

Learning Goal Orientations as Correlates of Reading Comprehension Performance among Secondary School Students in Kiambu County, Kenya

Teresia Kiragu¹, Dr. Doyne Kageni Mugambi², Prof. Theresia Kinai²

¹PhD Student, Kenyatta University, Kenya

²Educational Psychology Department, Kenyatta University, Kenya

Abstract: A significant number of students in public day secondary schools in Kiambu County have been performing below average in national examinations. Despite the research efforts and the measures that have been put in place to address this issue, significant improvement has not been realized. The aim of this study was to investigate learning goal orientations as correlates of reading comprehension performance among secondary school students in Kiambu County. The specific objectives of this study were; to examine the relationship between learning goal orientations and reading comprehension performance, to establish if there are differences in reading comprehension performance of Form Two students with mastery and performance goal orientations and to find out if there are gender differences in goal orientation towards reading comprehension among Form Two students. This study used correlational research design. The target population was the entire 176 public sub county day secondary schools in Kiambu County in the year 2019 with a population of 8142 Form Two students. Public day secondary schools were selected using purposive sampling and the students were selected using proportionate stratified sampling. The sample size was 20 public day schools representing 11% and 860 students representing 10.6%. Goal Orientation Questionnaire and English comprehension test were used to collect data. Data analysis involved the use of Pearson correlation and t-test to test the research hypotheses with the aid of SPSS program version 23. The results showed that there was a significant positive relationship between learning goal orientation and reading comprehension performance, $r(856) = .14, p < .05$. The mean difference in reading comprehension performance of respondents with mastery and performance goal orientation was not statistically significant, $t(825) = -1.28, p > .05$. The results also revealed that the mean difference in reading comprehension performance based on learning goal orientation between the male and female respondents was also not statistically significant $t(854) = -1.05, p > .05$. Teachers, parents and all other stakeholders should train students on skills required to develop mastery learning goal orientation to enhance reading comprehension performance. The study found that there was a significant difference in reading comprehension performance of students with different learning goal orientations. The study recommends that teachers should use diverse teaching methods that cater in the different learning goal orientations to improve reading comprehension performance. It was established that there was a significant mean difference in reading comprehension performance of students with mastery and performance goal orientation. The study therefore recommends

that students should be guided to develop mastery goal orientation to improve reading comprehension performance.

Key Words: learning goal orientation, mastery goal orientation, performance goal orientation, reading comprehension performance

I. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Globally, English language is one of the mostly used communication and instructional language in learning institutions. Being an international language, it is the most common language in many countries spoken as a native or a second language. It is also commonly used in the world of commerce, media, technology, and entertainment, which are all antecedents of education. At present, English language exists in two forms; written and spoken language which make it the most preferred instructional language in schools. For learners to comprehend, and effectively use English as a communication tool, reading comprehension is fundamental in enhancing understanding and information processing. Reading comprehension forms a basis for learning by enabling learners to recognize and understand words and concepts not only in English but also in other subjects. Martina (2019) argued that in the era of globalization and rapid diffusion of knowledge, the role of reading comprehension in language acquisition cannot be underestimated.

There is abundant evidence that a student's success in school is to a large extent dependent on reading comprehension and proficiency in English. However, below average performance in reading comprehension especially among students where English is a second language still remains a challenge across many countries around the globe. In the US, Khashabi et al. (2018) report that there is a great challenge in reading multiple sentences among elementary school learners. The study solicited and verified questions and answers for reading comprehension challenge using a 4-step crowdsourcing experiment. The learners were tested using datasets containing words from different domains such as science, fiction stories, and travel guides and it was established that most of the learners had reading comprehension challenges. In Canada, Al Janaideh et al. (2020) examined reading comprehension skills among refugee children and found that majority of the learners had difficulties in reading comprehension which was linked with high rate of illiteracy among the children.

In Nigeria, despite the efforts that have been made by the government to improve the level of performance in schools, poor academic achievement still remains a major challenge especially among students in public schools. A study by Hamisu and Sadiq (2019) examined the impact of Edmodo (ICT integrated comprehension reading) on reading comprehension and subsequent performance in English among senior students in secondary schools. The report indicated that the students exposed to the Edmodo performed significantly higher in reading comprehension and in examination tests compared to those not exposed to the treatment. This clearly indicates that reading comprehension skills play a key role in students' performance at any level and in any subject. This research was conducted in response to the dwindling performance in English among the students.

In Kiambu County, the problem of dismal performance in English in secondary schools in the past decade has been a great concern to educators and other stakeholders. A research by Wangari (2018) examined reading proficiency as a predictor of academic achievement among students in Kiambu County. The findings indicated that comprehension was a key predictor of students' performance. Students who had inadequate ability to comprehend instructional texts performed poorly in English tests. Ndung'u (2020) reported that difficulty in reading comprehension resulted in poor transmission of knowledge and poor performance in English in secondary schools. Table 1 shows the KCSE grades in English from the year 2016 to 2018 in Kiambu County.

Table 1: Kiambu County KCSE grades in English from the year 2016 to 2018

Year	Grades									Mean Score
	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+ and below	
2016	10	86	457	1011	1732	2143	2731	2614	18431	3.9
2017	11	96	449	980	1817	2297	2605	2820	17723	4.3
2018	35	162	651	1243	2214	2960	2842	3181	16747	4.6

The KCSE mean scores in English for Kiambu County in the years 2016, 2017, and 2018 were 3.9, 4.3, and 4.6 respectively. As indicated in Table 1 the mean score has been increasing progressively but it's still below average and a most of the learners scored grade D+ and below in the three years period. Reading proficiency is considered important not only in academic achievement but also in the progress of an individual in the world of work. Different scholars (Ndungu, 2017, 2011; Wangari, 2018; Yumbya, 2019) have linked reading comprehension performance to poor performance in English and other subjects.

Below average performance in English has been linked to inadequate learning materials, teaching methods, metacognitive and cognitive capabilities. The variables associated with metacognitive and cognitive factors include attitude, goal orientation, memory, communication, and learning styles. Wangari (2018) found that cognitive and metacognitive factors influence learners' capability to comprehend what they read in English. Yumba 2019 also established that metacognitive factors are key factors that determine the ability to comprehend instructional texts and reading comprehension performance.

This study focused on the influence of learning goal orientation on reading comprehension performance. According to Pintrich (2000), learning goal orientation refers to the motive or purpose that makes a student to pursue an achievement task. Early conceptualizations of learning goal orientation dichotomized the concept into performance and mastery goals. A student with mastery learning goals focuses on the learning task to better his reading comprehension skills while a student with performance goals focuses on a learning

task with the aim of outperforming other students. Due to the inconsistent results that researchers obtained regarding the dichotomies of learning goals, later the construct was expanded to include avoidance and approach. Elliot and Church (1997) suggested that performance-learning goal should be categorized into performance-approach and performance-avoidance.

Recent literature presents a shift in goal orientation models with one perspective proposing that mastery goal should consist of avoidance dimension and the other perspective indicating that students may exhibit different goal orientations depending on the circumstances. This debate and continued research in this area have seen other goals such social goals, work avoidance and extrinsic goals being introduced into the model. In this study, the researcher focused on performance goals and mastery goals in an endeavour to address the problem of reading comprehension performance in secondary schools. Mastery goal orientation is characterized by taking reading comprehension task with the aim of learning to improve competence skills, to understand and acquiring new knowledge. On the other hand, learners with performance learning goal orientation take a reading comprehension task with the aim of outperforming others, to show competence, superiority and to avoid demonstration of lack of ability (Pintrich, 2000).

Related research on the relationship between learning goal orientation and reading comprehension performance presents mixed findings. Documented literature on learning goal orientation has largely focused on general academic achievement as the outcome variable. Usoroh et al. (2015) in a study that examined the relationship between learning goal

orientation and academic achievement established that the two variables are significantly related. Specifically, academic achievement was significantly related to mastery and performance learning goal orientations. Zarei and Gilanian (2014) researched on the relationship between learning goal orientation and language learning strategies. The findings showed that language learning strategies were significantly related to learning goal orientation. Similar results were obtained by Ng'ang'a et al. (2018). However, the studies focused on overall academic achievement and some studies did not focus on the sub categories of learning goal orientation hence the need for the current study.

Related studies on the relationship between learning goal orientation and reading comprehension performance mostly focused on samples drawn from areas outside Kiambu County. Some of the studies used experimental designs with very small samples that discredit the external validity of the findings. Furthermore, is a divergence on how the variables contribute to reading comprehension performance due to mixed findings. Most of the studies that have been conducted on learning goal orientation focused on general academic performance. To this end, the below average performance in English in Kiambu County has not received much scholarly interest. The highlighted issues necessitated the present study that was conducted in Kiambu County. The study focused on learning goal orientation as correlates of reading comprehension performance with the aim of providing empirical evidence that may be used to help students realize the goals of education.

Significance of the Study

The results of the study provide information on practical strategies that educators, administrators, and policymakers can use to improve reading comprehension performance and support the teachers of English to enhance learning among students. English teachers may also use the results to categorize learners based their learning styles in order to strategize instructional approaches that fit each individual category of learners. Based on this knowledge they can plan for learning materials, resources, and prepare content for various learning goals to meet learners' individual needs. This can go a long way in enhancing comprehension proficiency which will, in turn, improve learning outcomes not only in English but also in other subjects as well. The results of the study may also be utilized by curriculum developers in developing instructional materials that work best for learners' different learning goal orientation in order to improve academic outcomes. The results will also add to the existing literature on learning goal orientation as correlates to the proficiency in reading comprehension and provide recommendations for further research in this field.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Studies on the association between learning mastery and performance goal orientations and performance have reported divergent findings. In Iran, Zarei and Gilanian (2014)

conducted a study to examine the correlation between goal orientation and language learning strategies. The study selected 145 university students specializing in teaching and translating English language. Data were collected using motivated strategies questionnaire and strategy inventory for language learning. The collected data were subjected to step wise multiple regression analysis and the results indicated that there was a considerable relationship between language learning strategies and goal orientation. Since the study used a sample of university students and focused on language learning strategies, there was need to use a sample of secondary school students focusing on reading comprehension performance to compare the results.

In an experimental study, Stec (2015) carried out a study to investigate the influence of goal orientation on academic achievement among third grade students in USA. The researcher used convenience sampling to select 23 students (11 females and 12 males) to participate in the study. The study used flip charts, goal orientation scale, readers response prompts and reflection rating scale were used to collect data. The results of data analysis showed that there were no significant correlations between the participants' initial goal orientations and performance on written responses.

Edwards (2014) conducted a study to investigate the unique influence of learning goals on performance. A sample of 79 university students with a mean age of 25.5 years participated in the study. Learning goal orientation was assessed using achievement goal orientation questionnaire. The results showed that performance goal orientation was significantly related to self-efficacy, interest and learning. Another research by Abd-El-Fatta (2018) explored the effect of achievement goals on academic achievement. The study involved a sample of 350 high school students to complete achievement goals questionnaire. The results of hierarchical cluster analysis showed that achievement goal orientation significantly influenced academic achievement.

A research by Botsas and Padelladu (2019) investigated the influence of goal orientation and the strategies used in reading comprehension among primary school pupils in Greece. The sample size consisted of 122 children who were in 5th and 6th grades. The goal orientation scale that was used to collect data focused on performance approach, performance avoidance and mastery goal orientations. Reading comprehension strategy was measured using a reading text of 172 words. The results indicated that there was a significant relationship between goal orientation and reading comprehension strategy use.

A correlational study by Ghavam et al. (2011) examined the relationship between achievement goals and metacognitive reading strategy use among university students. A total of 103 students were selected to complete the achievement goals questionnaire and reading strategies inventory. The collected data were subjected to Pearson correlation analysis and the results revealed a significant relationship between mastery goal orientation and metacognitive reading strategy. It was

also revealed that performance goal orientation was not significantly related to metacognitive reading strategy. The findings were contradictory as other studies reviewed indicated that there were no significant relationships between goal orientation and performance hence the need for this study to make a contribution to this debate.

A correlational study carried out by Samareh and Kezri (2016) in Nigeria investigated the correlation between goal orientations and academic engagement among paramedical university students. The researchers randomly selected 360 students to provide information. Data collection involved the use of goal orientation and academic engagement questionnaires. The results of Pearson correlation analysis and structural equations modeling revealed that mastery goals were significantly associated to academic engagement. Most of the studies that have been conducted on goal orientations focused on academic achievement as the outcome variable. Therefore, there was need to investigate the association between goal orientations and other learning outcomes such as reading comprehension performance, a concern this study seeks to address.

Locally, the link between goal orientation and reading comprehension performance has not received much attention. However, studies on the correlation between goal orientation and academic performance have been conducted. Other scholars have also focused on metacognitive strategies and reading comprehension performance. Ng'ang'a et al. (2018) investigated the association between goal orientation and academic performance among secondary school students in Kiambu County. Guided by the goal orientation theory, the study employed mixed methods research design. The researchers used simple random sampling and purposive sampling to select 665 students to complete the achievement goals questionnaire and 40 students for interviewing respectively. The results of Pearson correlation analysis revealed that the domains of goal orientation were significantly associated with academic performance. The results are important in explaining school achievement from the perspective of student's goal orientation but there was need to examine how the domains are related with reading comprehension performance, which was an objective of the current study.

III. METHODOLOGY

a. Research Design

The research employed a correlational research design. According to Seeram (2019), correlational research design refers to a quantitative technique employed where more than one variable under the same subjects is being studied to establish a variance or relationship. By using this research design, the researcher probed to determine the correlation between learning goal orientations and reading comprehension performance. This technique was the most appropriate for this study because the research variables (learning goal orientations and reading comprehension)

cannot be manipulated without violating research work ethics. Manipulation would require experimental research that will isolate the students based on their learning goal orientations and this was not also possible because secondary school students are taught under one roof. In the past, correlational research design has been successfully used to study the elements that affect learning outcome among secondary schools' students in Kiambu County.

A study by Wangari (2018) used a correlational design to determine the correlation between metacognitive and cognitive reading strategy, reading comprehension performance, and academic outcome. The results were consistent with most of the findings from research work done in this field. In another research, Chacha (2018) also used correlational design to study the influence of reading activities on performance in English. The researcher established that reading activities correlated significantly with students' performance. Another study by Aguta et al. (2019) also used correlational research design and found that English proficiency significantly correlated with the learning outcomes.

b. Locale of the Study

The research was conducted in Kiambu County. KNEC statistics (2018) report indicated that the County was ranked 36 and 38 in KCSE countrywide in 2017 and 2018 respectively. Additionally, the statistics revealed that most students in public day secondary schools performed dismally in the two years. Research has shown that reading comprehension is associated with general academic performance. Therefore, dismal academic performance among students in public day secondary schools in Kiambu County can be attributed to inadequate reading comprehension skills. Some studies tried to address the issue of below average performance in reading comprehension but none of them attempted to find out the correlation between learning goal orientations and reading comprehension performance, a gap this study addressed.

c. Sampling Techniques

The study used purposive sampling to select public day secondary schools because statistic from Kiambu County Education Office revealed that most public day schools have been performing below average in national examinations. Simple random sampling technique was employed in the selection of 20 schools out of 176 targeted public day secondary schools. The schools were provided with codes from 1 to 174, which were then written on pieces of paper, folded, placed in a bowl, and reshuffled. From there, 20 pieces were randomly picked to select the study participants. To select the respondents, proportionate stratified sampling was used to ensure that both male and female students were given equal opportunities of participating in the study. Research assistants who were instructed throughout the process to avoid biasness. Two schools did not participate in the research because they participated in the pilot study. Simple random

sampling technique was employed in selecting one stream for schools with more than one stream.

d. Research Instruments

The study employed two research instruments namely; achievement goal orientation questionnaire and English comprehension test.

i. Achievement Goal Orientation Questionnaire

This questionnaire was used to measure the student's goal orientation towards reading comprehension. The free to use Achievement Goal Questionnaire-Revised (AGQ-R) was developed by Elliot and Murayama (2008) and has a reliability coefficient of 0.84. The scale consists of 12 items each for performance goals and mastery goals that was measured on a five point Likert scale (Appendix B). The respondents were required to rate their achievement goal orientation on a scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1). The items measured the domains of goal orientation as follows: 1, 3 and 7 measured mastery approach, 5, 11 and 9 measured mastery avoidance, 2, 4 and 8 measured performance approach and 6, 10 and 12 measured performance avoidance. To come up with the scores of each sub scale, the researcher calculated the sum of the scores of the items in each sub scale. Each of the subscales (mastery approach, mastery avoidance, and performance approach and performance avoidance) consisted of three items. The expected minimum score in each sub scale was 3 while the maximum score was 15. To obtain the scores of mastery goal orientation, the sum of the scores of mastery approach and mastery avoidance subscales was computed. The scores of performance goal orientation were obtained in a similar way. The expected highest score for both performance and mastery goals was 30 while the lowest score was 6.

Elliot and Murayama (2008) conducted a study among university students to establish internal consistency and confirm the correlation of the factors of the scale. The results showed that the factor loadings ranged from .73 to .93 and each statistic met the criteria for a fitting model ($\chi^2(48, N = 229) = 78.32, p < .01$). A pilot study was carried out in two schools representing 10% of the sample size to test the reliability and validity of this scale. The sample size for the pilot study was 30 students who were proportionately sampled from the two schools. The sampling frame for the pilot study was guided by Connelly (2008) who suggested that a sample size of 10-30 respondents is appropriate for a pilot study. The schools that were involved in the pilot study were not involved in the actual study. The reliability coefficients of the pilot study are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Reliability Coefficients of LGO Scale

LGO Sub Scale	Alpha coefficients (Validation)	Alpha coefficients (Pilot Study)
MApp	.79	.71
MAv	.82	.81
Papp	.86	.78
PAv.	.89	.73
Overall	.84	.76

Note. LGO = Learning Goal Orientation; MApp= Mastery Approach; MAv = Mastery Avoidance; PApp = Performance Approach; PAv = Performance Avoidance.

The results obtained indicate that the reliability coefficients of the subscales were within the acceptable range of .70 or more. Principal components analysis was conducted to establish the construct validity of LGO scale. The results showed that all the factor loadings ranged from .61 to .73. Elliot and Murayama recommended that factor loadings greater than .50 are acceptable.

ii. English Comprehension Test

The study adapted the English Comprehension test from the Pavement form two-term III examination (2018). The passage was about peer pressure among students and had eight paragraphs. The respondents were required to read and answer six multiple choice questions to measure their reading comprehension. Initially the comprehension test questions consisted were open-ended, however the researcher formulated multiple choices for the individual questions. The questions were developed to ensure that scoring was objective and quantitative data for testing the research hypothesis could be generated. The passage was also restructured to achieve acceptable discriminative and difficulty indices. For instance, in the original passage, the first question read "Why did the author start smoking?" but it was restructured and revised to achieve acceptable level of discrimination and difficulty indices, to read as "Why did the author start smoking bhang?" Furthermore, the findings from the pilot study revealed that the items were within the recommended range; hence they were not altered. Test-retest technique was employed in establishing the reliability of the comprehension test.

Table 3: Test Re-test Reliability Coefficient for Reading Comprehension Test

		Test 1	Test 2
Test 1	Pearson Correlation	1	.713
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	30	30
Test 2	Pearson Correlation	.713	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	30	30

The results indicate that the correlation coefficient of the test and retest scores was greater than .70 as recommended by Biemer, Christ and Wiesen (2009).

e. Data Collection

Data collection was done using questionnaires that were distributed to the respondents. For ease in identifying and coding of the questionnaires, the 20 sampled public schools were given individual codes. In most of the schools that participated in the research, the researcher delivered the questionnaires in person, with the help the research assistants. Permission was sought from the administrator before the administration of questionnaires in every school that participated. This was followed by a simple random sampling to select the participants. The researcher dedicated 15 minutes to guide the students through the requirements and answered any concerns. After understanding what was expected of them, they were given an opportunity to participate in the study by filling the research instruments. In schools where the researcher did not deliver the questionnaires in person, class teachers who were requested to assist in data collection were guided through what the students were required to do to enable them to instruct the respondents. In such cases, the questionnaires were delivered, and the class teachers assisted the collection of data at their convenience, and the filled questionnaires were collected at a later date. The research data collection method was the most suitable because it enabled the researcher to reach a large number of participants in a cost-effectively way compared to other methods.

f. Data Analysis

All the research instruments were checked and verified for completeness. Out of 100%, which represented 860 questionnaires administered, only 0.6% representing five questionnaires were excluded because they consisted of more than four items left unanswered. The complete questionnaires were then coded into a data Codebook and the data was entered into SPSS (Version 23) for analysis. Preliminary data cleaning involved checking for missing values and outliers. Missing data were replaced whereas outliers were deleted before analysis. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential analyzes. The assumptions for the test were analyzed using kurtosis, scatter plots, and skewness. Inferential statistics; Pearson correlation and independent samples t-test were used to test the following hypotheses;

- H₀₁ There is no significant relationship between mastery and performance goal orientations and reading comprehension performance among secondary school students in Kiambu County.
- H₀₂ There are no significant differences in reading comprehension performance of students with mastery and performance goal orientations in Kiambu County.

H₀₃ There are no significant gender differences in learning goal orientations towards reading among secondary school students in Kiambu County.

IV. FINDINGS

a. Demographic Data of the Participants

The demographic data of the participants collected consisted of gender and age. Table 4 presents the gender information of the respondents.

Table 4: Gender of the Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	419	48.9
Female	437	51.1
Total	856	100.0

Table 3 indicates that 419 of the participants representing 48.9%, were male students whereas 437 (51.1%) participants were female. The findings reveal that female participants involved in the research were slightly higher more that of male students. This difference can be attributed to the fact that more female students are enrolled in public day secondary schools in Kiambu County compared to male students every year.

The researcher further examined the respondents' age distribution by gender, and the results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Gender and Age cross tabulation

		Age			Total
		16-18	19-20	21 and above	
Gender	Male	366(42.8%)	45(5.2%)	8(0.9%)	419
	Female	415(48.5%)	20(2.3%)	2(0.2%)	437
Total		781	65	10	856

Table 5 shows that most of the participants, 91.3% (781) were between 16-18 years, Female students were the majority with 48.5%, whereas male students represented 42.8%. Respondents aged between 19-20 years represented a total of 65 (7.5%), with male students representing the highest percentage of 5.2% whereas female students represented 2.3%. Those aged 21 and above were the least in the sample, with only 8 male students representing 0.9% and 2 female students representing 0.2%. The results reveal that most of the participants were within the accepted age category (16-17 years) for students in form two. The students who were in the age bracket (≥ 19) might have been delayed in schooling due to various reasons such as sickness, poor performance, and economic challenges. Majority of the male students were older than their counterparts in the age category of 19 to 20, and 21 years and above. The difference may be attributed to the fact that older male students are less sensitive to age and more willing to continue with their studies compared to female students. These factors can be attributed to the high number of older male students as they delay them in

proceeding to the next level. In regard to the problem the current study sought to resolve, the results revealed that a majority of the participants were at the expected age in cognitive and metacognitive development.

b. Descriptive Analysis of the Respondents' Learning Goal Orientations

The respondents were categorized either to be having mastery goal orientation or performance goal orientation using their scores on achievement goal orientation scale. Respondents who had a higher score in mastery goal orientation subscale than in performance goal orientation subscale were classified as having mastery goal orientation. On the other hand, respondents who had a higher score in performance goal orientation sub scale than in the mastery goal orientation sub scale were classified as having performance goal orientation. The respondents who had equal scores in mastery and performance goal orientation scales were assigned code 0 and excluded in subsequent analyses. Respondents with mastery goal orientation were given code 1 while those with performance goal orientation were assigned code 2. The results were as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Categories of Learning Goal Orientation

		Frequency	Percent
	.00	28	3.3
	Mastery	275	32.1
	Performance	553	64.6
	Total	856	100.0

The results indicate that 275 respondents representing 32.1% had mastery learning goal orientation while 553 respondents representing 64.6% had performance learning goal orientation. A total of 28 students (3.3%) were not categorized into either having mastery or performance goal orientation because they had equal scores in mastery and performance goals sub scales. The results indicate majority of the students involved in the study had performance goal orientations.

Regarding the gender of the students and the type of learning goal orientation, the findings are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Type of Learning Goal Orientation by Gender

Gender		Type of Learning Goal Orientation				Total	%	
		.00	Mastery	%	Performance			
Gender	Female	14	146	53.09	259	46.84	419	48.95
	Male	14	129	46.91	294	53.16	437	51.05
Total		28	275	100.00	553	100.00	856	100.00

The results show that 146 female students (53.09%) and 129 male students (46.91) had mastery goal orientation while 259 female students (46.84%) and 294 male students (53.16) had performance goal orientation. The results indicate that majority of the students with mastery goal orientation were

female while majority of the male students had performance goal orientation.

Mastery and performance goal orientations were further sub-divided into two categories namely approach and avoidance goals. Table 8 presents the proportion of students with performance approach and performance avoidance goal orientations.

Table 8: Distribution of Students in Performance Goals Sub-scales

	Frequency	Percent
Performance approach	307	55.51
Performance avoidance	246	44.49
Total	553	100.00

Table 8 shows that 307 students representing 55.51% had performance approach goal orientations while 246 students representing 44.49% had performance avoidance goal orientations.

The results of the distribution of the respondents in the mastery goal orientation sub scales are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Distribution of Students in Mastery Goals Sub-scales

	Frequency	Percent
Mastery approach	150	54.6
Mastery avoidance	125	45.4
Total	275	100.0

According to Table 9, 150 students representing 54.6% had mastery approach goal orientation while 125 students representing 45.4% had mastery avoidance goal orientation. The results indicate that majority of the students had mastery approach goal orientation.

Table 10: Types of LGO and Gender Cross Tabulation

	Gender				Total
	Male		Female		
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
Mastery approach	64	42.67	86	57.33	150
Mastery avoidance	71	56.80	54	43.20	125
Performance approach	133	43.32	174	56.68	307
Performance avoidance	137	55.69	109	44.31	246

Table 10 shows that 42.67% male students had mastery approach LGO while 56.80% had mastery avoidance LGO. On the other hand, 86 (57.33%) female students had mastery approach LGO while 54 (43.2%) females had mastery avoidance LGO. A total of 133 (43.32%) male students had performance approach LGO while 137 male students (55.69%) had performance avoidance LGO. Female students with performance approach LGO were 174 (56.68%) while those with performance avoidance LGO were 109 (44.31%). The results show that majority of the female students had mastery approach and performance approach LGOs. Majority

of the male students had mastery avoidance and performance avoidance LGOs. Mastery approach and performance approach LGOs have been shown to be associated with better learning outcomes compared to mastery avoidance and performance avoidance LGOs. Clearly the results support the difference in reading comprehension performance in Kiambu County which was in favour of female students.

Table 11 presents descriptive statistics for learning goal orientation scores.

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics for Respondents' Learning Goal Orientation Scores

M	SD	Min.	Max.	Sk	Kur
49.88	6.51	21.00	60.00	-0.98	-0.74

Note. N= 856. Sk = skewness; Kur = kurtosis; M = mean

Table 11 shows that the mean of learning goal orientation scores was 49.88 with a standard deviation of 6.51. The minimum score was 21.00 while the maximum score was 60.00. The expected minimum score was 12 while the expected maximum score was 60.00. The skewness and kurtosis coefficients were below three indicating that the scores satisfied the criteria for normality. According to Pintrich (2000), learning goal orientation is categorized into two; mastery goals and performance goals. The descriptive statistics for the two categories are presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics for Mastery and Performance Goal Orientation Scores

Category	N	M	SD	Min.	Max.	Sk	Kur
Mastery	275	23.96	3.98	10	30	-0.62	-0.21
Performance	553	25.91	3.64	6	30	-0.43	2.57

Note. N= 828. Sk = skewness; Kur = kurtosis; M = mean; SD= Standard deviation; Min-Minimum; Max-Maximum

The results indicate that the mean of mastery goal orientation scores was 23.96 (*SD* = 3.98). The minimum and maximum scores were 10 and 30 respectively. The skewness and kurtosis coefficients were - 0.62 and - 0.21 respectively. The mean of performance goal orientation scores was 25.91 (*SD* = 3.64). The minimum score for performance goal orientation was 10 while the maximum score was 30. The kurtosis and skewness coefficients indicate that the scores of mastery and performance learning goal orientations were near normal distribution.

The researcher then compared the means in reading comprehension performance of respondents with mastery goal orientation and performance goal orientation and the results are presented in Table 13.

Table 13: Descriptive Statistics for Reading Comprehension Scores by Type of Learning Goal Orientation

Type of LGO	Mean	N	SD
Performance	49.67	553	9.75
Mastery	50.32	275	10.12

Note. LGO-Learning goal orientation; N-Sample size; SD- Standard deviation

The results indicate that the mean score of respondents with performance learning goal orientation was 49.67 (*SD* = 9.75). The mean score of reading comprehension performance of respondents with mastery learning goal orientation was 50.32 (*SD* = 10.12). The findings revealed that students with mastery learning goal orientation performed better in reading comprehension than students with performance learning goal orientation. Similar findings were reported by Dekker et al. (2016) in a study that was carried out among secondary school students. It was established that students with mastery goal orientation performed better in academics than those students with performance goal orientation. Sakiz (2011) also reported that mastery goal orientation positively influenced academic achievement while performance goal orientation negatively affect academic achievement. The differences in academic performance of students with mastery and performance goal orientations may be attributed to the fact that the students pursue learning goals with different motives. In mastery goal orientation, the aim of learning is to enhance competence whereas in performance goal orientation, the aim of learning is to get favorable judgement. Students who seek to enhance competence in learning, understand the learning content better than those who seek favorable judgements hence the difference noted in reading comprehension performance among students with mastery and performance goal orientation.

Reading comprehension scores were categorized into low, moderate and high and Table 14 presents the findings on learning goal orientation and the level of reading comprehension performance.

Table 14: Reading Comprehension Levels and LGO Cross Tabulation

		Type of learning goal orientation				Total
		.00	Mastery	%	Performance	
Reading comprehension levels	Low	7	49	65.33	91	147
	Moderate	19	188	68.36	368	575
	High	2	38	13.81	94	134
Total		28	275	100.00	553	856

The findings indicate that 65.33% of the respondents with mastery goal orientation had low performance in reading comprehension, 68.36 had average performance while 13.81% had high performance. On the other hand, 16.45% of the respondents with performance goal orientation had low performance in reading comprehension, 66.55% had moderate performance while 17% had high performance.

Each of the two domains of learning goal orientation was divided into two levels as shown in Table 15.

Table 15: Descriptive Statistics for the Subscale Scores of LGO

LGO Sub Scale	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Sk	Kur
MAPP	12.64	1.79	5	15	-0.02	1.47
MAV	11.32	2.93	3	15	-0.71	-0.32
PAPP	13.17	1.86	3	15	-0.54	2.10
PAV.	12.75	2.50	3	15	-0.61	2.46

Note. N = 828. LGO = Learning Goal Orientation; Sk = skewness; Kur = kurtosis; MAPP= Mastery Approach; MAV = Mastery Avoidance; PAPP = Performance Approach; PAV = Performance Avoidance.

Mastery approach goal orientation was categorized into mastery approach and mastery avoidance. The mean score on mastery approach sub scale was 12.64 (*SD* = 1.79). The maximum score was 15 while the minimum score was 5. The average of the scores on mastery avoidance subscale was 11.32 (*SD* = 2.93). The maximum score was 15 while the minimum score was 3. In the two subscales of mastery goal orientation, the expected maximum score was 15 while the minimum was 3. Performance goal orientation was also divided into two; performance approach and performance avoidance. The mean score on performance approach sub-scale was 13.17 (*SD* =1.86). The maximum and minimum scores were 15 and 3 respectively. On performance avoidance subscale, the mean score was 12.75 (*SD* = 2.50) with 3 and 15 as the minimum and maximum scores respectively. The skewness coefficients for all the scores in the subscales of achievement goal orientation scale are within the recommended range of + – 1. Therefore, the results indicate that the scores were near a normal distribution because even the kurtosis coefficients were below 3.

Concerning the subscales of LGO and reading comprehension performance, the results are presented in Table 16.

Table 16: LGO Sub Scales and Reading Comprehension Performance

LGO Sub Scale	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Sk	Kur
MAPP	50.17	10.36	17.32	72.62	-.58	.23
MAV	49.88	9.72	17.32	72.62	-.57	.23
PAPP	49.99	10.77	17.32	72.62	-.43	.17
PAV.	49.55	9.49	17.32	72.62	-.73	.53

Note. N = 828. LGO = Learning Goal Orientation; Sk = skewness; Kur = kurtosis; MAPP= Mastery Approach; MAV = Mastery Avoidance; PAPP = Performance Approach; PAV = Performance Avoidance.

Table 16 indicates that the reading comprehension performance mean score for students with mastery approach LGO was 50.17 (*SD* = 10.36). The minimum score was 17.32 while the maximum score was 72.62. Students with mastery avoidance scored a mean of 49.88 with a standard deviation of 9.72. The minimum and maximum scores of students with this type of LGO were 17.32 and 72.62 respectively. The mean

score of students with performance approach LGO was 49.99 (*SD* = 10.77) with a minimum score of 17.32 and maximum score of 72.62. Students with performance avoidance LGO scored a mean of 49.55 (*SD*=9.49) with 17.32 and 72.62 as the minimum and maximum scores respectively.

Table 17: Reading Comprehension Levels and Types of Mastery Goals

		MAPP		MAV		Total
		F	%	f	%	
Reading comprehension levels	Low	24	47	27	53	51
	moderate	51	43	68	57	119
	High	75	71	30	29	105
Total		150	55	125	45	275

Note. f – Frequency; % - percentage; MAPP-Mastery Approach; MAV-Mastery Approach

The results show that 47% of the students with low performance in reading comprehension had mastery approach LGO while 53% had mastery avoidance LGO. Regarding students with moderate performance, 43% had mastery approach LGO while 57% had mastery avoidance LGO. Among the students with high performance in reading comprehension performance, 71% had mastery approach LGO while 30% had mastery avoidance LGO. The results show that students with mastery approach LGO performed slightly better than students with mastery avoidance LGO.

Performance goal orientation was categorized into performance approach and performance avoidance and the levels of reading comprehension performance of the students based on the two categories are presented in Table 18.

Table 18: Reading Comprehension Levels and Performance Goals Levels Cross tabulation

		PAPP		PAV		Total
		F	%	f	%	
Reading Comprehension levels	Low	60	58.82	42	41.18	102
	moderate	192	53.78	165	46.22	357
	High	55	58.51	39	41.49	94
Total		307	55.51	246	44.48	553

Note. f – Frequency; % - percentage; PAPP-Performance Approach; PAV-Performance Approach

Table 18 shows that 58.82% of the students with low performance in reading comprehension had performance approach LGO while 41.18% had performance avoidance LGO. Among the students with moderate performance in reading comprehension, 53.78% had performance approach LGO while 46.22% had performance avoidance LGO. For the students with high performance in reading comprehension, 58.51% had performance approach LGO while 41.49% had performance avoidance LGO. The findings show that students with performance approach LGO performed slightly better than students with performance avoidance LGO.

c. Hypothesis Testing

The objective of this research was to examine the relationship between learning goal orientations and reading comprehension performance. From this objective, the researcher came up with the following null hypothesis;

H₀ There is no significant relationship between learning goal orientations and reading comprehension performance.

The hypothesis was tested using Bivariate Pearson Correlation Analysis and the results are presented in Table 19.

Table 19: Correlation between Learning Goal Orientation and Reading Comprehension Performance

		Reading Comprehension T Score
LGO total score	Pearson Correlation	.14**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	856

Note. LGO - Learning Goal Orientation; N- Sample size

The results showed that there was a significant positive relationship between learning goal orientation and reading comprehension performance, $r(856) = .14, p < .05$. On the basis of the results, the null hypothesis was rejected. The findings imply that an increase in learning goal orientation scores lead to a significant increase in reading comprehension scores. Therefore, students with high scores in learning goal orientation had better scores in reading comprehension compared to students with low scores. Learning goal orientation is a form of motivation which means that students with high scores in learning goal orientation are highly motivated to learn while students with low scores in LGO have low motivation. This explains the difference in reading comprehension performance among students with different scores and types of LGO.

Since learning goal orientations were categorized into mastery goal orientation and performance goal orientation, to better understand the relationship between learning goal orientation and reading comprehension performance, the following supplementary hypotheses were advanced.

H_{02a} There is no significant relationship between mastery goal orientation and reading comprehension performance.

H_{02b} There is no significant relationship between performance goal orientations and reading comprehension performance.

The data were subjected to Pearson Correlation Analysis and the findings are presented in Table 20.

Table 20: Correlations between Mastery and Performance Goal Orientation and Reading Comprehension

		Reading Performance T score
Mastery Goal Orientation	Pearson Correlation	.15**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003
	N	275
Performance Goal Orientation	Pearson Correlation	.10**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	553

Table 20 shows that there was a positive and significant correlation between mastery goal orientation and reading comprehension performance, $r(275) = .15, p < .05$. It was also established that performance goal orientation and reading comprehension performance were significantly correlated, $r(553) = .10, p < .05$. The findings support the results presented in Table 4.13 which indicates that students with mastery goal orientation performed better in reading comprehension than students with performance goal orientation.

This study used a 2 × 2 learning goal orientation model that consist of mastery and performance goal orientation each with two levels; approach and avoidance. Therefore, it was important to analyze how each of the levels contribute to reading comprehension performance. Table 20 presents the correlation matrix.

Table 21: Correlation Matrix for the Scores in LGO Subscales

		T Score	MAPP	MAV	PAPP	PAV
T Score	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
MAPP	Pearson Correlation	.23**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00				
MAV	Pearson Correlation	.17*	.29**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.04	.00			
PAPP	Pearson Correlation	.11**	.32**	.25**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.00	.00		
PAV	Pearson Correlation	.11**	.25**	.13**	.18**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.00	.00	.00	

Note. N= 828; MAPP-Mastery Approach; MAV-Mastery Avoidance; PAPP-Performance Approach; PAV-Performance Avoidance.

The results indicate that the scores in the subscales of learning goal orientation were significantly related to reading comprehension performance. The results also indicate that the scores in the subscales were significantly correlated but multicollinearity indices were within the acceptable range of less than 0.3.

To establish how the levels of learning goal orientation predicted reading comprehension performance, the researcher

conducted multiple regression analysis. Before running the regression analysis, the researcher tested the assumptions. The results showed that the data set met the criteria for use of regression analysis.

Table 22: Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.46 ^a	.26	.21	9.89

The results presented in Table 22 indicate that the multiple correlation coefficient of 0.46 was moderate. The findings imply that the levels of learning goal orientation; mastery approach, mastery avoidance, performance approach and performance avoidance moderately predicted reading comprehension performance. The coefficient of R square was 0.26 and when converted to percentage it became 26%. The results imply that the 26% variance in reading comprehension performance was explained by the levels of learning goal orientation. The rest (74%) is explained by other factors such as the quality of teaching, IQ, learning context and attitude.

Table 23: ANOVA Summary Table

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2194.19	4	548.55	5.60	.00
Residual	83305.81	824	97.89		
Total	85500.00	828			

Table 23 indicates that the regression model significantly predicted reading comprehension performance, $F = 5.60$, $P < .05$. The regression coefficients for the independent variables are presented in Table 24.

Table 24: Regression Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	36.61	3.03		12.09	.00
MAPP	.42	.21	.08	1.98	.04
MAV	.39	.14	.01	2.45	.01
PAPP	.27	.20	.05	1.34	.01
PAV	.10	.16	.10	0.28	.78

Note. N= 828; MAPP-Mastery approach; MAV-Mastery avoidance; PAPP-Performance approach; PAV-Performance avoidance.

Table 24 indicates that mastery approach, mastery avoidance and performance approach significantly predicted reading comprehension performance. Performance avoidance goal orientation did not significantly predict reading comprehension. Using the regression coefficients that were obtained, the following prediction equation for reading comprehension performance from the levels of learning goal orientation was developed.

$$\hat{y} = 0.42MAPP + 0.39MAV + 0.27PAPP + 0.10PAV + 36.61$$

From the equation, mastery approach leaning goal orientation had the highest predictive index of 0.42, followed by mastery avoidance with a predictive index of 0.39 and then performance approach with an index of 0.27. Performance avoidance had the least predictive value of 0.10. All the regression coefficients were positive implying that an increase in the scores of the levels of learning goal orientation results to an increase in reading comprehension performance.

d. Discussion of the Results

The researcher hypothesized that there was no significant relationship between learning goal orientation and reading comprehension performance. The data collected were subjected to bivariate Pearson correlation analysis and the results showed that there was a significant relationship between learning goal orientation and reading comprehension performance. The findings were consistent with some of the results of past research work conducted in this area and contradictory to the findings of other studies. A study by Zarei and Gilanian (2014) in Iran established that there was a significant relationship between goal orientation and language learning strategies. The study was carried out among university students majoring in English language and translation. Even though the study did not focus on reading comprehension performance, the findings demonstrate that learning goal orientation is a very important psychological construct in school achievement both at secondary and university level. This is because goal orientation is an aspect of motivation and research has shown that motivation is pivotal in academic achievement (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996).

Another research carried out in Nigeria by Samareh and Kezri (2016) investigated the relationship between goal orientation and academic engagement among university students. The findings showed that mastery goals orientation were significantly correlated with academic engagement. Similar results were also reported by Was and Beziat (2015). The researchers established that there was a positive and significant correlation between goal orientations and academic achievement. In both cases, the samples consisted of university students. The findings also confirm the importance of learning goal orientation in educational contexts. The descriptive analysis of learning goal orientations among the students who were involved in the current study indicated that majority of the students had performance goal orientation. Correlation analysis indicated that performance goal orientation has a weak predictive power on reading comprehension performance. Therefore, based on the findings of this study, the problem of below average performance in English may be attributed to the type of learning goal orientation adopted by the students.

Ng'ang'a et al. (2018) studied the association between goal orientation and academic achievement of secondary school students. The sample consisted of 665 students and the results showed that the domains of learning goal orientation were significantly related to academic achievement. The results demonstrated that goal orientations were important in

educational achievement. Even though the study focused on general academic performance, the results confirm the importance of learning goals in academic success. The current study confirmed the importance of learning goal orientations as demonstrated by Ng'ang'a, et al. (2018).

The findings of the current study were contrary to the results of a study conducted by Stec (2015) which showed that there were no significant correlations between goal orientation and performance in written responses. The sample of the study consisted of 12 male and 11 female students in third grade. The negative results may be attributed to the small sample that was used and the age of the children. Ghavam et al. (2011) using a sample of university students reported that there was positive relationship between mastery goal orientation and metacognitive reading strategy. However, the study found that performance goal orientation was negatively related to metacognitive reading strategy. The findings may be attributed to the fact that performance goal orientation is a form of extrinsic motivation which does not significantly enhance the development of cognitive skills.

V. DIFFERENCES IN READING COMPREHENSION PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH MASTERY AND PERFORMANCE GOAL ORIENTATIONS

This section presents descriptive statistics of mastery and performance goal orientations, hypothesis testing and discussion of the findings.

a. Descriptive Analysis of Reading Comprehension Scores by Goal Orientation Type

The respondents were categorized into having either mastery or performance goal orientation based on the scores. Respondents whose scores were equal in the two subscales were excluded. Table 24 presents the descriptive analysis results.

Table 25: Descriptive Statistics of Reading Comprehension Performance by Goal Orientation Type

Type of LGO	Mean	N	SD
Performance	49.67	553	9.75
Mastery	50.32	275	10.12

Note. LGO- Learning Goal Orientation; N-Sample Size

The reading comprehension mean score of respondents with performance goal orientation was 49.67 ($SD = 9.75$). Table 25 also indicates that the mean score of reading comprehension performance of students with mastery goal orientation was 50.32 with a standard deviation of 10.12. The results revealed that respondents with mastery goal orientation performed better than those with performance goal orientation. To establish whether the mean difference was statistically significant or not, the data were subjected to independent samples t test.

The researcher also analyzed the levels of reading comprehension performance based on the types of LGO and the results are presented in Table 26.

Table 26: Reading Comprehension Performance Levels and LGO Types

		Type of learning goal orientation			Total	
		Mastery	%	Performance	%	
Reading comprehension levels	Low	49	35.00	91	65.00	140
	Moderate	188	33.81	368	66.19	556
	High	38	28.79	94	71.21	132

Table 26 shows that 35% of the students with low performance in reading comprehension had mastery LGO while 65% had performance LGO. A majority of the students (66.19%) with moderate performance in reading comprehension had performance LGO while 33.81% had mastery LGO. Regarding students with high performance in reading comprehension, 28.79% had mastery LGO while 71.21% had performance LGO.

b. Hypothesis Testing

The third objective of this study was to find out if there is a significant difference in reading comprehension performance of students with mastery and performance goal orientations in Kiambu County. The following hypothesis was advanced;

H_{04} There is no significant difference in reading comprehension performance of students with mastery and performance goal orientations.

The hypothesis was tested using independent samples t test and the results are presented in Table 27.

Table 27: Results of Independent Samples T-Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff.	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.06	.00	-1.28	825	.19	-.92	.72	-2.32	.48
Equal variances not assumed			-1.29	640.45	.19	-.92	.71	-2.31	.47

Table 27 indicates that the mean difference in reading comprehension performance of respondents with mastery and

performance goal orientation was not statistically significant, $t(825) = -1.28, p > .05$. The implication of the findings is that

even though the respondents with mastery goal orientation performed better in reading comprehension than those with performance goal orientation, the mean difference was not statistically significant. The findings mean that the difference in reading comprehension performance among students with mastery and performance LGOs was not meaningful.

c. Discussion of the Results

The study sought to find out if there were significant differences in reading comprehension performance among students with mastery and performance goal orientations. The results showed that there were mean differences in reading comprehension performance between the two groups of students but the difference was not statistically significant. The results supported the findings of Dekker et al. (2016) who established that students with mastery goal orientation performed better in academics than students with performance goal orientation. The study used a sample of 735 students aged 10 to 19 years. Through mediation scrutiny, it was established that learning goal orientation affected academic performance of the students. Contrary to the results of the current study, Dekker et al. (2016) found that there was a significant relationship between goal orientation and academic achievement. Empirical evidence that has associated the different types of learning goal orientations to different levels of academic achievement has presented inconsistent findings.

Most of these studies were carried out using samples of students drawn from classrooms in different cultures. Classroom situations and the general learning environments are unique and influence the motivational processes of the students differently (Zimmerman, 1994). School factors, home factors and the student's prior learning experiences influence the students to adopt either mastery goal orientation or performance goal orientation. Students with mastery goal orientation and performance goal orientation also responded differently to learning situations (Kaplan & Middleton, 2002). In this study, students with performance goal orientation performed better than students with mastery goal orientation.

In another study, Keys et al. (2012) used a sample of 7th and 8th grade students to investigate the relationship between LGO and mathematics performance. The researchers found that there was a significant relationship between LGO and mathematics performance. When the domains of LGO were examined, it was established that MGO significantly predicted mathematics performance. However, performance goal orientation did not significantly predict mathematics performance. Students with mastery goal orientation performed better in mathematics than students with performance goal orientation. Elliot and Church (1997) argued that students with mastery goal orientation are characterized by positive attitudes, persistence, high levels of intrinsic motivation and better retention of learnt information. The researchers noted such characteristics were lesser among students with PGOs. The differences in academic performance between students with MGO and PGO may be attributed to the differences in learning approaches and strategies used by

the two categories of learners. The current study established that majority of the students had PGOs and the results of inferential analysis showed that PGO had a weaker predictive index compared to mastery goal orientation. Therefore, the below average performance in English among Form Two students from day secondary schools in Kiambu County may be attributed to learning goal orientation. Majority of the students were found to have PGO.

In Turkey, Sakiz (2011) reported that MGO was positively related to academic achievement. In contrast, PGO was negatively related to academic performance. Contrary to these findings, Jowkar et al. (2011) established that MGO and PGO were significantly related to academic performance. Academic performance of students with mastery and performance goal orientations did not differ significantly. Based on these results, literature on learning goal orientation and academic achievement is still not settled. However, the findings of the current study link the problem addressed to performance goal orientation. The study found that majority of the students had performance learning goal orientation. The findings of the correlation analysis showed that performance goal orientation weakly correlated with reading comprehension performance compared to mastery goal orientation.

VI. GENDER DIFFERENCES IN MASTERY GOAL PERFORMANCE AND PERFORMANCE GOAL ORIENTATION TOWARDS READING COMPREHENSION PERFORMANCE

To establish if there were gender differences in mastery goal performance and performance goal scores, the researcher first computed descriptive statistics of the scores and the scores are presented in Table 28.

Table 28: Descriptive Results of Mastery Goal and Performance Goal Orientation by Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Mastery goal	Male	419	23.93	4.13	.20
	Female	437	23.98	3.83	.18
Performance goal	Male	419	25.79	3.65	.18
	Female	437	26.05	3.55	.17

The results indicate that male students scored a mean of 23.93 ($SD=4.13$) which was slightly lower than that of female students which was 23.98 ($SD=3.83$) in mastery goal performance. Similarly, performance goal score for the male students was 25.79 ($SD=3.65$) slightly lower than that of female students which was 26.05 ($SD=3.55$).

To establish if the mean difference was statistically significant, the researcher conducted independent samples t-test and the results are presented in Table 29.

Table 29: Independent Samples T-Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mastery Learning Goal Orientation	Equal variances assumed	-.19	854	.84
	Equal variances not assumed	-.19	842.45	.84
Performance Learning Goal Orientation	Equal variances assumed	-1.05	854	.29
	Equal variances not assumed/	-1.05	850.05	.29

Table 29 shows the mean difference in mastery learning goal orientation between male and female respondents was not statistically significant, $t(854) = -.19, p > .05$. The results also revealed that the mean difference in performance learning goal orientation between the male and female respondents was also not statistically significant $t(854) = -1.05, p > .05$. The findings imply that even though female respondents scored a higher mean than male respondents in both mastery learning goal orientation and performance goal orientation, the difference was not statistically significant.

a. Discussion of the Results

The findings of this research showed that the mean difference in learning goal orientation towards reading comprehension performance between male and female respondents was not statistically significant. Past research literature reviewed also reported similar findings. A study by Benati, et al. (2020) which was conducted among college English Language Learners (ELLs) students established that female students had a greater mastery goal orientation tendency than males which was attributed to their higher self-efficacy in learning English. Another study by Ramos et al. (2020) among secondary school students established that female students were more goal oriented in learning compared with their male counterparts in both high-ability and average-ability student.

The study findings revealed that female students reported slightly higher levels of both mastery goal and performance goal orientation. However, the gender differences in mastery learning goal orientation and performance goal orientation between female and male respondents was not statistically significant. These findings are consistent with the results of Asian and Akta (2020). The study used a sample of 642 high school students and the findings revealed that female students had higher scores of mastery goal orientation than male students. Sun et al. (2019) study findings among Chinese students also reported that girls had a higher score on mastery goals and intelligence perception with regard to achievement compared to boys. Furthermore, Honicke et al. (2020) found high levels of performance goal orientation among female students compared to their male counterparts and concluded that, mastery and performance goal orientation made it easier

for the students to remember learned concepts increasing their reading capabilities.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The study established that learning goal orientation and reading comprehension performance were significantly correlated. Further analysis revealed that mastery goal orientation had a higher correlation coefficient with reading comprehension performance than performance goal orientation. The results imply that students with mastery goal orientation performed better in reading comprehension than students with performance goal orientation. Based on the findings, teachers and parents need to constantly train the students to develop learning strategies that enhance mastery of content for better comprehension of learning content. To enhance competence and develop skills among learners, there is need to incorporate learning goals content in secondary school course content to enable the learners to adopt learning orientations that enhance reading comprehension performance.

Regarding differences in reading comprehension performance of students with mastery goal orientation and performance goal orientation, it was established that the mean difference was statistically significant. Students with mastery goal orientation performed better than students with performance goal orientation. The inference from the findings is that students need to adopt mastery goal orientation that focus on enhancing competence. This will enable them to understand learning content and therefore perform well in reading comprehension. The teachers also need to train the students on learning goal orientation that focuses on mastery of content to improve the quality of learning outcomes.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Teachers, parents and all other stakeholders should train students on skills required to develop mastery learning goal orientation to enhance reading comprehension performance. The study found that there was a significant difference in reading comprehension performance of students with different learning goal orientations. The study recommends that teachers should use diverse teaching methods that cater for the different learning goal orientations to improve reading comprehension performance.

It was established that there was a significant mean difference in reading comprehension performance of students with mastery and performance goal orientation. The study therefore recommends that students should be guided to develop mastery goal orientation to improve reading comprehension performance.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The study established that there was a significant relationship between learning goal orientations and reading comprehension performance. However, the study did not investigate the variables that influence learning goal orientations. Therefore, future research should investigate the

factors that can be manipulated to influence learning goal orientations for better reading comprehension performance.

The study found that there was a significant difference in reading comprehension performance of students with different learning goal orientations. The study recommends that teachers should use diverse teaching methods that cater for the different learning goal orientations to improve reading comprehension performance.

Since the study established that learning goal orientation was significantly related to reading comprehension performance, there is need to use a research design that will establish the direction of influence. Similar studies should also be carried out in other counties for more conclusive findings.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aguta, M. H., Gichohi, P., & Wamalwa, B. (2019). Effects of comprehension monitoring on academic performance of primary school pupils in Nakuru West Sub-County, Kenya. *American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(2), 269-287.
- [2] Al Janaideh, R., Gottardo, A., Tibi, S., Paradis, J., & Chen, X. (2020). The role of word reading and oral language skills in reading comprehension in Syrian refugee children. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 41(6), 1283-1304.
- [3] Al-Jarrah, H. & Ismail, N. S. (2018). Reading Comprehension Difficulties Among EFL Learners in Higher Learning Institutions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8 (7), 32-41., doi:10.5539/ijel.v8n7p32.
- [4] Ambatchew, M. D.(2011). International communities building places for youth reading. *Handbook of research on children's and young adults*. New York: Routledge
- [5] Awe, T. M. (2014). Relationship between Reading Attitudes and Reading Comprehension Performance of Secondary School Students in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Review of Arts and Humanities*, 3(2), 203-215.
- [6] Chacha, F. G. (2018). Effectiveness of use of picture books in teaching pre-school pupils' English oral skills in Tigoni zone of Limuru sub-county, Kiambu county, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation), University of Nairobi.
- [7] Chawwang, N. (2008). An Investigation of English Reading Problems of Thai 12 th-Grade Students in Nakhonratchasima Educational Regions 1, 2, 3, and 7 (Doctoral dissertation).Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand.
- [8] Gitonga, M. D. (2014). Factors influencing students' performance in KCSE in public day secondary schools in kikuyu sub county of Kiambu County, Kenya (Unpublished Masters project). University of Nairobi.
- [9] Hamisu, L., & Sadiq, R. A. (2019). Effect of EDMODO online learning tool on the English language reading comprehension performance among secondary school student students in Kaduna state. *Nigeria. Northwest Journal of Educational Studies*, 2, 41-62.
- [10] Karanja, W. (2015). Effects of Reading Difficulties on Academic Performance among form Three Students in Public Secondary Schools, Kiambu County, Kenya. (Unpublished Masters Thesis), Kenyatta University.
- [11] Khashabi, D., Chaturvedi, S., Roth, M., Upadhyay, S., & Roth, D. (2018, June). Looking beyond the surface: A challenge set for reading comprehension over multiple sentences. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 1, 252-262.
- [12] Lianne, E., Barnes, F. M., Dennis, J. & Raghobar, K. (2010). Effects of reading goals on reading comprehension, reading rate and allocation of working memory in children and adolescents spina bifida and meningomyelocele. *Journal of Neuropsychology*,16(3), 517-525.
- [13] Martina, F., Syafryadin, S., Rakhmanina, L., & Juwita, S. (2020). The effect of time constraint on student reading comprehension test performance in narrative text. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 8(3), 323-329.
- [14] Masoud, S. M. & Mehmoush, N. (2015). The Difference between Field Independent and Field Dependent Cognitive Styles regarding Translation Quality. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(11), 2373-2381. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0511.23>.
- [15] Mugo, J. Kaburu, A., Limboro,C. & Kimutai, A. (2011). Are our children learning? Annual learning assessment report. Nairobi: Uwezo.
- [16] Mwaniki, W. E. (2015). Meta cognition and attitudes towards reading as correlates of reading comprehension performance among standard six pupils in Dagoretti Division, Nairobi. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya. Nazanin and Afghari (2007)
- [17] Ndung'u, Z. W. (2020). Influence of information communication and technology integration projects on the performance of public secondary schools in KCSE in Kiambu County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation), University of Nairobi.
- [18] Nozari, A. Y. & Siamian, H. (2015). The relationship between field dependent-independent cognitive style and understanding of English text reading and academic success. *Mater Sociomed*, 27(1), 39-41. doi: 10.5455/msm.
- [19] Oludipe, B. D. (2014). Cognitive style profiles and physics achievement of senior secondary school students in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Orientations, knowledge monitoring and academic achievement. Journal of Education and Human Development*, 4(3), 67-77.DOI: 10.15640/jehd.v4n 3a8.
- [20] Rezaee, A. Ebrahimi, M. Bakhshizadeh, Y. & Rahimi, S. (2019). Revising Linkage between Field Dependence-Independence Cognitive Styles with Iranian EFL Learners" *Global-Local Reading Comprehension. International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 7(1), 10-16.
- [21] Runo, N.M., Karugu, T. & Mugo, J. (2010). Identification of reading disabilities and teacher oriented challenges in teaching reading to standard five learners in Nyeri and Nairobi Districts, Kenya (Unpublished masters Project), Kenyatta University.
- [22] Seeram, E. (2019). An overview of correlational research. *Radiologic Technology*, 91(2), 176-179.
- [23] Sheykhi, M., & Mohamadi, Z. (2017). The Effect of Metacognitive Strategies Training on Reading Comprehension of Field-dependent / Field-independent Learners.
- [24] Spenser, M., Quinn, M. J. & Wagner, K. R. (2014). Specific reading comprehension disability: Major problem, myth or misnomer. *PMC*, 29(1), 3-9.
- [25] Wangari, M. D. (2018). Metacognitive knowledge and cognitive reading strategy use as predictors of reading comprehension performance among form three students in Kiambu County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation), Kenyatta University.
- [26] Yumbya, K. J. (2019). Influence of reading activities on performance in english among grade one pupils in primary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation), Kenyatta University.