Abstract: This study aimed at evaluating why, despite the introduction of free prison education, prisoners in Uganda have lower formal and vocational skills compared to the general population. The study was basically quantitative and a cross sectional survey design was used. The study population comprised eight hundred convicted adult male and female prisoners. Purposive sampling was used. Data were analyzed using descriptive, parametric and non-parametric statistics. The study found statistically non-significant differences in achievement goal orientations across all the demographics. The main conclusions include the need to: deepen prisoners’ knowledge on setting various achievement goal orientations to help them in information acquisition and engagement in learning; support goal orientations equally regardless of age, gender, religion and level of education; and achievement goal orientations that allow academic social comparison among learners, which results into richer academic engagement. It is recommended that teachers/instructors in prison education can use achievement goal orientations to improve prison education programme through measurement and evaluation of learning outcomes, choosing appropriate methods of instruction and instructional materials, and in helping learners to choose achievable and realistic goals. Therefore, achievement goal orientations greatly determine the extent to which education as rehabilitative strategy can be successful.
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Educating prisoners has become a worldwide concern as a measure that can save community costs associated with criminal behavior (Bodmann, Hulleman & Harackiewicz, 2008). Reports by the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (2012), the Australian Council for Social Service (2002), the Canadian Government Productivity Commission (2004), the American Correctional Association (1997), The European Prison Rules (2006) and the Uganda Human Rights Commission (2015) suggest that prisoners suffer cumulative social and economic disadvantages, low education levels, higher rates of mental illness and greater rates of unemployment compared to the general population (Fullan & Langworthy, 2013). Education being one of the most significant individual and social change phenomena, it has been adopted as one of the major strategies to rehabilitate prisoners and prepare them for successful integration with their families, communities and the employment world (Boyar & Mosley, 2007).

Globally, the history of education in prisons can be traced in the United States in 1789 (Gehring, 1995). The early prison education programmes were often referred to as Sabbath school with a purpose of teaching inmates how to read in order to be able to read the Bible. Ryan (1995) states that it took nearly one hundred years for the concept of educating prisoners to receive any appreciable support from the public, lawmakers and the prisoners themselves in America. The 1900s brought to United States the industrial revolution. As a result of the demand for workers to support the industrial revolution, it became important for both politicians and prison personnel to adopt a philosophy that inmates can and need to be rehabilitated. Schools were seen as a solution to the problems of industrialization, urbanization, increased crime rates, social upheaval and
the vast number of immigrants (Young & Mattucci, 2006). The Government of Australia adopted a national Strategy for Prisoner’s Vocational Education and Training to contain recidivism (Australian National Training Authority, 2011). This strategy aims at developing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating vocational education and training among prisoners as part of an integral education system. In Africa, prison education is more pronounced in southern, western and eastern Africa with a purpose of preparing prisoners for integration into society. Emphasis should be placed on providing education, skills based training and work programme (Boyar & Mosley, 2007).

In Uganda, education in prisons, which entails vocational and academic programmes, was introduced in 1995 to enable inmates leave the prison with more skills so as to be in position to find meaningful and long-term employment after serving their sentence (Uganda Prison Act, 2006). However, a study by the Uganda Human Rights Commission (2015) to assess the prisoners’ conditions established that an average of 90% of all prisoners in Uganda did not have a high school diploma and 85% have no vocational education. In the same study, recidivism rates of prisoners who do not participate in prison education were between 65-75%. In response to the United Nations standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners, Uganda enacted the Prisons Act 2006 as a step to ensure prisons play a rehabilitative role. This act, recommends academic and vocational training be offered to convicted prisoners to facilitate their rehabilitation and reformation and to prepare for reintegration into the local communities. For academic and vocational training to register achievements, there is need for an understanding of demographic variations in achievement goal orientations among prisoners on formal and vocational training in Uganda.

Achievement goal orientations refer to a person’s set of beliefs that reflect the reasons why they approach and engage in academic and learning tasks. Achievement goal orientations are basically divided into two categories; mastery and performance goals. Mastery goals involve learning to gain competency and understanding for the improvement of one’s self. Emphasis on success as a result of hard work and effort is a focus, as well as taking on more challenging tasks. Some of the examples of mastery goals include; learning how to solve proportions by cross multiplying, being able to identify the verb in a sentence, learning how to dribble the ball when being defended by another player, being able to summarize a book written on an 8th grade reading level and learning how to play Rock Band on the hard level. Performance goals on the other hand involve being successful with little effort or showing ability with little effort as well as how a person performs individually. There is a major emphasis on comparing one’s self to others and the potential of refraining from challenging tasks. Some of the examples of performance goals are; Completing 10 problems for homework, getting 7 out of 10 math problems correct, winning the basketball game, reading 5 books, being the first to finish the newest version of Rock Band.

Locke, Spiriduso and Silverman (2007) transformed the dichotomous achievement goals into mastery approach goals, mastery avoidance goals, performance approach and performance avoidance goals that lead to different outcomes. Mastery-approach goals reflect the desire to attain self-improvement, develop new skills, improve or develop competence, try to accomplish something challenging and trying to gain an understanding or insight. For example, my goal in the class is to learn all of the features of the human body because I am interested in anatomy and physiology and want to be able to build base knowledge of these principles. Mastery-avoidance goals reflect the desire to avoid not performing worse than one aspires. For example, Jane’s goal in class is to avoid misunderstanding the features of a human body and principles of human physiology as presented to her by her teacher. Performance-approach goals can be defined as the desire to do better than others. For example, Peter’s goal in class is to identify all of the bones, muscles and tissues in the human body more quickly and better than her classmates. Performance-avoidance goals are the desire to avoid doing worse than others. Example, Gloria’s goal in class is to avoid appearing incompetent at identifying anatomy or applying principles of physiology. There is limited research on how the contextual factors (in this case, the prison environment) influence prisoners’ achievement goal orientations. The purpose of the study was to assess if there were some demographic variations in achievement goal orientations among prisoners on formal and vocational education in Luzira prison, Uganda.
Problem

Prisoners in Uganda have the lowest formal and vocational skills compared to the general population despite introduction of prison education in Uganda in 1996 (The Uganda Prison Service Commission, 2015). A survey by Uganda Human Rights Commission (2015) shows that 85% of the prisoners in all the 225 government prisons lack basic education, nor do they have any vocational skill and 80% of prisoners are school drop outs. The survey further revealed that less than a quarter of prisoners in Uganda participate in education and training. Low participation in formal and vocational training among prisoners in Uganda can be associated with achievement goal orientations (Fullan & Langworthy, 2013).

Lack of knowledge of achievement goal orientations may lead to failure, poor performance and loss of interest in the learning process (Patrick, Ryan & Kaplan, 2007). The prisoners’ goal orientations determine their participation in a learning setting and the reasons for engaging, persisting and progressing on a task (Lynch, 2008). The choice of achievement goal orientations can open up opportunities for increase in participation in formal and vocational training, broaden prisoner’s academic horizons and provide a second chance to learn the skills and competences needed in order to reintegrate in society (Deshler & Schumacher, 2006). This is central for adequate implementation of academic and vocational education in prisons, otherwise it may lead to wasted government initiative and commitment to education as a rehabilitation strategy for prisoners reflected by low enrollment, high drop outs, overcrowding in prisons and increased expenditure.

Literature Review

Gender Variations in Achievement Goal Orientations

Gender variations in achievement goal orientations have been studied without reaching consensus. Elliot and Friedman (2007) reported that males scored significantly higher on mastery approach goal orientation whereas there was no significant variations between males and females performance approach goal orientations. On the other hand, Brdar, Rijavec and Loncaric (2006) found a significant difference between males and females on both mastery goals and performance goal orientations when using the competitive orientation. Guba and Lincoln (2005) investigated the relationship between gender preferences for achievement goal orientations among college students. The study indicated that compared to females, male students were more likely to believe that their effort to leads to mastery goals. The study further believed that students reported positive responses for courses of the same gender and male students responded more positively to courses which are problem based. In contrast, Hughes (2009) conducted a study on whether gender had an impact on achievement goals among post graduate students of South East University. The study revealed no statistically significant variations between males and females. However, regardless of gender, the post graduate students showed variations in performance goal orientations.

Harackiewicz, Durik, Barron, Ke, Linnenbrink-Garcia and Tauer (2008) found that females with high masterly goals performed better than males with high masterly goals. Phillips and Burbules (2000) found that among undergraduate students with high initial skills, males performed better in the performance approach condition while females performed better in masterly goal orientations. From the above literature, generally there are limited studies dedicated to examining gender variations in achievement goal orientations. The few studies that have been done so far report contradictory results (Brdar, Rijavec & Loncaric, 2006). Specifically, no study has documented gender variations in achievement goal orientations of prisoners on formal and vocational training in Uganda. Therefore, the results on gender variations in achievement goal orientations are inconclusive requiring more research.

Age Variations in Achievement Goal Orientations

Studies on age and achievement goal orientations indicate variations in achievement goal orientations whereby younger people tend to be mastery goal oriented compared to older people who are performance goal oriented (Roebken, 2007; Phillips & Burbules, 2000; Abikoye & Shalanin, 2012; Sideridis, 2006). A few studies however, suggest that performance goals may be more adaptive for younger people than for older people (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002; Meece, Anderman & Anderman, 2006; Chamorro, Premuzicn & Furnham, 2008). Developmental research generally shows that younger children’s beliefs are different from older people’s beliefs whereby children are more directed towards performance goals (Darnon & Harackiewiez, 2007). This
is further supported by a study in Korea that reported significant variations between primary and secondary school students (Elliot & Friedman, 2007).

Deshler (2006) acknowledges that younger people are still taking shape so their achievement goal orientations are not stable compares to elderly people. He contends that none the less masterly goals are quite common among younger children who are in the process of acquiring new knowledge and skills whereas elderly people and perfectionists who feel that they have reached their peak in life focus on not doing worse than their past performances.

Darnon, Butera and Harackiewicz (2007) report a statistically significant relationship between age and achievement goal orientations among University students in Peru. The study further revealed that younger people are incremental theorists who believe in mastery goals. Failure for them simply means that they need more practice to be more competent because they seldom engage in achievement related strivings for the purpose of avoiding impeding failure. Other studies however, reveal that with a few exceptions, mastery avoidance goal orientations largely overlap with performance goal orientations among people with different ages (Phillips & Burbules, 2000; Brdar, Rijavec & Loncaric, 2006; Darnon & Harackiewicz, 2007). Such mixed findings required further research on age and goal orientations.

**Education Level and Variations in Achievement Goal Orientations**

Available literature generally show that there is limited research on education level and achievement goal orientations (Eliot & Church, 1997; Elliot, Maier, Binser, Friedmann & Pekrun 2009; Bodmann, Hulleman & Harackiewicz 2008; Ames, 1992). In a study among secondary students of Peru, learners in lower secondary were more oriented towards performance goals (Deshler, 2006). Bodmann, Hulleman and Harackiewicz (2008) revealed that learners in middle classes tend to be grounded in performance avoidance goals and they view themselves as lacking ability and wishing to avoid public demonstrations of achievement that would confirm their lack of ability. Such students often base their sense of competence on their last grade and never truly build a sense of self-worth. Whereas Elliot, Maier, Binser, Friedmann and Pekrun (2009) reported a negative relationship between education levels and achievement goal orientations, Ames (1992) reported a positive relationship between education levels and achievement goal orientations.

**Religious Variations in Achievement Goal Orientations**

Most studies on achievement goals are silent about religious variations in achievement goal orientations (Elliot & Friedman, 2007). Available related literature focus on the role of religion in an educational setting. A few studies however, indicate that learners who are more committed to their religion tend to be oriented towards mastery goals than learners who are not committed to any religion (Darnon, Butera & Harackiewicz, 2007).

**Duration in Prison and Variations in Achievement Goal Orientations**

Several studies on achievement goals are silent about how duration in prison influences choice of goals (Elliot et.al 2009). Available related literature focuses on duration in school that leads to resilience in an educational setting and the choice of achievement goals. Poropat (2014) suggest that learners who have been in school longer are more oriented towards mastery goals than towards performance goals. Patrick, Ryan and Kaplan (2007) suggest no significant variations between duration in a school and choice of achievement goal orientation. This study examined whether duration in prison had an effect on achievement goal orientations.

**Methodology**

**Research Design and Methods**

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey design because it provides description of trends and attitudes or opinions of a population, allowing generalisation from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about some characteristics, attitude or behaviour of that population (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007). A quantitative approach was mainly used to collect data, analyse and present the findings. This approach was chosen because it allows generalizations about the phenomenon, involves many cases, and employs prescribed procedures to ensure validity and reliability (Creswell & Plano, 2007).
Study Population

In this study, the population was adult male and female prisoners enrolled on both formal and vocational training in Luzira prison who are participating in formal and vocational training.

Sampling Strategies

The study adopted purposive sampling strategies. A purposive sample is a non-probability sample that is selected based on characteristics of a population and the objective of the study (Creswell & Plano, 2007). This sampling strategy was chosen because it is economical, allows proper representation, prevents unnecessary and irrelevant items entering into the sample per chance, ensures intensive study of the selected items gives and gives accurate results.

Sample Size

To increase chances of participation and bearing in mind that some prisoners may withhold their participation in the study, a total of eight hundred prisoners on formal and vocational education were involved in the study. The criteria for inclusion in the study was adult male or female prisoner who is enrolled on both formal and vocational training and above primary 7. Creswell (2007) suggests that there are no specific rules when determining the sample size of census studies. Sample size in such cases is best determined by the time allotted, resources available and study objectives.

Instruments/ Measures

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the following measures/tools were used; the bio data section consisted of: gender, duration in prison, age, religion and level of education. This section intended to provide demographic information on the respondents. To measure the achievement goal orientations Patterns of Adaptive Learning Survey was used (Bodmann, Hulleman & Harackiewicz, 2008). In this scale, three types of students’ achievement goal orientations were assessed: Mastery, Performance Approach and Performance Avoidance. This instrument had fourteen items on a Likert type scale ranging from 1(not at all true) to 5 (very true). Items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 measured mastery goal orientations, items 6,7,8,9 and 10 measured performance approach goal orientations while items 11, 12, 13, and 14 measured performance avoidance goal orientations. The Cronbach’s alpha was; α= .85 for mastery goals, α= .89 performance goals and α= .74 for performance avoidance goals.

Procedure

After receiving clearance from my supervisors and the Department of Educational Foundations and Psychology Mbarara University of Science and Technology (MUST), Permission to conduct research was sought from the MUST Research Ethical Review Committee (Reference no: MUREC1/7). The Dean Faculty of Science at MUST then availed me an introductory letter. Permission was also sought from the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (Reference no: SS5ES) which legitimizes all research projects carried out in the country. Clearance was also sought from the Commissioner General of Prisons in Uganda (Reference no: ADM/143/219/01). The researcher proceeded to Luzira main prison which was the centre of data collection. An introductory letter was presented to the officer in charge of Luzira prison and the warden in charge of welfare and education. The purpose of the study was clearly explained to them and appointments for data collection were scheduled. Study participants were asked to sign consent forms and briefed on the purpose of the study. Participation was purely voluntary and withdrawal at any point was accepted without any reprimand. However, interestingly, all prisoners were willing to participate. The next step was data collection where prisoners were requested to fill in the questionnaires on study variables. The prisoners submitted the filled questionnaires to the inmate head teachers who then hand them over to the government posted head teacher. The researcher picked the questionnaires from the government posted head teacher on a weekly basis. After data collection, the participants were debriefed.

Data Management

To ensure organisation of data, the completely filled instruments were screened, coded and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 20. Achievement Goal orientations scores were interpreted as follows; 1 point if a prisoner circles 1, 2 points if the prisoners circles 2, 3 points if the prisoners...
circles 3, 4 points if the prisoners circles 4, 5 points if the prisoners circles 5. The item scores for each of the elements of goal orientations was computed by taking the mean of the items.

Data Analysis

Data was analysed as follows: Descriptive statistics i.e. Frequencies and percentages, means and standard deviations was computed for demographic information. Independent t tests for dichotomous predictors and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. A Post hoc test using Turkey’s Least Significant Difference (LSD) was conducted in order to precisely ascertain where the difference existed.

Ethical Considerations

The identities of the respondents were kept confidential throughout the study since they did not have to put their names on any of the tools of data collection. After filling in the instruments, they were kept confidentially only accessible to the researcher and the advisors/supervisors.

Presentation of Findings

Demographic Characteristics of Prisoners Included in the Study

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 800)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary level</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate holder</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced level</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma holder</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree holder</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age category (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration in Prison (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that the 800 study participants were included in the study. The study was comprised of mainly males (54%) while females were (46%). Majority participants had at least advanced secondary level
of education (74%) compared to degree holders (4.9%). Most of the participants were in middle adulthood 18-35 years (51.4%), Muslims (35.6%) dominated and the majority of prisoners had spent 6-10 years in prison (59.3%).

**Demographic Variations in Achievement Goal Orientations across Education, Religion, Duration and Age**

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variations</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>82.13</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82.25</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>82.02</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82.25</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration in Prison</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>81.97</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82.25</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>72.74</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72.78</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way ANOVA found statistically non-significant differences in achievement goal orientations across all the demographics included i.e. Education ($F_{[4,795]}=.28, p > .05$); religion ($F_{[4,795]}=.56, p > .05$); duration ($F_{[3,796]}=.83, p > .05$) and age ($F_{[1,798]}=.38, p > .05$).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variations</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>785.12</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After conducting the t test, there was no statistical significant difference across gender, ($t_{[798]}=.20, p > .05$).

The study found statistically non-significant variations between education levels and achievement goal orientations ($F_{[4,795]}=.28, p > .05$). This contradicts the findings by Deshler (2006) in a study among secondary students of Peru, who suggested that learners in lower secondary were more oriented towards performance goals. The study further contradicts Bodmann, Hulleman and Harackiewicz (2008) who revealed that learners in middle classes tend to be grounded in performance avoidance goals.

The study found statistically non-significant variations between religious background and achievement goal orientations religion ($F_{[4,795]}=.56, p > .05$). This finding differs from a study by Daron, Butera and Harackiewicz (2007) who indicate that learners who are more committed to their religion tend to be oriented towards mastery goals than learners who are not committed to any religion However, most studies on achievement goals are silent about religious variations in achievement goal orientations (Elliot & Friedman, 2007).
In Luzira prison, prisoners have the freedom to participate in any religion of their choice. All the religious denominations have the same target which is rehabilitation through reading religious texts, hymns and actions. This possibly explains why there are no religious variations in achievement goal orientations among prisoners.

The study found a statistically non-significant variations between duration in prison and achievement goal orientations duration ($F_{[3,796]} = .83, p > .05$). This finding concurs with a study by Patrick, Ryan and Kaplan (2007) who found no significant variations between duration in a school and choice of achievement goal orientation. However, it deviates from a study by Poropat (2014) who suggests that learners who have been in school longer are more oriented towards mastery goals than performance goals. This could be possible because all the study participants were serving long term sentences.

The study found statistically non-significant variations between age and achievement goal orientations age ($F_{[1,798]} = .38, p > .05$). This finding deviates from studies by Roebken (2007); Phillips and Burbules (2000); Abikoye and Shalanin (2012); Sideridis (2006) who indicate variations in age with regard to achievement goal orientation. The finding further deviates from a study by Deshler (2006) who suggests that masterly goals are quite common among younger people than elderly. It should be noted, though, that there hasn’t been such a study conducted among prisoners. It should be noted that the majority of participants were between eighteen years and forty-five.

The study found no statistically significant difference across gender, ($t_{[798]} = .20, p > .05$). This finding contradicts a study by Elliot and Friedman (2007) who reported that males scored significantly higher on mastery approach goal orientation whereas there were no significant variations between males and females’ performance approach goal orientations. This finding further differs from Brdar, Rijavec and Loncaric (2006) who found a significant difference between males and females on both mastery goals and performance goal orientations when using the competitive orientation. However, this finding concurs with a study by Hughes (2009) who revealed no statistically significant variations between males and females in achievement goal orientations among post graduate students.

**Discussion**

The study reveals similarities in achievement goal orientations among different prisoners on formal and vocational training in Luzira prison. This is supported by a study by Fullan and Langworthy (2013) who propose that people’s motives and goals may depend on the environmental context. Therefore, even if the prisoners on various educational programmes in Luzira prison share the environmental settings, it’s important to deepen their knowledge on setting various achievement goal orientations to help them in information acquisition and frame individuals’ engagement in academic achievement settings.

There is a need to support goal orientations equally regardless of age, gender, religion and level of education because prison learners are likely to be more active in information acquisition, which increases their ability to acquire knowledge and skills. Poropat (2014) notes that achievement goal orientations lead to high academic achievement including standardized achievement tests, course grades and Grade Point Average (GPA), exam scores, and performance on academic tasks.

Again, achievement goal orientations allow academic social comparison among learners i.e. a process to obtain information regarding a student’s ability and learning level by comparing his or her academic performance with that of others. When learners compare themselves with others who are different from them, they obtain richer, more differentiated information regarding self-evaluations. Specifically, mastery goals demonstrate a parallel relation to self-improvement whereas performance goals demonstrate parallel relations to self-evaluation and self-reinforcement, suggesting that achievement goal orientations relate to the direction of academic social comparisons.

The study reveals several ways that teachers/instructors in prison education could use goal orientations to improve prison education programme, which include:

1. Measuring a student’s achievement goal orientation has value to inform prison education instruction (how students learn) and to manage the assessment of learning in order to achieve a more accurate measure of performance. In particular, this study provides prison education implementers the knowledge of students’ achievement goal orientation to predict the level of importance and effort a student is likely to attribute to learning.
2.) Prison education instructors should provide learners participating in prison education with grouping by providing activities where learners work together on tasks. This helps learners who have developed learned helplessness and struggle in learning environments. Learners who have developed learned helplessness believe that they have little or no control over the outcome of the behavior or task. To help such learners overcome this helplessness, opportunities for small successes must be developed. Instructors should assist these learners with developing incremental goals to achieve the desired outcome.

3.) Prison education instructors can utilize the various principles of achievement goals to enhance learners’ interactions and engagement in the learning environment. Such principles include: time allotted for students to introduce their own topics and tasks in the classroom, evaluation dimension in the classroom, provision of rewards and feedback and opportunities to actively participate in the decision making process in the classroom. This ultimately helps prisoners on various educational programmes to set multiple achievement goal orientations which increases cognitive ability and increases completion rates of educational programs.

4.) Prison education instructors can increase engagement in the learning environment by assisting learners in developing achievement goal orientations goals that meet their needs. As prison learners construct such goals, instructors should ensure that they are developing achievable and realistic goals. Instructors should help prisoners participating in education to develop a plan of action to learn or complete a given task by using specific activities that require students to perform in front of their peers. As a part of a learning activity, instructors should require learners to submit goals for the course, workshop, or unit. The learners’ goals can be submitted individually in a written form or can be shared with the instructor verbally, either in an individual meeting or in a group environment. Submitted goals should be examined to determine if the learner has developed a mastery or performance goal and if the goal is attainable and realistic.

5.) To increase learner engagement, prison education instructors must engage learners in the development of achievement goal orientations that are attainable and realistic. This can be through exploring and understanding learners’ previous experiences in education, the pertinent content/skill/behavior, and failure. In addition, when developing a new lesson or workshop, instructors should provide time for the learners to share their previous experience with the content, skill, or behavior. During this time of sharing, the instructor can determine if the learners are engaged in the learning environment and if they have experienced previous failure regarding the lesson being presented. This enables the instructor to adapt the learning activities and identify learners who may require additional assistance. By assisting learners in the developing realistic goals, instructors can help prisoners in various educational programmes to increase their knowledge, skill, and motivation for learning.

Conclusions

The study found statistically non-significant differences in achievement goal orientations across all the demographics, which could be attributed to the setting (prison environment). It is therefore important to deepen prisoners’ knowledge of setting various achievement goal orientations to help them in information acquisition and engagement in learning. There is need to support goal orientations equally regardless of age, gender, religion and level of education. Achievement goal orientations allow academic social comparison among learners, which results in richer academic engagement.

Teachers/ instructors in prison education can use achievement goal orientations to improve prison education programmes through measurement and evaluation of learning outcomes, choosing appropriate methods of instruction and instructional materials, and in helping learners to choose achievable and realistic goals. Therefore, achievement goal orientations greatly determine the extent to which education as a rehabilitative strategy can be successful.
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