

Quantitative Descriptive Studies on Self-Efficacy in Students Who Are Completing Their Thesis Within One Semester

Shania Kintani¹ Pamela Hendra Heng²

¹Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanagara, West Jakarta – 11440, Indonesia

²Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanagara, West Jakarta – 11440, Indonesia

Email: pamelah@fpsi.untar.ac.id

Submitted : July 2022, Revised : December 2022, Accepted: February 2023

ABSTRACT

Self-efficacy has been found to be one of the strongest factors predicting performance in education. Individuals with low self-efficacy have irrational thinking, negative feelings towards themselves that they cannot complete tasks or work given to them, these individuals tend to avoid tasks especially on challenging tasks. Students who take thesis and thesis proposal subjects need to have high self-efficacy to be able to complete the task and not easily give up until the exam. Students who have self-efficacy in themselves will feel able to get through this thesis task and graduate. This study aims to get the idea of self-efficacy in students who are completing the final thesis task. This study used descriptive research methods, with this purposive sampling technique to find participants who are willing to provide the information needed. Self-efficacy measurements use a general self-efficacy scale measuring tool based on Bandura theory. The study sample numbered 104 students who were divided into 27 male participants and 77 female participants. The data in this study was processed with the help of Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) application version 22. The result is self-efficacy in students who are completing a thesis is quite high ($M = 3.0136$, $SD = 0.48925$). The dimensions of variable self-efficacy are level, strength, and generality.

Keywords: *Self-Efficacy, undergraduate student, thesis assignment*

1. PREFACE

Background Research

Education is considered to be able to lead someone to a better future. University is considered as a means to provide broad insights so as to make a great contribution in the world of education in Indonesia [4]. Student development requires cooperation between lecturers and students to produce good output. To produce a good output, students need self-efficacy to be able to complete a given task. Research from [2], said that the confidence of students in their ability to perform a task affects the time of completion of the task. Students who do not have self-efficacy can not complete academic tasks because they find the task difficult, then they will tend to delay and end up doing the task in the last moments of collection by cheating on the task of a friend.

College assignments require students to have high self-efficacy so as to avoid procrastination in completing tasks [5]. Self-efficacy has been found to be one of the strongest factors predicting performance in education [8]. According to [7], self-efficacy is expressed as a person's belief in his or her ability to organize and perform necessary actions in achieving a certain level of performance.

Added to the change in the learning system due to the coronavirus disease pandemic (Covid-19). The usual learning method is to meet face-to-face on campus. Its development can be done through distance learning (PJJ) or online. This online learning system has to undergo adjustments again and there are many new obstacles. In addition, students also have difficulty in accessing sources for thesis materials from the campus library [1].

The impact of covid-19 also resulted in curriculum differences in the taking of subjects for this semester. In normal learning conditions, thesis proposal and internships happen in semester 7 and continued thesis in semester 8. In this pandemic period there is an appeal to do activities from

home, so that internship activities are postponed. Therefore, the thesis subjects are changed to semester 7 along with the thesis proposal [3].

Research on the final thesis task that should be done for one year becomes only done within one semester. According to Nurcahyo dan Valentina [6], there is anxiety when data retrieval that is not maximal has an impact on the limitations of the data collected.

On the other hand, the challenge has an indirect effect that causes students to doubt their ability to work on thesis proposals and thesis in one semester and experience anxiety when going to face a thesis exam. Such psychological conditions can affect the performance of student thesis work. There was a decrease in student performance, one of which was a delay in completing the thesis. Therefore, self-efficacy contributes to success in student performance [6].

Based on the background described above, researchers are interested in researching the picture of self-efficacy in students who are completing the final thesis task.

Problem Formula

Based on the explanation above, the formulation of the problem in this study is how to describe self-efficacy in students who are completing the final thesis task?

Paper Structure

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 1 introduces the preliminaries used in this paper, which include background research and problem formula. Section 2 presents research method. There are participants, sampling techniques, Type of research, Settings and Equipment, and measuring tools. Then results and discussion in section 3. Section 4 concludes the paper and presents direction for future research.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

Participant

The participants involved in the study were students. Entering the early adult stages. Early adulthood with an age of about 18-25 years. Students who take thesis and thesis proposal subjects. Male or female and studying in Jakarta. The study has no economic, social, cultural, tribal, religious, racial, and inter-racial (SARA) levels. The number of participants in the study was 104. Male participants 27 people (26%) and women 77 people (74%). Participants with the age of 20 years amounted to 11 people (10.6%), age 21 years amounted to 76 (73.1 years), age 22 years amounted to 13 people (12.5%), age 23 years amounted to 3 (2.9%), age 24 years amounted to 0 (0%), age 25 years amounted to 1 (1%). Participants were from Tarumanagara University amounted 102 (98,1%) and participants were from Krida Wacana University amounted 2 (1,9%). The majority of participants came from psychology departments of 98 people (94.2%), electrical engineering 4 people (3.8%), accounting majors amounted to 2 people (1.9%). Based on the number of subjects taken, only thesis proposals and thesis numbers of 63 people (60.6%), an additional 1 to 2 subjects of 15 people (14.4%), 3-4 subjects of 16 people (15.4%), and more than 4 subjects of 10 people (9.6%).

Sampling Techniques

The technique takes samples using purposive sampling. Researchers use this sampling technique to find participants who fit the criteria of participants in order to provide the information needed. Sampling in this study was to use questionnaires distributed to participants who met the above criteria.

Type of Research

This study is descriptive research that aims to find out the picture of self-efficacy in students in completing the thesis. The research design used is a survey. Survey research is used because the subjects are studied and the aspects that want to be studied are limited. Research instruments or tools used to collect data are questionnaires.

Research Setting and Equipment

In this pandemic period, the collection of participant data is only done online. They filled out a questionnaire through google forms. Participants fill in through gadgets and links to google forms. The equipment used in the study was a mobile phone, laptop, and google forms feature.

Self-Efficacy Measuring Tools

Ralf Schwarzer's self-efficacy scale was first developed by Jerusalem and Ralf Schwarzer, whose original version was made in German. This self-efficacy scale consists of 10 items with format responses from scores of 1 to 4. This measuring tool consists of three domains, namely: level, strength, and generality. In addition, according to Ralf Schwarzer the reliability coefficient of the self-efficacy scale has an alpha Cronbach of 0.759 so that this scale can be said to be reliable and can also be proven through discriminant validity and convergent validity. All the items in this measuring instrument are favorable items. This measuring instrument has been adapted by Dwi Agnes Setiani into Indonesian.

The level dimension has a Cronbach alpha reliability of 0.847 with 4 items, the strength dimension has a Cronbach alpha of 0.705 with 3 items, and the generality dimension has a Cronbach alpha of 0.699 with 3 items.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Main Data Analysis

Self-Efficacy Variable Overview

The self-efficacy measuring tool uses a measurement scale of a scale of 1-4, so it has a hypothetic mean of 2.5. The overall self-efficacy measurement result was an empirical mean higher than the hypothetical mean of 3.0136. It has a standard deviation of 0.48925, a minimum value of 1.89 and a maximum value of 4.00. An overview of self-efficacy variables can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1

Overall Overview of Self-Efficacy Variables

Self-Eff icacy	Score Value		Mean	Standard Deviation
	Min.	Max.		
	1.89	4.00	3.013 6	0.48925

Dimension Overview of Self-Efficacy Variables

The results of self-efficacy measurements at the level dimension have an empirical mean of 3.0409, with a standard deviation of 0.58200, a minimum value of 1.50, and a maximum value of 4.00. The results of self-efficacy measurements in strength dimensions have an empirical mean of 3.1955, with a standard deviation of 0.48630, a minimum value of 1.67, and a maximum value of 4.00. The results of self-efficacy measurements in the generality dimension have an empirical mean of 2.8045, with a standard deviation of 0.60314, a minimum value of 1.33, and a maximum value of 4.00. An overview of the dimensions of the self-efficacy variable can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2

Dimension Overview of Self-Efficacy Variables

Dimensio n	Score Value		Mean	Standar d Deviation
	Min.	Max		
Level	1.50	4.00	3.040 9	0.58200
Strength	1.67	4.00	3.195 5	0.48630
Generalit y	1.33	4.00	2.804 5	0.60314

Level Dimension Overview

In this dimension there are four points of question, namely item 4, 6,9, and 10. For item 4 it has a mean of 2.98 and a standard deviation of 0.763. Point 4 is "In unexpected situations I always know how I should behave". Item 6 has a mean of 2.98 and a standard deviation of 0.737. Point 6 is " I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort ". Item 9 has a mean of 2.94 and a standard deviation of 0.666. Point 9 is " If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution ". Item 10 has a mean of 3.26 and a standard deviation of 0.638. Point 10 is " I can usually handle whatever comes my way ". An overview of the dimensions of the level can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Level Dimension Overview

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Point 4	2.98	0.763
Point 6	2.98	0.737
Point 9	2.94	0.666
Point 10	3.26	0.638

Strength Dimension Overview

In this dimension there are three questions, namely item 1,2,8. For item 1 is " I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough " has a mean of 3.38 and a standard deviation of 0.580. Item 2 is " If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want. " has a mean of 3.29 and a standard deviation of 0.552. Item 8 is " When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions. " has a mean of 2.91 and a standard deviation of 0.698. An overview of strength dimensions can be seen in Table

Table 4

Strength Dimension Overview

	Mean	Standard Deviation
--	------	-----------------------

Point 1	3.38	0.580
Point 2	3.29	0.552
Point 8	2.91	0.698

Generality Dimensions Overview

In this dimension there are three questions, namely item 3,5,7. For item 3 is " It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals. " has a mean of 2.58 and a standard deviation of 0.856. Item 5 is " Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations. " has a mean of 2.98 and a standard deviation of 0.607. Item 7 is " I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities. " has a mean of 2.86 and a standard deviation of 0.806. Item 7. An overview of the generality dimensions can be seen in table 5.

Table 5

Overview of the Dimensions of Generality

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Point 3	2.58	0.856
Point 5	2.98	0.607
Point 7	2.86	0.806

Normality Test

The normality test was conducted using the One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Normally-distributed data has a significance value (p) > 0.05, while normally non-distributed data has a significance value (p) of 0.005 and a self-efficacy variable of 0.170 (> 0.005), so the data is normally distributed.

DIFFERENCE TESTS

Self-Efficacy Reviewed from Gender

Data processing uses independent sample t-tests because distributed data is normal and has only two gender groups. Descriptive analysis of the self-efficacy variables reviewed from the gender showed a woman's mean result of 3.0400 higher than the male mean of 2.9383. It had a significance of 0.599 (> 0.05), indicating that there was no significant difference in terms of gender. Details about this data can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6

Self-Efficacy Test Results Reviewed from Gender

Variabl e	F	Significance (p)	Informatio n
Self-Ef ficacy	0.27 8	0.599	Insignifica nt

Self-Efficacy Reviewed from Age

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is normally distributed. Descriptive analysis results on age- reviewed self-efficacy variables showed a result of $F(3,100) = 2,183$. It had a significance of 0.076 (> 0.05), indicating that there was no significant difference in age. Details about this data can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7

Self-Efficacy Test Results Reviewed from Age

Variable	F	Significance (p)	Information
Self-Efficacy	2.183	0.076	Insignificant

Self-Efficacy Reviewed from the University

Data processing uses independent sample t-tests because the data is normally distributed. The results of descriptive analysis on self-efficacy variables reviewed from the university showed the mean of Universitas Tarumanagara was 3.0079 lower than the mean of Krida Wacana Christian University of 3.3056. It had a significance of 0.397 (> 0.05), indicating that there was no significant difference reviewed from the university. Details about this data can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8

Results of Self-Efficacy Test Reviewed from University

Variable	F	Significance (p)	Information
Self-Efficacy	2.200	0.397	Insignificant

Self-Efficacy Reviewed from the Department

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is normally distributed. The results of descriptive analysis on self-efficacy variables reviewed from the majors showed a result of $F(3,100) = 0.370$. Having a significance of 0.692 (> 0.05), indicates that there is no significant difference in the majors. Details about this data can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9

Results of Self-Efficacy Test Reviewed from Majors

Variable	F	Significance (p)	Information
Self-Efficacy	0.370	0.692	Insignificant

3.2.5. Self-Efficacy Reviewed from The Subjects

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is normally distributed. The results of descriptive analysis on self-efficacy variables reviewed from the subjects taken showed results $F(3,100) = 0.121$ and $p = 0.948$ (> 0.05). The results showed no significant difference in self-efficacy reviewed from the subjects. Details about this data can be seen in Table 10.

Table 10

Self-Efficacy Test Results Reviewed from Subjects

Variable	F	Significance (p)	Information
Self-Efficacy	0.121	0.948	Insignificant

Level Dimensions Reviewed from Gender

Data processing uses independent sample t-tests because distributed data is normal and has only two gender groups. Descriptive analysis on the dimensions of the level reviewed from the gender showed the female mean result of 3.0822 higher than the male mean of 2.9259. It had a

significance of 0.140 (> 0.05), suggesting that there was no significant difference in gender. Details about this data can be found in Table 11.

Table 11

Level Dimensions Reviewed from Gender

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Level	2.209	0.140	Insignificant

Level Dimensions Reviewed from Age

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is normally distributed. Descriptive analysis results on the dimensions of the level reviewed from age showed a result of $F = 1,782$. Having a significance of 0.138 (> 0.05), indicates that there was no significant difference in age. Details about this data can be found in Table 12.

Table 12

Level Dimensions Reviewed from Age

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Level	1.782	0.138	Insignificant

Level Dimensions Reviewed from the University

Data processing uses independent sample t-tests because the data is normally distributed. The results of descriptive analysis on the dimension level reviewed from the university showed the mean of Universitas Tarumanagara was 3.0368 lower than the mean of Krida Wacana Christian University of 3.2500. It had a significance of 0.243 (> 0.05), indicating that there was no significant difference reviewed from the university. Details about this data can be found in Table 13.

Table 13

Level Dimensions Reviewed from the University

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Level	1.381	0.243	Insignificant

Level Dimensions Reviewed from the Department

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is normally distributed. The results of descriptive analysis on the level dimensions reviewed from the major showed a result of $F = 0.960$. Having a significance of 0.433 (> 0.05), indicates that there is no significant difference in the majors. Details about this data can be found in Table 14.

Table 14

Level Dimensions Reviewed from the Department

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Level	0.960	0.433	Insignificant

Level Dimensions Reviewed from Subjects

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is normally distributed. The results of descriptive analysis on the dimensions of the level reviewed from the subjects taken showed results of $F = 0.109$ and $p = 0.955 (> 0.05)$. The results showed no significant difference in level dimensions reviewed from the subjects. Details about this data can be found in Table 15.

Table 15

Level Dimensions Reviewed from Subjects

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Level	0.109	0.955	Insignificant

Strength Dimensions Reviewed from Gender

Data processing uses independent sample t-tests because distributed data is normal and has only two gender groups. The results of descriptive analysis on the strength dimensions reviewed from the gender showed a woman's mean result of 3.2237 higher than the male mean of 3.1235. It had a significance of 0.531 (> 0.05), indicating that there was no significant difference in gender. Details about this data can be found in Table 16.

Table 16

Strength Dimension as Reviewed by Gender

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Strength	0.531	0.468	Insignificant

Strength Dimensions Reviewed from Age

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is distributed normally. Descriptive analysis results on strength dimensions reviewed from age showed results of $F = 3.264$. Having a significance of 0.015 (< 0.05), indicates a significant difference in age. Details about this data can be found in Table 17.

Table 17

Strength Dimensions Reviewed from Age

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Strength	3.264	0.015	Significant

Dimensions of Strength Reviewed from the University

Data processing uses independent sample t-tests because the data is distributed normally. The results of descriptive analysis on the strength dimension reviewed from the university showed the mean of Universitas Tarumanagara was 3.1895 lower than the mean of Krida Wacana Christian University of 3.5000. Having a significance of 0.599 (> 0.05), indicates that there is no significant difference in review from the university. Details about this data can be found in Table 18

Table 18

Dimensions of Strength Reviewed from the University

	F	Significance (p)	Information
--	---	---------------------	-------------

Strengt h	0.27 8	0.599	Insignifica nt
--------------	-----------	-------	-------------------

Strength Dimensions Reviewed from the Department

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is distributed normally. The results of descriptive analysis on the strength dimensions reviewed from the majors showed a result of $F = 0.763$. It has a significance of $0.552 (> 0.05)$, indicating that there is no significant difference in the majors. Details about this data can be found in Table 19.

Table 19

Strength Dimensions Reviewed from the Department

	F	Significance (p)	Informatio n
Strengt h	0.76 3	0.552	Insignifica nt

3.2.15. Strength Dimensions Reviewed from Subjects

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is distributed normally. Descriptive analysis results on strength dimensions reviewed from the subjects taken showed results of $F = 0.152$ and $p = 0.928 (> 0.05)$. The results showed no significant difference in strength dimensions reviewed from the subjects. Details about this data can be seen in Table 20.

Table 20

Strength Dimensions Reviewed from Subjects

	F	Significance (p)	Informatio n
Strengt h	0.15 2	0.928	Insignifica nt

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from Gender

Data processing uses independent sample t-tests because distributed data is normal and has only two gender groups. The results of descriptive analysis on the generality dimension reviewed from the gender showed the female mean result of 2.8202 higher than the male mean of 2.7654. It had a significance of $0.443 (> 0.05)$, indicating that there was no significant difference in terms of gender. Details about this data can be found in Table 21.

Table 21

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from Gender

	F	Significance (p)	Informatio n
Generalit y	0.59 2	0.443	Insignifica nt

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from Age

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is distributed normally. Descriptive analysis results on generality dimensions reviewed from age showed results of $F = 2.045$. Having a significance of $0.094 (> 0.05)$, indicates that there is no significant difference in age. Details about this data can be found in Table 22.

Table 22

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from Age

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Generality	2.045	0.094	Insignificant

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from the University

Data processing uses independent sample t-tests because the data is distributed normally. The results of descriptive analysis on the generality dimension reviewed from the university showed the mean of Universitas Tarumanagara was 2.7974 lower than the mean of Krida Wacana Christian University of 3.1667. It had a significance of 0.159 (> 0.05), indicating that there was no significant difference reviewed from the university. Details about this data can be found in Table 23.

Table 23

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from the University

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Generality	2.010	0.159	Insignificant

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from the Department

Data processing uses one-way Anova, because the data is distributed normally. Descriptive analysis results on the generality dimension reviewed from the major showed a result of $F = 1.158$. It has a significance of 0.334 (> 0.05), indicating that there is no significant difference in the majors. Details about this data can be found in Table 24.

Table 24.

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from the Department

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Generality	1.158	0.334	Insignificant

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from Subjects

Data processing uses one-way anova because the data is distributed normally. The results of descriptive analysis on the generality dimension reviewed from the subjects taken showed results of $F = 0.180$ and $p = 0.910$ (> 0.05). The results showed no significant difference in generality dimensions reviewed from the subjects. Details about this data can be found in Table 25.

Table 25

Generality Dimensions Reviewed from Subjects

	F	Significance (p)	Information
Generality	0.180	0.910	Insignificant

4. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

Based on the results of research and discussions that have been done it can be concluded that self-efficacy is classified as high because it has an empiric mean that is higher than the

hypothetic mean. All dimensions of self-efficacy are high, and the order is the dimension of strength is the highest dimension, then the level dimension and finally generality. Normality test results show normal distributed self-efficacy results. In different tests, only the strength dimensions were reviewed from the age of participants who had significant differences.

Suggestion

The results of this study could be an additional material for educational psychology. At least this research can contribute and further refine the theory of self-efficacy in students. For the researchers can further balance the number of male and female participants. The results of this study can be used as a reference for educators in adjusting appropriate materials for teaching in terms of self-efficacy in students. Lecturers can be motivated at the beginning of thesis proposal guidance so that students have high self-efficacy to be able to complete the final thesis task. Parents can provide social support to their children. As well as being a reference for students in increasing self-efficacy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In this study, researchers want to thank the supervisor who has provided guidance and input with patience in the preparation of this thesis. Thank you also to the supporters of the researchers. Researchers also thanked participants who had provided the necessary data in this study.

REFERENCES

- Afriyeni,N & Murjito,W.H, (2014) Hubungan antara efikasi diri dengan prokrastinasi akademik pada siswa kelas xi SMA negeri 9 Padang, *Jurnal Antropologi: Isu-isu Sosial Budaya*. 16(2) 191-199.
- Alimah,C & Khoirunnisa,R.N (2021) Hubungan antara self-efficacy dengan stres akademik pada mahasiswa yang sedang mengerjakan skripsi di masa pandemi covid-19, *Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*. 8(2) ,160-170. <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/character/article/view/40972>
- Anggreni,P, Suartini,N.W & Mahendradatta,U (2019) Strategi pengembangan sumber daya manusia di 3 perguruan tinggi dalam menghadapi persaingan global (Studi pada Universitas di Provinsi Bali), *ISEI Business and Management Review*. 3(1),26–34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36217/ibmr.v3i1.83>
- Bandura, A, *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*, W.H Freeman and Company. New York, 1997, p. 3.
- Damri,D, Engkizar,E & Anwar,F (2017) Hubungan self-efficacy dan prokrastinasi akademik mahasiswa dalam menyelesaikan tugas perkuliahan, *Jurnal Edukasi: Jurnal Bimbingan Konseling*. 3(1) (2017) 74-95. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22373/je.v3i1.1415>
- Klassen,R.M, Krawchuk,L.L & Rajani,S (2008) Academic procrastination of undergraduates: Low self-efficacy to self-regulate predicts higher levels of procrastination, *Jurnal Elsevier: Contemporary Educational Psychology*. 33(4) , 915–931. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2007.07.001>
- K.P.S.S. Psikologi, Pengumuman Pembimbingan Proposal Skripsi dan Skripsi 2020/2021. 2020.
- Nurchahyo,F.A, Valentina,T.D, (2020) Menyusun skripsi di masa pandemi? Studi kualitatif kesejahteraan psikologis. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Dan Call Paper “Psikologi Positif Menuju Mental Wellness”*, pp. 136–144. https://doi.org/10.1007/SpringerReference_223312