



## GOAL SETTING FOR UNIVERISTY UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS MAJORING IN HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT – ANEMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM INDONESIA

**Ricky**

*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*

**Syanne Helly**

*Pelita Harapan University, Indonesia*

This research is about how goal attainment is being affected by goal setting elements and self efficacy. One hundred and sixty seven undergraduate students majoring in Hospitality Management (representing 79.5% of the population) were being asked to fill out a questionnaire about how their Grade Point Average is being influenced by their goal setting elements and their beliefs on their capability. The analysis using Discriminant Analysis stated that only goal setting elements, particularly goal effectiveness and goal stress discriminate the students' performance. Goal stress must be perceived positively to produce the positive impact. The result is expected to provide insight for academicians particularly academic program managers on how to continue the sophomore's study as well as getting ready with the new batch in the new academic period.

**Keywords:** Goal Setting Elements, Self Efficacy, Hospitality Management, Discriminant Analysis, Goal Effectiveness, Goal Stress.

### Introduction

Success is everyone's expectation in life but many, even after sacrificing their lives were disappointed of not getting it. Empirical studies agreed that success is multi interpretation, depends on the person, and is this absolute relativity? A variety of studies has shown that the type of goal orientation influences their educational performance (for example, Ames, 1992, Ames and Archer, 1988; Valle et al, 2003 and Roebken 2007). In Management, historical research from scientific management until modern management approach let us know that success indicates multi-measurements on the working technique, human development and process approach. Most executives, professionals and entrepreneurs put a huge amount of time into their jobs, success should be measured by the results you produce, not the number of hours you log. Aside from process, research done by Godin indicates that failure as the opposite of success can be defined as design failure and failure of will<sup>1</sup>. These tell us one crucial conclusion; true success depends as well in the accuracy of success setting. Correct goal demands appropriate process to achieve it, but incorrect goal determines true failure.

Research repeatedly shows that the goal attributes such as specificity and difficulty lead to a better task performance than no goals, do your best goal or specific and easy goal (Latham and Lee,1986; Lee, Locke and Latham,1990; Locke, Shaw, Saari and Latham, 1981; Mentho,Steel and Karen, 1987;Tubbs:

1987 in Lee et.al, 1991. These valuable works are based on the work of Edwin Locke in 1964 as he wrote on the subject of specificity, difficulty and task performance (Citation Classic No 32, August 10, 1992). This psychological theory then being applied by Locke and Latham within industrial organization psychology over a 25-year employing some 400 laboratory and field study (Locke & Latham, 1990, 2002,) in Locke & Latham 2006.

Besides the goal-related elements, research indicated as well the important of the goal getters' task-related confidence. Past findings indicated that self efficacy often mediate or partially mediate the effects of other potentially motivating variables such as personality traits, feedback, participation in decision making job autonomy and monetary incentives.(Bandura,1997 in Locke and Latham, 2006). Both researchers to some extent tried to answer the first question in this paper, where there are eight movers of researchers in Goal Setting namely *Goal Choice* where goals tend to be revised due to effort rather than ability (Donovan & Williams, 2003) *Learning Goals* led to make the goal getter to do their best (Seijts & Latham, 2001). *Framing* which means goals being perceived as challenge or threat has a different effect on performance (Drach-Zahavy and Erez , 2002). The next "mover" is *Affect* where goal progress and goal importance were strong predictors of feelings of success and well being, success in one realm compensated for failure in the other (Wiese & Freud, 2005). *Group Goals* is also another important topic where, group can add positive and negative things in goal attainment, with group, goals are being shared, yet conflicts are potential( DeShon et.al., 2004). *Goal and Traits*, where The effects of goal setting as a state on the effects of goal orientation as a trait were studied by Seijts, Latham, Tasa, and Latham (2004). Macro-level group, where Baum and Locke after using a longitudinal design found that growth goals, self efficacy and organizational vision were significantly predict future organizational goal (Baum and Locke, 2004)

Goals and Sub-conscious priming that explain where goal, once accepted and understood, remains in the periphery of consciousness as a reference point for guiding and giving meaning to subsequent mental and physical action. (Locke and Latham, 2006).

In Education, researchers are having research more for primary and secondary education( Schunk, 1990) where difficult goals led to higher motivation during learning, self-efficacy, and skill acquisition. Prior to that research by Schunk and Rice resulted that children with reading difficulties showed that giving children feedback on how well they were learning to use a comprehension strategy improved their reading comprehension self-efficacy and achievement.(Schunk & Rice, 1989). In the higher education, Latham and Brown discovered that entering MBA students who set specific difficult learning goals subsequently had higher GPAs and higher satisfactions with their MBA Program. Later Locke and Latham added that learning goal is highly related with Meta cognition as a learning goal facility. Meta cognition-namely planning, monitoring and evaluating progress toward goal attainment is necessary in environments where there is minimal structure or guidance (Locke and Latham, 2006)

An interesting research done by Zimmerman and Kitsantas indicates possible combined strategy (subsequently) between process goal (following steps in strategy) and outcome goal demonstrated higher self-efficacy and skill in educational goal attainment (Zimmerman and Kitsantas, 1999).

The final notable relevant research is the one being done by Roebken in UC Berkeley as he tried to link students' multiple goals, satisfaction and achievement. The result of this research support the notion that students pursuing both mastery and performance goals are more satisfied with their academic experience, show a higher degree of academic engagement and achieve better grades than students who pursue mastery orientation alone. (Roebken, 2007)

This research is aimed to know influence of goal setting elements and self efficacy toward academic goal for undergraduate students studying in the School of Economics majoring in hospitality management. The focus of the study is toward the sophomore students, just finished their year one study. Academic goal being used is semester two GPA and goal setting elements were adapted from Lee, Bobko, Earley and Locke. (Lee et.al, 1991). These goal setting elements are going to be adjusted for undergraduate students who are also having internship (business management experience) as part of their academic studies. Self Efficacy or perceived self-efficacy is people in this case students' belief about their capabilities to produce effects. This research serve three purposes, to add additional empirical

studies on goal setting particularly for Higher education students, providing valuable information for the academic program manager in dealing with students for the rest of their studies (additional three years) and to demonstrate the usage of Discriminant Analysis in determining the differentiating goal setting factors and self efficacy.

**Method**

Literature survey and a brief interview with the academic program managers enable us to composed a questionnaire blending questions on goal, goal setting elements and self –efficacy. Two hundred and two students were being asked to fill out questionnaire as they were participating in an annual program for hospitality management students namely- Professional Development Program. The respondents are the sophomore of School of Economics bachelor level, a four-year study awarding the graduates with Bachelor in Economics (majoring in Hospitality Management).

The questionnaire consists of three essential parts, the first contain questions on respondent profile as well as their goal, the later contains seven sections questions on goal setting elements namely – lecturer’s role, goal stress, goal efficacy, goal rationale, goal conflict, organizational facilitation of goal attainment and goal clarity, the last part consist of seventeen questions on self efficacy. The goal is here is student’s previous semester Grade Point Average which later being categorized into Pass (2.00-2.75), Satisfactory (2.76-3.50and Cum laude (3.51-4.00)

A factor analysis on goal setting elements was being done to confirm the reliability of the questions where eventually the researchers are being confirmed that there are indeed seven new groups on goal setting elements.

The next step is to analyze the relationship between the GPA, New Goal setting elements and self efficacy using Discriminant Analysis (DA). DA has the same purpose as multiple linear regressions by predicting an outcome. The essential difference is the criterion variable is a categorical type of data instead of interval type of data.

Brief explanation on discriminant analysis

DA involves the determination of a linear equation like regression that will predict which

Group the case belongs to.

The form of the equation or function is:

$$D = v_1x_1 + v_2x_2 + \dots + v_ix_i + a$$

- Where D = discriminate function
- v = the discriminant coefficient or weight for that variable
- X = respondent’s score for that variable
- a = a constant
- i = the number of predictor variables

This function is similar to a regression equation or function. The v’s are unstandardized discriminant coefficients analogous to the b’s in the regression equation. These v’s maximizethe distance between the means of the criterion (dependent) variable. Standardized discriminant coefficients can also be used like beta weight in regression.

Good predictors tend to have large weights, where the role of this function is to maximize the distance between categories. After using an existing set of data to calculate the discriminant function and classify cases, any new cases can then be categorized. The number of discriminant functions is one less the number of groups. There is only one function for the basic two group discriminant analysis.

**Discussions**

One hundred and ninety one questionnaires returned but only 167 questionnaires that can be processed, this number represents approximately 79.5% of the population.

## Factor Analysis Result

**Table 1.** Anti-image matrix score, grouping and reliability-based selection.

No	Anti-image Correlation Matrix	Group	Cronbach Alpha
A1	0.582	4	0.731
A2	0.849	4	
A3	0.786	4	
B1	0.793	2	0.782
B2	0.853	2	
B3	0.759	2	
C1	0.656	7	0.572 (deleted)
C2	0.554	7	
C3	0.743	1	0.733
C4	0.625	1	
D1	0.569	11	0.073 (deleted)
D2	0.761	6	
D3	0.763	6	
D4	0.327	6	
E1	-0.677	7	0.572 (deleted)
E2	0.520	3	
E3	0.732	3	
E4	0.703	3	
E5	0.695	3	
E6	0.746	11	0.073 (deleted)
E7	0.855	8	
E8	0.697	8	0.758
F1	0.802	9	
F2	0.650	9	0.585 (deleted)
F3	0.733	5	
F4	0.737	5	
F5	0.709	5	0.649
G1	0.654	1	
G2	0.702	1	
G3	0.576	1	
G4	0.849	10	Deleted

The above table clearly shown there were seven factors left where factor 1 (consists of C3,C4, G1, G2, G3) is being renamed to *Goal effectiveness*, factor 2 (consists of B1,B2,B3) is still being named *Goal stress*, factor 3 (consists of E2,E3,E4,E5) is being named as *Goal conflict*, factor 4 (consists of A1,A2, A3) is being named as *Lecturer's role*, factor 5 (consists of F3,F4,F5) is being named as *Organizational Facilities of goal achievement*, factor 6 (consists of D2&D3) is being named as *Goal rationale* and factor 7 (consists of E7&E8) is being named as *Goal choice*.

The next step is to process the new sets of goal setting elements, self efficacy with three categories of Grade Point Average (GPA).

## Group Statistics

Table 2. Discriminant Analysis Statistics.

Klas GPA		Mean	Std. Deviation	Valid N (listwise)	
Pass	Factor1	3.6064516	.40158333	62	62.000
	Factor2	2.9086022	.73717166	62	62.000
	Factor3	2.9596774	.58005361	62	62.000
	Factor4	3.6612903	.52441983	62	62.000
	Factor5	3.8333333	.56860805	62	62.000
	Factor6	3.5000000	.66529914	62	62.000
	Factor8	3.0967742	.78321903	62	62.000
	REGR factor score 10 for analysis 1	-.0065982	.77473029	62	62.000
	AVGSEFF	3.3266129	.46967727	62	62.000
Satisfactory	Factor1	3.7973684	.54011695	76	76.000
	Factor2	3.3377193	.80276083	76	76.000
	Factor3	3.0657895	.68843835	76	76.000
	Factor4	3.7894737	.62973741	76	76.000
	Factor5	3.8464912	.60965270	76	76.000
	Factor6	3.5855263	.62390255	76	76.000
	Factor8	3.3157895	.90863306	76	76.000
	REGR factor score 10 for analysis 1	.0141954	1.19647719	76	76.000
	AVGSEFF	3.4720395	.46305088	76	76.000
Cum Laude	Factor1	4.0250000	.36025353	24	24.000
	Factor2	3.6250000	.75060362	24	24.000
	Factor3	3.2187500	.52291252	24	24.000
	Factor4	4.0555556	.46797608	24	24.000
	Factor5	3.7916667	.57156874	24	24.000
	Factor6	3.6250000	.53669682	24	24.000
	Factor8	3.2916667	.76494766	24	24.000
	REGR factor score 10 for analysis 1	.1264632	.77406061	24	24.000
	AVGSEFF	3.5781250	.45714809	24	24.000
Total	Factor1	3.7580247	.48553337	162	162.000
	Factor2	3.2160494	.80925651	162	162.000
	Factor3	3.0478395	.62835062	162	162.000
	Factor4	3.7798354	.58052543	162	162.000
	Factor5	3.8333333	.58536322	162	162.000
	Factor6	3.5586420	.62650019	162	162.000
	Factor8	3.2283951	.84349680	162	162.000
	REGR factor score 10 for analysis 1	.0228696	.99088227	162	162.000
	AVGSEFF	3.4320988	.47067514	162	162.000

## Tests of Equality of Group Means

**Table 3.** Tests of Equality of Group Means.

	Wilks' Lambda	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Factor1	.914	7.452	2	159	.001
Factor2	.896	9.259	2	159	.000
Factor3	.981	1.539	2	159	.218
Factor4	.950	4.168	2	159	.017
Factor5	.999	.079	2	159	.924
Factor6	.994	.473	2	159	.624
Factor8	.985	1.234	2	159	.294
REGR factor score 10 for analysis 1	.998	.160	2	159	.852
AVGSEFF	.963	3.062	2	159	.050

From the test of equality of group means, it is stated that only factor 1 and 2 that are consistently significantly act as the differentiator between pass, satisfactory and cum laude. Self Efficacy is in the border line of significance with 0.050. It must be considered as not significantly significant.

## Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

**Table 4.** Unstandardized coefficients for Canonical Discriminant Function.

	Function	
	1	2
Factor1	1.347	1.676
Factor2	.934	-.910
(Constant)	-8.064	-3.375

Based on the table 4 above it is stated there are two functions

Function 1:  $Z_1 = -8.064 + 1.347GE + 1.676 GS$

Function 2:  $Z_2 = -3.375 + 1.676 GE - .910$

Both functions indicated that goal effectiveness is the one that can be used to discriminate the three categories of GPA.

## Main Findings and Further Discussions

1. Self efficacy is not a discriminator among GPA classification.

Statistics regard self efficacy not as the discriminator among levels of GPA, but the level of significance is exactly 0.05. This borderline score can be explained from the fact that students with low self-efficacy can obtain higher levels and vice versa. It is most likely that students in their first year are still trying to "test the water" on how to learn in a University. The adaptation is not just about having a higher level of academic study but also the nature of hospitality management which tends to blend conceptual understanding and practical skill. Students who are coming from rote learning kind of previous education finds it weird to be judged based on personal analysis and group work. Program managers needs to

educate the students on how is it like to study in a University where guidance and rules are less compare to their previous education. Knowledge and understanding on studying in a University must be balanced by the dissemination of self management and self regulatory mechanism. Self regulatory mechanism must be based on self confident, so self confident to self regulate one self.

## 2. Goal setting elements influence on GPA classification

Seven factors influencing goal successfulness (GPA level) in the sense of goal effectiveness and goal stress. Discriminant analysis stated clearly that goal effectiveness is very crucial in differentiating GPA level. Goal effectiveness explains the how students suppose to know what to do in their studies, combine with the confident that his certain involvement in the academic process is heading towards goal accomplishment. Another confirmation of Locke and Latham theory happens again, where goal effectiveness explains goal clarity, specificity does influence good performer and bad performer. Finally, realizing that there are multiple goals in life and academic life, goal effectiveness explains how prioritization is very important to achieve a higher goal. Goal effectiveness element confirms the importance of meta-cognition in goal attainment facilitation where students needs to be trained to plan, to be monitored and getting priceless evaluation.

3. In relation with goal setting elements, it is worth to notify that goal stress can contribute negatively and positively toward goals. It is clearly important to educate the students on how to deal with stress, a stressful (too difficult to attain) kind of goal can impact both positive and negatively to the students. Empirically it is worth to believe that goal stress, being perceived positively can produce the best effort which later will trigger another important issue of goal setting namely personal growth. Personal growth in the case is in performance improvement (despite not really attaining the goal and endurance in dealing with stress. Goal stress effect is indeed might be influenced be major of the students, where perceived stress may be marginally more important for Accounting students. (Zajacova, Lynch & Espenshade, 2005). This is confirmed with the fact that Hospitality management under the Faculty of Economics has set quantitative courses like accounting as compulsory courses.

## Conclusion

Goal effectiveness is important for goal attainment, academic program managers need to ensure that students are clear with the specificity of the academic goal, being confident that they can self regulate themselves as well as prioritizing activities during academic life. The fact that meta-cognition demands mentors and tutors, there is a strong belief to involve more lecturers or dedicated alumni to be involved in the academic process.

Goal stress is the other goal setting element that discriminate strongly students performance, so far it is belief that goal stress being perceived positively will produce personal growth which is very important for both goal attainment and self efficacy.

Self Efficacy is not yet a significant element due to the significant that is exactly 0.05, it is worthy to re-test this element using more respondent or trying to expand it using higher semester students. It is belief that self efficacy is still not really significant since sophomores are still trying to adjust to the academic life in a University particularly in Hospitality Management Program.

## References

1. Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71–81). New York: Academic Press.
2. Burns, RB & Burns RA (2008) *Business Research Method & Statistics using SPSS*, SAGE Publication: United Kingdom (<http://www.uk.sagepub.com/burns/website%20material/Chapter%2025%20-%20Discriminant%20Analysis.pdf>)

3. Godin, Seth (2010) Redefining Failure, Harvard Business Review Vol.88, No.9, Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation : Boston, USA.
4. Lee, C., Bobko, P., Earley, P.C. & Locke, E.A. (1991) An Empirical Analysis on Goal Setting Questionnaire, *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 12, pp 467–482).
5. Locke, E.A, Saari L M, Shaw K N & Latham G P (1981). Goal setting and task performance: 1969-1980. *Psychol. Bull.* 90:125–52, 1981.
6. Locke, E.A. & Latham, G.P. (2006) New Direction in Goal Setting Theory Current direction of Psychological Science Vol 15 No 5 pp 265–268.
7. Pozen, R C (2011) Managing yourself – Extreme Productivity, Harvard Business Review, Vol. 89, No 5., Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation : Boston, USA.
8. Roebken, Heinke (2007) Multiple goals, Satisfaction and Achievement in University Undergraduate Education: *A Student Experience in the Research University*. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.2.07, Center for Studies for Higher Education, UC Berkeley.
9. Zajacova, A, Lynch, S.M, Espenshade, TJ (2005) *Self Efficacy, Stress and Academic Success in College* Research in Higher Education, Vol. 46, No. 6, September.