Goal Achievement as a Predictor of Personal Growth Initiative for Generation Z

Putri Saraswati
University of Muhammadiyah Malang
psaraswati@umm.ac.id

Abstract: *Personal Growth initiative (PGI) is individual intentional involvement in changing and developing as a person. It means that individual feels active, enthusiastic, and good endurance to force their activities and problems. One of the factors which influence PGI is achievement goal. There are several dimensions of achievement goal, such as mastery goal (mastery approach (MAP), mastery avoidance (MAV)), performance goal (performance approach (PAP) and performance avoidance (PAV)). This research is aimed to identify the influence of achievement goal (MAP, MAV, PAP and PAV) to PGI for generation z. There were 388 senior high school students involved in this research. The Data were randomly taken by using cluster random sampling. Likert scale instument for dependent and independent variables were employed. The result shows that there is a correlation between MAP, MAV, PAP and PAV to PGI (R=0.655, Adjusted R square = 0.423). MAP, MAV, PAP and PAV influence PGI in amount of F 71.842 (sig. = 0.000). Nevertheless, PAV does not fit in regression model because coefficient significance is less than 0.05. Hence, the influence of MAP, MAV and PAP to PGI increase to 93.838 (sig. 0.000) and regression model becomes Y = 20.465 + 1.112 MAP + 1.077MAV + 0.356 PAP.*

Keyword: Personal growth initiative, achievement goal and generation z

Introduction

The development in a life is definite for human beings. The development covers two possibilities, which are promoting and declining. The growth or improvement will be optimal if someone is aware and attain it. The growth is dynamic and planned to be a better human being. In sphere of psychology, it is best known as personal growth initiative (PGI) (Robitschek in Robitschek & Keyes, 2009). Someone who understands the change and beliefs that the change is possible will take initiative to realizae the process to be better (Robitschek in Robitschek & Keyes, 2009). It means that personal growth initiative is an active and conscious process. People are trying to change intentionally to improve his self. Robitschek & Cook (1999) explain that individuals who have good PGI do not only help his self for intentionally improving, but also proactive to change process and seek the opportunity to be better.

In educational context, someone who has a good PGI will have purpose for good achievement and the potential is optimum to be well-being in mind, emotion and social aspects. Robitschek, 1998; Robitschek & Kashubeck, 1999 (in Robitschek & Keyes, 2009) show that PGI has a correlation with psychological, emotional and social well-being. Meanwhile, Deci & Ryan, 1985 (in Robitschek & Keyes, 2009) mention that someone who attains his goal will appear to his internal motivation. In other words, someone who has achievement goal has a personal growth initiative. This statement is in line with Robitschek's opinion (in Ogunyemi & Mabekoje, 2007).

He has explained that someone with good personal growth initiative always feel challenge and grow to the goal that individual wants to reach in his life. Furthermore, Blackie, Jayawickreme, Forgeard, & Jayawickreme (2015) mention that personal growth initiative is defined as intentional desire to be better and it is a belief to arrange the goal may optimally improve.

The goal in internal motivation is called as achievement goal. Achievement goal is a reason to accomplish and to finish the tasks. In this research, it is called as academic task. Pintrich & Schunk (2000) elucidate that achievement goal is a reason to finish the tasks. Someone who has clear goals in academic will acquaint strong effort to catch the goal. Harackiewicz & Elliot (1993) and Cerasoli & Ford (2014) show that achievement goal makes people improve, try and apply their competencies through daily activities.

Good achievement goal motivates someone to show their best academic achievement, mastery something needed to attain the goal and show specific behavior for avoiding activities or something that may provide ruthless effects to their performance. Moreover, There are 4 sub dimensions in achievement goal, namely mastery approach (MAP), mastery avoidance (MAV), performance approach (PAP), and performance avoidance (PAV) (Elliot, 1999; Elliot & McGregor, 2001;Pintrich, 2000 in Chen, 2015).

Mastery goal are mastery approach anda mastery avoidance that show how are someone performace to finish the tasks (Cerasoli & Ford, 2014). Someone shows good mastery goal in order to foster his academic

performance as he wants to improve the competencies (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996 in Cerasoli & Ford, 2014) tries to understand and mastery the tasks (Dweck & Elliot, 1983; Nicholls,1984 in Cerasoli & Ford, 2014). Good mastery goal makes someone to get better focus, superior orientation and greater cognition for relevan competences to predict triumph in future (Cerasoli & Ford, 2014). Mastery approach (MAP) focuses on improving competences, learning and mastering tasks. Mastery avoidance (MAV) focuses on do not loss the competences, learning and mastering the tasks (Elliot & McGregor, 2001 in Echeita et al., 2009). Good mastery goal shows endurance to finish the tasks, persistence to face the fails, high level to complete the tasks, and positive attitude for study (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996 in Cerasoli & Ford, 2014).

Performance goals are defined as performance approach (PAP) and performance avoidance (PAV). Performance goal is ego-goal (Nicholls 1989, Thorkildsen & Nicholls 1998 in Covington, 2000) or self-enhancing goals (Skaalvik 1997 in Covington, 2000) namely someone performance become standart to improve his abilities. Performance goal has a positive correlation to arise, remember strategy without understanding (e.g. Karabenick&Collins-Eaglin 1997, Pintrich et al 1993 in Covington, 2000). Performance approach (PAP) emphasizes best performance observed by others, while performance avoidance (PAV) focuses on avoiding failure or avoiding inferior performance (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Elliot & McGregor, 2001 in Chen, 2015).

Good achievement goal will appear to good personal growth initiative. Someone who has achievement goal will actively attain to goal. Clearly goal, make someone know that to reach the goal has to effort for change and the best performance to finish the tasks. This behaviors are not only on adults learner but also on adolances and children learner.

Generation z is defined as a group of people who are born in 1998 to date (Abdullah, 2011). In psychology, a-twenty-year-old individual is considered as adolescents. Adolescents are ranging from 10-13 to 18-22 years old (Santrock, 2003). Piaget mentions that early adolescents to early adult has same cognitive ability (Santrock, 2002). Adolescents are able to make a plan and able to hypothesize problems, adult people are more systematic, and more considered. Adolescents use intellectual ability to reach the goal. Hence, achievement goal and personal growth initiative are beyond systematic and planned.

Furthermore, generation z covers various characteristics, such as has child untill middle adolacence were called pre-adolasence (Piaget & Inhelder, 2000). In this period, adolescents have external motivation. It is happen too on academic process. Addition, ability to thinking still use concret reasoning and there are someone become early operational formal phase of thinking. On emotional maturity, not as good as on higher developmental phase. Hence, achievement goal and PGI on this generation not as good as on higher generation.

In this current study, researcher proposes a statement of problem; Are there influences of *achievement goals* (Mastery approach, Mastery Avoidance, Performance Approach, Performance Avoidance) to *personal growth initiative* on generation z in Malang city? The aim of this research is to figure out the influence of *achievement goals* (Mastery approach, Mastery Avoidance, Performance Approach, Performance Avoidance) to *personal growth initiative* on generation z in Malang city.

Method

This current study was indicated as a quantitative research. The research subjects were senior high school students situated in Malang city. So as to pick out the participants, cluster random sampling was employed. In total, there were 388 students consisted of gender differences and grades. Likert scale was the way to take the data for achievement goal and personal growth initiative variable. Coefficient reliability pointed 0.824 (for achievement goal) and 0.806 (for personal growth initiative). The item validities were about 0.280 – 0.613 (for achievement goal) and 0.314 – 0.609 (for personal growth initiative). In analyzing the data, researcher selected multiple regression by using SPSS application.

Result

Coefficient tolerance closed to 1 and VIF abaout 1 (MAP=1.620; MAV=1.362; PAP=1.348;PAV=1.231). It means that there is no multicollinearity. Then, there is no correlation for independent variable. In addition, the coefficient for independent variable indicates below 0.05 (MAV-PAV=-.001; MAP-PAV=-.167; PAP-PAV=-.300; MAV-PAP=-.021; MAP-MAV=-.464; MAP-PAP=-.296). These results have shown that there are no multicollinearities in regression equation.

Shows data position follow the diagonal line. It means normal distribution data. Addition, coefisien D-W 1.977 namely between -2 to + 2, it shows there is no autocorelation.

Multiple regression test

Multiple regression test shows R= 0.655. It means that there are strong correlations between Mastery Approach (MAP), Mastery Avoidance (MAV), Performance Approach (PAP), Performance Avoidance (PAV) and Personal Growth initiative as coefficient correlation is above 0.5 point. Moreover, variation of PGI is 42.3% and explained by mastery Approach, Mastery Avoidance, Performance Approach, and Performance Avoidance. SEE 4.078 shows minor SEE value and makes regression model fits to predict PGI. In this research, F coefficient = 71.842 (sig. 0.000 < 0.05) which means MAP, MAV, PAP and PAV simultaneously influence PGI.

Equation of regression in this research is Personal Growth Initiative = 19.430 + 1.072 Mastery Approach + 1.077 Mastery Avoidance + 0.291 Performance Approach + 0.382 Performance Avoidance. Furthermore,

if we see at each T coefficient of independent variable and significance value, the significant equation regressions (<0.05) are MAP, MAV, and MAP. PAV variable is not significant for equation of regression as there is a signification coefficient beyond 0.05.

The R and adjusted R square are 0.65 and 41.8% to PGI. SEE coefficient increases to be 0.02 (SEE=4.093). It shows that equation regression fits to predict PGI. The second regression test shows the influence of MAP, MAV and PAP increase 21.996% become 93.838 (sig = 0.000 < 0.05). Thus, MAP, MAV, and PAP simultaneously influence to PGI.

The regression test shows MAP, MAV and PAP have significant t test (sig < 0.05, namely sig. MAP= 0.000, sig MAV=0.000 and sig. PAP=0.001). The regression model is Personal Growth Initiative = 20.465 + 1.112 MAP + 1.077MAV + 0.356 PAP. It means if there is no increase one point MAP, MAV and PAP, the PGI score is 20.465. Forewhile, each one point increase of MAP will increase MAP score 1.112. One poin increase MAV will increase 1.077 poin of MAV and 1 point PAP will increase 0.356 PAP point.

Discussion

This reseach shows there is correlation between achievement goal and PGI (r=0.655, F= 71.842, p= 0.000). Increasing the achievement goal score effects on increasing PGI score. Nevertheless, there are significant correlation and influence of MAP, MAV, and PAP to PGI. Increasing MAP, MAV and PAP effect and infleunce to increasing PGI score. The regression model is PGI = 20.465 + 1.112 MAP + 1.077MAV + 0.356 PAP.

PGI is a process or a mechanism to improve someone to be better. PGI is not a content or result of effort (Robitschek,1998; Thoen & Robitschek, 2013). PGI is a skill designed to do a better process (Robitschek et al., 2012; Thoen & Robitschek, 2013). The PGI skills are divided into six categories; 1) showing readiness to change, 2) planning and implementing the process of change, 3) using resources, 4) displaying intentional behavior (Robitschek et al., 2012; Thoen & Robitschek, 2013). Furthermore, PGI is skill to change and improve both cognitive and behavior aspects (Robitschek, 1998 dalam (Robitschek et al., 2012). Likewise, Robitschek, 2012 in Yakunina, Weigold, & Weigold, 2013) proposes that someone with good PGI will have good planning, open-minded mindset, challenging action and resources to improve his ability.

In this research, MAP, MAV, and PAP have correlation and influence to PGI. It is for the reason that someone with a good mastery goal wants to improve his competences and expertise as well as to mastery his tasks (Cerasoli & Ford, 2014). On the other hand, Nicholls 1984, Pintrich &Schunk 1996 (in Covington, 2000) say that someone has a good mastery goal believes that the efforts are key to succeed and to fail. Consequently, appropriate learning strategies are important to reach the successes. In western theory, mastery goal has a correlation ability to adapt in study (Hau & Ho, 2008; Ho & Hau, 2008 in (Chen, 2015)) by using better learning strategies than before (Chan & Lai, 2006; Liem, Lau, & Nie, 2008; Salili & Lai, 2003 in (Chen, 2015)) and ability to self-efficacy (Lau & Lee, 2008 in (Chen, 2015).

MAP and MAV explain that someone with MAP more focus on improving abilities, learnings, and mastering the tasks. However, someone with MAV concerns to do without losing his competencies, learnings, and mastering the tasks (Elliot & McGregor, 2001 in Echeita et al., 2009). Someone with MAP uses self-implement standard, progress and deep understand to the tasks (Pintrich, 2000). Individual with MAV tries to avoid do not understand the tasks, avoid activities that do not study, or avoid activities that do not mastery the tasks. Someone with MAV using do not to be wrong standart, to do not mistakes (Pintrich, 2000).

In addition, someone with PAP focuses to be superior, the best to others, to be smartest and do the best for tasks that th others. Someone with PAP use normative standart to be the best in class (Pintrich, 2000). Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Elliot & McGregor, 2001 (in Chen, 2015) said someone with PAP focuss on the other performance, the goal to avoid fails or look like do not competences or inferior. In western literary, show that PAP has a positive corellation with expectation for performance competences, effort and presistent to study and learning as a chellanges (Elliot & Church, 1997; McGregor & Elliot, 2002; Zusho, Pintrich, & Cortina, 2005 dalam (Chen, 2015). Nevertheless, research in China shows that PAP has a correlation with adaptation skill in study (Chan & Lai, 2006; Ho & Hau, 2008; Lau & Lee, 2008; Lau, Liem, & Nie, 2010; Liem et al., 2008; Salili & Lai, 2003) and academic achievement (Hau & Ho, 2008; Ho & Hau, 2008; Salili, Chiu, & Lai, 2001; Salili & Lai, 2003; Shih, 2005 in (Chen, 2015). Someone with PAP focuss on competences performance on the others (Echeita et al., 2009). Thus, clear that mastery goal has influence to PGI, because someone with good mastery goal will do the best effort to mastery tasks, improve the experties. It seems to PAP.

Nevertheless, this reseach shows that PAV do not influence to PGI. It because PAV are linked to lower academic achievement and maladaptive learning (e.g., negative learning strategies, lower self-efficacy) (Chen, 2015). Someone with PAV are focused on not demonstrating incompetence relative to others and try to avoid being outperformed by others (Echeita et al., 2009). Someone who do not focused on mastery, understanding the tasks. Someone does not try, effort the best performance thus he can improved the personal quality. He just focuss how to other see him not to be better quality life. He try to do negative learning strategies, thus, he can improved his quality of life to be better. Negative learning strategies namely do not understand his learning style, or cheating at class. Others, lower self efficacy make someone feel insecure in study and not confident to doing activities. In this research shows that 41.8% contribution from AG (MAP,MAV, and PAP) to PGI, whereas 58.2% PGI does contibuted by

others. The other factors are hope (Shorey, Little, Snyder, Kluck, & Robitschek, 2007), and culture (Robitschek, 2003). Ogunyemi & Mabekoje (2007) said factors that influence to PGI are behavior in risk taking self efficacy.

Conclusion

Based on the research results, it can be said that there are correlation and influence achievement goal and personal growth initiative. Moderately, there are positive influence between mastery approach to PGI, mastery avoidance to PGI, and performance approach to PGI. Nevertheless, there is no influence performance avoidance to PGI. The influence of MAP, MAV, and PAP to PGI can be described through regression equation, PGI = 20.465 + 1.112 MAP + 1.077MAV + 0.356 PAP.

For the students, it is suggested; 1) students have to understand that mastery the tasks and subjects will help them in improving their personal growth, confidence, and pleasure. Hence, students need to recall and recognize the materials that have been accepted, such as asking to teacher or other when they do not understand the materials and tasks. 2) Performance goal influences to PGI that means there are friends, others who need comparator to present better efforts and results. Therefore, students must be grouped in order to study. 3) for other reseachers, revalidation for PGI and achievement goal scale. Doing reseach abaout stress, psychopatology and abnormality to PGI.

References

Abdullah, Khairul. (2011). Generasi apakah, anda? X, Y atau Z?. http://khairulabdullah.com/generasi-apakah-anda-x-y-atau-z/. diakses tanggal 2 desember 2017

Blackie, L. E. R., Jayawickreme, E., Forgeard, M. J. C., & Jayawickreme, N. (2015). The protective function of personal growth initiative among a genocide-affected population in Rwanda. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 7(4), 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000010

Cerasoli, C. P., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic Motivation, Performance, and the Mediating Role of Mastery Goal Orientation: A Test of Self-Determination Theory. *The Journal of Psychology*, 148(3), 267–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2013.783778

Chen, W. W. (2015). The relations between perceived parenting styles and academic achievement in Hong Kong: The mediating role of students' goal orientations. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 37, 48–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2014.11.021

Covington, M. V. (2000). GOAL THEORY , MOTIVATION , AND S CHOOL A

CHIEVEMENT : An Integrative Review. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 171–200. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.171

Echeita, G., Simón, C., Verdugo, M. Á., Sandoval, M., López, M., Calvo, I., & González-Gil, F. (2009). Paradojas y dilemas en el proceso de inclusión educativa en España. *Revista de Educacion*, 349(9), 153–178. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits

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

Monk, F.J & Haditono, Knoers A.R. (2002). Psikologi Perkembangan Pengantar Dalam Berbagai Bidangnya. Yogyakarta: UGM Press

Noor, J. (2011). Metode Penelitian Skripsi, Tesis, Disertasi & Karya Ilmiah. Jakarta: Kencana Prenadamedia Group

Ogunyemi, A. O., & Mabekoje, S. O. (2007). Self-efficacy, risk-taking behavior and mental health as predictors of personal growth initiative among university undergraduates. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 5(12), 349–362.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). An Achievement Goal Theory Perspective on Issues in Motivation Terminology, Theory, and Research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 92–104. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1017

Pintrich, Paul R. (2000). Handbook of Self Regulation. Academic Press.

Robitschek, C. (2003). Validity of personal growth initiative scale scores with a Mexican American college student population. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50(4), 496–502. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.50.4.496

Robitschek, C., Ashton, M. W., Spering, C. C., Geiger, N., Byers, D., Schotts, G. C., & Thoen, M. A. (2012). Development and psychometric evaluation of the Personal Growth Initiative Scale-II. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59(2), 274–287. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027310

Robitschek, C. (1998). Personal Growth Initiative: Construct and its measure. *Measurement and Evaluation In Counseling and Development*, January (30)

Robitschek, C., & Cook, S. W. (1999). The influence of personal growth initiative and coping styles on career exploration and vocational identity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(1), 127–141. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1650

Robitschek, C., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2009). Keyes's Model of Mental Health With Personal Growth Initiative as a Parsimonious Predictor. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(2), 321–329. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013954

Shorey, H. S., Little, T. D., Snyder, C. R., Kluck, B., & Robitschek, C. (2007). Hope and personal growth initiative: A comparison of positive, future-

oriented constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *43*(7), 1917–1926. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.06.011

Thoen, M. A., & Robitschek, C. (2013). Intentional growth training: Developing an intervention to increase personal growth initiative. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, *5*(2), 149–170. https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12001

Yakunina, E. S., Weigold, I. K., & Weigold, A. (2013). Personal growth initiative: Relations with acculturative stress and international student adjustment. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation*, *2*(1), 62–71. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030888