THE SELF-EFFICACY SCALE OF THE FIFTH SEMESTER STUDENTS IN ONLINE LEARNING

Citra Suryanovika
English Literature Study Program
Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Asing Pontianak
csuryanovika@yahoo.com

Abstract- *The study discusses the self-efficacy of STBA Pontianak students in online learning during the covid-19 situation. The study involved 34 fifth-semester students of STBA Pontianak enrolled in learning theories subject. The study was a quantitative design. It used a questionnaire referring to the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) of Chen, Gully, & Eden (2001). The online questionnaire contains eight variables, and five response categories of the Likert scale is distributed. The study found that the mean was 29,3, while the standard deviation was 5,1. The responses toward all 8-item NGSES were varied. The first variable had the highest mean. The overall figure showed that the students had a high self-efficacy scale in implementing online learning during the Covid-19.*

Keywords: *self-efficacy, the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES), the fifth-semester students.*

INTRODUCTION

The coronavirus pandemic hits Indonesia in February, teaching and learning activities drastically change, from face-to-face interaction into online learning. Both students and teachers must adapt to the unconventional classes which require them to use online platforms. The adaptation has a drawback because of learning media unfamiliarity. It is known that both students and teachers have accustomed to traditional learning and teaching strategies which did not use technology as much as online learning. Inequality in internet coverage between regions in Indonesia becomes a major shortcoming in online learning. Thus, online learning cannot run as smoothly as expected. Curriculum and learning outcomes also still refer to the conventional class activities; it is not surprising that online activities provide students with piled-up tasks. In STBA Pontianak, for example, some lecturers who were not familiar with using digital media in teaching were

overwhelmed by the sudden change. It was because they had to learn how to use new teaching media. They also ended with a pile of work as they had to design a new teaching approach, provide feedback to students, write teaching reports, conduct virtual community service and meetings. Students and lecturers faced academic challenges in applying virtual classes. They had excessive workloads and use digital devices beyond working hours.

Those aforementioned challenges of online classes were faced in the first semester of applying online classes. STBA Pontianak started the online classes in March 2020, requiring students and lecturers to use free online platforms. All subjects used Google Classroom, and lecturers independently determined their platforms (*Whatsapp, Zoom, Webex,* or *Google Meet*). After offline meetings were forbidden, most students in STBA Pontianak went back home to their hometown because their parents were worried about the Covid-19 situation. Unfortunately, poor internet connection in most of West Kalimantan areas obstructed the use of sophisticated learning platforms. In the first semester of online learning, particularly in the second semester of 2020, most students of STBA Pontianak conveyed their rejection toward the practice to the university. They stated that they dealt with technical issues in operating *Zoom, google meet*, or *google classroom*. Besides, they also dealt with cognitive problems which made them hardly understand the materials. The students knew that online class was the best option during the pandemic, especially to support the government in reducing the number of the Covid-19 outbreaks. This fact, however, does not reduce students' complaints about how online classes run.

This sudden change posed serious concerns because of facility insufficiency and inadequate preparedness. It was supported by Muthuprasad, Aiswarya, Aditya and Jha (2020) who argued that a comprehensive online scheme in the class had never been implemented before the pandemic because direct interaction still provides more advantages, like a prompt response. They stated that the learning shift has some technical obstacles in developing countries, like the suitability of devices and availability of bandwidth. Muthuprasad, Aiswarya, Aditya, & Jha (2021, p.1) studied students' perceptions toward online learning in India, and they found that the failures of online class implementation were constraint in technology, learning distraction, teacher's incapacity, learner's low self-efficacy scale, and health problem due to long exposure to

technology. Solihah & Mudjiran (2020) studied students' problems in online learning by using a descriptive quantitative design. They found that majority of the students had hindrances in online learning, especially lack of facilities and infrastructures, students' limitations in the economy, and being technology illiterate (p.3). In addition, Assapari (2021, p.15), that studied the lecturers' challenges in teaching EFL during the pandemic, reported that some students did not have devices, sufficient internet coverage, and data package to participate in online learning. Furthermore, Assapari (2021, p.26) concluded that students were not prepared to learn online. Although Assapari (2021) did not directly highlight the main cause of the existing challenges, the lack of academic preparedness seemingly raises the issue.

As suggested by a former researcher, these external hindrances may influence students' learning motivation. Gustiani (2020, p.23) found that regulation and environmental conditions influenced students' motivation in learning. She stated that passive participation in online learning becomes students' choice when they were demotivated. "Motivation denotes the internal cognitive and affective processes that instigate and sustain goal-directed actions and outcomes" (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2021, p.2). Schunk and Dibenedetto (2020) discussed how self-efficacy influences motivation, as initiated by Bandura (1994). Likewise, DeTure (2004, p.23) stated that self-efficacy influences students' achievement significantly. Bandura (1994, p.71) stated that people's self-efficacy has influence in the way people perceive, think, motivate themselves, and behave. Self-efficacy is about one's belief in his/her abilities to complete the assigned tasks that affect his/her life (Bandura; 1994, p.2). Furthermore, Bandura (2006, p.309) stated that belief affects people's thinking and behaviour; they may have erratic, strategic, pessimistic, or optimistic thinking. In other words, accomplishing a certain task highly depends on the self-efficacy one has. Bandura (2006, p.310) believed that self-efficacy scales should suit the objectives. Therefore, some former researchers used different approaches in assessing self-efficacy.

Some researchers that have assessed students' self-efficacy are Bong (2004), DeTure (2004), Nwoke, Onuigbo, & Odo (2016), Aamir, Tallouzi, Pilotti, & Alaoui (2017), Peechapol, Na-Songkhla, Sujiva, & Luangsodsai (2018), Tanius, Alwani, & Muein (2020), Pantu (2021), and Ningsih & Sugiman (2021). They have different purposes in assessing self-efficacy. Bong (2004, p.284) studied the academic self-efficacy

(one of seven variables) in four subjects in Korean high schools. For academic self-efficacy, Bong (2004, p.290) used Self-Efficacy subscale of MSLQ (the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire), which is similar to Pantu (2021, p.3). Meanwhile, DeTure (2004, p.26) used OTSES (the Online Technologies Self-Efficacy Scale). Nwoke et al., (2016, p.118) differently employed the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) to assess self-efficacy of inpatients' caregivers in Nigeria. Likewise, Aamir et al. (2017, p.18) also used NGSES, but they used it to examine the students of Prince Mohammad Bin Fahd University (PMU) that live in the Eastern Region of the Kingdom. Peechapol et al., (2018, p.75) identified factors influencing self-efficacy in online learning. Tanius et al., (2020, p.108), in the meantime, did not mention the types of self-efficacy scale they used. They only reported that the questionnaire was to examine self-efficacy of Shah Alam University students in Malaysia. Similarly, Ningsih & Sugiman (2021, p.968) examined self-efficacy among junior high students in Yogyakarta by delivering questionnaires that contained 15 positive statements and 15 negative statements.

By considering varied self-efficacy scales that former researchers used, this study aims to assess students' self-efficacy in online learning. It uses the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) of Chen, Gully, & Eden (2001) because eight items of NGSES have gone through the content analysis process. The result shows that the NGSE scale is highly reliable, internally consistent, and stable over time (p.69). In other words, eight items of NGSE are relevant self-efficacy scales to assess students' self-efficacy in online learning during the Covid-19 situation. This study has one research question: how is the result of the NGSE scale of 34 respondents in online learning? The study will provide a positive advantage to the students of STBA Pontianak who participated in filling the questionnaire; they can learn about their strengths and weaknesses in online learning. This study can be a reference for the next research because the findings are the initial self-efficacy result of the students of STBA Pontianak.

METHODS

The study derived from the researcher's initial observation toward students' complain over online learning implementation. After introducing the fifth-semester students to self-efficacy theory, the researcher then assessed students' self-efficacy to find out whether students' self-efficacy influence students' punctuality in task submission. In

this initial evaluation, the writer used the new general self-efficacy (NGSE) of Chen, Gulli and Eden (2001) which contains 8 validated items.

Research design

This quantitative research met some major characteristics of quantitative research stated by Creswell (2012: p.13), particularly the characteristics of the data collection and data analysis process. The study only collected the data using questionnaire designed in an online form. Afterward, the writer described and interpreted the finding descriptively.

Data Collection

The study was done in the even semester. It was between March and June 2021. It involved 37 sixth-semester students of STBA Pontianak enrolled learning theories subject in the morning class. The researcher taught learning theories subject in which the students learned self-efficacy in the fifth meeting. All 37 participants were assigned to complete the questionnaire on March 15, 2021. Out of 37 participants, only 34 students completed the questionnaire, while 3 students were absent.

The questionnaire was close-ended referring to the New General Self-Efficacy Scale of Chen, Gully and Eden (2001). Creswell (2012, p.220) claimed that predetermined closed-ended questions aim to obtain beneficial information. The researcher designed a form using Jotform in https://form.jotform.com/211019189602451. The questionnaire had eight closed-ended questions with five predetermined response categories.

Table 1. Eight Close-Ended Items

ITEMS
1. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself
2. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them
3. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me
4. I believe I can succeed at almost any endeavor to which I set my mind.
5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges
6. I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks
7. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well.
8. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.

The researcher distributed the link to fill questionnaire to fifth semester students of STBA Pontianak, particularly class 2A1 and 2C1. The respondents were specifically chosen because the writer acted as a participatory observer that taught self-efficacy in this class.

Data analysis

In doing qualitative data analysis, Creswell (2012, p.238) recommends the writer to organize data by types using a matrix or table, transcribe and analyze it. Furthermore, Creswell (2012, p.10) provides some steps to collect and analyse data using questionnaire, he said that the researcher should list the response into a computer program, select a statistical procedure, analyse, report the results in tables and draw conclusion to confirm whether the findings meet the expected trends or not. The researcher downloaded the responses from the online platform and checked the identity the respondents to make sure that the respondents were students enrolling learning theories class. To find the respondents' total score, the researcher used the following weight:

Table 2. Likert Scale Table

Category	Score
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Neither Agree nor Disagree	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1

In analysing the data, the researcher initially calculated and presented the respondents' score. After that, the percentage of each item by five categories to show the trend of self-efficacy. The percentage is to provide answer to the feasibility of the studied aspects.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study found that 34 respondents had varied scores. The highest score was 38, and the lowest score was 9.

Table 3. Respondents' Scores

Respondents	Score	Respondents	Score
R1	38	R18	29
R2	**36**	R19	29
R3	35	R20	29
R4	35	R21	29
R5	34	R22	28
R6	34	R23	28
R7	33	R24	28
R8	33	R25	27
R9	33	R26	27
R10	32	R27	26
R11	32	R28	26
R12	31	R29	26
R13	31	R30	25
R14	30	R31	25
R15	30	R32	25
R16	30	R33	23
R17	30	R34	9

The researcher calculated the mean and standard deviation of all scores, and it was found that the mean was 29,3, while standar deviation was 5,1.

Figure 1. Result of Respondents' NGSES scale

Sample	: 34
Minimum	: 9
Maximum	: 38
Mean	: 29,3
Standard deviation	: 5,1

After attaining the respondents' scores, the researcher identified the responses of each variable as in the following table.

*self-efficacy,
the New
General Self-
Efficacy Scale
(NGSES)*

___**008**___

Table 4. Result of 8-item NGSES scale

Variables	Answer					Total	Mean	Mean²	SD
	SA	A	NA/D	D	SD				
Variable 1	12	16	5	0	1	34	4,12	17,71	3,69
Variable 2	4	24	5	0	1	34	3,88	15,59	3,42
Variable 3	5	23	3	2	1	34	3,85	15,56	3,42
Variable 4	10	16	5	2	1	34	3,94	16,47	3,54
Variable 5	7	18	5	2	1	33	3,85	15,67	3,44
Variable 6	3	15	11	3	2	34	3,41	12,59	3,03
Variable 7	2	8	15	6	3	34	3,00	10,00	2,65
Variable 8	1	15	13	5	0	34	3,35	11,82	2,91

According to the table, the most chosen category was agreed; it was about 50% of choices in this category. After that, 23% of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed (the neutral category). The latter percentage indicated that the respondents did not know the best choice they should have to represent themselves. The following description explains how each variable answered.

The first variable was about students' belief in their ability to achieve goals that they had set. There were 16 (47%) respondents who agreed with the statement, 12 (35%) respondents strongly agreed with the statement, 5 (15%) respondents stated that they neither agreed nor disagreed, and only one (3%) respondents who strongly disagreed. The overall score for the first variable was 82,4%, and it could be categorized into an excellent score. It means that the majority of the students believed in their abilities. Out of eight variables, the most positive response was the first variable, while the least positive response was the seventh variable which showed a pretty good score (60). The mean and standard deviation for the seventh variable was also the lowest rate.

The second variable was about the respondents' beliefs in themselves to accomplish difficult tasks. The overall score was 77,6% (good) from 24 (71%) respondents that agreed with the statement, four (12%) respondents stated that they strongly agreed with the statement, five (15%) respondents stated that they neither agreed nor disagree, and only one (3%) respondent who strongly disagreed. In the meantime,

the third variable was about important outcomes which the respondents could obtain. The overall score was 77,1 (good) from 25 (68%) respondents that agreed with the statement, five (15%) respondents stated that they strongly agree with the statement, three (9%) respondents stated that they neither agreed nor disagreed, and two (6%) respondents that disagree, and one (3%) respondent that strongly disagreed.

The fourth variable was about the respondents' beliefs in any endeavor. It was found that 10 (29%) respondents strongly agreed, 16 (47%) respondents agreed, five (15%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, two (6%) respondents disagreed, and one (3%) respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. The overall score was 78,8 (Good) and categorized into the second rank that the respondents mostly chose. In the fifth variable, the statement was about the respondents' beliefs in overcoming challenges. There were seven (21%) respondents who strongly agree, 18 (55%) respondents agree, five (15%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, two (6%) respondents disagree, and one (3%) respondents strongly disagree with the statement. The sixth statement was about the respondents' confidence in effectively doing many different tasks. It was found that the answers were three (9%) respondents strongly agreed, 15 (44%) respondents agreed, 11 (32%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, three (9%) respondents disagreed, and two (6%) respondents strongly disagreed with the statement.

The seventh statement is whether the respondents could do most of the tasks very well compared to other people. The answers were two (6%) respondents strongly agreed, eight (24%) respondents agreed, 15 (44%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, six (18%) respondents disagreed, and three (9%) respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. The eighth statement was about "even when things are tough, I can perform quite well," the answers were one (3%) respondents strongly agreed, 15 (44%) respondents agreed, 13 (38%) respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, five (15%) respondents disagreed with the statement.

The mean of five variables, variable 1-6, showed that the respondents' perceived beliefs in their ability and thinking. They believed that they could achieve goals they had set, accomplish difficult tasks, attain important outcomes, succeed at any endeavor, overcome many challenges, and perform different task effectively. The lowest mean was in the fifth variable, it denoted that the respondents could not compare their ability to other people.

The high score of the self-efficacy scale indicated that 33 out of 34 respondents had high self-efficacy in online learning during the Covid-19 pandemic. In this study, only one respondent showed low self-efficacy. The score indicated that the students who participated in the study did not face major issues in online learning. The students may cope with the challenges and hindrances well. The next study focuses on the correlation of the self-efficacy scale and successful academic grades that should be taken into consideration by the researcher in the future. It is to prove that the self-efficacy scale correlates with academic achievement.

CONCLUSION

In this study, 34 respondents had varied scores. The highest mean was in the first variable. By looking at the findings, it could be concluded that the respondents' perceived beliefs in their ability and thinking. The researcher acknowledged that the number of respondents became the limitation of the study. However, the questionnaire initially provided the respondents with an experience to identify their self-efficacy. The future researcher should consider assessing the self-efficacy scale of all students in STBA Pontianak in all subjects they enroll in.

REFERENCES

Aamir, S., Tallouzi, E. A., Pilotti, M. A. E., & Alaoui, K. El. (2017). Research Development, Challenges and Opportunities At the Department of Civil Engineering At Prince Mohammad Bin Fahd University. *Asia Pacific Journal of Contemporary Education and Communication Technology*, *3*(2), 14–26. https://doi.org/10.25275/apjcectv3i2ict2

Assapari, M. M. (2021). the Challenges of Teaching Efl for Adult Learners: Online Learning During the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Jurnal Ilmiah Spectral*, *7*(1), 011–028. https://doi.org/10.47255/spectral.v7i1.64

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-Efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior (* (Vol. 4, pp. 71–81). New York: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.25033-2

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales. In E. F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Ed.), *Self- efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307–337). Greenwich: CT: Information Age.

Bong, M. (2004). Academic Motivation in Self-Efficacy, Task Value, Achievement Goal Orientations, and Attributional Beliefs. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *97*(6), 287–298. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.97.6.287-298

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a New General Self-Efficacy

Scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, *4*(1), 62–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004

DeTure, M. (2004). Cognitive Style and Self-Efficacy: Predicting Student Success in Online Distance Education. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *18*(1), 21–38. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15389286ajde1801_3

Gustiani, S. (2020). Students ' Motivation in Online Learning During Covid-19 Pandemic Era : a Case Study. *Holistics Journal*, *12*(2), 23–40.

Muthuprasad, T., Aiswarya, S., Aditya, K. S., & Jha, G. K. (2021). Students' perception and preference for online education in India during COVID -19 pandemic. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *3*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2020.100101

Ningsih, S., & Sugiman. (2021). Self-efficacy of junior High School Students in Online Learning. *AKSIOMA: Jurnal Program Studi Pendidikan Matematika*, *10*(2), 964–971. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24127/ajpm.v10i2.3561

Nwoke, M. B., Onuigbo, E. N., & Odo, V. O. (2016). Social support, self-efficacy and gender as predictors of reported stress among inpatient caregivers. *Social Science Journal*, *54*(2), 115–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2016.08.001

Pantu, E. A. (2021). Online Learning: The Role Of Academic Self-Efficacy In Creating Academic Flow. *Psychological Research and Intervention*, *4*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.21831/pri.v4i1.40381

Peechapol, C., Na-Songkhla, J., Sujiva, S., & Luangsodsai, A. (2018). An exploration of factors influencing self-efficacy in online learning: A systematic review. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, *13*(9), 64–86. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v13i09.8351

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2021). Self-efficacy and human motivation, (November), 153–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adms.2020.10.001

Solihah, M., & Mudjiran, M. (2020). Problems faced by students in online learning and their implications for guidance and counseling services. *Jurnal Neo Konseling*, *2*(3), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.24036/00306kons2020

Tanius, E., Alwani, N. I. A., & Muein, S. A. (2020). University Students' Self-efficacy in Online Learning due to COVID-19. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering & Multidisciplinary Physical Sciences*, *8*(6), 107–113. https://doi.org/10.37082/ijirmps.2020.v08i06.011