



GOAL ORIENTATION OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS IN THE VARANASI DISTRICT

Gyaneshwari Thapa^a, Dr. Ponam Singh Kharwar^b,

^aResearch School, faculty of Education Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi India

^bAssistant Professor, faculty of Education Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi India.

^bCorresponding Author: Dr. Ponam Singh Kharwar,

Abstract: Goal orientation explains why students behave in particular ways in a particular situation to achieve their goals. These goals may be to master a subject (a mastery goal orientation), excel in a given endeavor (a performance-approach goal orientation), or avoid failure altogether (a performance-avoidance goal orientation). The purpose of the study was to examine higher secondary students' goal orientation. The descriptive survey method was used. Using a multistage random sampling technique, 734 higher secondary students were chosen from schools in Varanasi district's two educational blocks (Nagar Nigam and Kashi Vidyapeeth). The data were gathered using a self-developed and standardized Goal orientation Scale. Parametric statistical approaches were applied to the data analysis. Results showed that female students scored higher than male students on both the mastery (MGO) and performance approach goal orientation (PAGO) scales. Males, in contrast to females, have a high-performance avoidance goal orientation (PAvGO). In comparison to students attending schools in rural areas, students from urban localities had higher levels of mastery and performance approach orientation but lower levels of avoidance orientation. Similarly, Higher secondary students in CBSE board schools exhibit greater mastery and performance approach orientation but lower avoidance orientation when compared to students in UP board schools. Between higher secondary students in the arts and sciences, there are no appreciable differences in terms of mastery, performance approach, or avoidance goal orientation.

Introduction

Motivation plays a fundamental and vast role in human life, influencing various aspects of behavior, achievement, and overall well-being. It also has a significant impact on student's academic lives when we discuss it in an academic setting. It influences many facets of their school experience, influencing their attitudes, behaviors, and

overall academic achievement (Dupeyrat & Mariné, 2005). To explain how students are driven, directed, and sustained toward a particular behavior related to the learning process in the classroom, there are several theories of motivation given by psychologists, one of which is goal orientation theory. Goals have a big impact on student motivation. As students become increasingly engaged in their academic work, they become more responsible for initiating, controlling, and maintaining their behaviour (Elliot & Harackiewicz 1994; Kaplan & Maehr 2007). Additionally, they direct students' cognitive and emotive domains. Achievement Goal Theory, also known as Goal Orientation Theory (Elliot & Harackiewicz 1994; Kaplan & Maehr 2007), is a widely used concept that relates to the scientific study of achievement goals. Goal orientations explain why students engage to learn. The fact that they can be utilised for predicting students' academic achievement gives them significance (Harackiewicz, Barron, Pintrich, Elliot, & Thrash, 2002).

Need of Study

Finding goal orientation in higher secondary students is the aim of this study. Students become more performance-oriented and likely to miss out on learning opportunities in order to achieve favourable assessments when learning in a competitive environment, in particular. On the other hand, in a collaborative, non-competitive environment, students might prioritise learning over immediate achievement. It's a common misconception that students who want to learn a subject seek out challenges and study diligently. This is supported by studies by Fortune, Sinclair, and Hawton (2008) and Dweck (1986), which demonstrated that students who were driven by mastery goals persisted in the task longer than those who were motivated by performance goals. However, Archer (Ames & Archer, 1988), Meece (Meece, Blumenfeld, & Hoyle, 1988), discovered that students who were more focused on mastery or performance goals continued on their tasks equally. However, there aren't many similar studies on higher secondary students' goal orientation in the Indian context. Therefore, Goal-Orientation of higher secondary school students in the Varanasi district is the problem chosen for the present study.

Objectives

1. To study the different types of goal orientations of higher secondary students.
2. To compare goal orientation of higher secondary students in relation to their Gender (Male/Female).
3. To compare goal orientation of higher secondary students in relation to their locale (urban/rural).
4. To compare goal orientation of higher secondary students in relation to their board (CBSE/UP).
5. To compare goal orientation of higher secondary students in relation to their academic stream (Arts/Science).

Null Hypothesis

1. There is no significant difference between goal orientation of male and female higher secondary students.
2. There is no significant difference between goal orientation of urban and rural higher secondary students.
3. There is no significant difference between goal orientation of CBSE and UP board higher secondary students.

4. There is no significant difference between goal orientation of arts and science stream higher secondary students.

Methodology

The descriptive survey method was used to conduct this study. Students in the XI class from the widely dispersed Varanasi district schools made up the study's population. The researcher employed multistage random sampling methods to create a representative sample. The Varanasi district has ten educational blocks, which contain the schools. In the first stage, two blocks were chosen at random from a pool of 10 blocks. Blocks from Nagar Nigam and Kashi Vidyapeeth were chosen. Each educational block was a form of collective unit that contained groups of schools. From each sampled educational block, school clusters were simply drawn at random in the second stage. (Retrieved from <https://schools.org.in/uttar-pradesh/varanasi/nagar-nigam>) The Nagar Nigam educational block was divided into ten school clusters. Four of these school clusters—Bhelupur, Dashamedh, Nagwa, and Kotawali—were chosen by simple random sampling. The Kashi Vidyapeeth block was split into thirteen school clusters in a similar fashion (found at <https://schools.org.in/uttar-pradesh/varanasi/kashividyapeeth>). Aditya Nagar, Seergovardhan, Tikari, Kandwa, Amarkhaira, and Kesharipur were chosen by simple random selection from among the six school clusters. Every group of schools known as a cluster is a collective sort of entity. From a total of ten sampled school clusters, 18 higher secondary schools were chosen at random for the third stage. 760 students were chosen at random from sampled schools for the fourth stage. Only 734 students responded to all of the tool statements. According to formulated objectives, a rating scale named as Goal orientation scale was developed by Investigator to measure goal orientation of higher secondary school students. There were 33 items from three types of goal orientation. The reliability of scale was determined by test-retest method was found to be 0.78 and validity is 0.88.

Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1

Mean scores and SD of different types of goal orientations of higher secondary students

Goal Orientation(GO)	Total		
	N	Mean	SD
Mastery Goal Orientation	734	39.40	2.41
Performance Approach Goal Orientation	734	33.71	2.58
Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation	734	29.03	2.44

FINDINGS 1: Table 1 shows that students have obtained mean scores 39.40 and SD 2.41 for mastery goal orientation (MGO), 33.71 and 2.58 for performance approach goal orientation (PAGO), and 29.03 & 2.44 for performance-avoidance goal orientation (PAvGO). It is indicated that higher secondary students are highly mastery

goal oriented (39.40) compared to performance approach (33.71) and performance-avoidance goal orientations(29.03).

Table 2

Significance of difference between goal orientation mean score of male and female higher secondary students.

Goal Orientation	Male			Female			t-value	Remark
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Mastery Goal Orientation	376	39.32	2.20	358	39.91	2.29	3.50	Significant at .05 level
Performance Approach Goal Orientation	376	33.07	2.52	358	33.63	2.39	3.32	Significant at .05 level
Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation	376	29.64	2.36	358	29.11	2.68	3.23	significant at .05 level

FINDINGS 2: Table 2 shows that the calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=3.50, p<.05$) for male students ($M=39.32, SD=2.20$) and female students ($M=39.91, SD=2.29$) is found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. On the basis of this, It is inferred that there is a significant difference between male students and female students on mastery goal orientation (MGO). It is indicated that female students have high mastery goal orientation than male students.

The calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t = 3.32, p<.05$) for male students ($M = 33.07, SD = 2.52$) and female students ($M = 33.63, SD = 2.39$) is found to be significant at .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.it can be inferred that there was a significant difference between male students and female students on performance approach orientation. It is indicated that female students have higher performance approach goal orientation (PAGO) than male students.

the calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=3.23, p<.05$) for male students ($M=29.64, SD=2.36$) and female students ($M=29.11, SD=2.68$) is found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. On the basis of this, It is inferred that there is a significant difference between male students and female students on performance avoidance goal orientation (PAvGO). It is indicated that male students have performance avoidance goal orientation than female students.

As a result, female students scored higher than male students on both the mastery (MGO) and performance approach goal orientation (PAGO). Males, in contrast to females, have a high-performance avoidance goal orientation (PAvGO).

Table 3

Significance of difference between goal orientation mean score of urban and rural higher secondary students.

Goal Orientation(GO)	Urban			Rural			t-value	Remark
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Mastery Goal Orientation	489	40.73	1.61	245	40.42	1.93	2.31	Significant at 0.05 level
Performance Approach Goal Orientation	489	34.43	1.92	245	33.82	1.82	3.47	Significant at 0.05 level
Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation	489	30.00	1.87	245	30.57	1.70	3.23	significant At 0.05 level

FINDINGS 3: The table 3 shows comparison of urban and rural higher secondary students on three subscales of goal orientation. the calculate t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=2.31, p<.05$) for urban ($M=40.73, SD=1.61$) and rural students ($M=40.42, SD=1.93$) is found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. the null hypothesis is rejected. On the basis of this, It is inferred that there is a significant difference between urban and rural higher secondary students on mastery orientation (MGO). It is indicated that urban students have high mastery goal orientation than rural students.

The calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=3.47, p<.05$) for urban ($M=34.43, SD=1.92$) and rural students ($M=33.82, SD=1.82$) is found to be significant at .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.it can be inferred that there was a significant difference between urban and rural students on performance approach orientation. It is indicated that urban students have higher performance approach goal orientation (PAGO) than rural students.

The calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=3.23, p<.05$) for urban ($M =30.00, SD = 1.87$) and rural students ($M = 30.57, SD =1.70$) is found to be significant at .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.it can be inferred that there was a significant difference between urban and rural students on performance avoidance orientation. It is indicated that rural students showed a higher performance avoidance orientation (PAvGO) than urban students.

As a result, higher secondary students studying in schools located in urban areas show higher mastery and performance approach orientation but low avoidance orientation as compared to those studying in schools located in rural areas.

Table 4

Significance of difference between goal orientation mean score of CBSE and UP board higher secondary students

Goal Orientation (GO)	CBSE			UP			t-value	Remark
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Mastery Goal Orientation	351	41.35	2.03	383	40.69	2.60	3.87	Significant at 0.05 level
Performance Approach Goal Orientation	351	33.90	1.70	383	33.25	1.98	4.02	Significant at 0.05 level
Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation	351	30.03	2.31	383	30.56	1.63	3.25	Significant at 0.05 level

FINDINGS 4: Table 4 shows comparison of CBSE and UP higher secondary students on three subscales of goal orientation. the calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=3.87, p<.05$) for CBSE board ($M=41.35, SD=2.03$) and UP board students ($M=40.69, SD=2.60$) is found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. On the basis of this, It is inferred that there is a significant difference between CBSE and UP board higher secondary students on mastery goal orientation (MGO). It is indicated that CBSE board students have high mastery goal orientation than UP board students.

The calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=4.02, p<.05$) for CBSE board ($M= 33.90, SD =1.70$) and UP board students ($M=33.25, SD= 1.98$) is found to be significant at .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between CBSE board and UP board students on performance approach orientation. It is indicated that CBSE board students have higher performance approach goal orientation (PAGO) than UP board students.

The calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=3.25, p<.05$) for CBSE board students ($M = 30.03, SD = 2.31$) and UP board students ($M = 30.56, SD =1.63$) is found to be significant at .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.it can be inferred that there was a significant difference between CBSE board and UP

board students on performance avoidance orientation. It is indicated that UP board students showed a higher performance avoidance orientation (PAvGO) than CBSE board students.

As a result, higher secondary students studying in CBSE board schools show higher mastery and performance approach orientation but low avoidance orientation as compared to those studying in UP board schools.

Table 5

Significance of difference between goal orientation mean score of Arts and Science higher secondary students

Goal Orientation (GO)	Arts			Science			t-value	Remark
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
Mastery Goal Orientation	316	40.30	2.81	418	40.71	2.82	2.05	Not Significant at 0.05 level
Performance Approach Goal Orientation	316	34.75	2.51	418	34.96	2.41	1.11	Not significant at 0.05 level
Performance Avoidance Goal Orientation	316	29.62	2.70	418	29.62	2.40	0.01	Not significant at 0.05 level

FINDINGS 5: The table 5 shows comparison of arts and science higher secondary students on three subscales of goal orientation. the calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=2.05, p>.05$) for arts ($M=40.30, SD=2.81$) and science students ($M=40.71, SD=2.82$) is not found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. On the basis of this, It is inferred that there is no significant difference between arts and science higher secondary students on mastery goal orientation (MGO).

the calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=1.11, p<.05$) for arts ($M=34.75, SD=2.51$) and science students ($M=34.96, SD=2.41$) is not found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. On the basis of this, It is inferred that there is no significant difference between arts and science higher secondary students on performance approach goal orientation (PAGO).

the calculated t-value at degree of freedom 732 ($t=0.01, p<.05$) for arts ($M=29.62, SD=2.70$) and science students ($M=29.62, SD=2.40$) is not found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. On the basis of this, It is inferred that there is no significant difference between arts and science higher secondary students on performance avoidance goal orientation (PAvGO).

As a result, there is no significant difference between arts and science higher secondary students on mastery, performance approach and avoidance goal orientation.

Conclusion

- It is concluded that higher secondary school students differ in goal orientation with reference to their gender, locale, school board except academic stream. Study found female students scored higher than male students on both the mastery (MGO) and performance approach goal orientation (PAGO). Males, in contrast to females, have a high-performance avoidance goal orientation (PAvGO).
- As a result, higher secondary students studying in schools located in urban areas show higher mastery and performance approach orientation but low avoidance orientation as compared to those studying in schools located in rural areas.
- As expected from finding of CBSE board students show higher mastery and performance approach orientation but low avoidance orientation as compared to those studying in UP board schools.
- The academic stream has no influence on higher secondary students' goal orientation.

Educational Implications

- Teachers must acknowledge students' current learning preferences and support their development while also giving them the chance to try out various learning methods.
- In order to work with their students on self-regulated learning strategies like goal orientation that could improve students' academic achievement, teachers should be given access to intervention programmes run by professionals in the schools themselves.
- Teachers should encourage students to adopt a mastery orientation rather than a performance-avoidance goal orientation and give them appropriate academic assignments that enhance self-esteem and allow them to compete with others without fear of making errors or being judged by others. Finally, learning settings should encourage students to adopt self-oriented tasks that will aid in their academic performance.

References

- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of educational psychology*, 80(3), 260.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American psychologist*, 41(10), 1040.
- Dupeyrat, C., & Mariné, C. (2005). Implicit theories of intelligence, goal orientation, cognitive engagement, and achievement: A test of Dweck's model with returning to school adults. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 30(1), 43-59.
- Elliot, A. J., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1994). Goal setting, achievement orientation, and intrinsic motivation: a mediational analysis. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 66(5), 968.

Fortune, S., Sinclair, J., & Hawton, K. (2008). Help-seeking before and after episodes of self-harm: a descriptive study in school pupils in England. *BMC public health*, 8, 1-13.

Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Pintrich, P. R., Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Revision of achievement goal theory: Necessary and illuminating.

Kaplan, A., & Maehr, M. L. (2007). The contributions and prospects of goal orientation theory. *Educational psychology review*, 19, 141-184.

Meece, J. L., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Hoyle, R. H. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. *Journal of educational psychology*, 80(4), 514.

