GO, ADELINA MULYANI

STUDENT'S MOTIVATIONAL GOAL ORIENTATION IN FACING NATIONAL EXAM IN INDONESIA

Master's Thesis in Education

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Master's Degree Programme in Learning, Education and Technology

2017
Title
Student's Motivational Goal Orientation in Facing National Exam in Indonesia

Major subject
Learning, Education and Technology

Type of thesis
Master Degree Thesis

Year
2017

Number of pages
50 + 5

Abstract
The aim of this study is, first, to explore students’ personal achievement goal orientation in relation to National Exam in Indonesia. The second aim is to study the relation between students’ perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation preferences with student’s personal achievement goal. According to Zimmerman (2011) goal orientation is the purpose or the reason of the learners’ achievement. This study used goal orientation theory as the theoretical framework. Goal orientation theory’s primary focus is how students think about their performance in their study. Many researchers have identified two types of goals that are mainly prominent in an achievement setting and they were referred by various names in the literature. However, in this study, these two goal orientations will be referred to as a mastery goal orientation and a performance goal orientation. Mastery goal orientation focuses on the development of knowledge, new skill, deep learning and improving their level of competence, thus is self-referential. Performance goals determines to demonstrate their competency to gain positive judgment, and in some cases, learners will feel successful by trying to outperform peers on academic tasks.

This study was conducted using sample collected in a primary and secondary school in Indonesia. Pattern of Adaptive Learning Survey (PALS) by Carol Midgely et al., (2000) was used as data collection instrument in this study. There were three scale used; (1) Personal Achievement Goal Orientations, (2) Perceptions of Teacher’s Goals, and (3) Perceptions Of Parent’s Goals Perceptions. The questionnaires had been developed according to the trichotomies theoretical framework for students’ goals. The questionnaires used had also been modified to focus on engagement in specific task which is the National Exam.

The results shows that there are; (a) non-significant differences of exam and non-exam group, for both personal mastery goal orientation and performance-approach goal orientation; (b) perception of teachers’ and parents’ mastery goal orientation do influence students’ personal mastery goal orientation due to moderate positive correlation result when it comes to students’ perception of the goal orientation delivered by parents and teachers in exam group students; (c) perception of teachers’ and parents’ mastery goal orientation have weak positive correlation with student’s personal mastery goal orientation in non-exam group students. On the other hand, for students’ personal performance-approach orientation, perception of teachers’ and parents’ performance-approach goal orientation do not have any correlation.

The conclusions of this study highlight that there are many aspects influencing students’ personal achievement goal orientation that need to be considered. National Exam, in this context, was not giving much impact since there was no difference found in exam and non-exam group. Predictors of this result might be influenced of the International Curriculum adopted by the school or caused by the timing when the survey were distributed (post-exam). Parents’ and teachers’ contribution in endorsement of goal orientations are somehow important according to the correlation result. In the future study, more specific result might be seen from pre- and post-exam data to analyze whether the result differ from pre- and post-exam. In this case, longitudinal study will be suitable method to collect the data. Another suggested topic for further research is to investigate the relationship between teachers’ personal goal orientation in their teaching with students’ learning behavior.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, students will face National Exam thrice in their school year, which in grade 6 (the end of their primary years education); grade 9 (the end of their junior high school education) and lastly in grade 12 (the end of their senior high school education). National Exam is one of important and interesting issues in Indonesian Education. As the biggest Archipelago country in the world, Indonesia has wide spread islands around and due to the geographic condition, National Exam is being used as measurement tool to ensure quality of education. Even though score obtained from National Exam is not the main determiner of students’ graduation, National Exam is still having direct influence in students learning motivation. Referring to Qudsyi & Putri's (2016) study among high school students in facing National Exam, it is found that there is negative relationship between student’s self-efficacy and anxiety level felt in pre-exam situation. More study found that self-efficacy and perception of goal orientation from learning environment (Parents, Teacher and Peers) are having association with adoption of students’ personal achievement goal orientation (Hult & Germano, 2016; Gutman, 2006; A Kaplan & Maehr, 1999; Pajares & Cheong, 2003; Wolters, Yu, & Pintrich, 1996).

There are several researches done related to National Exam in Indonesia previously (Dewi & Mangunsong, 2012; Qudsyi & Putri, 2016; Suharto, 2012). However, the data normally collected just from one grade level which faced or about to face National Exam with larger number of participants. In contrast, this current study is trying to cover a wider range of grades. It consisted of multiple grades which divided into exam group (Grade 6, 9, and 12) and non-exam group (Grade 7, 8, and 10).

In previous studies related to National Exam, the research is more likely focused on test anxiety or self-efficacy. One of the example is the study conducted by Dewi & Mangunsong (2012) about contribution of student’s perception towards teacher’s goal orientation and student’s orientation as a mediator in test anxiety on elementary school’s Final Exam. Similar study conducted by Qudsyi & Putri (2016) aims to analyze correlation of self-efficacy and anxiety of National examination among high school students. In this current study, goal orientation theory
is being used as the main theoretical framework instead. Considerable number of researchers have identified two types of goals that are mainly prominent in an achievement setting, and they were referred by various names in the literature (e.g., Ames & Archer, 1988; Anderman & Maehr, 1994; Anderman & Midgley, 1997; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Gutman, 2006; Maehr & Midgley, 1991; Middleton, Kaplan, & Midgley, 2004; Pajares & Cheong, 2003). However, in this study, these two goal orientations will be referred to as a mastery goal orientation and a performance goal orientation. Mastery goal orientation focus on the development of knowledge, new skill, deep learning and improving their level of competence, thus is self-referential. In contrast, performance goals oriented learners determine to demonstrate their competency to gain positive judgment, and in some cases learners will feel successful by trying to outperform peers on academic tasks.

This study was conducted using sample collected in a primary and secondary school. Pattern of Adaptive Learning Survey (PALS) by Carol Midgley et al., (2000) is used as data collection instrument in this study. Three scales were used: (1) Personal Achievement Goal Orientations, (2) Perceptions of Teacher’s Goals, and (3) Perception Of Parent’s Goals Perceptions. The questionnaires had been developed according to the trichotomies theoretical framework for students’ goals and had been modified to focus on focus on engagement in specific task, which is the National Exam. PALS had been used in several studies focusing on personal achievement goal orientation, adaptive and maladaptive learning pattern, and perception of goal orientation from learning environment and teacher’s goal orientation. (Review from Dewi & Mangunsong, 2012; Friedel, Hruda, & Midgley, 2001; A Kaplan & Maehr, 1999; Avi Kaplan & Midgley, 1997; Middleton, Kaplan, & Midgley, 2004; Carol Midgley & Urdan, 2001; Urdan & Midgley, 2003).

Endorsement of mastery goal orientation has been found to be related to positive learning outcomes such as self-efficacy, positive affect, student’s wellbeing, persistence, and self-regulated learning. In contrast, endorsement of performance goal orientation is commonly associated to negative affect in events which involve difficulty or challenges, and they rather use of surface rather than deep learning strategies. (Review on Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Wolters et al., 1996)
This study aims to, first, explore students’ personal achievement goal orientation in relation to National Exam. The second aim is to study the relation between students’ perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation preferences with student’s personal achievement goal. Relationship between curriculums practice by the school will be discussed in relation with this study’s aims.
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Motivation have an important role in learning process, motivation is the drive to do things. There is no universal definition of what motivation is and explanation of how it works, researchers have agreed that a students’ level of motivation is what predetermines their engagement in learning (Guay, Vallerand, & Blanchard, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Zimmerman, 2011). There are many different source of learning motivation, which students are constantly expose to in their learning process. These sources can be divided into motivational beliefs and self-regulation strategies (Zimmerman, 2011). Researchers have tried to shed light to it by differentiating intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000) measuring situational and contextual motivation (Guay et al., 2000) analyzing goal-setting (Midgley, 2002) and so on.

Personal goals (or personal goal orientations) refer to the specific goals that individuals strive to reach in achievement contexts, such as school or in this study context focusing on National Exam. In this study goal orientation theory is used as a theoretical framework. According to Zimmerman (2011) goal orientation is the purpose or the reason of learners’ achievement. Goal orientation theory primary focus is how students think about their performance in school and study, their tasks and themselves in learning. Many researchers had adopted goal orientation framework in their studies (e.g., Ames & Archer, 1988; Anderman & Maehr, 1994; Anderman & Midgley, 1997; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Gutman, 2006; Maehr & Midgley, 1991; Middleton, Kaplan, & Midgley, 2004; Pajares & Cheong, 2003).

2.1 Goal Orientation Theory

The original definition of goal orientation was a situated orientation for action in achievement tasks (Ames, 1992; Dweck, 1986). In later on researchers discussed that goal orientation is not just focusing on what people are attempting to achieve, but it defines on why and how people are trying to achieve various objectives (Anderman & Maehr, 1994). Goal Orientation is one of the interesting part of motivation when it comes to learning. There are various investigation on the goal orientation. Several research investigate it as a “state” (e.g., through experimental manipulations or questionnaires that focused on engagement in a specific task) or as a “trait” (e.g., through questionnaires and interviews that focused on cross-situational engagement such
as in a domain, class, and even learning in general). However in this study students’ personal achievement goal orientation will be investigate as a state, since questionnaires used are focused on engagement in specific task which is the National Exam.

For the past couple of decades, there has been numerous researches in the field of goal orientation as presented in the figure 1 (e.g. Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Maehr & Midgley, 1991; Midgley, Arunkumar, & Urdan, 1996). These researchers have examined and defined goal orientation in various terms. Most of the model propose two general goal orientations, which concern on the reason or aim of an individual when approaching and engaging in a learning process. Mastery, learning, task goal orientation, stand for similar understanding where learners are trying to develop new skills and gain in depth learning to improve their competence. For performance goal orientation learners are focusing on their performance of gaining positive judgement or public recognition and avoiding negative judgment, they are focusing on demonstrating their ability and skills to others.

Figure 1: Models of Goal Orientation
According to Ames (1992), the two goal orientations are labeled *Mastery* and *Performance* goals. Mastery goal orient learners “develop new skills, try to understand their work, improving their level of competence, or achieving a sense of mastery based on self-referenced standard” (p.262). In contrast performance goal orient learners focus on their ability and self-worth, public recognition that one has done better than other. In study did by Vedder-Weiss & Fortus (2013), the results highlighted importance of mastery goals. The result indicates that students’ who are more driven by the mastery goal orientation to develop competence in science class, tend to be more engaged in science learning in school as well as out of school (continuing motivation). In Dweck’s model, the two goal orientations are labeled as *learning* and *performance* goal. Learning goals focus on increasing competence and performance goal focus on gaining positive judgement or avoiding negative judgement of competence in completing or performing a task (Dweck & Leggett, 1988).

Endorsement of mastery goal orientation has been found to be related to positive learning outcomes such as self-efficacy, positive affect, student’s wellbeing, persistence, and self-regulated learning (Review on Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Wolters et al., 1996). In contrast endorsement of performance goal orientation commonly associated to negative affect in learning process which involve difficulty or challenges, they rather use of surface learning strategies rather than deep learning strategies. Nevertheless, there are several studies that did not find such negative learning outcomes. In study did by Kaplan & Maehr (2007), found that the relation between performance and mastery goals is not dichotomous; students’ are not either mastery or performance oriented. Students can have both goal orientations or they can be highly oriented toward one goal orientation while not so much to the other; or they can be highly oriented to one of the goal orientation. In another study did by Wolters et al., (1996) endorsement of performance goal orientation positively predicted students’ task value, self-efficacy, and cognitive and self-regulatory strategy used. Often, performance goals orientation has been associated with a maladaptive pattern of cognition, affect, and behavior (Review on Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988). However, unlike the researches concerning mastery goals, research concerning performance goals are inconsistent.
In studies conducted by Maehr and Midgley and their colleagues (e.g., Anderman & Midgley, 1997; Kaplan & Midgley, 1997; Maehr & Midgley, 1991; Middleton & Midgley, 1997; Midgley et al., 1998, 1996) have mainly used the term *task goals* and *performance goals* in their research which still correspond with Ames and Dweck. Task-focused goals orient learners to increase their competence and mastering the task to progress in learning. Performance goals orientation aims on doing better than others and demonstrating ability to the peers and teachers.

Harackiewicz and Elliot and their colleagues are having same definition of the two goal orientation, labeled *Mastery* and *Performance* goal orientation. Mastery goal orientation focus on the development of knowledge, skill, and competence and thus is self-referential. Performance goals determined to demonstrate competence by trying to outperform peers on academic tasks (e.g., Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996) They also make distinction between two types of performance goals: *performance-approach* and *performance avoid*. This distinction of occurred due to early studies in goal orientation often confounded two types of performance goal. According to their research that individuals can be positively motivated to try to outperform others and demonstrate their competence, which reflects performance-approach orientation goal. In contrast, individuals can be negatively motivated and try to avoid appearing incompetent, dumb, or stupid, which labelled as performance-avoid goal orientation.

These researchers have identified two types of goals that are mainly prominent in an achievement setting. Referred to by various names in the literature. In this study these two goal orientations will be referred to as a mastery goal orientation and a performance goal orientation. Mastery goal orientation focus on the development of knowledge, new skill, deep learning and improving their level of competence, thus is self-referential. Performance goals determined to demonstrate their competency to gain positive judgment, in some extend learners will feel successful by trying to outperform peers on academic tasks.

**2.2 Influential Aspect in Student’s Personal Achievement Goal Orientation.**

In several studies, there are arguments about the influence of goal orientations that being emphases on their learning environment and how it effect students’ personal achievement goal
orientation (Ames, 1992; Avi Kaplan & Maehr, 2007; Mucherah, 2008; C A Wolters, 2004). These emphases are predicted to be mediated by students’ perceptions as predictor of their personal achievement goal orientation (Nolen & Haladyna, 1990). According to Wolters (2004) when students perceive a mastery goal orientation, most likely they will adopt personal mastery goal orientation. Then, when students perceive a performance goal orientation, most likely they will adopt personal performance goal orientation. Perception of mastery-oriented goal structure, associated with adaptive educational outcomes. Whereas, perception of performance-oriented goals, associated with maladaptive outcomes (Turner et al., 2002; Wolters, 2004). A perceived emphasis on demonstrating ability or competence may be stressful to students and it has been found to be associated with negative effects, whereas a perceived emphasis on mastery and understanding may provide opportunities for growth of deep learning and has been found to be associated with positive affects in learning (Ames & Archer, 1988; A Kaplan & Maehr, 1999).

Research conducted on goal perception received different result in their finding. Anderman & Midgley (1997) found that there is no relation between student’s grade and perceptions of mastery goal structure and the perceptions of performance goal structure are negatively related to the grade. However, Midgley & Urdan (2001) found positive relation between perceptions of mastery goal structure and grades in mathematic. In this study there are three influential factor considered as predictor of student’s personal achievement goal orientation, these factors are; teachers, parents, and National Exam.

2.2.1 Teacher’s Goal Orientation

Motivation research and theory has emphasized a social-cognitive perspective (Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Weiner, 1985). Based on this perspective, learning motivation develops from interaction between students within social context of the classroom and school. Social-contextual factors (messages from teachers about difficulty of the task, information about importance of learning materials, delivery of learning goals and many others) are influencing cognition of students regarding academic work and performance (e.g., Learning outcomes, Learning goal orientation, self-efficacy in academic ability). Align with social context, teachers are having vital role in adaptation of students’ personal achievement goal orientation.
Teachers’ goal orientation are influenced by different intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors include teachers’ personal value and belief. Extrinsic factor consists of; school’s expectation, curriculum or standard set by Ministry of Education including parents’ expectation. When teachers adopted mastery goal orientation in the teaching process most probably they will encourage students to explore more deeply into tasks to gain deep understanding and importance of learning, as well as intellectual growth are highlighted the by recognizing the effort in learning. On the other side, when teachers adopted the performance orientation, most probably they will emphasize the importance of getting good grades, right answers, or just to past the test.

 Teachers may influence their students’ motivation through endorsement of the curriculum and instructional practices in the teaching and learning process (Logan & Skamp, 2008), through social support and engagement they offered (Wang & Eccles, 2012) and by facilitating students to discover their strengths and being role models for the students (Sjaastad, 2012). Students who perceived mastery goal orientation from their teachers may be encourage to be engage in academic work in order to develop competence by gaining deep understanding and meaningful learning. Students who perceived performance goal orientation from their teachers may focus on getting good score or passing the test, so they will not look stupid or incompetence from other students, their aim to be engage in academic work is to demonstrate competence (Middleton et al., 2004; Carol Midgley et al., 2000).

Perceived goal orientation have a direct impact on students’ engagement in classroom setting, For example in research done by Patrick, Anderman, Ryan, Midgley, & Edelin (2001) to investigate the explicit and implicit ways used by four fifth-grade teacher in communicating goal orientation to their students. The study used survey data about perception of classroom mastery and performance goal structure, data collected from 223 students in 10 classes to identify 4 classrooms motivational profiles. Classroom observation was used to generate data to describe teachers’ talk and practices regarding tasks, authority, recognition, grouping, evaluation, time, social interactions, and help-seeking in those classes. The study found that teachers who were perceived having high mastery goal orientation focus, deliver learning as an active process and it was reflected in their practices. They required involvement from all the students, encouraged students’ interaction, emphasized on effort for learning and demonstrated
social and affective support for students’ progress. On the other hands, teachers who stress on formal assessments, grades and students’ comparative performances are strongly perceived by the students to emphasize performance goal orientation.

In study by Vedder-Weiss & Fortus (2013) the aim was to analyzed the students' perceptions of goals emphases in their educational environment which consisted of parents, peers, teachers, and schools, in relation to their own goals orientations and their engagement in science learning in (classroom) and out of school (extra-curricular engagement). Data was collected from fifth to eighth grade of Israeli students with total participants of 1,614 students. The study is also compared relation between traditional and democratic schools in elementary and middle school grade levels. Result of the study shown that perceptions of the goals that significant adults (parents and teachers) emphasize were predictors of students' motivation, in and out of school, than perceptions of the goals that peers and schools emphasize. And Perceptions of teachers' performance goals emphases negatively predicted classroom engagement.

2.2.2 Parent’s Goal Orientation

Beside school environment and goal orientation perceived from school, home environment plays an important role as well on constructing student’s personal learning goal. Many studies have presented that parents also influence their children’s motivation for learning (Ames, 1992; Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Kamins & Dweck, 1999; Wentzel, 1998; Zimmerman, Bandura, & Martinez-Pons, 1992). Parents could support students’ engagement by highlighting the value of learning (Lambaron, Brown, Mounts, & Steinberg, 1992) through their responses to academic success or failure (Kamins & Dweck, 1999).

Friedel et al., (2001) conducted a study from students in four seventh grade classes (N = 945), studying about the relation between perceived parent achievement goals and children's use of avoidance behaviors in learning found that students' personal goals were predicted more strongly by perceived parent goals than by perceived teacher goals. When students perceived that their parents expected them to focus on inquiring deep learning by improving themselves and develop and acquire new skills, students will more likely adopt mastery goal orientation. Thus, Students
who tend to adopt mastery goal are highly supported and encourage by their parents during difficult learning task faced by the students (Hokoda & Fincham, 1995; Wentzel, 1998).

According to Schunk, Pintrich, & Meece (2008) there are positive relations between parental involvement in schooling and several motivational variables, including school engagement, intrinsic motivation, and mastery goals. However, when students perceived that their parents emphasized school grades, demonstration of ability and/or avoiding the demonstration of lack of ability in comparison to others, then a performance goal orientation was more likely to be adopted by the students and probability of avoiding help and self-handicapping. (Friedel et al., 2001).

Based on Gutman (2006) studies on how parent goal orientations influence the math achievement of 50 African American students during the high school transition, students whose parents endorsed mastery goals had significantly higher grades than their peers whose parents did not endorsed mastery goals, while there is no significant differences were found between students whose parents did endorse and students whose parents did not endorse performance goals. Students were a part in larger longitudinal studies in southern Michigan, in which more than 75% of them were at or below U.S. poverty threshold. Only 5 of them were take care of by their father, 5 were with their guardian and the rest were with their mother. The study was conducted by giving out survey during last year in middle school and first year spring in high school, in which the researchers read them aloud in the classroom and students’ mathematics GPA, on the other hand, were obtained from the school record. Their parents were also interviewed in order to obtain the data about parents’ goal orientation. Pattern of Adaptive Learning Survey, same with this study, was used as a scale. In this case, parents’ mastery goals were found to be more influential than parent performance goals in terms of achievement in math.

2.2.3 Motivational Basis National Exam Creates in Indonesia

In Indonesia, students will face National Exam thrice in their school year, which in grade 6 in the end of their primary years education; grade 9 in the end of their junior high school education and lastly in grade 12 in the end of their senior high school education. National Exam is one of
important and interesting issue in Indonesian Education. Due to wide spread islands around Indonesia, National Exam is being use as measurement tool of Indonesian education quality.

Indonesian education system consist of basic education, secondary education, and higher education. Basic education consists of six years of elementary education and three years of junior secondary schools. Secondary education consists of three years of schooling at general senior secondary schools or vocational senior secondary schools.

Based on Ministry of Education regulation (Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia, 2013) No. 3 of 2013, there are four standards for completing a certain level of students, (1) students need to complete their entire learning program (6 years for primary schools and 3 years for both junior and senior high school), obtain a minimum grade at final assessment for all subjects, pass school exams, and pass the National Examination (UN).

Under the regulation of National Education Standards Agency (Peraturan Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan, 2013) No. 0022/P/BSNP/XI/2013 about Standard Operating Procedures (POS) Implementation of National Examination in School Year 2013/2014, graduation of students from National Exam (UN) is determined based on Final Score (NA). Final score (NA) is obtained from combined score of school exam (40%) and several subjects tested through National Exam (UN) (60%). Average of Final score (NA) should be minimum of 5.5 out of 10 and each of the subjects should not score lower than 4.0 out of 10.

Even though score obtained from National Exam is not the main determination of students’ graduation, National Exam is still having direct influence in students learning motivation. In Qudsyi & Putri's (2016) study among high school students in facing National Exam, they found that there is a negative relationship between student’s self-efficacy and anxiety level felt by student in pre-exam. More study found that self-efficacy and perception of goal correlate with adopted student’s personal goal orientation (Hult & Germano, 2016; Gutman, 2006; A Kaplan & Maehr, 1999; Pajares & Cheong, 2003; Wolters, Yu, & Pintrich, 1996). The other influence is, that some Indonesian Universities or Overseas University are using National Exam result as recommendation for university enrollment or scholarship (Maulipasi, 2015).
Due to the importance and influence of National Exam to students’ future upon graduation, students are psychological burden during pre-exam period. According to Indonesian Ministry of Education (2012) survey on National Exam reported in tempo.co, 56% of students felt anxious in facing of UN, 22.4% of students felt very anxious, and 21.6% of students feel indifferent in facing of UN. The survey also presented the results of that as much as 37.2% of students feel very worried about the exam, 37.2% of students felt quite worried, and 25.6% of students feel not worried. Another survey about test anxiety was distributed to 292 National Exam Participant in Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri 7 Bandar Lampung, the result shown that 47% of the students are worried that they are not able to achieve their parents’ expectation in getting high grade in the exam and 53% or the students were confident and ready to face National Exam (Suharto, 2012).

In study conducted by Herman & Golan (1993) about how much influence does standardized testing apply on teaching and learning in upper elementary classroom, revealed that standardized testing has extensive effects on schools and the teaching and learning processes within them especially it will have stronger effects on special needs students. Schools stressed messages to their teachers about the importance of test-curriculum alignment, and teachers design their lesson plan with such alignment in mind.

Student accountability have grown, so has the emphasis on ability differences between students, which may promote performance goal structure. There are the pressure on teachers to produce high test scores, which may promote controlling behavior among teacher (Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006). Extensive time, attention, and effort are devoted to make sure that students are taught tested objectives, are given practice based on the test content, and spending special time in test-preparation exercises. According to the result, standardize test affected less attention to science, to art, to thinking skills, to skills and content. External demands caused by curriculum, in this context National Exam as the standardize test will promote shallow levels of understanding, that may challenge these efforts and receive training in how to create mastery goal structures, supportive learning environments, and lifelong learner attitudes (Herman & Golan, 1993).
2.3 Conclusion of Theoretical Framework

Goal orientation is one of a considerable aspects of learning motivation, as it is revealed to be affecting both learning outcome and learning behavior. Zimmerman (2011) goal orientation is the purpose or the reason of learners’ achievement. Personal goal orientations refer to the specific goals that individuals strive to reach in achievement contexts. Most of goal orientation model referred two general goal orientations, *Mastery* (learners are trying to develop new skills and gain in depth learning to improve their competence) and *Performance* (learners are focusing on their performance of gaining positive judgement or public recognition and avoiding negative judgment, they are focusing on demonstrating their ability and skills to others) goal orientation. (review to Ames, 1992; Dweck & Legget, 1988; Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Maehr & Midgley, 1991; Midgley, Arunkumar, & Urdan, 1996).

Moreover, previous studies found that there are influences from the learner’s learning environment, be it from home or school environment. In Indonesian education context, National Exam is included as one of the influencer. Students who perceived mastery goal orientation from their teachers may be encourage to be engage in academic work in order to develop competence by gaining deep understanding and meaningful learning. Students who perceived performance goal orientation from their teachers may focus on getting good score or passing the test, so they will not look stupid or incompetence from other students, their aim to be engage in academic work is to demonstrate competence (Middleton et al., 2004; Carol Midgley et al., 2000).

Similar result being found in relation to students’ perception of parents’ goal orientation. Students' personal goals were predicted more strongly by perceived parent goals than by perceived teacher goals. When students perceived that their parents expected them to focus on inquiring deep learning by improving themselves and develop and acquire new skills, students will more likely adopt mastery goal orientation (Friedel et al., 2001). Thus, Students who tend to adopt mastery goal are highly supported and encourage by their parents during difficult learning task faced by the students (Hokoda & Fincham, 1995; Wentzel, 1998).
Besides learning environment, students are also faced with curriculum expectation set by the Ministry of Education. In this context, National Exam is one of the cause of anxiety that students experiencing. Standardize test caused less attention to science, to art, to thinking skills, to skills and content. External demands caused by curriculum, in this context National Exam as the standardize test will promote shallow levels of understanding, that may challenge these efforts and receive training in how to create mastery goal structures, supportive learning environments, and lifelong learner attitudes (Herman & Golan, 1993).
3. AIM & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The aim of this study is first to explore students’ personal achievement goal orientation in relation to national exam. The second aim is to study the relation between students’ perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation preferences with student’s personal achievement goal.

The specific research question for this study are; (a) Do the students’ goal orientation differ between the exam and non-exam group? ;(b) Is there a correlation between students’ own goal orientation and their perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation in exam group students?; (c) Is there a correlation between students’ own goal orientation and their perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation in non-exam group students?.

This study will, hopefully, reveal more insights on influence of learning environment (National Exam, Teachers, and Parents) towards students learning motivation in term of personal achievement goal orientation. Through this students, educators and parents are hopefully more aware of the importance of students’ personal achievement goal orientation in their learning outcomes. So, every influential factors are able to work hand-in-hand to support students to be lifelong learner.
4. METHODS

4.1 Participants

This study was conducted using sample collected from Sekolah Victory Plus, Indonesia. The school was established in 1998 located in Bekasi, Indonesia. The school implements combination of curriculum which are; Indonesian National Curriculum, International Baccalaureate and Cambridge Curriculum. The total participants of this studies are 283 (Male \( N = 134 \) (47.3%) and Female \( N = 149 \) (52.7%) participants. Data was collected from students ranging from grade 6, aged around 12 years old (\( N = 53 \)); grade 7, aged around 13 years old (\( N = 46 \)); grade 8, aged around 14 years old (\( N = 57 \)); grade 9, aged around 15 years old (\( N = 39 \)); grade 10, aged around 16 years old (\( N = 55 \)) and grade 12, aged around 18 years old (\( N = 33 \)). Data collection was approved by both Primary and Secondary Principal, with acknowledgments of the School Board. The data used in this study were collected during second semester of the students’ grade levels (April-May 2016) after the National Exam.

4.2 Instruments

Instrument being used in this study is scales from the Pattern of Adaptive Learning Survey (PALS) (Carol Midgley et al., 2000). There are three scale used in this study, namely personal achievement goal orientations, perceptions of teacher’s goals, and perceptions of parent’s goals perceptions. The questionnaire has been developed according to the trichotomies theoretical framework for students’ goal orientations (see, Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Middleton & Midgley, 1997). Total of 30 items were distributed to the students. The questionnaires used have been modified to focus on engagement in specific task which is the National Exam. The questionnaires used are summarized below and Table 1 presents sample items of all scales.

Table 1: Sample items for the scales used in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Achievement Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Mastery Goal Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s important to me that I learn a lot of new concepts after taking the National Exam.</td>
<td>One of my goals is to master a lot of new skills after taking National Exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance-Approach Goal Orientation

One of my goals is to show others that school work and National Exam is easy for me.
One of my goals in taking National Exam is to look smart comparing to the other students

Performance-Avoid Goal Orientation

One of my goals is to keep others from thinking I’m not smart in school.
One of my goals in taking National Exam is to avoid looking like I am having difficulty doing the work.

Perception of Teacher’s Goal Orientation

Mastery Goal Orientation

My teacher thinks mistakes are okay as long as we are learning. One of my goals.
My teacher wants us to understand our work, not just memorize it.

Performance-Approach Goal Orientation

My teacher points out those students who get good grades as an example to all of us.
My teacher lets us know which students get the highest scores on a test.

Perception of Parents’ Goal Orientation

Mastery Goal Orientation

My parents would like me to do challenging school work, even if I make mistakes.
My parents want me to understand my school work, not just memorize how to do it.

Performance-Approach Goal Orientation

My parents would like it if I could show that my exam result are better than other students in my class.
My parents would like me to show others that I am good with my studies through my grades.

4.2.1 Student’s Achievement Goal Orientation Scale

It consists 3 subscales covering; mastery goal orientation ($\alpha = .687$, with 5 questions), performance-approach orientation ($\alpha = .820$, with 5 questions), and performance-avoidance orientation ($\alpha = .531$, with 4 questions).

4.2.2 Perceptions of teacher’s goal orientations scale

This scale consist of 2 subscales including; Teacher Mastery Goal Orientation ($\alpha = .794$, with 5 questions) and Teacher Performance Goal Orientation ($\alpha = .615$, with 3 questions).
4.2.3 Perceptions of parents’ goal orientations scale

Revised edition of the questionnaire ‘Perceptions of Parents, Home Life, and Neighborhood’ from the Manual for the Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scales (PALS) (Carol Midgley et al., 2000) was used to assess student’s perceived parent goals. There are 2 subscale, the first subscale is, Parent Mastery Goal Orientation ($\alpha = .791$, with 6 questions), which refers to students’ perceptions that their parents want them to develop their competence. And the second subscale is, Parents Performance Goal Orientation ($\alpha = .791$, with 4 questions), which refers to students’ perceptions that their parents want them to demonstrate their competence.

4.3 Data collection procedure

Surveys were completed by the students during their school hours in 30-40mins sessions. Purpose of the study and survey procedure were explained face-to-face in the session. Students were being informed that their answers were confidential, and it will not affect their grades or performance in the school. The survey was distributed via email using online survey which was considered to be the most convenient procedure, since all students are equipped with their personal gadget. The use of a Likert-type response scale was described with example and translation to Bahasa Indonesia of the survey was provided. The survey format was in 5-point scale, the range is from 1 (Not True at All) to 5 (Very True). The session was casual and students were encouraged to raise their inquiries regarding the survey. Students’ personal goal orientations were assessed after the National Exam for grade 6, 9 and 12. For grade 7, 8, and 10, students’ personal goal orientations close to the end of academic year of their grades. Students were asked to respond to items in terms of their National Exam result rather than about any of school work or particular school subject.

4.4 Data analysis and Research Method

Research method used in this study is quantitative research and IBM SPPS Version 23 is used as analysis software. Data was collected using Google Form and exported into Microsoft Excel sheet. From Microsoft Excel sheet, data was input into SPSS to be analyze. The first step was to test for data reliability using Cronbach Alpha test. The second step was to recode items in
subscales to be new variable for further analysis. Followed by normality test of the new variable to discover either to use parametric or nonparametric test to answer this study research questions. The workflow of preliminary analysis of the data is briefly display in figure 2.

Figure 2: The workflow of preliminary analysis using SPSS

Data input to SPSS
Cronbach Alpha test for Reliability
Recoding items of subscale to new variable
Normality Test of the New Variable
Not Normally distributed result = Nonparametric statistic
Spearman Rank Corellation Coefficient and Mann-Whitney U test.

4.4.1. Reliability Test

Cronbach Alpha test used to test the reliability of the data. This test is necessary due to the fact that students were asked more than three times for one subscale in the questionnaires. Result of the reliability test can be view on Table 2. Standard use to accept reliability result $p > 0.6$. Due to unreliability of Performance-avoid Goal Orientation subscale, all subscale of Performance-avoid goal are omitted from this study.

Table 2: Reliability Index Evaluated by Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
<td>Mastery Goal Orientation (5 Items)</td>
<td>$\alpha = .687$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s important to me that I learn a lot of new concepts after taking the National Exam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of my goals is to learn as much as I can.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Orientations</td>
<td>One of my goals is to master a lot of new skills after taking National Exam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s important to me that I thoroughly understand the task I have at school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s important to me that I improve my skills this year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Approach Goal Orientation (5 Items)</td>
<td>It’s important to me that my school friends think I am good at my school work or studies.</td>
<td>$\alpha = .820$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of my goals is to show others that I’m good at my studies.
One of my goals is to show others that school work and National Exam is easy for me.
One of my goals in taking National Exam is to look smart comparing to the other students
It’s important to me that I look smart compared to others.

**Perception of Teacher’s Goals**

**Teacher Mastery Goal (5 Items)**
- My teacher thinks mistakes are okay as long as we are learning.
- My teacher wants us to understand our work, not just memorize it.
- My teacher really wants us to enjoy learning new things.
- My teacher recognizes us for trying hard.
- My teacher gives us time to really explore and understand new ideas.

**Teacher Performance-Approach Goal (3 Items)**
- My teacher points out those students who get good grades as an example to all of us.
- My teacher lets us know which students get the highest scores on a test.
- My teacher tells us how we compare to other students.

**Teacher Performance-Avoid Goal (4 Items)**
- My teacher tells us that it is important that we don’t look stupid in class.
- My teacher says that showing others that we are not bad at class work should be our goal.
- My teacher tells us it’s important to join in discussions and answer questions so it doesn’t look like we can’t do the work.
- My teacher tells us it’s important to answer questions in class, so it doesn’t look like we can’t do the work.

**Perception of Parents’ Goals**

**Parents Mastery Goal (5 Items)**
- My parents want me to spend time thinking about concepts.
- My parents want my school work or learning in school to be challenging for me.
- My parents would like me to do challenging school work, even if I make mistakes.
- My parents want me to understand my school work, not just memorize how to do it.
- My parents want me to see how my school work relates to things outside of school.

**Parents Performance Goal (5 Items)**
- My parents don’t like it when I make mistakes in my school work.
- My parents would like it if I could show that my exam result are better than other students in my class.
- My parents would like me to show others that I am good with my studies through my grades.
- My parents think getting the right answers in exam is very important.

### 4.4.2 Recoding Item to New Variable

As it can be seen on table 2, each subscale contained minimum of three items, subsequently items in subscales need to be recode to create new variable for further analysis. New value of the variables were the mean of total items.
4.4.3 Normality Test

Data was analyses in two groups; Exam Group of students that consisted grade 6, 9 and 12 who faced national exam on that year, and Non-Exam Group of students consist of grade 7, 8, and 10 who are not facing national exam on that year. Exam Group and Non-exam Group will be the grouping variable of this studies. Based Shapiro-Wilk’s test ($p > .05$) and visual interpretation of the scale’s histogram, normal Q-Q plots and box plots, results of all subscales were not normally distributed for both Exam and Non-exam group. (See Appendix 1 for histogram, normal Q-Q plots and box plots). Result of skewness and kurtosis can be view on table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Skewness Stat.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Kurtosis Stat.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement Goal Orientations</td>
<td>Mastery Goal Orientation</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.957</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exam Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-exam Group</td>
<td>-0.569</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance-Approach Goal Orientation</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exam Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-exam Group</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-0.427</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Teacher’s Goals</td>
<td>Teacher Mastery Goal</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.786</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exam Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-exam Group</td>
<td>-0.488</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Performance-Approach Goal</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.569</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exam Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-exam Group</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-0.351</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Parents’ Goals</td>
<td>Parents Mastery Goal</td>
<td>-0.247</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exam Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-exam Group</td>
<td>-0.563</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents Performance Goal</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-0.468</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exam Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-exam Group</td>
<td>-0.416</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-0.499</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The method used to analyze the data is nonparametric method, due to Normality test result where the data is not normally distributed. Mann-Whitney U test is used to find differences between student’s personal achievement goal between exam group and non-exam group students. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient is used to analyze the data to find the correlation
between students’ perception of parents’ and teachers’ goal orientation with students’ personal achievement goal orientation.
5. RESULT

The aim of this study is first to explore students’ personal achievement goal orientation in relation to national exam. The second aim is to study the relation between students’ perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation preferences with student’s personal achievement goal. Results are reported in three sections. The first section contains result of Mann-Whitney U test, used to find differences between student’s personal achievement goal between exam group and non-exam group students. And the second section contains Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient is use to analyze correlation of students perception of teacher’s and parent’s goal orientation with student’s personal achievement goal of exam group students. The forth third is similar to the third section, however it is spearman rank correlation coefficient result of non-exam group students.

5.1 Do the students’ goal orientation differ between the exam and non-exam group?

To answer this research question, student’s personal achievement goal orientation in exam and non-exam group were compare using the Mann Whitney U test, a non-parametric statistical technique.

5.1.1 Mastery Goal Orientation

According to the result shown in Table 4, there are insignificant differences \( (Z = -1.720; p = 0.085) \) of exam and non-exam groups students in their personal mastery goal orientation. Rank average of exam groups’ students was 132.63 and non-exam group students rank average was 149.41.
Table 4: Result of Mann Whitney U-Test to Compare the Groups Personal Mastery Goal Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Rank Average</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>132.63</td>
<td>8704.00</td>
<td>-1.720</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-exam</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>149.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

5.1.2 Performance-Approach Goal Orientation

Based on the result shown in Table 5, there are insignificant differences ($Z = -1.593; p = 0.111$) of exam and non-exam groups students in their personal performance-approach goal orientation. Rank average of exam group students was 133.32 and non-exam group students rank average was 148.87.

Table 5: Result of Mann Whitney U-Test to Compare the Groups Personal Mastery Goal Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Rank Average</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133.32</td>
<td>8789.50</td>
<td>-1.593</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-exam</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>148.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

5.2 Is there a correlation between students’ own goal orientation and their perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation in exam group students?

According to Table 6, correlation result in exam group students ($N = 125$) are as following; Correlation between student’s personal mastery goal and student’s perception of teacher’s mastery goal orientation is moderate ($r = .475, p < .05$), as well as student’s personal mastery goal and student’s perception of parents’ mastery goal orientation ($r = .441, p < .05$).

There is no correlation between student’s personal mastery goal and student’s perception of teacher’s performance-approach goal orientation ($r = .114, p < .05$) and student’s personal mastery goal and student’s perception of parents’ performance-approach goal orientation ($r = -$
Similar result found between student’s personal performance-approach goal and student’s perception of teacher’s mastery goal orientation \( (r = -0.156, \ p < 0.05) \), student’s personal performance-approach goal and student’s perception of teacher’s performance-approach goal orientation \( (r = 0.178, p < .05) \), as well as student’s personal performance-approach goal and student’s perception of parents’ mastery goal orientation \( (r = -0.014, p < 0.05) \). However, there is weak correlation between student’s personal performance-approach goal orientation and student’s perception of parents’ Performance-Approach goal orientation \( (r = 0.224, p < 0.05) \)

Table 6: Correlations of Exam Group Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s Perception of Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Goal Orientation Variable</th>
<th>Student’s Personal Mastery Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Student’s Personal Performance-Approach Goal Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Teachers’</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.475*</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery Goal Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Teachers’</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Approach Goal Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Parents’</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.441*</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery Goal Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Parents’</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Approach Goal Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .4, **p > .6, ***p > .8

5.3 Is there a correlation between students’ own goal orientation and their perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation in non-exam group students?

In non-exam group \( (N = 158) \), there are no correlations between student’s personal mastery goal and student’s perception of teacher’s performance-approach goal orientation \( (r = 0.047, p < .05) \), student’s personal mastery goal and student’s perception of parents’ performance-approach goal orientation \( (r = 0.187, p < .05) \), student’s personal performance-approach goal and student’s perception of teacher’s mastery goal orientation \( (r = -0.037, p < 0.05) \), student’s personal...
performance-approach goal and student’s perception of teacher’s performance-approach goal orientation is none \((r = .096, p < .05)\) and student’s personal performance-approach goal and perception of student’s parents’ mastery goal orientation \((r = .081, p < .05)\).

On the other hand, there is correlation, however weak, between student’s personal mastery goal and student’s perception of teacher’s mastery goal orientation \((r = .292, p < .05)\), student’s personal mastery goal and student’s perception of parents’ mastery goal orientation \((r = .388, p < .05)\), student’s personal performance-approach goal and student’s perception of parent’s performance-approach goal orientation \((r = .299, p < .05)\). Result can be seen in Table 7.

**Table 7: Correlations of Non-Exam Group Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s Perception of Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Goal Orientation Variable</th>
<th>Student’s Personal Mastery Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Student’s Personal Performance-Approach Goal Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Teachers’ Mastery Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Teachers’ Performance-Approach Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Parents’ Mastery Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Parents’ Performance-Approach Goal Orientation</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*\(p > .4\), **\(p > .6\), ***\(p > .8\)
6. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This study is taking opportunity to fill the gap, since previous studies commonly classified the participant using gender, ethnicity or grade level and in this study the sample consist of multiple grades which divided into exam group (Grade 6, 9, and 12) and non-exam group (Grade 7, 8, and 10). In Table 4 the results of the frequency analysis of participants by group, shows that were more participants of Non-Exam students (N = 158, 55.8%), than Exam students (N = 125, 44.2%). However the different is not that significant, the sample group is close to equal for both group (see Table 8). This study aim are first to explore students’ personal achievement goal orientation in relation to national exam. The second aim is to study the relation between students’ perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation preferences with students’ personal achievement goal.

Table 8: Frequency of group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Exam</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 Finding similarity or differences of student’s personal achievement goal orientation between exam group and non-exam group students.

The results show that there are non-significant differences of exam and non-exam group of students, for both personal mastery goal orientation and performance-approach goal orientation. In comparison to previous studies where there are significant differences, they were normally conducted in classification of the students’ the gender or grades for the purpose of analyzing different goal orientation in transition from elementary school to secondary school. For example, in study conducted by Pajares & Cheong (2003) about changes of goal orientation in elementary (Grade 4-5), middle (Grade 6-8), and high school (Grade 9-11), a slight increase is found in task goal and further decline in performance-approach goal orientation from middle school to high school.
The other potential predictor of the result is influence of the school curriculum itself. In Sekolah Victory Plus, the school are dominantly based on International Baccalaureate curriculum with combination of Indonesian National Curriculum. International Baccalaureate (IB) School perceives education as holistic (Hare, 2010) The IB curriculum and ethos emphasize intellectual, personal, emotional and social growth through all domains of knowledge. The IB learner profile sets out the attributes that young people should develop through their experiences of IB World Schools and programmes (Bullock, 2011). IB Learner profile consisted of ten attributes which consisted of Inquirers, Knowledgeable, Thinkers, Communicators, Principle, Open-minded, Caring, Risk-Taker, Balanced, and Reflective (See Appendix 2 to review each LP attributes descriptions). In literature review conducted by Bullock (2011) about Learner Profile, she draw a link between conative aspects of learning with Inquirers and Principled. By being inquirers, students develop their natural curiosity and they acquire the skills necessary to conduct inquiry and research and show independence in learning. They actively enjoy learning and this love of learning will be sustained throughout their lives. And by being principled, students will act with integrity and honesty, with a strong sense of fairness, justice and respect for the dignity of the individual, groups and communities. They take responsibility for their own actions and the consequences that accompany them. Through this attributes learner are able to regulate their motivation independently and take responsible of their own learning.

In research done by Ling & Yan (2012) in investigating International School Assessment (ISA) data in 2009–2010 and 2010–2011 found at the global level there was evidence that, IB school students in Primary Year Programme (PYP) and Middle Year Programme (MYP) students mostly performed better than students from non-IB schools in the ISA assessment areas. In the 32 comparisons (8 grades by 4 domains), only 3 groups of non-IB students—grades 3 and 8 Mathematical Literacy and grade 5 Narrative Writing—performed better than their IB peers. The IB cohort outperformed the non-IB cohort with a relatively large margin in the regions of Europe, the Americas and Africa for most comparison groups. Since Curriculum adopted by the school might be on predictor of non-significant differences of goal orientation between Exam and Non-Exam group students.
Whereas this study investigated goal orientations as a “state” (e.g., through experimental manipulations or questionnaires that focused on engagement in a specific task (National Exam)). Goal orientation is also consider as a “trait”, where it slowly change as characteristic or quality of learners. Thus, relation between performance and mastery goals is not dichotomous; students’ are not either mastery or performance oriented. Students can have both goal orientations or they can be highly oriented toward one goal orientation while not so much to the other; or they can be highly oriented to one of the goal orientation (Avi Kaplan & Maehr, 2007)

Although the result shown there is non-significant between groups, this study is still going to analyze the correlation separately. Due to the fact that the correlation analysis is conducted to explore correlation between perception of parents’ and teachers’ goal orientation, which may vary in different group.

6.2 Analyzing correlation of students perception of teacher’s and parent’s goal orientation with student’s personal achievement goal of exam group students.

The results show, that perception of teacher’s and parents’ mastery goal orientation do influence student’s personal mastery goal orientation since there are moderate positive correlation when it comes to student’s perception of the goal orientation delivered by parents and teachers in exam group students; although the assumption about this group is that students will face National Exam and tend to reflect performance-approach goal orientation. This result might also infer that Parents and Teachers are trying to encourage students to develop personal mastery goal orientation. However, the correlation is only moderate which means we can’t conclude from this result that every Parents and Teachers delivers their goal orientation. There might also be Parents and Teachers who are trying to deliver, but still are unable to deliver the goal orientation well to the students.

Endorsement of mastery goal orientation has been found to be related to contribute positive outcomes in learning such as self-efficacy, positive affect, student’s wellbeing, persistence, and self-regulated learning (Review on Gonida et al., 2007; Ames, 1992; Dweck & Legget, 1988);
and it is decent to see correlation between student’s perception of parents’ and teachers’ mastery goal orientation with student’s personal goal orientation.

Study did by Gutman (2006) supports this statement. Gutman studied how parent’s goal orientations influence the math achievement of African American students during the high school transition. Students whose parents endorsed mastery goals had significantly higher grades than their peers whose parents did not endorse mastery goals. In this case parent mastery goals were found to be more influential than parent performance goals in terms of achievement in math. Consequently according to Gutman's finding, there is possibility for students who perceive mastery goal orientation from their parents will more likely score well in the National Exam. Another supporting study conducted by Dewi & Mangunsong (2012) on the contribution of student’s perception towards teacher’s goal orientation and student’s orientation as a mediator in test anxiety on elementary school’s Final Exam. The research found that although endorsement of mastery goal orientation from teachers won’t influence the students to adopt mastery goal orientation, teachers that endorse mastery goal orientation and learning process will reduce student’s feeling of nervous, tense, anxiety and other feelings that usually go along while students are facing an exam.

Finally, perceptions with student’s personal performance-approach goal orientation of teacher’s performance-approach goal orientation do not have any correlation. There is positive correlation with parents’ performance-approach goal orientation, however, it is a very weak correlation. Previously mentioned Gutman’s study shows there are no significant differences in term of student’s grade were found between students whose parents did endorse and students whose parents did not endorse performance goals in Math.

6.3 Analyzing correlation of students perception of teacher’s and parent’s goal orientation with student’s personal achievement goal of non-exam group students.

Results show that perception of teacher’s and parents’ mastery goal orientation have weak positive correlation with student’s personal mastery goal orientation in non-exam group students. On the other hand, for student’s personal performance-approach orientation, perception of teacher’s and parents’ performance-approach goal orientation do not have any
correlation. Predicted factor could be because the students are not going to face National Exam on that year; and this is based on self-efficacy and test anxiety research conducted by Qudsyi & Putri (2016) among high school students in facing National Exam, they found that there is a negative relationship between student’s self-efficacy and anxiety level felt by student in pre-exam situation. More study found that self-efficacy and perception of goal correlate with adopted student’s personal goal orientation (Hult & Germano, 2016; Gutman, 2006; A Kaplan & Maehr, 1999; Pajares & Cheong, 2003; Wolters, Yu, & Pintrich, 1996). Possible conclusion drawn from these previous researches, facing National Exam might be the factor of the correlation result found in this study. However, the reason of different correlation result retrieved from exam and non-exam group is uncertain. This will be a good research question for future research in this topic.

In other study, where the independent variables are segmented according to the grade level, they found that both students and teachers’ perception in middle schools emphasize mastery goal less than elementary schools and emphasize performance goal orientation more than elementary school (C. Midgley, Anderman, & Hicks, 1995; Vedder-Weiss & Fortus, 2011). In study conducted by Gonida et al., (2007) about the relationships among perceived parent goals, student achievement goal orientations, and emotional and behavioral engagement in the classroom, found different results from the three grade levels examined. There were more complicated pattern in junior high school than in the other two grade levels. Over time, some relationships faded and remains across adulthoods. Students’ perceptions of parental goals predicted their own achievement goal orientations in all three grade levels. However, in junior high school, performance-approach orientation was predicted by perceived parent mastery goals, as well. This shows that the mastery-related messages early adolescents perceived from their parents could be translated both to mastery and performance-approach orientations.

6.4 Practical Implication

Students need support from both environment, school and home since students’ personal goal orientation and academic or educational outcome are dependent to goal structure perceived in school or at home, which will projects types of goal orientation that the students will adopt (CA Wolters, 2004). Communication regarding purpose of learning and goal seems to be
important, especially in early adolescence. Transformation to adolescence might be very challenging and stressful for some students, because they are going to face National Exam three times (grade 6, 9, and 12) in their school years. In Qudsyi & Putri's (2016) study among high school students in facing National Exam, they found that there is a negative relationship between student’s self-efficacy and anxiety level felt by student in pre-exam. And supported with survey done to Indonesian Ministry of Education (2012) survey on National Exam there were high anxiety level in facing National Exam. Endorsement of positive learning goal from parents are teacher will help students in coping with challenges from school in transformation to adolescence. A wide range of studies have shown that goal orientations and goal structures are associated with a constellation of motivational and achievement outcomes for middle and high school students (e.g., Ames & Archer, 1988; Dewi & Mangunsong, 2012; Gonida, Kiosseoglou, & Voulala, 2007; Gonzalez, Doan Holbein, & Quilter, 2002; C. Midgley, Anderman, & Hicks, 1995; Vedder-Weiss & Fortus, 2013)

According to literature review and result of this study, endorsement of mastery goal orientation has been found to be related to positive learning outcomes such as self-efficacy, positive affect, student’s wellbeing, persistence, and self-regulated learning (Review on Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Ames (1992) for example found that student who endorsed performance goals orientation also reported to have be associated with negative affect in events which involve difficulty or challenges, in addition they rather use of surface rather than deep learning strategies. Nevertheless, there are several studies did not find such negative physiognomies. Several research found that the relation between performance and mastery goals is not dichotomous; students’ are not either mastery or performance oriented.

6.5 Research Evaluation

This study consist of multiple grades which divided into exam group (Grade 6, 9, and 12) and non-exam group (Grade 7, 8, and 10). Which brings new approach in segmenting the grouping variable compare to similar studies (e.g. Dewi & Mangunsong, 2012; Qudsyi & Putri, 2016) Correlation of students’ perception of both parents and teachers are analyze in this study as well. This study is well structure, starting from data collection to thesis writing. Data are reliable according to alpha result (See Reliability Test result) and questioner instrument (PALS) are a
tested instrument that is widely used in various research (e.g. Anderman & Midgley, 1997; Friedel et al., 2001; He, Gou, & Chang, 2014; Hult & Germano, 2016; Avi Kaplan & Midgley, 1999; Carol Midgley et al., 1996; Carol Midgley & Urdan, 2001; Pajares & Cheong, 2003; Schwinger, Steinmayr, & Spinath, 2016; Urdan & Midgley, 2003; Vedder-Weiss & Fortus, 2011; Wolters et al., 1996; Zhang, Watermann, & Daniel, 2016)

6.5.1 Research Limitation and Future Research

Some limitations are found in relation to previous study conducted in this field. Other studies are mostly subject-specific lessons, such as; Math, Science and English (e.g. Dweck, 1986; Gutman, 2006; He, Gou, & Chang, 2014; Vedder-Weiss & Fortus, 2013; Wolters et al., 1996; Zhang, Watermann, & Daniel, 2016) and in this study, the survey are generally focus to National Exam. It is actually difficult to combine different subjects into one category which is National Exam. In the future study, the survey can be classified into different subject that will be assess in National Exam, in this sense data generated can be more specific. The other limitation faced in this study, most of the researches were normally conducted in classification of the students’ the gender or grades for the purpose of analyzing different goal orientation in transition from elementary school to secondary school (e.g. Gonida et al., 2007; Middleton & Midgley, 1997; Carol Midgley et al., 1996; Pajares & Cheong, 2003). It is challenging to find similar study with similar way of grouping the participants.

Since the data was collected after the National Exam and only once there are limitation on Reliability and Validity of the data. In the future study, it will be better to take the data during pre and post exam to analyze whether the result differ from pre and post exam. In post-exam situation, students might have different goal orientation and test anxiety level since they already faced the test. While collecting the data, some students did not quite understand or sure on what to answer, even though the survey was available in both English and Bahasa Indonesia, some students were willing to ask question but some didn’t. This circumstances might influence Reliability and Validity of the data.

Longitudinal study will be more suitable method to analyses the transformation of students’ goal orientation and how perception of parents and teacher influence students’ personal goal
orientation. For example the study can start when the student are in grade 4 and ends when they take the National Exam which is in end grade 6. By longitudinal study there are chance to obtain better description of changes that might occur in the variables examined and in the pattern of relationships among them. Deeper analysis is needed in future research, regression analysis might be suitable to find predictors of student’s personal goal orientation and find and Analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be suitable to analyze the differences among group means and their associated procedures.

Analyzing relationship between teacher’s goal orientation and student’s goal orientation will be one interesting research question for future research similar to this study. Another research question could be correlation between gender and student’s goal orientation in exam and non-exam group. Research regarding correlation between adaptive or maladaptive learning pattern is also possible.

6.5.2 Ethical Issue

Data was collected anonymously, information retrieve from the data are remain confidential. Students was brief in the beginning of the session that their answers were confidential, and it will not affect their grades or performance in the school. Purpose of the study and survey procedure were explained face-to-face in the session and the survey were conducted in voluntary participation (there are some students who are not willing to complete or participate in the study). Data collection was approved by both Primary and Secondary Principal, with acknowledgments of the School’s Board. Based on School’s Board decision, consent latter for parents are not necessary since it is done within the school hours. The use of a Likert-type response scale was described with example and translation to Bahasa Indonesia was provided better understanding for the students. The session was casual and students were encouraged to raise their inquiries regarding the survey.

6.6 Conclusion

As a conclusion, this study is able to full fill the study’s aims which are to explore students’ personal achievement goal orientation in relation to National Exam in Indonesia and to study
the relation between students’ perception of teachers’ and parents’ goal orientation preferences with student’s personal achievement goal. Overall, this study found that there are; (a) non-significant differences of exam and non-exam group, for both personal mastery goal orientation and performance-approach goal orientation; (b) perception of teachers’ and parents’ mastery goal orientation do influence students’ personal mastery goal orientation due to moderate positive correlation result when it comes to students’ perception of the goal orientation delivered by parents and teachers in exam group students; (c) perception of teachers’ and parents’ mastery goal orientation have weak positive correlation with student’s personal mastery goal orientation in non-exam group students. And for students’ personal performance-approach orientation, perception of teachers’ and parents’ performance-approach goal orientation do not have any correlation.

According to Zimmerman (2011) goal orientation is the purpose or the reason of the learners’ achievement. This study used goal orientation theory as the theoretical framework, which referred to as a mastery goal orientation and a performance goal orientation. Mastery goal orientation focuses on the development of knowledge, new skill, deep learning and improving their level of competence, thus is self-referential. Performance goals determines to demonstrate their competency to gain positive judgment, and in some cases, learners will feel successful by trying to outperform peers on academic tasks.

Previous studies found that there are influences from the learner’s learning environment, be it from home or school environment (Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Patrick et al., 2001; Turner et al., 2002; Vedder-Weiss & Fortus, 2013; Wentzel, 1998). In Indonesian education context, National Exam is included as one of the influencer. Students who perceived mastery goal orientation from their teachers may be encourage to be engage in academic work in order to develop competence by gaining deep understanding and meaningful learning. Students who perceived performance goal orientation from their teachers may focus on getting good score or passing the test, so they will not look stupid or incompetence from other students, their aim to be engage in academic work is to demonstrate competence (Middleton et al., 2004; Carol Midgley et al., 2000).
Similar result being found in relation to students’ perception of parents’ goal orientation. Students’ personal goals were predicted more strongly by perceived parent goals than by perceived teacher goals. When students perceived that their parents expected them to focus on inquiring deep learning by improving themselves and develop and acquire new skills, students will more likely adopt mastery goal orientation (Friedel et al., 2001). Thus, Students who tend to adopt mastery goal are highly supported and encourage by their parents during difficult learning task faced by the students (Hokoda & Fincham, 1995; Wentzel, 1998).

Besides learning environment, students are also faced with curriculum expectation set by the Ministry of Education. In this context, National Exam is one of the cause of anxiety that students experiencing. Standardize test caused less attention to science, to art, to thinking skills, to skills and content. External demands caused by curriculum, in this context National Exam as the standardize test will promote shallow levels of understanding, that may challenge these efforts and receive training in how to create mastery goal structures, supportive learning environments, and lifelong learner attitudes (Herman & Golan, 1993).

Researchers have found that endorsement of mastery goal orientation is related to positive learning outcomes such as self-efficacy, positive affect, student’s wellbeing, persistence, and self-regulated learning (Review on Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Wolters et al., 1996). In contrast endorsement of performance goal orientation commonly associated to negative affect in learning process which involve difficulty or challenges, they rather use of surface learning strategies rather than deep learning strategies. Yet, in study did by Wolters et al., (1996) found that endorsement of performance goal orientation positively predicted students’ task value, self-efficacy, and cognitive and self-regulatory strategy used. Often, performance goals orientation has been associated with a maladaptive pattern of cognition, affect, and behavior (Review on Ames, 1992; Dweck & Leggett, 1988). However, in study did by Kaplan & Maehr (2007) found that the relation between performance and mastery goals is not dichotomous; students’ are not either mastery or performance oriented. Students can have both goal orientations or they can be highly oriented toward one goal orientation while not so much to the other; or they can be highly oriented to one of the goal orientation.
In the future study, more specific result might be seen from pre and post exam data to analyze whether the result differ from pre and post exam. Longitudinal study will be suitable method to collect the data. Another suggested topic for further research is to investigate the relationship between teachers’ personal goal orientation in their teaching with students’ learning behavior.
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Students Personal Mastery Goal Orientation for Exam and Non-exam Groups
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Appendix 2

IB learner profile

The aim of all IB programmes is to develop internationally minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world.

As IB learners we strive to be:

**INQUIRERS**
We nurture our curiosity, developing skills for inquiry and research. We know how to learn independently and with others. We learn with enthusiasm and sustain our love of learning throughout life.

**KNOWLEDGEABLE**
We develop and use conceptual understanding, exploring knowledge across a range of disciplines. We engage with issues and ideas that have local and global significance.

**THINKERS**
We use critical and creative thinking skills to analyse and take responsible action on complex problems. We exercise initiative in making reasoned, ethical decisions.

**COMMUNICATORS**
We express ourselves confidently and creatively in more than one language and in many ways. We collaborate effectively, listening carefully to the perspectives of other individuals and groups.

**PRINCIPLED**
We act with integrity and honesty, with a strong sense of fairness and justice, and with respect for the dignity and rights of people everywhere. We take responsibility for our actions and their consequences.

**OPEN-MINDED**
We critically appreciate our own cultures and personal histories, as well as the values and traditions of others. We seek and evaluate a range of points of view, and we are willing to grow from the experience.

**CARING**
We show empathy, compassion and respect. We have a commitment to service, and we act to make a positive difference in the lives of others and in the world around us.

**RISK-TAKERS**
We approach uncertainty with forethought and determination. We work independently and cooperatively to explore new ideas and innovative strategies. We are resourceful and resilient in the face of challenges and change.

**BALANCED**
We understand the importance of balancing different aspects of our lives—intellectual, physical, and emotional—to achieve well being for ourselves and others. We recognize our interdependence with other people and with the world in which we live.

**REFLECTIVE**
We thoughtfully consider the world and our own ideas and experience. We work to understand our strengths and weaknesses in order to support our learning and personal development.

The IB learner profile represents 10 attributes valued by IB World Schools. We believe these attributes, and others like them, can help individuals and groups become responsible members of local, national and global communities.