidance goals and social class among high- school students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *00*(00), 1– 13. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2019.1681353

Duchesne, S., Larose, S., & Feng, B. (2019). Achievement goals and engagement with academic work in early high school: Does seeking help from teachers matter? *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *39*(2), 222–252. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431617737626

Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2015). *Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation : A mediational analysis approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation : A Mediational Analysis*. February. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.461

Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 × 2 achievement goal framework. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (Vol. 80, Issue 3, pp. 501–519). https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.80.3.501

Elliot, A. J., Murayama, K., & Pekrun, R. (2011). A 3 × 2 achievement goal model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *103*(3), 632–648. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023952

Harackiewicz, J. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1993). Achievement goals and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*(5), 904–915. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.5.904

Hussain Ch., A., Malik, M., Fatima, G., & Abid, U. (2017). Secondary school students' socio economic status, mathematics self-concept and achievement goal orientations: A correlational investigation. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, *39*(1), 215–227. http://login.ezproxy.ub.unimaas.nl/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1210306&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Kim, Y. H. (2022). Maternal responsive parenting trajectories from birth to age 3 and children's self-esteem at first grade. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*(April). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.870669

Kong, H., Wang, G., Cheng, D., & Li, T. (2023). *The impact of adolescent achievement goal orientation on learning anxiety : The mediation effect of peer interaction. March*, 1– 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1095498

Ireri, A. M., Mwangi, C. N., Mwaniki, E. W., & Wambugu, K. (2021). Cognitive Psychology Achievement goal orientations as predictors of academic achievement among secondary school students in embu county , kenya International Journal of School and. 2020. https://doi.org/10.35248/2329-8901.19.7.215

Lin, T. J. (2021). Exploring the differences in taiwanese university students' online learning task value, goal orientation, and self-efficacy before and after the COVID-19 Outbreak. Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 30(3),

191–203. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00553-1

Maguire, M., & Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a Thematic Analysis: A Practical, Step-by-Step Guide for Learning and Teaching Scholars. All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (AISHE-J), 8(3). https://doi.org/http://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/view/335

Monteiro, D., Teixeira, D. S., Travassos, B., Duarte-Mendes, P., Moutão, J., Machado, S., & Cid, L. (2018). Perceived effort in football athletes: The role of achievement goal theory and self-determination theory. Frontiers in Psychology, 9(AUG), 1– 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01575

Mugisha. (2021). Compassion international's contribution to education in uganda.

Ng'ang'a, M. & D. (2018). Relationship between achievement goal orientation and academic achievement among form three students in Kiambu County, Kenya. 6(4), 53–68.

Nyakato, V. N., Achen, C., Chambers, D., Kaziga, R., Ogunnaya, Z., Wright, M., & Kools, S. (2021). Very young adolescent perceptions of growing up in rural southwest uganda: Influences on sexual development and behavior. African Journal of Reproductive Health, 25(2), 50– 64. https://doi.org/10.29063/ajrh2021/v25i2.5

Pierre, U., France, M., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2007). Avoidance Goals: When Uncertainty Makes a Difference. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207301022Şahin, E., & Kürkçü, R. (2016). Sex and Age Differences in Achievement Goal Orientations in Turkish Adolescents. Journal of Education and Practice 7(27), 149–156. www.iiste.org

Smith, J., Nadeau, M. F., Archambault, I., Guimond, F. A., St-Amand, J., Fitzpatrick, C., & Gagnon, M. (2022). Linking High school students' achievement goal orientations with their competence beliefs and their perception of teachers' emotional support during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Frontiers in Education, 7(March), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.762766

Soyer, M. K., & Kirikkanat, B. (2019). Undergraduates' achievement goal orientations, academic self-efficacy and hope as the predictors of their learning approaches *. European Journal of Educational Research, 8(1), 99– 106. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.8.1.99

Subaşi, M. (2020). Modeling the relationships among mastery goal orientations, positive coping strategy, and motivational beliefs in science. Science Education International, 31(4), 328– 333. https://doi.org/10.33828/sei.v31.i4.1

Üztemur, S. (2020). Achievement goals and learning approaches in the context of social studies teaching: Comparative analysis of 3x2 and 2x2 models. Participatory Educational Research, 7(2), 1– 18. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.20.16.7.2

Wiederkehr, V., Darnon, C., Chazal, S., & Guimond, S. (2015). From social class to self-efficacy: internalization of low social status pupils' school performance. Social Psychology of Education, October. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-015-9308-8

Yeh, Y., Kwok, O., Chien, H., & Sweany, N. W. (2019). How college students' achievement goal orientations predict their expected online learning outcome: The mediation roles of self-regulated learning strategies and supportive online learning behaviors. Online Learning Journal (OLJ), 23(4), 23–41. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v23i4.2076Zhao, Y., Zheng, Z., Pan, C., & Zhou, L. (2021). Self-Esteem and academic engagement among adolescents: A moderated mediation model. Frontiers in Psychology, 12(June). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.690828