

CONSTRUCTION OF COMPETITIVE BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

MM Tri Susetyaning Mildawani
Perbanas Institute

Tri Ratna Murti
UPI YAI

Anastasia Sri Maryatmi
UPI YAI

ABSTRACT: *Competitive behavior questionnaire is an instrument that is used to determine how strongly individu competes in achieving certain superior targets. Competitive behavior is a behavior to achieve a superior position with respect to the personal targets to be addressed (Gracia, Tor & Schff, 2013). Theory of competitive behavior is developed from Cognitive Social theory, as a result of individual interaction, with its environment (Bandura, 1986). One form of competitive behavior is survival in studying at the level of undergraduate education. However, this competitive behavior has not been widely studied. Therefore, instrument that can be used as a tool is needed to find out appropriate competitive behavior of individuals. In this study, a competitive behavior questionnaire was prepared based on aspects of the drive to compete, the desire to achieve superior positions and self-representation. In total there are 14 aitemes with validity score more than 0.30. The reliability score was 0.81.*

KEYWORDS: Competitive behavior, measurement, psychology, questionnaire

INTRODUCTION

This paper aims to describe the construction of competitive behavior instrument, especially competitive behavior is described as an important behavior in meeting individual survival. Frankl (2014) says that basically individuals have the desire to survive. This survival effort is the result of self-reflection on the dynamics experienced by individuals, as part of an effort to come out "as winners". This winning behavior is part of competitive behavior (Bartram, 2005). Every individual interacts with his social environment. This situation of social interaction demands the ability of individuals to be competitive. Competition exists in all areas of life, at home, on campus, or at work (Barnett & Casper, 2001). At home, individuals compete with other family members, so they still feel "home", "accepted", not separated from the family.

Competitive behavior is not easy to operationalize (Driscoll, 2005). Therefore, an understanding of competitive behavior is carried out through behavioral indicators, including competitive motivation (Johnson, 2012) and enjoyment of competition, feelings of pleasure in competing (Houston, et al., 2002). Enjoyment in competition includes, among others, feelings of liking competition, including liking when facing "opponents", and getting satisfaction when competing with others. Conversely, individuals who are careful in competition, will avoid quarrels with others, choose to remain silent, and choose to avoid conflict.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Meanwhile, according to Mudrack, et al. (2012), this competitive behavior is an individual's competence to develop themselves. In practice, the term competitive behavior is often exchanged with the term competition. Bartram (2005) said that competitive behavior in the world of work as a form of performance. Performance according to Bartram can be measured through eight work competencies. The eight work competencies are obtained from multidimensional analysis of variable measurements which are the result of managers' observations on the performance of their employees. Eight competencies include: leadership skills, support, self-presentation, stimulus analysis or interpretation, realization of concepts, organization, adaptation or breakthrough, and performance display. In his explanation, Bartram's competitive behavior is influenced by personality traits and certain motivations, including the openness personality traits. The personality traits of openness are positively correlated with self-presentation competencies. Self-motivation is one of the strongest predictors of eight competitive behavioral competencies.

Ajzen (1991) sees the importance of intention factors in Competitive Behavior. Ajzen describes that intention is a predictor of Competitive Behavior. Individual intentions on competitive behavior are influenced by cognitive abilities, work attitudes, and subjective norms derived from perceptions of the social environment. With their cognitive abilities, individuals can influence their social environment to behave towards their priority life goals. By Bandura (1986) asserts that with cognitive abilities, individuals are able to influence their social environment, to display competitive behavior. Bandura (in Denier, Wolters & Benzon, 2014) emphasizes that individual behavior is the result of reciprocal triadic relationships between individuals and their social environment.

As for Garcia, Tor and Gonzales (2006) say that Competitive Behavior is the behavior of individuals achieving certain subjective positions. In the field of social psychology-organization, competitive individual behavior can be seen from several behavioral indicators that include cognition, affection, and psychomotor (Schoenfelt & Pedigo, 2005). Aamodt (2010) says that cognitive indicators can be referenced from the level of individual understanding of the problem at hand and how the individual is trying to deal with the problem at hand. Thus individuals are able to optimize the reasoning function. Chanche (2013), a cognitive psychologist, defines critical thinking as the ability to analyze facts, generate and organize ideas, defend opinions, make comparisons, draw conclusions, evaluate arguments, and solve problems. Critical thinking ability of individual factors, which is the main basis for innovation so that its survival (McLeod, 2011).

In his research, Pitra (in Morales, 2011), emphasized that the knowledge and abilities that exist in individuals are needed to bring up ideas that can be more valuable to the results of behavior. In line with competitive concepts, it is emphasized that ignorance and learning directly influence competitive behavior (de Castro, 2013). According to Tidd et al. (2006), the ability to think critically and confidently allows individuals to make innovations that contribute directly to individual achievement. The ability to think critically is key for individuals to display competitive behavior. With their critical abilities, individuals will be able to optimize humanitarian functions in achieving achievements, especially in displaying competitive behavior. This competitive behavior can be generated when individuals have the confidence and ability to adapt to the dynamics that accompany competitive behavior.

Social life is currently dominated by technology. The generation that is familiar with technology is the millennial generation which is also called the generation Y (gene Y). According to Meier, Austin and Crocker (2010), Y genes are born between millennia change, between 1982 and 2000. In terms of numbers, Y gene population increases from year to year, reaching around 76 billion, or about 15% of the population in the workforce (Paul, 2004).

This amount is the amount potential increases in line with demographic conditions, replacing previous generations of work (BPS, 2013). In Indonesia, the population of gene Y with its competence is interesting to study, given the existence of the Y gene coloring almost all aspects of life, especially the increasingly competitive world of work (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). According to Sebastian (2016), 50% of Indonesia's productive age population is millennial. By Solnet and Hood (2008) it is said that the Y gene is a generation that is familiar with technology. Speed in work and practicality are prominent features. Technological proficiency is one of the prominent characteristics, as a result of research presented by NACE (2011). Myers and Sadaghiani (2010) said that gene Y has characteristics of competitive behavior. In addition, gene Y also shows respect for colleagues, both colleagues and colleagues from different generations. In addition, one characteristic feature that stands out in gene Y is that gene Y is capable of competitive work.

Table 1. Aitem Distribution per Aspect

Encouragement to compete	Like competition	1. I am a person who likes competition. 2. I enjoy the atmosphere of the competition. 3. I am not interested in achievements based on competition. 4. For me, friends are friends, not competitors.	Fav Fav Un-Fav Un-Fav
	Enjoy the challenge	5. I enjoy an achievement race in class, 6. When I was in class, I was encouraged to be the best. 7. Making friends is more interesting than competing 8. I don't like the ambitious atmosphere of the competition.	Fav Fav Un-Fav Un-Fav
Desire to achieve a superior position	Eager to reach the best	9. I intend to be the best. 10. Achieving in class, is more challenging to do than making friends. 11. Competition breaks friendships. 12. I prefer friendship rather than competition	Fav Fav Un-Fav Un-Fav
	Being number one	13. I am challenged to be the best when a friend becomes a competitor. 14. I must be superior to peers. 15. For me, it's not important to be a champion 16. The presence of friends who are competing makes me feel inferior in my work.	Fav Fav Un-Fav Un-Fav

Self-Representation	Representing	17. By becoming a champion, people are better known. 18. Being famous is important. 19. Instead of fighting, it's better to avoid competition	Fav Fav Un-Fav
	Stand out	20. I have the ambition to be the class leader 21. I was challenged to be the head of the organization 22. It's better to be friends, rather than indulging in ambition to be a champion.	Fav Fav Un-Fav

This research is important because in the current era of PT Revolusi Industri 4.0, the Y gene dominates work and gene Y and 50% of the total productive age population of Indonesia. The potential of the Y gene is important for review and research, especially relating to data on competitive behavior, so that it can be developed to achieve superior positions. This superior position can be a foothold for survival.

Although competitive behavior among Y genes is assumed to be an important behavior, this competitive behavior has not been widely explored. Therefore, the authors construct a measuring instrument, in the form of a Competitive Behavior questionnaire. This questionnaire is compiled based on aspects of Competitive Behavior, namely the Competitive Encouragement, Desire to achieve superior positions, and Self Representation (Garcia, Tor and Schiff, 2013). With 5 scales from Likert.

METHODOLOGY

1. Questionnaire of Competitive Behavior

Competitive Behavior is behavior to achieve subjective superior positions (Garcia, Tor, and Schiff, 2013). Questionnaire for measuring the competitive behavior of Likert scale questionnaires, with 5 scales compiled based on aspects of Encouragement to compete, Desire to achieve superior positions, and Self Representation. Encouragement to compete can be interpreted as a motivation for competitiveness. The desire to achieve a superior position is defined as a strong spirit to be the most important. Self-representation is defined as an individual's ability to display self-competence. Of the three aspects, 22 statement items were made, consisting of 12 favorite items and 10 unfavorable items arranged with 5 scales. For a favorable item, the scale moves from very inappropriate (given a score = 1); inappropriate (score = 2); quite appropriate (score = 3); accordingly (score = 4); very suitable (score = 5). For unfavorable items, the opposite scale and scoring apply; very inappropriate (given a score = 5); inappropriate (score = 4); quite appropriate (score = 3); accordingly (score = 2); very suitable (score = 1).

Respondents were asked to give an assessment of each item that was in accordance with him. In each item, there is only one answer option that is in accordance with the conditions of the research respondents. The choice is between the range of the number one (1), which is the lowest value, up to the value of five (5), which is the highest value. The lowest value (1) reflects the lowest weight given by the respondent; and the highest value (5) reflects the

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

highest weight given by the respondent to a particular item. In favorable items, the highest value (5) is interpreted as the highest value for the respondent's choice of options that support the statement on the measuring instrument. The lowest value (1) reflects the lowest weight given by the respondent to a particular item. Giving a number value (scoring) is applied and interpreted to the contrary in the type of items that are not (unfavorable).

2. Preparation of Competitive Behavior Instruments / questionnaires

The item arrangements above are then rearranged in blueprint format, as in table 2 below.

Table 2. Blueprint for Competitive Behavior

No	Aspect	Indicator	Number Aitem Fav	Number Aitem Un Fav	Amount Aitem
1.	Encouragement	a. Liked	1,2	3,4	4
		b. Avoid	5,6	7,8	4
2.	Desire Achieve Position	a. Enjoy	9,10	11, 12	4
		b. Avoiding	13,14	15, 16	4
3.	Representat ion	a. Representing	17,18	19	3
		b. Against	20, 21	22	3
Total			12	10	22

The questionnaire that was prepared was then tried out to 60 active students at the Faculty of Psychology at Atma Jaya Catholic University, Jakarta, male and female. This trial conducted on 1-10 May 2018, the 60 questionnaires were distributed by distributing the questionnaire to the respondents of the research trial. The distribution of the questionnaire was carried out by the author, assisted by 3 students.

FINDINGS

Test of Difference and Reliability of the Measuring Instrument

An item is said to have high / satisfying power difference if it has a different power coefficient above 0.30, meaning that the item is able to distinguish individuals who have attributes from individuals who do not have the measured attributes (Azwar, 2016). The reliability concept contains the meaning of the extent to which the results of a measurement can be trusted (Azwar, 2016).

Estimated reliability for the Competitive Behavior scale, the Social Comparison scale, the Critical Thinking Ability scale, the Self Efficacy scale, and the Adaptability Ability scale used the Cronbach Alpha coefficient (Aritonang, 2017).

In a different item power test study, a Correlated Item Total Correlation approach was used, by correlating each item's score to the total score. Data obtained from 60 people. Different

power test results and reliability of the measurement scale can be seen in table 12 below (there is an appendix to things).

Scale of Competitive Behavior

Based on the different power tests of the Competitive Behavior scale, the different power scores for the 22 items are obtained, with a range of numbers 0.02 to 0.612. From the statistical calculation, there are 14 items with high difference power, namely 0.328 to 0.612 (greater than 0.300). From the reliability test, it was found that the Competitive Behavior scale has a reliability score of high power score and the reliability score of the Competitive Behavior scale can be seen in table 17 below:

Table 3. Results of Competitive Behavior Scale Different Tests with N = 60

No.	Indicator	Amount Aitem Before Difference Test	Amount Aitem the After Difference Test	Number Aitem with High Difference	Skor Aitem with a High Difference
1	Encouragement to Compete	8	4	1, 4, 6, 8	0,587; 0,436; 0,328; 0,467
2	Desires to Achieve Position	8	5	9,12,13, 14,16	0,416;0,541, 0,612,0,579; 0,430
3	Self Representation	6	5	16, 17, 19, 20, 22	0,430;0,402; 0,455,0,507; 0,545

Cronbach's reliability coefficient Competitive Behavior Alpha = 0.811

Table 4. Item Distribution on the Measurement Scale

No.	Measuring Indicator	Trial Change	Power Indicator	A High Difference Number Research Total	
1	Competitive Behavior	Encouragement Competence	1,2,3,4 5,6,7,8	1,9,17,4 12,5,14	7
		Desire to Achieve	9,10,11,12	6, 13	
		Achievements	13,14,15,16	19,16	4
		Self Representation	17,18,19 20,21,22	8,20,22	3
	Jumlah Aitem		22		14

In the description of the research data table 3 above, the Competitive Behavior variable has a mean value (average) of 3.4386, the standard deviation of 0.60132. Using a scale option 1–5, theoretically. The lowest score of the Competitive Behavior variable is 1, the highest score is 5, and the theoretical average score is 3. The empirical average score obtained is greater than

the theoretical average score, which is $3.4386 > 3$. The average value illustrates that the Competitive Behavior variable is quite high.

DISCUSSION

From the results of data analysis of 60 respondents in the research, 14 items of Competitive Behavior questionnaire were stated to have validity scores between 0.3 - 0.612. The validity score is above 0.3, indicating the item is valid. For more details, see the items in table 3. The Competitive Behavior questionnaire reliability score is 0.811. The Competitive Behavior Questionnaire meets the requirements of validity and reliability as a measurement tool. Competitive behavior questionnaires need to be studied by conducting research with more subjects.

Implication to Research and Practice

With the construction of the Competitive Behavior questionnaire, it is expected that research on competitive behavior will be more developed, and more profound. Competitive Behavior could be explore more detailed. Aitem-aitem could be more specific. Studies of aspects of competitive behavior can consider personality and motivation, such as research studies conducted by Bartram (2015).

CONCLUSION

Of the 22 Competitive Behavior items, as many as 14 items have an empirical average score of 3.44, with a standard deviation of 0.60. A score of 3.44 is greater than 3.0. The questionnaire reliability score with 22 items is 0.811. Thus, the Competitive Behavior questionnaire is stated to fulfill the element of validity and reliability as a research instrument.

Future Research

Competitive behavior is behavior to get a certain superior position. One of the objectives of competitive behavior is to do social comparison in terms of competence. Competitors are generally peer groups. This competitive behavior is not only important for students for survival, but it is also fitting for communities in the workplace, social community, and even old age communities. For this reason, research is very open by correlating competitive behavior with variables such as gender. Are there differences between the competitive behavior of men and women on campus? Are competitive behaviors influenced by personality characteristics? Does motivation affect competitive behavior? These can be used as further studies. Improvement of measuring instruments can be a priority

References

- Aamodt, M. G. (2010). *Industrial/organizational psychology: an applied approach*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50, 179-211.

- Balafoutas, L. Kretchmer, R., & Suffer, M. (2012). Distributional preferences and competitive behavior. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 83(1): 125–135. doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2011.06.018 PMID: PMC3617875.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory*. National Institutions of Mental Health. Rockville: Englewood Cliffs.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: WH Freeman & Company.
- Bandura, A. (2001). *Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective*. Annual review of Psychology, 52, 1-26.
- Bartram, D. (2005). The great eight competencies: A criterion-centric Approach to validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology* by the American Psychological Association, 90(6), 1185–1203.
- Bennett, J., Pitt, M., & Price, S. (2012). Understanding the impact of generational issues in the workplace". *Facilities*, 30(7/8), 278-288
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02632771211220086>
- Braden, P. A. (2000). *McClelland's theory of needs*. Parkersburg: West Virginia University.
- Chen, M. J., Su, K. H., & Tsai, W. (2007). Competitive tension: The awareness –motivation-capability perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 101-108.
- Creed, P. A., & Lee-Ann, P. (2001). Career maturity, career decision making, self-efficacy and career indecision: A review of the accrued evidence. *Journal Of Career Development, ACER (Australian Council For Educational Research)*, 10 (2), 1-22.
- Damon, C., Dompnier, B., & Poortvliet, P. M. (2012). Achievement goals in educational contexts: A social psychology perspective. *Social & Personality Psychology Compass*, 6, 700-771.
- de Castro, M., Verde, D., López, N. & González, C. *Journal of Competitiveness*, joc_1-2013_v2.indd 83 25.3.2013 18:24:59 84.
- de Silva, S. (1997). Human resources development for competitiveness: A priority for employers (International Labour Office; January). *Paper presented at the ILO Workshop on Employers' Organizations in Asia-Pacific in the Twenty-First Century*. Turin, Italy, 5-13 May.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4): 227-268.
<http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/theory.html> [02/03/06]
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., & Williams, G. C. 1996. Need satisfaction and the self-regulation of learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 8(3), 165-183.
http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/publications/pub_edu.html [02/03/06]
- Denier, H., Wolters, C. & Benzon, M. (2014) *Social cognitive theory*.
<http://www.education.com/reference/article/social-cognitive-theory>
- Doise, W. (1990). *Individual cognitive functioning: Societal aspects*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Driscoll, M. (2005). *Psychology of learning for instruction* (3rded.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Drucker, P. F. (2010), Innovation and entrepreneurship. *HarperBusiness edition of The Executive in Action p.357 et. seq.17*.

- Duckworth, A. & Gross, J. J. (2014). Self-control and grit. *Association of Psychological Sciences*, 23 (5).
- Febr, E. & Fischbacher, U. (2002). Why social preferences matter – the impact on non-selfish motivates on competition, cooperation, and incentives. *The economic journal*, 112, c1-c33.
- Fletcher, T. D., Major, D. A., & Davis, D. D. (2008). The interactive relationship of competitive climate and trait competitiveness with workplace attitudes, stress, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- Festinger, L. (1954). *A theory of social comparison processes*. *Human Relations*, 7, 117-140.
- Frankel, J., & Wallen, N. 2008. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Francis, J., Eccles, M.P., Johnston, M., & Walker, A. E. (2004). Constructing questionnaires based on the theory of planned behaviour: A manual for health services researchers-openaccess.city.ac.uk
- Frankl, V. E. (1967). *Logotherapy*. *Israel annals of psychiatry & related disciplines*, 5(2), 142-155.
- Frankl, V. E. (2014). *The will to meaning: Foundations and applications of logotherapy*. New York: PLUME.
- Frey, B. S. & Meier, S. (2004). Social comparison and prosocial behavior. Testing “conditional cooperation” in a field experiment. *American Economic Review*, 94, 1717-1722.
- Friedenberg, L. (1995). *Psychological testing: Design, analysis, and use*. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Garcia, S. M. , Tor, A. & Gonzalez, R. D. (2006). Ranks and rivals: A theory of competition. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 970-982.
- Garcia, S. M. & Tor, A. (2007). Standard and competition: Comparison of tasks vs scales. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 102, 95-108.
- Garcia, S. M., Tor, A. & Schiff, T. M. (2013). The psychology of competition: A social comparison perspective, *Perspectives on psychological science*, 8(6), Nopember 4.
- Galende, J. & De la Fuente, J. (2003). Internal factors determining a firm's innovative behaviour. *Research Policy*, 32(5), 715-736. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(02\)00082-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(02)00082-3)
- Giacolini, T., Gilbert, P., Bonaminio, A., Ferrara, F., Iliceto, P., Monniello, G., & Sabatello, U. (2013). A Validation of the social comparison scale and the submissive behaviour scale for use with italian people. *European Journal Of Developmental Psychology*, 10(6).
- Glass, A. (2007) "Understanding generational differences for competitive success". *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 39(2), pp.98-103, <https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850710732424>.
- Graf, L., Konig, A., Enders, A., & Hungenberg, H. (2012). Debiasing competitive irrationality: How managers can be prevented from trading off absolute for relative profit. *European Management Journal*, 30, 386-403.
- Gravetter, F. J. & Wallnau, L. B. (2013). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences*. (9thed). California: Wadsworth.
- Hayeon, S, Kim, J, Tenzek, K. E., & Lee, K. M. (2013). The effects of competition and competitiveness upon intrinsic motivation in exergames. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(4), 162–170. July.

- Helmreich, R.L. & Spence, J.T. (2008). Work and family orientation questionnaire: an objective instrument to assess components of achievement motivation and attitudes toward family and career. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 8(35).
- Hogg, M. A. (2000). Social identity and social comparison. In J. Suls & L. Wheeler (Eds.). *Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research*, New York: Kluwer Academic.
- Houston, J. M., McIntire, S. A. Kinnie, J. & Terry, C.. (2002). Analysis of scales measuring competitiveness. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. April 1, 62, 284-298.
- Howitt, D. & Cramer, D. (2011). *Introduction to research methods in psychology (3rd ed)*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.
- James, J., Bibb, S., & Walker, S. (2008). *Generation Y: Comparison between Asia and the rest of the world*. London: Talentsmoothie Ltd.
- Jones, D. C. (2001). Social comparison and body image: Attractiveness comparisons to models and peers among adolescent girls and boys. *Sex Roles*, 45, 9/10. November 2001. University of Washington.
- Latham, G. P. (2011). *Work motivation: History, theory, research and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mabey, C. & Iles, P. (1994). *Managing learning*. London: Irwin.
- Malhotra, D. (2010). The desire to win: The effects of competitive arousal on motivation and behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 103, 214-224.
- McLeod, S. A. (2011). *Bandura – social learning theory*. Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org/bandura.html.
- McRae, H. (1994). *The world in 2020*. Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Mehta, S. (2011). Human resource development for competitive advantage. *Zenith International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(1), May, ISSN 2231 5780. www.zenithresearch.org.in.
- Meier, J., Austin, S.F., & Crocker, M. (2010). Generation in the Workforce: Managerial Challenges. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 6, 68-79.
- Mildawani, MM. *Individual competitiveness: The key to competition in the era of globalization*. <http://ejournal.jurwidyakop3.com/index.php/jurnal-ilmiah/article/view/315>
- Morales, F. X., Villaverde, P. M., & Requena, G. (2011). Geographical and cognitive proximity effects on innovation performance in SMEs: a way through knowledge acquisition. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11365-011-0214-z>
- Noruzi, A., Dalfard, V. M., Azhdari, B., Nazari-Shirkouhi, S. & Rezazadeh, A. (2013). Relations between transformational leadership, organizational learning, knowledge management, organizational innovation and organizational performance: an empirical investigation of manufacturing firms. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 64(5-8), 1073-1085. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00170-012-4038-y>
- Pajares, F (2002). *Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy*. From: <http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/eff.html>
- Pajares, F. & Schunk, D. H. (2001) *The development of academic self-efficacy*, chapter in A. Wigfield & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation*. San Diego: Academic Press.

- Pink, D. H. (2009). *Drive: the surprising truth about what motivates us*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy techniques for analyzing industries & competitors*. The Fress Press: New York, USA.
- Porter, M. E. (1990). *Competitive advantage of nations*.(6th ed.) London & Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Porter, M. E. (1998). *Competitive advantage: creating and sustaining superior performance*. Free Press.
- Porter, M. E. (2000). The five competitive forces that shape strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 86, 78-93.
- Reich, R. (1992). *The work of nation*. New York: Published for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- Ross, L., & Nisbett, R. E. (1991). *The person and the situation: perspectives of social psychology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ryan, R. M., Williams, G. C., & Deci, E. L. (2009). Self-determination theory and physical activity: The dynamics of motivation in development and wellness, *Hellenic Journal of Psychology*, 6, 107-124.
- Schultz, D. & Schultz, S. E. (2000). *Psychology work today: Introduction to industrial & organizational psychology*, 6th. Ed. New York: MacMillan Publishing.
- Schunk, D. (2008). *Learning theories: An educational perspective* (5th ed.). Upper saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline, the art & practise of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.
- Sebastian, Y. (2016). *Generasi langgas: Millennials Indonesia*. Jakarta: Gagas Media.
- Shanti, T. I. (2017). The influence of psychosocial factors on academic performance. *Disertation*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya.
- Smither, R. D., & Houston, J. M. (1992). The nature of competitiveness: the development and validation of the competitiveness index. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 52,407 -418.
- Solnet, D. & Hood, A. (2008). Generation Y as hospitably employees: framing a research agenda. *Journal of Hospitably and Tourism Management*, 15, 59-68.
- Stevens, M. J., Michael A. & Campio, M. (2012). The knowledge, skill, and ability. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(1), March. First Requirements for Teamwork: Implications for Human Resource Management Published April 1, 1994.
- Sullivan, P. H. (1997). *Profiting from intellectual capital, extracting value from innovation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Suls, J., & Wheeler, L. (2000). *Handbook of social comparison*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic.
- Triratnamurti (2006). Several factors contribute to the style of managerial decision making in women's management. *Disertation*. Jakarta: University of Indonesia.
- Tidd, J. (2006). *A review of innovation models*. London: Imperial College.
- Wayment, H. A. & Taylor, S. E. Self-evaluation processes: Motives, information use, and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality*. Volume 63(4), 729-757. December 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1995.tb00315.x>