WORKING PAPER NO: 535

Savouring the Journey: Key to Leveraging the Double Edged Sword of Goals

Ramya Ranganathan
Visiting Faculty
Organizational Behaviour & Human Resource Management
Indian Institute of Management Bangalore
Bannerghatta Road, Bangalore – 5600 76
Ph: 080-26993699
ramya.ranganathan@iimb.ernet.in

Chirag Dagar
Indian Institute of Management Bangalore
Bangalore
chirag.dagar@iimb.ernet.in

Savouring the Journey: Key to Leveraging the Double Edged Sword of Goals

Abstract

Goal-setting is a double edged sword. On one side it holds the potential to spike productivity, align energies, create a sense of purpose, and provide direction. On the other side, however, it holds the potential to create stress, anxiety, fear of failure, narrowed focus (blocking out wider considerations), tendency to take shortcuts that might compromise on values, and self-judgment (or low self-esteem). In this paper, we propose a method to work with goals so as to accentuate potential benefits and at the same time mitigate the potential downsides associated with goal-striving. We propose that by choosing to consciously savor the journey during the process of striving towards the goal, one can experience a way of living and working that is productive, joyous, as well as value-driven.

Keywords: effects of goal-setting, goals, goal-setting process, goal striving, savoring the journey

1   Introduction

The art of goal-setting would most likely precede the creation of the word 'goal' itself. Indeed, one can probably imagine how prehistoric cavemen might have set daily targets and goals to achieve for themselves, 'probably something like make the next kill before tonight's darkness descends'. From then to now, generations of men and women have experimented with goal-setting in different forms and avatars, using it as a tool or framework to motivate and align the behavior of individuals and groups. Indeed, today it is unlikely that any individual or team in an organization would consider operating without goals and targets.

In organizational behavior goal-setting has been widely written about by both scholars and practitioners. Although goal-setting is clearly acknowledged as a tool that can increase productivity (Latham & Yukl, 1975), it also has certain darker aspects where it can increase stress and anxiety (Emmons & Kaiser, 1996; Cochran & Tesser, 1996), trigger unethical behavior (Barsky, 2008; Jensen, 2003; Schweitzer, Ordóñez, & Douma, 2004), and can lower self-esteem (Crocker & Park, 2004; Sorotzkin, 1985). Although most practitioners in organizations are aware of the potential problems associated in working with goals, the focus on productivity metrics often leaves them with no option but to embrace goal-setting as a necessary evil without which teams and individuals cannot function in organizations.

In this paper, we propose a method to effectively use and leverage the tool of goal-setting through which the downsides of working with goals can be minimized without taking away from the advantages that goal-setting offers. Specifically, we identify the conscious practice of savoring as something that can be integrated into the process of striving towards the goal such that it increases the desirable effects and decreases the undesirable effects of goal-setting.

Although the theoretical construct of savoring is relatively new to organizational science (Bryant, 1989), real life practices of savoring have been around for a long time. It is a part of most traditional cultures to take time out to celebrate, to appreciate what is going right, and to express gratitude for the enjoyment of one's experiences. While celebration is something that most people and groups do quite naturally, the practice of consciously making a choice to savor life events and experiences is, however, more of a recent idea (Bryant, 1989).

Although practices of goal-setting and savoring are both being discussed in organizations today, the idea of integrating the two into a single tool has not been attempted yet. In fact such an attempt at integration might even appear to be a contradiction in terms of the division of attention between the future and the present. Goal-setting works by pulling one's attention towards a future target, while savoring is more about the present acknowledgement of one's enjoyment. However, this contradiction exists only at the surface level and it is indeed possible for human beings to simultaneously hold an appreciation of the present alongside an intention for the future. Further some people mistakenly believe that in order to set a target for the future one needs to be discontent with the present. This again is not true because it is indeed possible to be content and happy in the present and at the same time hold an even more wonderful vision or goal for the future.

We explain the possible integration of goal setting and savoring by using the metaphor of mountain climbing. Let us compare the experiences of two people, A and B, who are climbing a mountain. Both of them have set the same goal for themselves - to reach the top of the mountain. However, person A is working purely with goal-setting and as she climbs she keeps her eyes clearly on the target. The goal, gives her the ability to focus on the climb and keeping her eyes on the target (the peak) gives her a sense of direction. In her mind she is acutely aware of the distance that still remains between herself and the peak and she keeps taking steps to reduce that distance. Every time she looks up she is reminded of how much distance she still has to cover. In her mind she has a clear criteria of success and failure - if she reaches the peak, she succeeds, if she does not she fails. According to her mental frame, anything that happens in her world that does not contribute towards getting closer to the peak is a distraction to her. Also, anything (or anybody) that slows down her progress towards the peak is a nuisance factor that needs to be eliminated.

Person B, on the other hand is using goal setting in combination with a resolve to savor the journey. She too has a goal of reaching the top of the mountain and she keeps her eyes on the target. However person B also decides to enjoy the journey and she acknowledges the fun that she is having on the way. She invests in building connections with her co-travelers and she delights in the joy of companionship. She admires the scenery around her and savors the delight of communing with nature. Apart from looking up to see how much she still has to traverse she also looks down every now and then to acknowledge and celebrate how much she has already achieved. She does not mind helping others along the way or taking

a moment off to click a picture or pen a verse because she sees all these activities as part of the larger experience that her journey is about. She is enjoying herself and reaping dividends with every step she takes. If she reaches the top that achievement will be a bonus to the sense of pride and achievement she already feels during every stage of the journey. She has already had so much enjoyment in the journey so far that if for some reason she does not reach the peak, she would not feel shattered by that failure.

So far the research in organizational science that explores the dynamics of goal setting has been separate from the stream of research that explores the dynamics of savoring. We find however that the psychological and affective dynamics set in motion through savoring have a fascinating interaction with the effects that are produced by goal setting. In this paper we examine this interplay as we wonder whether savoring might indeed be the alchemic key that scholars and practitioners of goal setting have been looking for.

We explore two fundamental research questions (1) What are the mechanisms through which goal setting works? (2) What is the effect of integrating goal setting with Savoring?

2   Goal-Setting, Goal-Striving & Savoring

Here we unearth the underlying constructs of goal-setting and goal-striving. Primarily, a goal is something that an individual is consciously involved in and is trying to do (Latham & Yukl, 1975). Austin and Vancouver (1996) defined a goal as an *"internal representation of a desired state"*, whereas, Elliot and Fryer (2008) described a goal as *"a cognitive representation of a future object that the organism is committed to approach or avoid"*. From the behavioral perspective, a goal-directed behavior is characterized by persistence, appropriateness, and searching, linked with the stimulus of the goal (Oettingen & Gollwitzer, 2001). Oettingen and Gollwitzer (2001) also differentiate the behaviorist view of goal-directed behavior, which encompasses needs, motives and incentives from that of the modernist view that is based on the internal subjective goal.

The determinants of goal-setting subsume the various factors affecting goal selection. It's quite often that goals are *assigned* (Oettingen & Gollwitzer, 2001) i.e. allotted by superiors and elders. An assigned goal can be accepted as a personal goal if the source is trustworthy and genuine (Locke & Latham, 1990). On other instances, individuals set their own goals referred to as *self-set* goals (Oettingen &

Gollwitzer, 2001). However, external factors such as social norms (Cantor & Fleeson, 1994), opinions and perspectives of other people (Wilpert, 1994) still influence the self-set goals. Based on the self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1991, 2000), self-concordance encompasses two important factors (internalization and ownership) and defines goals as *external, introjected, identified* and *internal* (Sheldon & Houser-Marko, 2001). According to the act identification theory (Vallacher & Wegner, 1987) individuals have the tendency to have a broad idea i.e. *abstract* goal and subsequently narrow down to the specifics when faced with difficulties i.e. *concise* goal. From the prospect of approaching pleasure and avoiding pain, the hedonic principle (Higgins, 1997), goals can be set based on approach motivation behavior as *positive* goals or based on avoidance motivation behavior as *negative* goals (Elliot, 1999, 2008). With an emphasis on ability (whether fixed or evolving), goals can be framed either as *performance* goals or *learning* goals (Dweck, 1996).

2.1 Process of Goal-Setting

Coming to the question of how goals are set, Oettingen and Gollwitzer (2001) suggested that goals arise based on either a reflective (deliberate) process or a reflexive (automatic) process. Rubicon model of action phases (Gollwitzer, 1990; Heckhausen & Gollwitzer, 1987), a reflective process, emphasizes on the factors of high feasibility and high desirability (considering plenty of wishes but scarce time) responsible for converting a wish into a goal. Oettingen (1996) described two different ways of setting goals under the reflective process namely: expectations (a combination of positive fantasies about the future while considering the negative aspects of the reality) and free fantasies (positive fantasies: disregarding the negative aspects of reality; negative fantasies: disregarding the positive aspects about the future). In the reflexive process of goal-setting, a goal might get created outside an individual's awareness. As per the automotive theory (Bargh, 1990), a goal gets activated automatically with respect to a particular situation as a result of repeated linking of mental representation of the situation and the individual's goal, in so doing the deliberate reflective process is avoided. Carver and Scheier (1999) pointed out another kind of goal automaticity that is primitive, inbuilt and intuitive, and that involves a default response to situations without any pre-thinking or preparation.

2.2 Goal-Striving

Once the goals are set, there lies a path between goal definition and goal attainment i.e. goal-striving. The difference between goal-setting and goal-striving is that goal-setting is concerned with what constitutes a goal (choosing amongst alternatives) while goal-striving incorporates the behavior exhibited towards an existing goal (progress towards a chosen goal) (Lewin, Dembo, Festinger, & Sears, 1944).

2.3 Determinants of Goal-Striving

The fundamental structure of goals plays an important role in moving towards goal attainment, namely goal-striving. The structure and thematic orientation of goal content hugely influences successful goal-striving (Oettingen & Gollwitzer, 2001). For consideration, goal setting theory (Locke & Latham, 1990) emphasizes on the efficacy of specific challenging goals in goal attainment, irrespective of whether a goal is assigned, self-set or participative, however under certain conditions (feedback, commitment, complexity).

Structural aspects of a goal include the time, outcome and ability factors. With respect to the time factor, Bandura and Schunk (1981) defined and stated that proximal goals (present or near future) are more effective than the distal goals (distant in future) for approach orientation; however the relationship reverses in the case of avoidance orientation (Cochran & Tesser, 1996). Higgins (1997) observed that goals defined with a positive outcome (accomplishment) resulted in more task efficiency than goals defined with a negative outcome (preventing failure). Further, learning goals accommodate for effective coping with failure and lead to better results than performance goals that focus on a lack of ability (Dweck, 1996).

With reference to the thematic aspects of a goal, self-concordance goals (Sheldon & Houser-Marko, 2001) founded on autonomy, competence and social integration - self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1991, 2000) culminate to more creativity, better flexibility and effective coping with failure (Ryan, Sheldon, Kasser, & Deci, 1996), and aids the process of goal-striving.

2.4 Process of Goal-Striving

The path from defining a goal to its subsequent attainment is characterized by numerous hindrances and obstacles. An individual employs various processes to ward off the difficulties which might include the inability to initiate action, distractions, failures, conflicts and so on. The Rubicon model of action phases (Gollwitzer, 1990; Heckhausen & Gollwitzer, 1987) involves framing goals from wishes, and a series of tasks for successful goal achievement, namely: planning, initiation, completion and evaluation. An implemental mindset enables the effective pursuit of goals by managing the challenges of goal-striving (Gollwitzer & Bayer, 1999). Planning goals through implementation intentions serve as a constructive self-regulatory mechanism which enables an individual to commit to goal-directed behavior (Gollwitzer, 1993). According to the action control theory, an action-oriented individual exercise shielding mechanisms (safeguarding current goal against competing goals), efficiently plans and executes actions, and adapts to any unforeseen occurrences (Kuhl & Beckmann, 1994; Oettingen and Gollwitzer, 2001). In contrast, a situation-oriented individual is driven by thoughts with limited control over them; one is constantly involved in thoughts about future and unable to focus on a specific current goal. Another perspective on the process of goal-striving comprises of the energization theory (Brehm & Self, 1989; Wright, 1996). It assumes that the effort expended on a goal is related to the difficulty of a task and the potential motivation related to a need, or a motive. That is, effort expended increases with task difficulty however it is constrained by potential motivation (with low potential motivation, effort expended is less even for a moderately difficult task).

Discrepancy reduction offers an alternative lens to analyze goal-striving. As per Bandura (1997), goals carry no motivational component; however, they serve as a measure for positive or negative self-evaluation, with feedback and self-efficacy aiding the goal pursuit. To contract the gap, individuals are steered by the negative self-evaluation linked with the discrepancy or the expected positive self-evaluation related to goal attainment. Discrepancy reduction theory suggested by Carver and Scheier (1998) is based on 'Do goals' and 'Be goals'. The discrepancy consequently created lead to compensatory goals and an objective to reduce the discrepancy, where the velocity of discrepancy reduction serves as the source for positive or negative affect.

2.5 Research on goals in organization

In organizational behavior goal-setting has been widely written about by both scholars and practitioners. The goal setting theory (Locke & Latham, 1990, 2002) describes the underlying dynamics of goal-setting i.e. (a) goals operate as the primary determinants of behavior, (b) precisely defined and difficult goals engender higher performance, and (c) a perceived discrepancy between the current performance and the desired goal acts as a catalyst to motivate the individual. Locke, Latham, and Erez (1988) explained the determinants of goal commitment categorized as external factors (authority, peer influence, rewards), interactive factors (participation, competition) and internal factors (expectancy, rewards). Extending task performance model (Locke, 1968) with regards to goal-setting activities in an organization, Quick (1979) examined the role oriented mechanism of goal-setting (superior-subordinate concordance, role matching) and suggested a dyadic goal-setting process encompassing the contextual variables that may impact the role oriented mechanism of goal-setting.

Some of the other studies have also looked into goal-setting in the organization. Lawrence and Smith (1955) investigated the effects of employee participation in setting goals and decision making, while Sorcher (1967) studied employee participation in goal-setting along with 'role training'. In a study on pulpwood producers, Ronan, Latham, and Kinne (1973) found that close supervision led to higher performance in presence of goals. In a role playing exercise organized for the supervisory training program, Wexley and Nemeroff (1975) evaluated and found the efficacy of goals and feedback in reducing absenteeism, and improving leadership skills. With a focus on goal difficulty, Zander and Newcomb (1967) found a strong correlation between goal difficulty and performance improvement as they examined 149 communities via United Fund campaigns. Studies by Raia (1965) on 15 plants of Purex Corporation highlighted the effectiveness (indirect) of specific goals in relation to *management by objective* (MBO). Specific goals improved productivity and reduced absenteeism, complaints and employee turnover. Similar improvements in performance due to MBO were observed by French, Kay, and Meyer (1966) in their research on MBO with General Electric Company (without objective criterion).

In a research study on stretch goals, Sitkin, See, Miller, Lawless, and Carton (2011) reported that there exists a paradox (organizations most likely to benefit from stretch goals least likely pursue them and vice versa) and organizational researchers need to identify control mechanisms and strategies that

organizations could implement to overcome the paradox. Further, Zhang and Jia (2013) found that stretch goals promoted unethical behavior and augmented relationship conflicts. It was also observed that informational-justice climates diminished the disruptive effect of stretch goals on unethical behavior, while interpersonal-justice climates greatly reduced the disruptive effect of stretch goals on relationship conflict. A recent study on goal disparity in the organization (Pyšný & Zrůst, 2014) used a quantitative survey to determine the disparities in the importance of the perception of goals in three corporate levels and with regards to corporate vision and personal goals. In parallel with alternate management theory, Neubert and Dyck (2016) demonstrated the merit of developing sustainable management theory based on virtue and cater to multiple forms of well-being for multiple stakeholders in the current and future years.

2.6 Research on Goals: other contexts

Besides the research on definitions and the underlying dimensions of goals, goal-setting and goal-striving, research has been conducted on the subject of goals in context with numerous other perspectives. In the domain of health, a study regarding the role of emotions in goal-striving highlighted the influence of anticipated emotions on effort allocation towards preventive health behavior (Nelissen, de Vet, & Zeelenberg, 2011). Boudreaux and Ozer (2013) in their research on goal conflict distinguished between conflicting and facilitating goals, their role in goal-striving and psychological well-being, and their effect on the personal affect of individuals. Fried and Slowik (2004) illustrated how the element of time can be integrated with the goal setting theory (Locke & Latham, 1990) and its sub-components (goal difficulty, goal attainability and goal specificity), and the soundness of the theory be enhanced. A meta-analysis of experimental evidence on goal monitoring suggested goal monitoring to be an effective self-regulation practice for goal attainment and increased monitoring interventions likely engendered behavioral change (Harkin, Webb, Chang, Prestwich, Conner, Kellar, Benn, & Sheeran, 2016). In a research focused on action crisis (conflict between continuing or quitting on a goal) and goal disengagement, Herrmann and Brandstätter (2015) reported the predictive ability of action crisis in ascertaining goal disengagement, where a severe action crisis was associated with an earlier disengagement. Nahrgang, DeRue, Hollenbeck, Spitzmuller, Jundt, and Ilgen (2013) examined the impact of three types of goals: specific learning, general ''do your best'' learning and specific performance with respect to teams, and reported the negative effects of specific learning goals (increased task complexity magnified the negative effects) and the importance of coordination in the

teams. In a recent study to test the link between traits and motivation for goal pursuit, McCabe and Fleeson (2015) found traits to be important for goal achievement and different goals impacted different traits in a differentiating manner. With respect to the role of hope in goal-striving, Nelissen (2015) discussed hope as an affective process that regulates the energy flow in the process of goal-striving.

3   Approach and Avoidance Goals theory, and introduction to Savoring

One of the prevailing paradigms in which goal-setting has been perceived and described, both in literature (Bandura, 1997; Locke & Latham, 1990) and practice, observes that to have and achieve future goals an individual needs to be discontented with the present. Supplementing this idea, it has been found that though approach motivation (behavior towards positive stimuli) and avoidance motivation (behavior away from negative stimuli) are intrinsically distinct as a function of valence (Elliot & Thrash, 2002), however, they represent a dynamic and complex relationship with achievement goal (Carver & Scheier, 1998, 1999; Gernigon, Vallacher, Nowak, & Conroy, 2015). In other words, approach and avoidance motives interact and are employed in combination towards the broader and big-picture achievement goal (Johnson, Chang, Meyer, Lanaj, & Way, 2013). Also, there is a development of cooperation amongst goals, characterized by avoiding a particular action (component) to approach (main goal) or approaching a particular action (component) to avoid (main goal) (Elliot, 2006). For example: with a goal to avoid missing deadline to deliver the quotation, a manager might invest time interacting with his team members (approach).

In addition, Elliot and Church (1997) integrated the classical approach-avoidance orientation with the contemporary orientation of mastery-performance and proposed mastery goals (achievement motivation founded on competence and task-mastery), performance-approach goals (founded on attaining high competence) and performance-avoidance goals (founded on preventing low competence and fear of failure). We would like to decouple these two goals and propound that an individual can operate solely on approach goals without any need (theoretically) to dislike, avoid or be discontented with anything. And, as an antidote to the practice of avoidance aspect, instead of being discontent with the present and wanting something in the future, we emphasize on enjoying the now, and not just come to the neutral rather go beyond in the positive by introducing the act of savoring.

3.1 Savoring

Bryant (1989) defines savoring as an emotion regulation phenomenon, cognitive in nature, used to sustain and prolong positive emotional experiences.

"Self-control is strength. Right thought is mastery. Calmness is power." James Allen

Successfully controlling or mastering the external factors in the environment is assumed to be advantageous for the well-being of an individual (deCharms, 1968; Phares, 1976; White, 1959). A two-process model of perceived-control described by Rothbaum, Weisz, and Snyder (1982) classifies controlling actions under a) primary control: efforts to change the world or b) secondary control: efforts to change oneself for the existing world. An alternate control framework involves evaluation of an event based on its positivity or negativity (Bryant & Veroff, 1984; Gregory, 1978; Reich & Zautra, 1981). By combining the primary and secondary control aspects with the positivity and negativity of an event, Bryant (1989) postulated the *four factor model of perceived control* and identified savoring as a control based phenomenon. The model describes the self-evaluations of an individual's ability to a) Avoid negative events, b) Cope with negative events, c) Obtain positive events and d) Savor positive events. Additionally, (Bryant, 1989) explains the underlying factors that affect the ability to savor, namely: a) behavioral/cognitive practices to magnify and elongate relishing of positive events, b) capability to expect or pre-empt future positive events or reminisce positive events from the past to augment well-being in the present, c) social resources (friends, family) who can help and participate in enjoying the positive events.

Savoring incorporates the self-regulation of positive feelings through generating, sustaining or amplifying positive affect by encompassing positive experiences from the past, present, or future (Bryant, 1989, 2003; Bryant, Ericksen, & DeHoek, 2008; Bryant & Veroff, 2007). This is in alignment with emotion regulation, which involves maintenance of an affective experience and not always a change in the intensity of an emotional experience (Denham, 1998; Gross, 2001). Components of savoring comprise of savoring by anticipating, savoring the present moment and savoring by reminiscing (Bryant, 2003; Bryant & Veroff, 2007). Savoring by anticipating is described as foreseeing and expecting future positive experiences to create well-being in the present (E.g.: a team working on a project looks forward to a sense of accomplishment and pride by completing it before the deadline, a manager expecting a promotion to climb up to the senior management by striking key business deals).

Savoring the current moment is amplifying and prolonging of positive experiences related to an event via specific thoughts and actions (E.g.: an employee is assigned the task to formulate a new marketing strategy, he is applying himself, brainstorming, putting on different hats to consider numerous perspectives, totally involved in the process he is letting his creative juices flow and relish the process). And, savoring by reminiscing includes recollecting and remembering of positive experiences from the past for the well-being in the present (E.g.: an executive remembering about the offsite get-together event of the firm where he got the opportunity to interact with colleagues, managers, and directors informally, a manager recollecting the month when his team was adjudged as the best team because of initiatives and changes introduced by him).

Savoring also involves four inter-related but different concepts namely: savoring experiences, savoring processes, savoring strategies and savoring beliefs (Bryant, Chadwick, & Kluwe, 2011). *Savoring experiences*, a broad aspect, involve consciously relishing and appreciating a positive stimulus driven by thoughts, actions, behaviors, feelings and perceptions (E.g.: eating a hearty meal, witnessing live sports match, an employee who underwent a surgery receiving a message for good health along with a basket of fruits, receiving appreciation and compliments for sharing significant and well-thought out ideas with superiors). Based on the focus of attention, savoring experiences could be *external* (world oriented: sourced outside of self) or *internal* (self-oriented: sourced within self), and further, be based on *cognitive reflection* (mainly introspection) or *experiential absorption* (perceptual engagement) (Bryant & Veroff, 2007). *Savoring processes*, an intermediate aspect, comprise of physical and mental functions extending over time that converts a positive stimulus into a positive feeling that an individual consciously relishes. Anchored on the emotional state, different savoring processes tend to regulate different emotional states such as thanking regulates gratitude, wondering regulates awe, reveling regulates pride (Bryant & Veroff, 2007) (E.g.: a team lead expressing gratefulness towards an executive in the team for extending beyond office hours to finish the tasks represents savoring process of feeling thankful by regulating emotional state of gratitude). As a narrow aspect, *savoring strategies* represent the specific action-plan or thought-process undertaken by an individual that increases/decreases the magnitude, or elongates/cuts down the duration of the positive experience (E.g.: mental picture of a waterfall to reminisce later, gratitude journal, keeping the awards/mementos on workstation to remind oneself of the successes and recognition, storing the appreciative e-mails received from clients and senior management). Categorized based on cognitive processes, behavioral processes or a combination

of both, (Bryant & Veroff, 2007) discusses ten savoring strategies (sharing with others, memory building, self-congratulation, sensory perceptual-sharpening, comparing, absorption, behavioral expression, temporal awareness, counting blessings, and kill-joy thinking). *Savoring beliefs* represent an individual's own view of one's capability to relish positive experiences while considering the component of time (the past, present and future). Savoring Beliefs Inventory (SBI), a self-report instrument assesses savoring beliefs of individuals and encompasses savoring the moment, savoring through reminiscence, and savoring through anticipation (Bryant, 2003).

3.2 Research on Savoring

Bryant, Morgan, and Perloff (1986) extended the research on the relationship between reminiscing and well-being with respect to the effects of reminiscence on younger individuals in everyday life. Results confirmed the association of reminiscence with greater well-being and reported imagery or relaxation as a more effective strategy than behavioral re-enactment or accessing memorabilia. Similar results were found in another study on reminiscence exploring the link between positive reminiscence and emotional experience among young adults. Reminiscing of positive memories led to an increase in the frequency of felt happiness and higher happiness was affiliated with cognitive imagery than memorabilia (Bryant, Smart, & King, 2005). A research that involved increasing savoring the moment as an intervention indicated significantly lower levels of negative affect; however the positive affect amongst the control and non-control group was not significantly different (Hurley & Kwon, 2012). A tendency to savor (Bryant, 2003) has been found to be beneficial for the well-being of an individual over his lifetime. It is positively correlated with advantages such as optimism, self-esteem, internal locus of control, value fulfillment, and life satisfaction; while negatively correlated with depression, guilt, hopelessness, and neuroticism. Tugade and Fredrickson (2007) suggest that savoring is an effective tool to maintain positive emotional experiences, build resiliency, and contributes towards well-being. They also mention interventions that promote savoring (relaxation therapies, guided meditation to engage in thematic imagery exercise). In contrast to the conventional thought that human beings aim to experience positive affect and strive to maintain it for the maximum duration (savoring), Wood, Heimpel, and Michela (2003) posited that it is the differences in self-esteem of individuals that steer them to either savor or dampen (counterpart of savoring) positive affect. Quoidbach, Berry, Hansenne, and Mikolajczak (2010) examined the relative impact of positive emotion regulation strategies (savoring and dampening) on two constituents of well-being i.e. positive affect and life satisfaction. They reported that *being present* in the

moment, positive rumination and communicating with others enhanced positive affect and life satisfaction respectively; on the contrary, being distracted, negative rumination and *fault finding* diminished positive affect and life satisfaction respectively. And, a diverse set of regulation strategies was more effective in overall happiness.

In the context of *Work-Family Conflict (WFC)* i.e. mutually incompatible expectations of work against expectations from family (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), Camgoz (2014) found that individuals possessing a high ability to savor experienced a lower level of WFC than those with lower capability. And, while WFC was negatively related with savoring the moment it was found not to be associated with savoring through anticipation or reminiscence. In an attempt to examine the impact of cultural differences on emotion regulation (savor or dampen), Miyamoto and Ma (2011) found that the notion of people preferring to savor rather than dampen *(hedonic emotion regulation)* was more prominent with *Westerners* than it was with *Easterners.* And, dialectical beliefs about positive emotions played a key role with respect to cultural differences in emotion regulation. In a study about age differences in subjective well-being and savoring, age differences had a non-linear effect on subjective well-being but did not have a direct association with savoring. However, age had an indirect effect i.e. a view of more time left in life led to greater savoring (younger individuals savoring more) (Ramsey & Gentzler, 2014). More recently, Bryant and Smith (2015) have endeavored to improve clarity in the conceptual understanding of savoring and the association among mindfulness, adversity, positive reappraisal, and savoring.

4   The Five Effects: Unpacking the effects of savoring on the double-edged sword of goal-setting

In the following section, we identify five key effects of goal-setting (help navigate, create meaning, fuel anxiety, trigger unethical behavior, and induce low self-esteem). We categorize these five effects under 'desirable effects' and 'undesirable effects', based on the mainstream view in the literature regarding the influence they typically have on productivity, performance, and well-being. We present each of these effects as a level I proposition. We then lay out the psychological dynamics that are at play in creating that particular effect and we examine how that effect might change or be modified if goal-setting is used in conjunction with savoring. These predictions constitute our level II propositions, for each of the five effects.

4.1 I: Goals Help Navigate

At the very core, goals perform a directive function while regulating task performance i.e. they facilitate the focus of an individual towards goal-pertinent actions and activities while reducing the impertinent activities (Locke & Bryan, 1969). In other words, goal-setting helps with performance by providing direction. Goal-setting also performs a directive function in motivation in the form of approach and avoidance actions (Elliot & Church, 1997) and improves persistence, intensity, and direction (Locke & Latham, 1984, 1990, 2002). In an organizational context, goals are used not just by individuals but also by groups and teams. When used by a team, setting a goal again helps by sending clear messages to each team member regarding the direction in which they need to steer their individual boats (French et al., 1966; Raia, 1965). In this way, goals can help align individual team member efforts into a common direction so that the team can then make progress collectively. This kind of navigational function served by goals has been summarized as proposition 1A. We propose that *goal-setting assists individuals and teams to perform better by proffering direction to their actions, behavior, and activities.*

Proposition 1A: Goals provide navigational inputs

We now examine what happens to the effect listed in proposition 1A when goal-setting is combined with savoring the journey. Let us revisit the *mountain climbing* analogy described earlier where both persons A and B aim to reach the top of the peak. Person A works purely with goal-setting, however, person B employs savoring alongside goal-setting. Savoring involves conscious generation, maintenance or magnification of positive emotions (the past, present or future) (Bryant, 1989, 2003; Bryant et al., 2008; Bryant & Veroff, 2007), therefore while savoring one is happy in the now, relishing and feeling good. Based on the Broaden and Build Theory (Fredrickson, 1998), good feelings and positive emotions enhance one's awareness and mindfulness, and opens up (*broaden*) more possibilities and alternatives in the head while building vital resources. Now, since person B is savoring the journey as she climbs, she realizes that she can experiment with different alternatives (routes, tracks, and terrains or different techniques: rappelling or bouldering) to climb up the peak. Person A, on the other hand, is more likely to depend only on the tried and tested route that she believes is the only option available to her. The resultant difference between the journeys of A and B is that although the goal remains the same, B is aware of a number of possible paths that could be taken towards the same goal. The positive impact that savoring the journey has towards unearthing multiple alternative paths leads us to formulate proposition

1B. Thus, we propose that *savoring the journey has an uplifting effect on the direction providing potential of goal-setting by amplifying the number of possible paths towards the same goal*

Proposition 1B: Savoring the journey enhances the navigation support provided by goals

4.2 II: Goals Create Meaning

Austin and Vancouver (1996) define goals as *"internal representations of desired states, where states are construed as outcomes, events or processes"*. The essence or significance that these states hold is the very reason for their *desirability*. In other words *"desired states"* evoke certain meaning or purpose for an individual in order to be pursued. Also, from possessing a rudimentary idea to its conclusive execution, goals perform an all-important function of bridging the *"having"* and the *"doing"* (Cantor, 1990; Sanderson & Cantor, 1999). Goals do this by providing the *"why"*, which signifies the meaning and purpose of an action. So, one of the powerful effects of setting goals is that they give individuals and teams a sense of purpose or meaning.

Personal goals represent important and intentional pursuits pertaining to various life situations (Elliot, Sheldon, & Church, 1997). They play a central role in invigorating a person and they also provide meaning and structure to one's actions and life activities (Klinger, 1977). Goals typically instill a sense of meaning and purpose by providing a reason for the efforts one undertakes (Ariely, Kamenica, & Prelec, 2008). In fact, goals that replicate the fundamental values of an individual create high levels of commitment, meaning and satisfaction because they are in synch with one's 'true self', (Gollwitzer, Wicklund, & Hilton, 1982; Vallacher & Wegner, 1987; Waterman, 1990, 1993). By helping to create a sense of identity and purpose with the activity, goals, therefore, become central to intrinsic motivation, where the primary objective behind engagement in an activity is the activity itself (Pittman, 1998; Waterman, Schwartz, Goldbacher, Green, Miller, & Philip, 2003). We, therefore, propose that *goal-setting helps individuals and teams work better by instilling in them a sense of identity with the task, engaging them intrinsically, and providing them with meaning.*

Proposition 2A: Goals create individual (or shared) meaning

Here we examine what happens to the effect listed in proposition 2A, that is the creation of meaning, when savoring the journey is used along with goal-setting. At an individual level, savoring only enhances the experience of meaning that one derives from engaging in a particular task. During the

process of savoring, the person chooses to consciously acknowledge and celebrate his or her own achievements and the progress made so far (Bryant, 1989, 2003; Bryant et al., 2008; Bryant & Veroff, 2007). In the context of the *mountain climbing metaphor,* for both persons, A and B, the aim to reach the summit provides the meaning and purpose to their actions. The difference lies in the respective meanings that persons A and B ascribe to those actions. For person A, who works purely with goal-setting, a sense of approaching the peak i.e. a reduction in the distance between her and the peak, serves as the fundamental meaning. However, for person B, who employs savoring along with goal-setting, a conscious effort to acknowledge every moment of joy, admire the panoramic scenery, and relish the delightful nature while progressing towards the peak, all these provide meaning to her actions.

At an interpersonal level, when a person decides to savor, an inflow of positive emotions raises one's awareness, encourages novel and exploratory possibilities, and builds resources (Fredrickson, 1998). As a result, one begins to acknowledge and appreciate the contributions of others who are part of the process as well. This appreciation coupled with mutual awareness and interaction may facilitate the formation of a connection (Berscheid & Lopes, 1997). And subsequently, an accretion of greater emotional carrying capacity, tensility and connectivity might even lead to the creation of high quality connections between people (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). Even when the formation of these connections is not directly tied to a task output, the creation of such relationships by themselves leads to the generation of meaning and purpose. This is because human beings are wired to form social bonds, and forming high quality relationships directly give a sense of meaning to one's existence (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Therefore, since person B is savoring the journey as she climbs, she can further enhance the meaning of her actions by forming bonds with fellow trekkers. The uplifting effect of high quality connections is especially pronounced when it is a team activity. This is because, in a group activity members share a common purpose based on a common goal. Also, they find their interactions meaningful because of the quality of human bonding that they experience. We propound that *savoring during the journey ushers an acknowledgment and appreciation of the presence of other co-travelers which leads to the formation of bonds and thereby augments the meaning of the goal-setting activity.*

Proposition 2B: Savoring the journey adds to the creation of meaning that goals create

Although numerous studies have stated and supported the advantages of goal-setting (Locke & Latham, 2006), there are some undesirable effects of goals setting namely: anxiety stemming from fear of failure, unethical behavior, and low self-esteem.

4.3 III: Goals Can Fuel Anxiety (fear of failure)

Anxiety is described as the subjective feeling of nervousness, apprehension, and worry associated with stimulation of the nervous system (Spielberger, 1983), while test-anxiety represents a performance anxiety originating from a fear of failure (Gordon & Sarason, 1955). The literature on achievement motivation describes a fear of failure as an avoidance motive based on anticipatory shame and embarrassment associated with failure (Atkinson, 1957).

The activation and inhibition system (Gray, 1982, 1990), hedonic principle (Higgins, 1997) and approach-avoidance motivation behavior (Elliot, 1999, 2008), all classify goals as positive and negative. A similar distinction is drawn in the form of acquisitional goals (goals that require emitting or emanating a behavior) and inhibitional goals (goals that entail restraining or eliminating a behavior) (Cochran & Tesser, 1996). Individuals, as a part of their personal strivings, majorly pursue positive (acquisitional) goals along with a few avoidance (inhibitional) goals (Emmons & Kaiser, 1996). However, a greater percent of avoidance goals lowers the level of well-being (less positive affect and more anxiety) (Emmons & Kaiser, 1996). Also, inhibitional goals might likely depict an "all-or-none" attitude where a successful inhibition followed by even a minor default is interpreted as a complete failure (Cochran & Tesser, 1996), this leads to anxiety all throughout the activity along with an excessive concern about failure.

Feedback is a component that is vital to the process of goal-setting (Locke & Latham, 1990, 2002) because it involves a comparison of the actual with the ideal performance (Bandura, 1986). To facilitate effective feedback, self-monitoring mechanism plays an instrumental role (Bandura, 1986; Kazdin, 1974). While acquisitional goals engender positive self-monitoring (tracking desired behaviors that one intends to increase), inhibitional goals give rise to negative self-monitoring (tracking negative behaviors that one intends to decrease) (Cochran & Tesser, 1996). By focusing on the negative aspects, negative self-monitoring becomes detrimental to performance, increases anxiety and reduces successive self-

monitoring (Bandura, 1986; Gottman & McFall, 1972; Kirschenbaum & Karoly, 1977). *Therefore, if one adopts inhibitional behavior and the consequent negative self-monitoring*, we propose that goal-setting can fuel anxiety because of the inherent fear of failure.

Proposition 3A: Goals can decrease wellbeing by creating anxiety related to achieving the goal

We now analyze how savoring the journey when combined with goal-setting impacts proposition 3A i.e. anxiety fuelled by goal-setting. Savoring incorporates a conscious identification, sustenance, and enhancement of positive affect comprising experiences from the past, present or future (Bryant, 1989, 2003; Bryant et al., 2008; Bryant & Veroff, 2007). Anxiety stems from a fear of failure at an event in the future, which is when one foresees and expects negative future experiences. This can be directly countered if the individual employs *savoring by anticipation* (Bryant, 2003), which involves consciously foreseeing and expecting positive future experiences. When an individual experience positive emotions, one becomes mindful and one's awareness broadens, this enhanced awareness encourages new and exploratory thoughts and builds physical, psychological and social resources (Fredrickson, 1998). Through willful and mindful acknowledgment of the progress and gains made (small-steps, milestones) towards the goal, savoring promotes acquisitional behavior. And consequently, acquisitional behavior fosters positive self-monitoring (tracking positive aspects and progress), and opposes the negative effects of inhibitional behavior and negative self-monitoring, which causes anxiety.

In the context of the *mountain climbing metaphor,* for both persons A and B, goal remains the same i.e. to reach the summit. Let us assume that both persons A and B exhibit inhibitional behavior. While, person A operates exclusively with goal-setting, person B employs goal-setting in conjunction with savoring the journey. It is more likely that person A might experience higher anxiety. This is because, at each milestone, she is more likely to be worried about - the distance she has covered and that still remains, the pace and progress, the event of failing to complete the trek, the reactions of her friends and family and so on. In other words, her approach of pure goal-setting fuels her anxiety that roots from a fear of failure. In contrast, person B, who also displays similar inhibitional tendencies, is savoring the journey as she climbs towards the peak. Savoring allows her to appreciate the pace as well as the distance covered so far, acknowledge her current level of proficiency, and consciously create memories which she might share with her friends and family, all signifying a shift towards acquisitional behavior. Savoring the journey is more likely to enhance her holistic experience and reduce the negative aspects.

Now, she has appreciated and lived each moment of the journey and will be more resilient in future treks, this feeling partly compensates for the disappointment in case of not reaching the summit. *Thus, we propose that savoring the journey has a dampening effect on the anxiety fuelling effect of goal-setting as it enhances the overall experience of the underlying towards the goal, and provides an alternate source of happiness and a sense of achievement so that everything is not dependent on the 'attainment of the goal'.*

Proposition 3B: Savoring the journey reduces anxiety related to achievement of the goal

4.4 IV: Goals Can Trigger Unethical Behavior

Although, the organizational literature has widely emphasized the constructive effects of goal-setting (Locke & Latham, 2006), there is evidence from the field as well as research that goal-setting can spark unethical behavior (Barsky, 2008; Jensen, 2003; Schweitzer et al., 2004) .

The likelihood to engage in unethical behavior has been theoretically linked with the amount of participation in the goal-striving process, the framing of the goal as a reward that is contingent on performance, as well as specific attributes of the goal itself like content, difficulty, specificity, and outcome (Barsky, 2008). Goals when framed as budgets and targets have also been found to have counterproductive effects by inciting unethical behaviors (Jensen, 2003) such as lying and acting dishonestly. In general, both the occurrence as well as the frequency of unethical behavior such as overstatement of performances has been found to be greater amongst people with specific unmet goals than with people operating with 'do-your-best' goals and this effect is more prominent when the goal is a monetary reward (Schweitzer et al., 2004).

According to (Barsky, 2008), people are more likely to engage in unethical behavior when the goals are specific and outcome oriented. This happens because specific and outcome oriented goals function through creating a narrowed focus of attention, such that other aspects or behaviors not specified as part of the goal are given little or no attention. While the directive function of goal-setting has a useful effect of blocking out irrelevant information (Barsky, 2008), the flipside is that other stakeholders in the project, and wider considerations of the community might get ignored. In fact, Wright, George, Farnsworth, and McMahan (1993), showed through a study that although focusing on specific goals improves goal relevant activities, it leads to a reduction in other important but goal irrelevant activities

such as helping co-workers. Also, in a goal pursuit or a task performance, ethical issues seldom appear as an explicit caveat (Trevino, Butterfield, & McCabe, 2001; Trevino & Youngblood, 1990), rather, it requires a conscious deliberation and categorization (Fiske & Taylor, 1991) to recognize an ethical issue. Goals defined on increasing specificity demands additional attention and processing (Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989), alternatively, they put cognitive load on an individual (Street, Douglas, Geiger, & Martinko, 2001). This might in turn compel individuals to compromise on their values, and adopt the unethical path towards attaining the specific goal. In other words, goals have the capacity to contract awareness of an individual by putting emphasis on the end of a goal rather than the path (means: ethical or unethical) undertaken to achieve the goal.

In case of outcome orientation of goals, an individual with a focus to attain a particular goal tends to ignore other alternate goals (ethical ways) that might come in the way of the pursuit of the main goal (Barsky, 2008; Shah, Friedman, & Kruglanski, 2002). Consequently, this might incite unethical behavior by undermining values and principles in order to achieve an outcome/performance based goal. Hence, we proffer that *goal-setting can motivate unethical behavior mainly due to the contraction of awareness.*

Proposition 4A: Goals can trigger unethical behavior

Now we analyze the effects on proposition 4A that is goal-setting motivates unethical behavior when savoring the journey is combined with goal-setting. When an individual decides to savor, one consciously endeavors to identify, sustain and appreciate positive emotions (Bryant, 1989; Bryant et al., 2008; Bryant & Veroff, 2007). Positive emotions such as joy, interest and contentment lead to a *broadening* of awareness and mindfulness, and further to the *building* of physical, psychological and social resources such as social bonds, creativity (Fredrickson, 1998). Fredrickson and Branigan (2005) tested the link between positive emotions and broadening of attention and thought-action range. As a part of two experiments, individuals were shown a movie clip that elicited emotions of amusement, contentment, neutrality, anger and anxiety. Relative to neutral and negative emotions, positive emotions were found associated with a broadened thought-action repertoire and enhanced attention. Since unethical behavior is likely to be more prominent in the case of specific unmet goals than in the case of 'do-your-best' goals, the *broadened awareness* can help draw attention to the positives even in the specific unmet goals. And, mindfulness can assist in the adoption of a more optimal combination of specific and 'do-your-best' goals, thereby limiting the unethical behavior. Further, savoring comprises

of taking a moment to cherish and celebrate the goal attained before moving on to the next one, which is likely to provide an opportunity to reflect and appreciate the path undertaken towards the goal rather than the attainment of goal. Put differently, savoring might contribute towards pro-active adoption of optimal behavior in line with ethical standards.

With respect to the *mountain climbing analogy* discussed earlier*,* person A, who employs pure goal-setting, is likely to engage in unethical behavior contrary to person B, who applies savoring the journey along with goal-setting. To elucidate, both persons A and B constitute a part of the contingent trekking to reach the peak. As a part of the group, each member is expected to fulfill one's responsibilities towards the group, manifest mutual understanding and observe basic ethical orientation during the trek. Person A, driven by the specific and narrow goal to just reach the top might neglect these broader expectations. For example - at campsites, she might not adhere to the conventions, eat at her own convenience, and litter while climbing. And, as each successive milestone starts to get difficult she might become more prone to unethical behavior such as – she might consume more from the supplies than the standard and not give heed to the needs of others. In contrast, person B savors the journey as she climbs and she appreciates each small milestone (hill) she reaches. As a result, she is flexible in her approach towards the specific goal to reach the top, is aware of her actions and adheres to the optimal expected behavior. She follows the conventions regarding time limits, littering and environmental concerns, which in a broader sense enables smooth organization of activities both at the camp as well as during the hike. And, since she savors each moment, stops to appreciate and reflect on each small achievement over the trek, she is less likely to neglect the ethical practices and the wider considerations. Eventually, this helps her to prolong her ethical orientation such as – help co-travelers who are low on their supplies, and cater to the wider considerations. Therefore, we propose that *savoring the journey diminishes the negative influence of goal-setting in motivating unethical behavior as it broadens the perspective and introduces flexibility.*

Proposition 4B: Savoring the journey reduces the need to use unethical means to attain the goal

4.5 V: Goals Can Induce Low Self-Esteem

Self-esteem, the evaluative constituent of the self-concept, involves a feeling of worthiness when judged by the self (Baumeister, 1998). On the other hand, contingencies of self-worth are the domains or factors (academics, job) with which an individual attaches one's self-esteem (Crocker & Park, 2004; Crocker &

Wolfe, 2001). The basic goal is to validate self (worthiness) based on the performance in the respective domains (Crocker & Park, 2004). An adequate performance is judged as a success accompanied with a feeling of worthiness and high self-esteem, while an inadequate performance is judged as a failure along with a feeling of worthlessness and low self-esteem (Crocker, Karpinski, Quinn, & Chase, 2003; Crocker, Sommers, & Luhtanen, 2002).

With respect to un-conditionality of a goal, if an individual stakes his/her self-worth contingent (conditional) on performance at a certain external event, one might undergo debilitating effects in the form of fragile and unstable self-esteem and other issues (Rogers, 1961). From the perspective of self-theory of ability (Dweck, 1986, 2000; Dweck & Leggett, 1988) - entity theory (fixed abilities) and incremental theory (malleable abilities); if a person with entity theory sets his/her goal of self-validation staked on performance at a domain, one is likely to acknowledge a failure with a judgment of worthlessness and low self-esteem (Crocker & Park, 2004). Also, malign perfectionism is found to be correlated with a lack of self-esteem (Cheng, Chong, & Wong, 1999; Stumpf & Parker, 2000). Perfectionists set and pursue highly unattainable goals to validate self-worth, however, any negative feedback pointing out the discrepancy between the perfectionist-self results in a negative judgment of self-worth and low self-esteem (Sorotzkin, 1985). Thus, we propose that *by attaching self-worth to the success or failure of a performance, goal-setting negatively impacts self-esteem*.

Proposition 5A: Goals Can Induce Low Self Esteem

We now probe into what happens to the effect listed in proposition 5A when savoring the journey is combined with traditional goal-setting. Goal-setting induces low self-esteem by attaching self-worth to the performance or outcome. Put differently, goal-setting frames the goal as *conditional*. Savoring incorporates a conscious generation, maintenance or magnification of positive emotions (the past, present or future) (Bryant, 1989, 2003; Bryant et al., 2008; Bryant & Veroff, 2007), therefore while savoring one is happy in the now, relishing and feeling good. When an individual experience positive emotions one's awareness enhances and opens up more possibilities and alternatives (*broadens*) in the head while building vital resources (Fredrickson, 1998). This awareness and mindfulness along with positive emotions help the individual to connect with the task deeply and prevents excessive worry about the outcome. Also, savoring incorporates acknowledgment and appreciation of one's own qualities, abilities, and achievements. That is, savoring one's own value, the value one can create and the

broader aspect i.e. value addition to others. In other words, savoring enables detachment (of self-worth) from the outcome, makes the goal unconditional, and increases self-esteem. A broadened awareness might encourage a realization that abilities can be enhanced through persistent efforts, and failures are but stepping stones towards improvement, hence representing a change from entity self-theory to incremental self-theory. In addition, savoring is likely to reduce the perfectionist tendencies by reframing the negative feedback about discrepancy from the ideal self as constructive and facilitate the adoption of effective behavior.

With respect to the *mountain climbing metaphor,* both persons A and B have the objective to reach the summit. Person A, who exclusively employs goal-setting and exhibits perfectionist tendency, has attached her self-worth with the goal. It is highly likely that in case she fails to reach the summit, person A will judge herself as a failure accompanied with lower self-esteem. Also, she is less likely to consider the failure as a learning experience. In contrast, person B, who also aims for perfectionism but applies savoring the journey along with goal-setting, focuses on each step taken towards the peak while generating and sustaining positive emotions. She enhances her whole experience of trekking by intrinsically connecting with the activity, though aware of the goal to reach the summit but not excessively worried about it. She also appreciates and enjoys her own self, her achievements, and the valuable moments she has created for herself and for others on the way (through sharing, caring and interacting). This way she does not attach her self-worth with the success or failure to climb up the peak and prevents negative impact on her self-esteem. Savoring the journey helps her make the best out of her trekking experience, so in the event of failing to reach the peak she is likely to be contented with her performance and consider this trek as a constructive feedback on her fitness. Therefore, we propound that *savoring the journey enhances self-awareness, detaches conditions and enables positive appraisal of failures, doing so it undermines the adverse effect of goal-setting on self-esteem.*

Proposition 5B: Savoring the journey increases self-esteem and therefore counters the negative impact of goals on self-esteem

5   Discussion

Although goal-setting and savoring are both fairly common practices in organizations, we have not found any scholars in organizational science exploring the interaction effect between them. In this paper we identified five key effects of goal-setting and categorized them as desirable effects (help navigate,

create meaning) and undesirable effects (fuel anxiety, trigger unethical behavior, and induce low self-esteem). These five key effects of goal-setting formed our level I propositions. The impact that savoring will have when integrated with goal-setting, constituted our II level propositions.

We proposed that savoring the journey during the process of goal striving will increase magnitude of the desirable effects of goal setting (help navigate and create meaning). Savoring contributes towards the navigational function of goal-setting through the creation of multiple paths towards the same goal. Further, by providing an opportunity to form bonds with other people, savoring adds further towards making the task as well as the journey more meaningful.

We also proposed that integrating savoring along with the process of goal-striving will help mitigate the undesirable effects of goal-setting (fuel anxiety, trigger unethical behavior, and induce low self-esteem) of goal-setting. By enhancing the holistic experience of the journey towards the goal, Savoring offers alternate sources of happiness and contentment and thereby reduces the anxiety related to failure of attainment of the goal. Savoring also has the effect of broadening one's awareness, and because of this it counters the tendency of giving into unethical practices due to the contraction of awareness created by goal-setting. Finally, Savoring also mitigates the damage that goal-setting can have on self esteem through (a) creating an avenue for positive self-worth that is not contingent upon goal attainment only, and (b) enabling positive appraisal of failures.

5.1 Different kinds of goals and the five effects

The different kinds of goals represent the determinants of the goal-setting process i.e. factors that influence the process of goal selection. For instance: the individual who sets the goal influences framing of assigned vs self-set goals, the factor of ability influences setting of learning vs performance goals, and the objective to approach-avoid influences setting of positive vs negative goals. We acknowledge that the relationship and even the magnitude of the five key effects of goal-setting are likely to be different for different kinds of goals. Case in point: the desirable effects that goals generate (help navigate and create meaning) might likely be high for self-set, positive and learning goals than for assigned, negative and performance goals. It is also likely that the undesirable effects that goals engender (fuel anxiety, trigger unethical behavior, and lower self-esteem) might be high for assigned, negative and performance

goals than for their counterparts respectively. However, on a general observation, all the five effects exist for all kinds of goals, i.e. even self-set, positive and learning goals might lead to anxiety, unethical behavior, and lower self-esteem, and similarly assigned, negative and performance goals might provide navigational support and create meaning for individuals. Therefore, in our research, we have considered that the five effects have a relationship with goals in a broad aspect that we have intended to explore, and analyze the impact when savoring the journey is combined with goal-setting.

5.2 Savoring not something utopian, rather innate

As an integral component of our research, we posit that the ability to savor is something that is natural and intrinsic to all human beings. We do not present the ability to savor as something that only certain individuals can practice and not accessible to others. This is evident from the fact that young children and even infants have the capacity to regulate positive emotions (Bryant et al., 2011). Environmental factors in the form socialization (family, friends) influence the mix of savoring methods that children acquire and practice over a period of time (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Also, a child's ability to savor progresses from the hedonic aspects (luxuriating & marveling) to the eudaimonic aspects (pride & accomplishment) (Bryant et al., 2011). Further, old-age brings in an awareness of the limited time left in the future and influences an individual's appreciation and savoring of the finite duration (Kurtz, 2008). Therefore, all individuals have their own capacities and particular ways to savor, and further, discover newer ways to savor over a lifetime. In an organization's context, we suggest that a manager can introduce initiatives that might promote savoring amongst employees, learning from each other and improve their approach towards the goal. For example: appreciation mails, mini-celebrations on task completion, recognition and rewards on efficient performance.

5.3 Savoring itself becoming a goal (goal conflict).

Goal conflict occurs when there is an incompatibility between two equally important goals. Alternatively, the pursuit of one significant goal interferes with the pursuit of another significant goal (Boudreaux & Ozer, 2013). A conflict may also arise if an individual is working toward multiple goals simultaneously (Boudreaux & Ozer, 2013). As a consequence, a conflict between equally important goals obstructs effective attainment of a goal and adversely impacts the well-being of an individual (Emmons & King, 1988). In our research, we discuss that, on one hand, we have the process of goal-setting that leads to framing a distant goal (future orientation), and on the other, we have savoring the

journey as a practice that emphasizes on the path towards that goal i.e. current orientation. Although it seems like savoring the journey might itself become a goal and lead to a goal conflict with the distant future goal, we suggest that savoring the journey acts more like an accompanying force or a facilitator towards the goal rather than a competitor to it. We posit that though we have been trained that these two processes can't go together, and creates a dichotomy—conflict and undesirable effects, it may or may not lead to the conflict based on an individual's belief that these two goals can go together and are not necessarily against each other. We invite the readers and managers at large to examine and understand that in fact savoring the journey might serve as a propeller that assists in the process of attaining a goal more effectively.

6   Future Research

6.1 Goal-setting and prioritization

The current research has assisted in identifying certain desirable and undesirable effects of goal-setting and their interplay with savoring the journey. It also points towards several areas of future research. At any given point in time, an individual has numerous thoughts and consequently may develop an array of aims, objectives, desires, dreams or aspirations. To illuminate, people in the due course of time (day, month, year or lifetime) seek and strive to attain multiple goals (Louro, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2007). Considering the ubiquitous pressure, finite amount of resources - time, energy and focus (Lewin, 1938; Miller, 1944; Muraven, Tice, & Baumeister, 1998) and the associated level of significance of the goals, identification of priorities through effective goal-setting becomes imperative. Further research can probe into how goals help in prioritization by encompassing the *evolutionary view* (short-term and urgent goals) and *delay of gratification view* (long-term and important goals) (Mischel, Shoda, & Rodriguez, 1989). Also, the role that savoring the journey will play with respect to prioritization of goals when combined with goal-setting can be examined.

6.2 Depletion of resources over consecutive goals and unethical behavior

In line with the hedonic treadmill theory (Brickman & Campbell, 1971), management today practices setting of one goal subsequent to the achievement of another, i.e. consecutive goals. Self-regulatory mechanism disciplines an individual with respect to a goal and prepares one for the successive goals (Baumeister, 2002; Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). However, individuals possess a limited capacity of self-regulation resources (Hagger, Wood, Stiff, & Chatzisarantis, 2010) which depletes from the first

task to the subsequent one (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998). As a result, this depletion makes it difficult for the individual to adhere to optimal behaviors (ethics, standards, policies) (Christian & Ellis, 2011). Therefore, a depletion of self-regulatory mechanism can lead goal-setting to unethical behavior (Welsh & Ordóñez, 2014). The link between depletion of self-regulatory mechanism over consecutive goals and unethical behavior offers a possible area to explore. On the other hand, savoring, by building physical, psychological and social resources (Fredrickson, 1998), might prevent depletion of the self-regulatory resources and might even contribute towards their replenishment. Therefore, how savoring the journey impacts this relationship could be taken up for future research.

6.3 Learning versus Performance Goals and Perfectionism to Anxiety

The current research has analyzed learning-performance goals and perfectionism in connection with self-esteem. Future research could investigate into how entity theory (performance goals) and incremental theory (learning goals) (Dweck, 1986, 2000; Dweck & Leggett, 1988) might lead to anxiety. Similarly, the link between a goal inclined towards perfectionism and anxiety can be analyzed. Also, further research can highlight how savoring the journey when used in conjunction with goal-setting might impact anxiety that is created by goals.

6.4 Defensive Pessimism

In the current research, we have described the process of savoring and its components: savoring by anticipation, savoring by reminiscence and savoring the moment. Savoring by anticipating involves foreseeing and expecting future positive experiences to create well-being in the present. However, in everyday life people undertake various activities in order to safeguard their current and future interests. These actions include thinking realistically, creating contingency plans and adopting a cautious outlook. In other words, they adopt defensive pessimism (Bryant et al., 2011; Norem & Cantor, 1986). It represents negative thinking that harnesses anxiety related to potential failure into positive outcomes. Defensive pessimism engenders negative expectations about the future and this might prove to be a hindrance in the process of savoring (especially savoring by anticipation). Therefore, future research can focus on investigating how specifically defensive pessimism can obstruct the process of savoring in individuals, the probable reasons and the ways to counter the negative effects.

6.5 Sequential ordering of a positive experience and diverse impact

A positive event might lead to different kinds of responses from different individuals based on the sequence in which it is perceived (Bryant et al., 2011). For instance: an individual who got promoted as a manager after five years of service might think about it distinct ways: a) that it took him five years to progress, or b) the number of years he has in future to grow further post becoming a manager. The order in which an individual considers an event impacts the way one feels about it or savors it. Possible future research can study about the significance of sequential ordering of a positive experience with respect to the process of savoring.

References

- Ariely, D., Kamenica, E., & Prelec, D. (2008). Man's search for meaning: The case of legos. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 67*(3), 671-677.

- Atkinson, J. W. (1957). Motivational determinants of risk-taking behavior. *Psychological review, 64*(6p1), 359.

- Austin, J. T., & Vancouver, J. B. (1996). Goal constructs in psychology: Structure, process, and content. *Psychological bulletin, 120*(3), 338.

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control: New York: Freeman.

- Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 41*(3), 586.

- Bargh, J. A. (1990). Auto-motives: Pre-conscious determinants of social interaction In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition* (Vol. 2, pp. 93-130). New York: Guilford Press.

- Barsky, A. (2008). Understanding the ethical cost of organizational goal-setting: A review and theory development. *Journal of Business Ethics, 81*(1), 63-81.

- Baumeister, R. F. (1998). The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 680-740). New York: MaGraw-Hill.

- Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Ego depletion and self-control failure: An energy model of the self's executive function. *Self and Identity, 1*(2), 129-136.

- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of personality and social psychology, 74*(5), 1252.

- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological bulletin, 117*(3), 497.

- Berscheid, E., & Lopes, J. (1997). A temporal model of relationship satisfaction and stability. In R. J. Sternberg & M. Hojjat (Eds.), *Satisfaction in close relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Boudreaux, M. J., & Ozer, D. J. (2013). Goal conflict, goal striving, and psychological well-being. *Motivation and Emotion, 37*(3), 433-443.

- Brehm, J. W., & Self, E. A. (1989). The intensity of motivation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 560-570.

- Brickman, P., & Campbell, D. T. (1971). Hedonic relativism and planning the good society. In M. H. Appley (Ed.), *Adaptation level theory: A symposium* (pp. 287-302). New York: Academic Press.

- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology (6th ed.)* (pp. 793-828). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

- Bryant, F. B. (1989). A four-factor model of perceived control: Avoiding, coping, obtaining, and savoring. *Journal of personality, 57*(4), 773-797.

- Bryant, F. B. (2003). Savoring Beliefs Inventory (SBI): A scale for measuring beliefs about savouring. *Journal of mental health, 12*(2), 175-196.

- Bryant, F. B., Chadwick, E. D., & Kluwe, K. (2011). Understanding the processes that regulate positive emotional experience: Unsolved problems and future directions for theory and research on savoring. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 1*(1).

- Bryant, F. B., Ericksen, C. L., & DeHoek, A. H. (2008). Savoring. In S. J. Lopez (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of positive psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 857-859). New York: Wiley/Blackwell.

- Bryant, F. B., Morgan, L., & Perloff, L. S. (1986). *The Role of Reminiscence in Everyday Life*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association convention, Washington, D. C. .

- Bryant, F. B., Smart, C. M., & King, S. P. (2005). Using the past to enhance the present: Boosting happiness through positive reminiscence. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 6*(3), 227-260.

- Bryant, F. B., & Smith, J. L. (2015). Appreciating Life in the Midst of Adversity: Savoring in Relation to Mindfulness, Reappraisal, and Meaning. *Psychological Inquiry, 26*(4), 315-321.

- Bryant, F. B., & Veroff, J. (1984). Dimensions of subjective mental health in American men and women. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 116-135.

- Bryant, F. B., & Veroff, J. (2007). *Savoring: A new model of positive experience*: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Camgoz, S. M. (2014). The role of savoring in work-family conflict. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 42*(2), 177-188.

- Cantor, N. (1990). From thought to behavior:" Having" and" doing" in the study of personality and cognition. *American psychologist, 45*(6), 735.

- Cantor, N., & Fleeson, W. (1994). Social intelligence and intelligent goal pursuit: A cognitive slice of motivation. In W. Spaulding (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (Vol. 41, pp. 125-179). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1999). Themes and issues in the self-regulation of behavior. In R. S. Wyer (Ed.), *Advances in social cognition* (Vol. 12, pp. 1). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Cheng, S. K., Chong, G. H., & Wong, C. (1999). Chinese frost multidimensional perfectionism scale: A validation and prediction of self-esteem and psychological distress. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 55*(9), 1051-1061.

- Christian, M. S., & Ellis, A. P. (2011). Examining the effects of sleep deprivation on workplace deviance: A self-regulatory perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(5), 913-934.

- Cochran, W., & Tesser, A. (1996). The 'what the hell'effect: Some effects of goal proximity and goal framing on performance. In L. L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.), *Striving and feeling: Interactions among goals, affect, and self-regulation* (pp. 99-120). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Crocker, J., Karpinski, A., Quinn, D. M., & Chase, S. K. (2003). When grades determine self-worth: consequences of contingent self-worth for male and female engineering and psychology majors. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 85*(3), 507.

- Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2004). The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychological bulletin, 130*(3), 392.

- Crocker, J., Sommers, S. R., & Luhtanen, R. K. (2002). Hopes dashed and dreams fulfilled: Contingencies of self-worth and graduate school admissions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(9), 1275-1286.

- Crocker, J., & Wolfe, C. T. (2001). Contingencies of self-worth. *Psychological review, 108*(3), 593.

- deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York: Academic Press.

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Perspectives on motivation* (Vol. 38, pp. 237-288). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- 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.

- Denham, S. A. (1998). *Emotional development in young children*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Dutton, J. E., & Heaphy, E. D. (2003). The power of high-quality connections. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (Vol. 3, pp. 263-278). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American psychologist, 41*(10), 1040-1048.

- Dweck, C. S. (1996). Implicit theories as organizers of goals and behavior. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior* (pp. 69-90). New York: Guilford Press.

- Dweck, C. S. (2000). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*: Psychology Press.

- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological review, 95*(2), 256-273.

- Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational psychologist, 34*(3), 169-189.

- Elliot, A. J. (2006). The hierarchical model of approach-avoidance motivation. *Motivation and Emotion, 30*(2), 111-116.

- Elliot, A. J. (2008). *Handbook of approach and avoidance motivation* (A. J. Elliot Ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis.

- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 72*(1), 218.

- Elliot, A. J., & Fryer, J. W. (2008). The goal construct in psychology. *Handbook of motivation science, 18*, 235-250.

- Elliot, A. J., Sheldon, K. M., & Church, M. A. (1997). Avoidance personal goals and subjective well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(9), 915-927.

- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 82*(5), 804.

- Emmons, R. A., & Kaiser, H. A. (1996). Goal orientation and emotional well-being: Linking goals and affect through the self. In L. L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.), *Striving and feeling: Interactions among goals, affect, and self-regulation* (pp. 79-98). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Emmons, R. A., & King, L. A. (1988). Conflict among personal strivings: Immediate and long-term implications for psychological and physical well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 54*(6), 1040-1048.

- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition, 2nd edition*. Massachusetts: McGraw-Hill.

- Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of general psychology, 2*(3), 300.

- Fredrickson, B. L., & Branigan, C. (2005). Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought-action repertoires. *Cognition & Emotion, 19*(3), 313-332.

- French, J. R., Jr, Kay, E., & Meyer, H. H. (1966). Participation and the appraisal system. *Human Relations*.

- Fried, Y., & Slowik, L. H. (2004). Enriching goal-setting theory with time: An integrated approach. *Academy of management review, 29*(3), 404-422.

- Gernigon, C., Vallacher, R. R., Nowak, A., & Conroy, D. E. (2015). Rethinking approach and avoidance in achievement contexts: The perspective of dynamical systems. *Review of general psychology, 19*(4), 443.

- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1990). Action phases and mind-sets. In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition* (Vol. 2, pp. 53-92). New York: Guilford Press.

- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1993). Goal achievement: The role of intentions. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 141-185). Chichester, UK: John Wiley.

- Gollwitzer, P. M., & Bayer, U. (1999). Deliberative versus implemental mindsets in the control of action. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 403-422). New York: Guilford Press.

- Gollwitzer, P. M., Wicklund, R. A., & Hilton, J. L. (1982). Admission of failure and symbolic self-completion: Extending Lewinian theory. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 43*(2), 358.

- Gordon, E. M., & Sarason, S. B. (1955). The relationship between "test anxiety" and "other anxieties". *Journal of personality, 23*(3), 317-323.

- Gottman, J. M., & McFall, R. M. (1972). Self-monitoring effects in a program for potential high school dropouts: a time-series analysis. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 39*(2), 273.

- Gray, J. A. (1982). *The neuropsychology of anxiety*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Gray, J. A. (1990). Brain systems that mediate both emotion and cognition. *Cognition & Emotion, 4*(3), 269-288.

- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of management review, 10*(1), 76-88.

- Gregory, W. L. (1978). Locus of control for positive and negative outcomes. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 36*(8), 840.

- Gross, J. J. (2001). Emotion regulation in adulthood: Timing is everything. *Current directions in psychological science, 10*(6), 214-219.

- Hagger, M. S., Wood, C., Stiff, C., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2010). Ego depletion and the strength model of self-control: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin, 136*(4), 495.

- Harkin, B., Webb, T. L., Chang, B. P., Prestwich, A., Conner, M., Kellar, I., Benn, Y., & Sheeran, P. (2016). Does monitoring goal progress promote goal attainment? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychological bulletin, 142 (2)*, 198-229.

- Heckhausen, H., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1987). Thought contents and cognitive functioning in motivational versus volitional states of mind. *Motivation and Emotion, 11*(2), 101-120.

- Herrmann, M., & Brandstätter, V. (2015). Action crises and goal disengagement: Longitudinal evidence on the predictive validity of a motivational phase in goal striving. *Motivation Science, 1*(2), 121.

- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American psychologist, 52*(12), 1280.

- Hurley, D. B., & Kwon, P. (2012). Results of a study to increase savoring the moment: Differential impact on positive and negative outcomes. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 13*(4), 579-588.

- Jensen, M. C. (2003). Paying people to lie: The truth about the budgeting process. *European Financial Management, 9*(3), 379-406.

- Johnson, R. E., Chang, C. H., Meyer, T., Lanaj, K., & Way, J. (2013). Approaching success or avoiding failure? Approach and avoidance motives in the work domain. *European Journal of Personality, 27*(5), 424-441.

- Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Motivation and cognitive abilities: An integrative/aptitude-treatment interaction approach to skill acquisition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(4), 657-690.

- Kazdin, A. E. (1974). Reactive self-monitoring: the effects of response desirability, goal setting, and feedback. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 42*(5), 704.

- Kirschenbaum, D. S., & Karoly, P. (1977). When self-regulation fails: Tests of some preliminary hypotheses. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 45*(6), 1116.

- Klinger, E. (1977). *Meaning and void: Inner experience and the incentives in peoples lives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Kuhl, J., & Beckmann, J. (1994). *Volition and personality*. Gottingen: Hogrefe.

- Kurtz, J. L. (2008). Looking to the Future to Appreciate the Present The Benefits of Perceived Temporal Scarcity. *Psychological Science, 19*(12), 1238-1241.

- Latham, G. P., & Yukl, G. A. (1975). A review of research on the application of goal setting in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 18*(4), 824-845.

- Lawrence, L. C., & Smith, P. C. (1955). Group decision and employee participation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 39*(5), 334.

- Lewin, K. (1938). The conceptual representation and the measurement of psychological forces.

- Lewin, K., Dembo, T., Festinger, L., & Sears, P. S. (1944). Level of aspiration.

- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3*(2), 157-189.

- Locke, E. A., & Bryan, J. F. (1969). The directing function of goals in task performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4*(1), 35-42.

- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1984). *Goal Setting: A motivational technique that Works!* : Elsevier.

- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting & task performance*: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American psychologist, 57*(9), 705.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current directions in psychological science, 15*(5), 265-268.
- Locke, E. A., Latham, G. P., & Erez, M. (1988). The determinants of goal commitment. *Academy of management review, 13*(1), 23-39.
- Louro, M. J., Pieters, R., & Zeelenberg, M. (2007). Dynamics of multiple-goal pursuit. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 93*(2), 174.
- McCabe, K. O., & Fleeson, W. (2015). Are traits useful? Explaining trait manifestations as tools in the pursuit of goals.
- Miller, N. E. (1944). Experimental studies of conflict.
- Mischel, W., Shoda, Y., & Rodriguez, M. L. (1989). Delay of gratification in children. *Science, 244*(4907), 933-938.
- Miyamoto, Y., & Ma, X. (2011). Dampening or savoring positive emotions: a dialectical cultural script guides emotion regulation. *Emotion, 11*(6), 1346.
- Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological bulletin, 126*(2), 247.
- Muraven, M., Tice, D. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Self-control as a limited resource: Regulatory depletion patterns. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 74*(3), 774.
- Nahrgang, J. D., DeRue, D. S., Hollenbeck, J. R., Spitzmuller, M., Jundt, D. K., & Ilgen, D. R. (2013). Goal setting in teams: The impact of learning and performance goals on process and performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 122*(1), 12-21.
- Nelissen, R. (2015). The motivational properties of hope in goal striving. *Cognition and Emotion*, 1-13.
- Nelissen, R., de Vet, E., & Zeelenberg, M. (2011). Anticipated emotions and effort allocation in weight goal striving. *British journal of health psychology, 16*(1), 201-212.
- Neubert, M. J., & Dyck, B. (2016). Developing sustainable management theory: goal-setting theory based in virtue. *Management Decision, 54*(2), 304-320.

- Norem, J. K., & Cantor, N. (1986). Defensive pessimism: harnessing anxiety as motivation. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 51*(6), 1208.

- Oettingen, G. (1996). Positive fantasy and motivation. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior* (pp. 236-259). New York: Guilford Press.

- Oettingen, G., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (2001). Goal setting and goal striving. In A. Tesser & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 329-347). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

- Phares, E. J. (1976). *Locus of control in personality*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning.

- Pittman, T. S. (1998). Motivation. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 549-590). New York: McGraw-Hill

- Pyšný, T., & Zrůst, J. (2014). Goal Disparity in the Organization. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 12*, 549-556.

- Quick, J. C. (1979). Dyadic goal setting within organizations: Role-making and motivational considerations. *Academy of management review, 4*(3), 369-380.

- Quoidbach, J., Berry, E. V., Hansenne, M., & Mikolajczak, M. (2010). Positive emotion regulation and well-being: Comparing the impact of eight savoring and dampening strategies. *Personality and individual differences, 49*(5), 368-373.

- Raia, A. P. (1965). GOAL SETTING AND SELF-CONTROL: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Management Studies, 2*(1), 34-53.

- Ramsey, M. A., & Gentzler, A. L. (2014). Age differences in subjective well-being across adulthood: The roles of savoring and future time perspective. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 78*(1), 3-22.

- Reich, J. W., & Zautra, A. (1981). Life events and personal causation: Some relationships with satisfaction and distress. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 41*(5), 1002.

- Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

- Ronan, W. W., Latham, G. P., & Kinne, S. (1973). Effects of goal setting and supervision on worker behavior in an industrial situation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 58*(3), 302.

- Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J. R., & Snyder, S. S. (1982). Changing the world and changing the self: A two-process model of perceived control. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 42*(1), 5.

- Ryan, R. M., Sheldon, K. M., Kasser, T., & Deci, E. L. (1996). All goals are not created equal: An organismic perspective on the nature of goals and their regulation. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior* (pp. 7-26). New York: Guilford Press.

- Sanderson, C. A., & Cantor, N. (1999). A life task perspective on personality coherence. In D. Cervone & Y. Shoda (Eds.), *The coherence of personality: Social-cognitive bases of consistency, variability, and organization* (pp. 372-392): Guilford Press.

- Schweitzer, M. E., Ordóñez, L., & Douma, B. (2004). Goal setting as a motivator of unethical behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*(3), 422-432.

- Shah, J. Y., Friedman, R., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2002). Forgetting all else: on the antecedents and consequences of goal shielding. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 83*(6), 1261.

- Sheldon, K. M., & Houser-Marko, L. (2001). Self-concordance, goal attainment, and the pursuit of happiness: Can there be an upward spiral? *Journal of personality and social psychology, 80*(1), 152.

- Sitkin, S. B., See, K. E., Miller, C. C., Lawless, M. W., & Carton, A. M. (2011). The paradox of stretch goals: Organizations in pursuit of the seemingly impossible. *Academy of management review, 36*(3), 544-566.

- Sorcher, M. (1967). Motivating the hourly employee. *Crotonville, NY: General Electric Company, Behavioral Research Service*.

- Sorotzkin, B. (1985). The quest for perfection: Avoiding guilt or avoiding shame? *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 22*(3), 564.

- Spielberger, C. D. (1983). Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory STAI (form Y)(" self-evaluation questionnaire").

- Street, M. D., Douglas, S. C., Geiger, S. W., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). The impact of cognitive expenditure on the ethical decision-making process: The cognitive elaboration model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(2), 256-277.

- Stumpf, H., & Parker, W. D. (2000). A hierarchical structural analysis of perfectionism and its relation to other personality characteristics. *Personality and individual differences, 28*(5), 837-852.

- Trevino, L. K., Butterfield, K. D., & McCabe, D. L. (2001). The ethical context in organizations: Influences on employee attitudes and behaviors. *The next phase of business ethics: Integrating psychology and ethics, 3*, 301-337.

- Trevino, L. K., & Youngblood, S. A. (1990). Bad apples in bad barrels: A causal analysis of ethical decision-making behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(4), 378-385.

- Tugade, M. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2007). Regulation of positive emotions: Emotion regulation strategies that promote resilience. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 8*(3), 311-333.

- Vallacher, R. R., & Wegner, D. M. (1987). What do people think they're doing? Action identification and human behavior. *Psychological review, 94*(1), 3.

- Waterman, A. S. (1990). Personal expressiveness: Philosophical and psychological foundations. *Journal of Mind and Behavior, 11*(1), 47-73.

- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 64*(4), 678.

- Waterman, A. S., Schwartz, S. J., Goldbacher, E., Green, H., Miller, C., & Philip, S. (2003). Predicting the subjective experience of intrinsic motivation: The roles of self-determination, the balance of challenges and skills, and self-realization values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(11), 1447-1458.

- Welsh, D. T., & Ordóñez, L. D. (2014). The dark side of consecutive high performance goals: Linking goal setting, depletion, and unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 123*(2), 79-89.

- Wexley, K. N., & Nemeroff, W. F. (1975). Effectiveness of positive reinforcement and goal setting as methods of management development. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(4), 446.

- White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. *Psychological review, 66*(5), 297.

- Wilpert, B. (1994). Participation research in organizational psychology. In G. d'Ydewalle, P. Eelen, & P. Bertelson (Eds.), *International perspectives on psychological science* (Vol. 2, pp. 293-310). Hove, UK: Erlbaum.

- Wood, J. V., Heimpel, S. A., & Michela, J. L. (2003). Savoring versus dampening: self-esteem differences in regulating positive affect. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 85*(3), 566.

- Wright, P. M., George, J. M., Farnsworth, S. R., & McMahan, G. C. (1993). Productivity and extra-role behavior: The effects of goals and incentives on spontaneous helping. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(3), 374-381.

- Wright, R. A. (1996). Brehm's theory of motivation as a model of effort and cardiovascular response. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior* (pp. 424-453). New York: Guilford Press.

- Zander, A., & Newcomb, T., Jr. (1967). Group levels of aspiration in United Fund campaigns. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 6*(2), 157.

- Zhang, Z., & Jia, M. (2013). How can companies decrease the disruptive effects of stretch goals? The moderating role of interpersonal-and informational-justice climates. *Human Relations*, 0018726713483630.