

Manuscript's Code: 2019.03.185

Title: "How Proponents and Opponents Influence Self-Efficacy and Achievement Goals: The Role of Anticipated emotions of Others"

	Comments of reviewer	Author Amendment
Reviewer 1	1. Please rewrite the important point from the articles that could easily found by the reader	Thank you for your opinion. I have changed the manuscript totally and hopefully made the important points of the article, as exhibited in the Abstract, more salient.
	2. Abstract and introduction still not mention why important and what is the aim of the research. The details are on the manuscript.	I appreciate and accept your inputs. I have accommodated your inputs as described in the Abstract and Introduction.
	3. The result and the method is good.	Thank you very much.
	4. Difficult to understand, lack of reading attractiveness.	I strongly agree with you that my manuscript was written in poor English, organized less-systematically, overused of abbreviations, less-attractive, and finally hard to understand. I have made substantial improvements to accommodate your inputs. To mention, here, the list of my corrective actions:
	5. Should rewrite with some important points that should be clear. A lot of sentences is difficult to read and understand.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve writing quality. 2. Re-write the Abstract and Introduction to make the critical points more salient. 3. Re-write several hard-to-read tables (Table 6, Table 7, and Table 8) to make them more informative and reader-friendly. 4. Avoid the over-used of abbreviations. For simplification reason, positive AEPros is represented by <i>proponents' joyfulness</i>, negative AEPros substituted by <i>proponents' distress</i>, <i>opponents' joyfulness</i> represents positive AEOps, and <i>opponents' distress</i> is used as a proxy for negative AEOps. 5. Re-writing the literature review and add some supporting references to make hypothesis formulation more soundly. 6. Rearrange the structure of the manuscript.

A Table of Amendment (1st Manuscript Revision)

<p>Reviewer 2</p>	<p>1. The study proposes about How Proponents and Opponents Influence Self-Efficacy and Achievement Goals. In the study, the theory of anticipated emotions and achievement goals was used as the basis for self-efficacy. This model proposed interesting.</p>	<p>Thank you very much.</p>
	<p>2. In Abstract: The author explained about “Other researchers are encouraged to use anticipated emotions of proponents and opponents as proxy for subjective norm the Theory of Planned Behavior or as antecedents of desire in the Model of Goal-Directed Behavior to predict behavioral intention.” It is not a major part of his research. It would be better if the author also researched gender based.</p>	<p>Thank you for your input. I strongly agree with you. I have replaced “the suggestion” with the new one:</p> <p>“Further research is encouraged to investigate the efficacy of the concept in explaining the motivation to perform other types of social behaviors.”</p> <p>Gender-based study could not be included in the suggestion because the body of the text has stated:</p> <p>“However, the different proportion of males and females is expected not to affect self-efficacy and achievement goals since both segments are the same in terms of the mean of the two variables.” (Page 11, paragraph 1).</p>
	<p>3. For Title: It appears that the word emotions may be a proper noun in this context. Consider capitalizing the word</p>	<p>Sorry for the typo. I have fixed the mistake and please allow me to use the new title:</p> <p>In the Name of Love and Hatred: How Anticipated Emotions of Others Influence Achievement Motivation.</p> <p>I think this new title is more attractive.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	<p>4. Page 7 reveals that that males and females have the same mastery approach (F=0.14, sig.=0.71), it appears "that" author typed that twice in a row. Consider deleting one of them.</p>	<p>The mistake has been fixed.</p> <p>“ reveals that males and females have the same mastery approach (F=0.14, sig.=0.71) “</p> <p>(Page 11, paragraph 1)</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

A Table of Amendment (1st Manuscript Revision)

	<p>5. Page 8 Group 1 is framed with statement: "I you are successful in your study, people that love. It appears that the pronouns "I you" are used incorrectly.</p>	<p>Sorry for this disturbance mistake. "I" should be written as "If". The mistakes have been fixed.</p> <p>Group 1 is framed with the statement:</p> <p><i>"If you are successful in your study, people who love and care for you will feel like, happy, satisfied, pleased, inspired, proud, surprise, thankful, joyfulness, pleased, win and released and confidence."</i> (Page 11, paragraph 2).</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	<p>6. Consider rewriting the phrase.</p>	<p>Strongly agree and already done. Thank you.</p>
	<p>7. Page 13 with achievement goals the author Consider adding a comma. with achievement goals, the author</p>	<p>I have accommodated you suggestion:</p> <p>To test the mediating effect of self-efficacy on the relationship between proponents' and opponents' anticipated emotions with achievement goals, the author utilizes the method suggested by Kenny (2018).... (page 17 paragraph 2)</p> <p>Thank you</p>
	<p>8. Please use the template already given for writing References</p>	<p>Strongly agree. I have also found many mistakes in the References and have made substantial improvement subsequently using Harvard-Anglia format.</p>

Manuscript's Code: 2019.03.185

Title: How Proponents and Opponents Influence Self-Efficacy and Achievement Goals: The Role of Anticipated emotions of Others

	Comments of reviewer	Author Amendment
Reviewer 1	1. Introduction would need to be rewritten. It should start with an approach to give overview about study background, study limitation, and direction of the study.	The suggestion has been accommodated
	2. Problem Statement section is not provided. In one statement, what is the real problem? This section should be presented in a way that readers after convinced with evidence and justification understood the research element of the study. It would be good to start with the storyboard and the end with the issue that needs attention.	In the Introduction, the author has made clear statement to follow the suggestion: ... the research problem is, how others' anticipated emotions influence individuals' current achievement motivation? The author has tried to make smooth flow of storyboard to get to the research problem.
	3. No argument or justification created to explain the importance of study initial trust. Please include the problem statement and it need to be expanded.	Problem statement has been stated clearly and the reason why the study has been underlined in the Introduction
	4. What is the research inquiry that leads to specific research questions and research objectives?	Three research question has been stated followed research objectives. Thank you
	5. Research questions and research objectives must be able to answer the research problem.	

A Table of Amendment (2nd Manuscript Revision)

	6. The flow of the Abstract need to be revised. To begin with a bit on research problem and followed by the aims of the study.	This suggestion has been accomdate: ... However, the influence of proponents' and opponents' future emotions on achievement motivation remains unclear. ...
	7. Please include the theory used in the study.	I have accommodated the suggestion by stating clearly that the main theory of this study is Mayer and Salovey's (1997) emotional
		intelligent theory in the Abstract and Introduction. Thank you.
	8. Please include the method was applied to examine the research model. For example, Partial Least Squares (PLS).	The correction has been made. In the Abstract it is clearly stated that the Mann Whitney test with normal approximation supported by Monte Carlo estimation to test the main effect of the experimentation. To test the mediation effect, the author stated directly the use of Bayesian estimation technic with 5000 times bootstrapping as suggested by Reviewer 2
	9. To include the description of the research method and design. Please state the selection and numbers of participant.	In the Abstract I have accommodated this suggestion by stating clearly that the study utilizes static group design that involve 203 participants chosen judgmentally. Thank you.
	10. To include the implication from the findings and suggestion avenues for future research. Significance - who would benefit from this and what is new about it?	The people who may concern with the finding of the study have been cited in theoretical and managerial contributions. They are any parties that involve theoretically and managerially in achievement-related tasks, such educational practitioners, trainer, training centre management, and families in general
	11. The discussion on Methodology need further explanation / elaborations.	The suggestion has been made additional explanations about research site, research design, and analysis technic as also suggested by Reviewer 2.
	12. Need to include Population, Sampling and Data Collection Procedure.	In research method has been stated that the population are the body of students of the university chosen as the site of the study.
	13. Measures - How would the researcher validate the reliability and validity of the constructs? Details require.	The validation of the construct uses the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with structural equation modelling (SEM) and the reability analysis uses Cronbach Alpha. The author have tried to describe them in details. Thank you.

A Table of Amendment (2nd Manuscript Revision)

	14. Recommend that the definition be provided for all the variables under the measurement section before explaining the measure.	The definition about dependent variables has been added.
	15. The content and flow of writing the introduction chapter need to be improved. This chapter is not well structured.	Thank you for this suggestion. I have improved the Introduction.
	16. The write up need to be improved. Not focus. Many points been mixed up in a	The single sentence paragraphs has been rewritten. The author has also utilized grammar checking application. Thank you.

	single paragraph and section. The candidate is strongly recommended to use topic sentence and conclusion sentence.	
	17. The justification of the study could be better organized through the use of subheadings that separate that theoretical and managerial contribution.	Theoretical and managerial contributions have occupied a separate section in the final part of the manuscript.
Reviewer 2	1. See the comments	
Reviewer 3	1. The authors have shown theoretical gaps in their study. However, there is no data to support the actual situation occurring in the institution unless it is merely an assumption that future emotions may affect individuals' current achievement motivation.	Thank you
	2. Abstract - it is necessary for the author to include the background, objectives, methodology, significant findings, and significance of the study in this section. Also, consider explaining the implications and the conclusion of the research briefly.	The suggestion has been accommodated. Thank you.
	3. What type of sampling design being used?	The author has stated directly that the study uses judgmental design. Thank you.

A Table of Amendment (2nd Manuscript Revision)

	4. The statistics are appropriate and handled with competence. The author shows a critically intelligent application of appropriate principles and practices relevant to the problem under the study.	Thank you. The statistical method has been improved following the Reviewer 2 suggestion to improve the robustness of the method
	5. This manuscript is very well written. The data are appropriately attached and can be clearly legible. The writing style is easily understood by readers from various fields.	Thank you
	6. There is some authors' name that not cited in the text but listed in the references such as Landry (2003), Ames & Archer. (1988), Hsieh, Sullivan & Guerra, (2007), Israelashvili, Sauter, & Fischer, (2019), Malhotra (2020), Mellers & McGraw (2001), Nicholls (1984), and Schunk & Pajares (2009).	Thank you for the the detail correction. It helps me to avoid the disturbance mistake. The corrections has been made. Ames & Archer. (1988) and Hsieh, Sullivan & Guerra, (2007) are skipped out. The rest have cited in text.
	7. Citations in the text and references list do not follow the format.	The correction has been made. Thank you.
	8. Cite the names of all authors in the first citation - Hair, J.F., W.C. Black, B.J. Babin, and R.E. Anderson, (2014)	The suggestion has been accommated. Thank you.
	9. There are some citations in the text but missing under the list of references such as Bagozzi et al. (2016), Davis and Rusbult (2001), Darnon et al. (2007)	The mistake has been corrected. Thank you.

The List of Amendment – Round 2 (Reviewer 2)

	Comment	Revision
--	---------	----------

A Table of Amendment (2nd Manuscript Revision)

1	<p>This regards the manuscript "How Proponents and Opponents Influence Self-Efficacy and Achievement Goals: The Role of Anticipated emotions of Others," which is under consideration by Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business.</p> <p>Title of paper is similar to: "Achievement as Gift and Prestige: Formulating Anticipated Emotion of Others as New Determinant of Consumer Motivation</p> <p>Author: Bilson Simamora, ASEAN MARKETING JOURNAL June 2016 - Vol.VIII - No. 1 - 29-53 Title must be changed.</p>	<p>The author has used the initial title.</p>
2	<p>Commented [A3]: Misleading need to be aligned to content. Mediation effect is mentioned but baseline and conceptual model to show mediation effects are not shown. Only tabulation of results are available.</p>	<p>The mediation effect has been stressed in the abstract:</p> <p>Using Bayesian estimation technic with 1000 times bootstrapping, this study reveals that selfefficacy mediates the influence of anticipated proponents' joyfulness on performance-</p>
		<p>approach goals partially. Partial mediation of self-efficacy is also apparent in the impact of proponents' distress on mastery-approach and mastery-avoidance goals.</p>
3	<p>Commented [A4]: Literature need to be current to warrant strong underpinning theory and problem formulation.</p>	<p>The literature has been up-dated</p>
4	<p>Commented [A5]: This paper should discuss how personality traits and self-esteem predispose individuals to develop and strengthen perceived academic self-efficacy beliefs, and how these personal characteristics interact with learning conditions in improving academic performance.</p>	<p>The author has stressed the argument of selfdetermination theory (Ryan and Deci 2000) and self-esteem embedded in social envy and schadenfreude theory (Brambilla and Riva 2017; van Dijk, van Koingsbruggen, Ouwerkerk, and Wesseling 2011) the Introduction</p>

A Table of Amendment (2nd Manuscript Revision)

5	Commented [A6]: Problem formulation is vague and ambiguous. Should be leaning towards Indonesian academia context to support a cogent foundation. Thus, this paper should examine specific domain of selfesteem (e.g., in the academic context), rather than global selfesteem, in addition to basic traits and self-efficacy beliefs to better understand the personality underpinnings linked with a successful academic performance.	The problem formulation has been improved as also suggested by Reviewer 1
6	Commented [A7]: Outdated literature	The author has added more up-dated literatures
7	Commented [A8]: Outdated	
8	Commented [A9]: Outdated	
9	Commented [A10]: Outdated, provides weak support for hypotheses	
10	Commented [A11]: Justification for employing 4 hypotheses has not been addressed providing strong structural weakness for this study. Why has 4 hypotheses employed in this study? This has not been clarified and also the issue of how formal hypotheses for mediation effects are developed and articulated. There are two major approaches: segmentation and	

	<p>transmittal approaches. When adopting the segmentation approach, three hypotheses should be developed: H1) independent variable (X) effects mediator (M), H2) mediator (M) effects outcome variable (Y) and H3) mediation effect (e.g. M mediates the relationship between X and Y). Papers using the segmentation approach include Zhou, Benton, Schilling, and Milligan (2011), Paulraj (2011) and Wu, Choi, and Rungtusanatham (2010). Next, the transmittal approach, in turn, requires a single hypothesis stating that mediator (M) mediates the relationship between X and Y without delving into hypotheses relating X to M and M to Y are some of the examples for theorising mediation models using the transmittal approach.</p>	
11	<p>Commented [A12]: Justification on selection of unit of analysis is not specified.</p>	<p>The suggestion has been accommodated. Thank you.</p>
12	<p>Commented [A13]: Population and sample size are not justified.</p>	<p>Has been justified. Thank you.</p>
13	<p>Commented [A14]: Participants are not randomly assigned to conditions or orders of conditions because the independent variable is manipulated before the dependent variable is measured.</p>	<p>Static group design in this study allowed nonrandomized participants selection as long as the population are mostly homogenous and the researcher uses proper technic analysis (Malhotra 2020). This statement has been stressed in the manuscript to accommodate this suggestion. Thank you</p>

A Table of Amendment (2nd Manuscript Revision)

14	<p>Commented [A16R15]: Were steps taken to ensure that the groups are as similar as possible? Researcher made an assumption and not on a standardized h test. Are the same sex, are close in age, and have similar learning styles? Taking such steps would increase the internal validity of the study because it would eliminate some of the most important confounding variables. But without true random assignment of the students to conditions, there remains the possibility of other important</p>	<p>Thank you for this suggestion. Post-analysis revealed that there are no differences of the responses under investigation among males and females segment. The mediation effect using Hayes (2020) model 7 also showed that the coefficient h is not significant. Therefore there is no differences in self-efficacy and achievement goals between the two segments, including the difference of mediation effect in the two segments.</p>
	<p>confounding variables that the researcher was not able to control. This shows a design error</p>	
15	<p>Commented [A17]: Because participants are not randomly assigned—making it likely that there are other differences between conditions, therefore this quasiexperiments are generally somewhere between correlational studies and true experiments, this shows directionality problem</p>	<p>Static group experiment viewed as pre experimental design is possible (Malhotra 2020), especially if the use of the true experiment has its own challenge. To avoid the violation of randomization and the normality distribution of data, the researcher utilized nonparametric technic, namely Mann Whitney Test, to test the main effect of the experimentation on the dependent variables.</p> <p>To test the mediation effect, following your suggestion, I use Bayesian estimation method with 5000 times bootstrapping that is useful for small sample with unknown data distribution pattern (MacKinnon, Lockwood, and Williams 2004; Preacher and Hayes 2004; Zhao, Lynch and Chen 2010).</p> <p>Following your suggestion, I used the procedure specified by Zhao, Lynch and Chen</p>
16	<p>Commented [A18]: Was a pilot test, face validity done? This shows reliability and validity problems.</p>	
17	<p>Commented [A19]: Estimate specific indirect effects, instead of total indirect effects.</p>	
18	<p>Commented [A20]: Explore other methods of mediation analysis, for example Monte Carlo simulation and Bayesian estimation.</p>	

A Table of Amendment (2nd Manuscript Revision)

19	<p>Commented [A21]: Researchers should follow Preacher and Hayes’s approach and bootstrap the sampling distribution of the indirect effect. The bias-corrected bootstrapping is considered a powerful method to detect mediation. A statistically significant indirect effect (t-value > 1.96, two tailed, $p < 0.05$) should be taken as an evidence for mediation (Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Zhao et al., 2010). Additionally, evaluating confidence intervals is another important condition to confirm a mediation effect.</p>	<p>(2010) to start the interpretation of the mediation from the indirect effect generated by pre-determined 5000 times bootstrapping, then make a check on c' (direct effect) and the direction of $axbxc$ to find the kind of the mediation.</p> <p>Fortunately, Hayes’ (2020) macro regression application named Process 3.5 plugged in SPSS 22 facilitates this analysis.</p>
20	<p>Commented [A22]: The posited model accounted for ? % of the variance in grades in males and for of the variance in females? What is the variance accounted for academic self efficacy in males and in females?</p>	
21	<p>Commented [A23]: Multiple mediation should be employed to reduce effect of insignificance. Mediation is necessary to test</p>	
	<p>theories in order to understand the causal relationship</p>	
22	<p>Commented [A24]: This shows the model is underpowered and needs to be rebuilt. This because models in the multi-group structure equation modeling framework (with gender) as the group variable should employ the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) which is particularly well suited for comparing the adequacy of nonnested models (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001; the lower the AIC index, the better the goodness-of-fit).</p>	

23	<p>Commented [A25]: The main contribution of this present study should have been to show clearly how both personality traits and self-esteem influenced students' perceived academic self-efficacy beliefs, which in turn influenced grades. Students' personality antecedents in order to better attune their efforts to improve their beliefs about how much they are capable to successfully pursue challenging academic and personal goals should have been a good contributor to educators.</p>	<p>The suggestion has been accommodated in the Introduction and General Discussion.</p> <p>As a theory of personality, Ryan and Deci's theory states that when introjected into self-regulation, people will internalize significant others' expectations and build self-esteem and express their image as socially responsible persons by accepting and working for it. Therefore, as Chen et al. (2009), the demarcation line between personal and collective goals becomes blurred, commonly found in an Asian family.</p>
----	--	---

Manuscript's Code: 2019.03.185

Title: "How Proponents and Opponents Influence Self-Efficacy and Achievement Goals: The Role of Anticipated Emotions of Others"

	Comments of reviewer	Author Amendment
Reviewer 1	1. What will a new contribution to this present study? The significance of the research needs to be expanded.	Thank you for the suggestions. The author has re-write and prescribed firmly present study's contributions and its significance for further research in expanding the concept and related research domains (page 34-35).
	1. Abstract entirely appropriate and comprehensive.	Thank you.
	2. The methods appear to be satisfactory	Thank you.
	3. As to improve the writing style candidate should start each paragraph with topic sentences, and at the end of the paragraphs or sub-section, the candidate must draw conclusions from the discussed issues/points and provide his views and stand on specific issues/points discussed.	The author agrees that some paragraphs are poorly written. The author has revised them to follow the direction tightly. Substantial changes are evident in the discussion, limitations, and direction for further research.
Reviewer 2	1. Since your participants came from Business college/Accounting courses, please state the implication for this study's generalization.	Agree, generalization is an important issue regarding this research. The author has made a consideration about this issue under the direction for further research (page 35, paragraph 3). Thank you.
	2. Gino's (2014) studies - https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/banking-culture-encourages-dishonesty/ - and Abraham et al. (2020) - https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2405844020311191#bib33 , for examples, found that Financial sectors have unique characteristics in terms of the peoples' behavioral ethics and moral emotions.	Gino's (2014) and Abraham et al.'s (2020) works substantially help the author find three interesting research issues for further research. The details are given under the <i>Limitation and Direction for Further</i> research issue (page 34-35). Thank you.
	3. Could non-business/accounting cultures reproduce similar results of the author's present study? Please express some statements regarding this concern in the author's LIMITATION, DIRECTION FOR	Agree that, as reported by recent studies (Lipson et al. 2016; Posselt and Lipson 2016), students in different disciplines have different mental health and sensitivity to mental disruption. Therefore, they are very likely different highly in responding to stimulation as in the present study. This

A Table of Amendment (3rd Manuscript Revision)

	<p>FURTHER RESEARCH AND CONTRIBUTIONS section.</p>	<p>issue has been cited in the direction for further research (page 35, paragraph 3). Thank you.</p>
	<p>4. Please consider the study of Arief Darmanegara Liem dan Youyan Nie (2008) https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00207590701838097 which found that "the Indonesian students endorsed more strongly than their Chinese counterparts on security, conformity, tradition, universalism and achievement values, social-oriented achievement motivation, and performance-approach and mastery-avoidance goals."</p>	<p>Lim and Nie's (2008) study strengthens, not change, theoretical perspective for the study's results, in which, especially, their findings help the author to explain why participants are more sensitive to proponents' anticipated distress. I see that, among others, based on their findings, this sensitivity is caused by the substantial endorsement of family-oriented goals and values to Indonesian students (Page 33, paragraph 2). Thank you for the suggestion.</p>
	<p>5. Saw that the author's study did not seem aware of that psychological facts. Could the authors integrate Liem and Nie's (2008)'s study results in your Discussions? How might the facts add or change perspectives in interpreting the author's current results?</p>	
	<p>6. Did the authors apply the Debriefing procedure to the author's study participants? Please elaborate on it.</p>	<p>Research procedure has been elaborated beneath "<i>Procedure</i>" new sub-section. Thank you (page 14).</p>
	<p>7. Does an Ethical Committee review the author's experimental protocol? Did the author's have Ethical Approval from the Committee? Please state them in the author's Methods section.</p>	<p>Before being executed, the research proposal was reviewed by the technical and ethical committee. The suggestion has been accommodated by creating the new subsection <i>Review and Legitimation</i> (page 14). Thank you.</p>