

ANALYZING STUDENTS' SELF-EFFICACY OF THEIR SPEAKING ABILITY ACROSS PROFICIENCY LEVELS

Nada Maulidia A.H¹, Henny Rahmawati², Dzurriyyatun Ni'mah³

^{1,2,3}*English Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Islam Malang*
Email: [1nadamaulidia37@gmail.com](mailto:nadamaulidia37@gmail.com)

Abstrak

This research is carried out to find out what kinds of self-efficacy dimensions students employ across proficiency levels in speaking ability. Data on students' use of self-efficacy dimensions were obtained from a Questionnaire adopted by (Agung et al., 2022). Students' use of self-efficacy dimensions was categorized into three dimensions: magnitude, generality, and strength. The researcher took five samples from each level—high, intermediate, and low—based on the grades from the lecturers. The procedure of this research includes some steps; distributing the questionnaire on students' self-efficacy, taking a score from an English lecturer, and analyzing the data by using SPSS 16. The results showed that all students frequently used the strength dimension across proficiency levels. And those students actually potentially have high self-efficacy, depending on the lecturer how to provide triggers so that self-efficacy can support their learning achievement. So, the lecturer should not underestimate that students with low level have low self-efficacy. It is due to the fact that the students actually have a potentially high level of self-efficacy so that the lecturer can trigger the students well.

Key Words: self-efficacy, speaking ability, proficiency level

INTRODUCTION

Speaking as one of the productive skills is a difficult action. Some components as well as speaking regarding a student for them to think about in class on speaking are grammar accuracy, vocabulary use, and clear pronunciation. Furthermore, speaking a language is especially difficult for foreign language learners since effective oral communication necessitates the capacity to utilize the language effectively in social interactions, however, they have certain issues using English because they are not used to doing so (Shumin, 2002, p. 204). According to Nunan (2003), most people, particularly English learners, find it challenging to speak a foreign language. They prefer to converse with others in their native tongue. Cameron (2005, p. 241) claimed that "acquiring the capacities is the technique used to become fluent in another language different beginning studying first language." According to the data presented above, self-efficacy is one of the elements influencing students' speaking abilities. Self-efficacy has been defined as people's beliefs in their personal capacities to do a certain activity with desired outcomes, according to Bandura (1997), as cited by Zhang & Ardasheva (2019), if people successfully complete the task, they will be more confident in taking on future challenges and will have a higher bar to meet. Students that have a high sense of self-efficacy are inquisitive, confident, and enjoy a challenge. Furthermore, self-efficacy influences students' learning accomplishments without relying on others. In summary, self-efficacy can help students become more independent. According to Rex & Roth (1998) in Paradewari (2017), self-efficacy can impact people's accomplishments. For example, if a student has a high level of self-efficacy, they will feel brave and thrilled to demonstrate their speaking skills in the classroom in front of their peers. The student will be confident in delivering the subject since

they have previously prepared themselves perfectly by learning the topic before presenting it. Meanwhile, students with poor self-efficacy may doubt their ability when faced with a problem, giving up and believing they cannot handle it.

Furthermore, self-efficacy can influence motivation and activity selection. When faced with adversity, a student with high self-efficacy will put out great effort and will most likely remark, "This is something I can handle." In contrast, a learner with low self-efficacy might distrust his own abilities, believing that "it appears to be hard and challenging." Furthermore, the problem is primarily concerned with answering the question: in this situation, are I able to do my assignment? . Self-efficacy beliefs are multimodal in nature and vary depending on the functional domain (Zimmerman, 2000). As an example, On a history test, one may be effective, but not on a biology exam. To put it another way, the perception of self-efficacy is decreasing given activity in a specific context.

Bandura (1997) identified the domain from which people learn about their own efficacy. They arrived at their results through performance achievement, social persuasion, physiological conclusions, and vicarious (observational) experiences (Schunk, 1985). Successes that are repeated develop self-efficacy; failures decrease it. Meanwhile, Zimmerman (2000, pp. 82–91) argued that self-efficacy is more concerned with performance capacities than with personal features for instance physical or psychological characteristics. Çubukçu (2008) demonstrates that personal direct encounters with activities have a greater influence on self-efficacy views rather the social comparison. Students In terms of self-efficacy, nobody can compare their estimated ability to that of their classmates in the same field. They evaluate their own talents to complete a specific activity.

According to Bandura (1997), in the social learning analysis, we can expect a person's self-efficacy through four main sources of information. These are: (1) Mastery experience, a person's personal expertise/mastery in a specific task; (2) Vicarious experience, a person's experience by imitating a model (observing a peer solving a specific task); (3) Verbal Persuasion, Verbal supports or encouragements from other people; and (4) Physiological State, an emotional stimulation in a person to control his/her fatigue, stress and/or anxiety. These sources will determine individuals when they believe to have competencies in completing particular tasks. And Bandura (1997) distinguishes self-efficacy into three dimensions such as, self-efficacy magnitude: the level of difficulty an individual perceives is required to complete a specific task (such as : easy, moderate and hard). According to Masitoh & Fitriyani (2018), magnitude dimension is associated to people's self-confidence in accomplishing tasks on several levels, as well as their ability to solve difficulties, (2) self-efficacy generality is associated to people's self-confidence in accomplishing tasks on several levels, as well as their ability to solve difficulties, and (3) self-efficacy strength is belief in one's ability to execute diverse things successfully (Urban, 2006). Students that are more interested in fluent people who speak a second or foreign language are more confident and less apprehensive (Thompson & Lee, 2014).

For many years, numerous studies on self-efficacy and language development studies had been carried out. Tilfarlioğlu (2009) investigated the levels and relationships In 2009, 175 GUSFL students had high expectations for their English language learning self-efficacy. The findings indicated that students' self-efficacy is relatively strong, as well as that there's is a cyclical relationship between self-efficacy and achievement. It also proved their deep relationship (Tilfarlioğlu, 2009, pp. 135–136). There are also other types of research on speaking ability or oral performance. For example, in a prior research conducted out by Desmaliza & Septiani (2018), entitled " Lower Secondary School Students' Self-Efficacy and Speaking Ability". According to the data's statistical hypothesis, empiric (0,755) > table (0,225), therefore they determined that Ho is rejected but Ha is accepted. According to the findings, there is a considerable relationship between self-efficacy and speaking ability. According to their findings, self-efficacy can influence students' learning outcomes in speaking at the junior high school level. Looking at their grades, it is clear that students with high levels of self-efficacy receive higher grades, whereas those with low levels of

self-efficacy receive lower score. Furthermore, the following study comes from Zhang & Ardasheva (2019), they did a study with the title "Self-Efficacy Sources in the public speaking in English field between college EFL learners". The combined sample results broadly corroborate Bandura's theorized Elements of self-efficacy included Mastery Experience, Vicarious Experience, and Verbal Persuasion, but not Physiological and Emotional States. Subsample results emphasize prior English Public Speaking course experience, gender, and academic major as characteristics that may influence the existence and extent of the association between self-efficacy and its theoretical foundations. Because the research indicated that different groups of students respond differently to their teachers' efforts, this is critical for teachers who want to raise their students' English Public Speaking self-efficacy beliefs.

Previous research has only focused on self-efficacy when speaking in public. Furthermore, there is research which focuses gender self-efficacy when it comes to speaking activities. There have been far too few research that have looked at self-efficacy is regard to speaking ability. The current study explores students' self-efficacy in speaking ability across competence levels. This study used a statistical descriptive methodology to determine the levels students' self-efficacy dimensions toward speaking ability uses. Reflecting upon the literature review, research on self-efficacy dimensions for third-semester students of the University of Islam Malang is a rare undertaking. Therefore, this research is conducted to reveal (1) What kinds of self efficacy dimensions do the students' employ across proficiency level in speaking ability?.

METHOD

This research employed a descriptive statistical methods. This research is called descriptive quantitative because the data is presented in numerical and descriptive form. It requires statistical analysis to determine the average score of the use of self-efficacy based on the three dimensions as a whole. The purpose of this study is to determine self-efficacy of students in a speaking activity. This research was conducted to find out what kinds of self-efficacy dimensions that the students' employ across proficiency level in speaking ability. 37 students in the third semester were involved as respondents, they are undergraduate students majoring in English at the University of Islam Malang. They were chosen because they had passed Speaking 1, 2 and 3, so they should have sufficient experience in speaking. Prior to the distribution of the questionnaire, an approval letter was sent to the head of the English department at the university to allow the students to participate in the study. Before answering the questionnaire, the students were asked to read the purpose section on the first page of the questionnaire which asked for their consent to participate in the study. From the 37 participants, the researcher took five samples from each proficiency level and then grouped into three namely high level, intermediate and low level. To find out their ability levels, the researcher asked for speaking scores from the lecturer.

The questionnaire was used by the researcher, and it enclosed three key themes covering to every dimension. First topic for the magnitude dimension relates by the students personal perception of their abilities to face obstacles in finishing activities. The second general theme relates with students confidence of attaining the level of adaption. The last focus emphasized the students' ability in performing the exercise successfully. The measuring scale for the questionnaire was designed as a Likert scale with 4 points. The following is a scale description: 1-Always (very high self-efficacy), 2-Sometimes (slightly higher self-efficacy), 3-Rarely (poor self-efficacy), and 4-Never (extremely low self-efficacy).

This study used data from a 15-item questionnaire Students' Self-Efficacy of their Speaking Ability Across Proficiency Levels adopted from (Agung et al., 2022). The questionnaire was divided into three sections: the purpose section, demographic information, and students' self-efficacy of their speaking ability. The first section was the section on the purpose which informed students about the title of the study, the study's purpose, and a declaration regarding agreement or

disagreement among students to take part in the study. The demographic information of the participants was presented in the second section.

RESULTS

The findings there are two data that the researcher takes, the first is form the questionnaire and the second is speaking scores form the lecturer. The scores from the lecturers are grouped into some levels from high, intermediate, and low levels. With details for high level (80-90 points), intermediate level (75-80 points), and low level (60-70 points). After grouping, researcher took 5 samples from each level according to the specified values. Then, the researcher looked for the average of each level in each question and continued to look for the average of each dimension in each level. As possible, The analysis results are visible in Table 1.

Tabel 1. Self-efficacy dimensions across proficiency level

Level of proficiency	Descriptive Statistics								
	High			Intermediate			Low		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Magnitude Dimension	5	2.80	.20	5	2.72	.33	5	2.56	.66
Generality Dimension	5	3.08	.10	5	3.04	.16	5	2.92	.36
Strength Dimension	5	3.36	.35	5	3.20	.46	5	3.28	.57

Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to calculate the average scores of each self-efficacy dimension as well as the levels inside each dimension. As shown in Table 1, at the high level the average of the three dimensions of self-efficacy consists of magnitude (2.80), generality (3.08) and strength (3.36). To have a better understanding of how self-efficacy dimensions are used, the mean scores for each level of each dimension were also analyzed. Interesting findings were revealed in the strength dimension, it turns out that at high levels, in addition to the strength dimension in self-efficacy there is also a high generality dimension (3.08), for high levels it turns out that they still have self-efficacy in a low dimension which has an average of (2.80) where the characteristics are always thinking about failure and focusing more on things that have negative value, quickly losing self-confidence, and if they find a task that is quite difficult, then they will tend to feel that it is beyond their ability. Based on the data, it can be concluded that most of the students at the high level have a strong belief in an activity and make it easier for them to speak in English. As explained by Bandura (1982) that students with high self-efficacy are able to make effective plans and succeed in completing a task.

The data shown in Table 1 shows that at the intermediate level the magnitude dimension has an average (2.72), the generality dimension at the intermediate level has an average (3.04), and the strength dimension at the intermediate level has an average (3.20). These results were obtained from the questionnaire results which were compared with the students' speaking scores. For the intermediate level, the average distance of the generality dimension is only slightly different from the generality dimension at the high level. However, the average on the strength dimension is lower than the average on the strength dimension at the low level which is (3.28). Based on the data, most learners at the intermediate level have high self-efficacy in certain activities. A number of learners at this level also rated themselves in the middle range in each statement. From the statements above, it can be concluded that learners at the intermediate level have high confidence in certain activities, but are still hesitant so that it affects their confidence in other activities. This is in line with the findings of Lestari et al. (2020) that many learners feel competent, but not yet fully confident in completing English learning tasks and achieving set goals.

At the low level, it can be seen in Table 1 that the magnitude dimension at the low level has an average of (2.56), while the generality dimension has an average of (2.92) which is lower than the intermediate and high levels. And finally, the strength dimension at the low level has an average of (3.28) which is higher than the intermediate level. However, although at a low level, the strength dimension is also owned by those at the low level. Even the average is higher than the intermediate level. From the above statement, it can be concluded that students who have low self-confidence face several obstacles that make it difficult for them to speak English fluently. As explained by Lestari et al. (2020) students who have low self-confidence usually have low academic achievement as well.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to find out what kinds of self-efficacy dimensions the students' employ across proficiency level in speaking ability. This study use descriptive analysis to describe the data collected from the instruments. After analyzing the data, the researcher found about factors that influence students' self-efficacy towards speaking ability and the dimensions owned by students based on proficiency level. The results showed that most students had the same answers to all the questions asked. The detailed explanation as follows:

Statistical analysis was used by the researcher to analyze the data. Based on the results of the questionnaire, the researcher found that most students have high self-efficacy because the average obtained for the high level on the strength dimension is (3.36), for the middle level on the strength dimension is (3.20) and for the low level on the strength dimension is (3.28). The dimensions in Table 1 explain that high-level students also still have low dimensions of self-efficacy, and can be influenced by physiological and affective state factors that have a significant influence in boosting student self-efficacy because physiological factors like as exhaustion, anxiety, and stress have an impact on students' performance and confidence in completing assignments. In psychological aspects, student approval is positively correlated with the achievement of speaking skills (Asakereh & Dehghannezhad, 2015). And the lowest average score is owned by the magnitude dimension. This shows that the perception of each individual will be different in perceiving the level of difficulty of a task, the perception of a difficult task is influenced by the competence possessed by the individual. The magnitude dimension is related to individual confidence in completing activities at various levels, as well as their ability to resolve difficulties (Masitoh & Fitriyani, 2018).

Based on the data in Table 1 at the intermediate level, the strength dimension has the highest average of (3.20) which is lower than at the low level. According to Urban (2006), the strength dimension relates to an individual's belief in his or her capacity to complete various activities successfully. Then the generality dimension averages (3.04), the generality dimension is related to the extent to which individual in all instances, beliefs are generalized (Lunenburg, 2011). As for the average magnitude dimension of (2.72), the difference between the high level and the intermediate level is only slight but different from the low level which is very low from both levels. It is possible that they are influenced by the factor of master experience, which is a strong source of self-efficacy (Zhang & Ardasheva, 2019). People can establish their opinions about their abilities based on previous performance in this scenario. Because they already know what went wrong and what was lacking. Students who have previously failed in speaking subjects will be more cautious and confident in studying speaking subjects in the next semester because they have learned from the previous class. Otherwise, individuals will have negative perceptions about previous activities, which may jeopardize their self-efficacy.

This finding is in line with the previous study by Agung et al., (2022) who concluded that these students with high self-efficacy were discovered as evidenced by their magnitude and strength. Whereas this study concluded that all students used the strength dimension at the proficiency level.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the data discussed in the findings, the researcher would like to explain the conclusions. The study reveals that speaking is a crucial skill in the classroom, and self-efficacy plays a significant role in motivating and ensuring students' performance. The strength dimension is used by students across proficiency levels, and even high proficiency levels have low self-efficacy dimensions. This highlights the importance of encouraging students at all levels, regardless of their level. Lecturers should not underestimate the potential for students with low self-efficacy levels to improve their learning achievements. By providing appropriate triggers and fostering a positive learning environment, lecturers can help students develop the necessary skills to succeed in the classroom.

Following the conclusion of the research, the researcher found that it had gaps and limits. Future studies can go deeper into the gaps and limits mentioned in this study to get a better result. According to the conclusion, the researcher makes various recommendations to students, lecturers, and future researchers. For students who are low level do not feel inferior because, from this result, those who are low level still have self-efficacy that is potential to achieve. From this result that the low level still has self-efficacy which is potential to have self-efficacy in high levels. Then for the lecturers, that the students with a low level of proficiency still potentially have a high level of self-efficacy, and from that, the lecturer must determine how to improve students' self-efficacy. Therefore, it can help with English learning. And last, for future researcher it is suggested to conduct interviews so as to obtain depth data about the reasons for how the students have their respective self-efficacy

REFERENCES

- Agung, A. S. S. N., Siboro, E. S., & Quinones, C. A. (2022). Exploring The Level Of Students' Self-Efficacy In Speaking Class. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 25(2), 651–659. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v25i2.4432>
- Asakereh, A., & Dehghannezhad, M. (2015). Student satisfaction with EFL speaking classes: Relating speaking self-efficacy and skills achievement. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1085354>
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122>
- Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Cameron, L. (2005). *Teaching languages to young learners* (7. printing). Cambridge University Press.
- Çubukçu, F. (2008). A study on the correlation between self efficacy and foreign language learning anxiety. 4 (1), 148–158.
- Desmaliza, D., & Septiani, T. (2018). Students Self- Efficacy And Their Speaking Skill At Lower Secondary School. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Education in Muslim Society (ICEMS 2017)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icems-17.2018.24>
- Lestari, Z. W., Saleh, M., Mujiyanto, J., & Yusuf, S. (2020). Students' Self Efficacy in Learning English: A Case Study at a Vocational High School. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Science and Education and Technology (ISET 2019)*. Kota Semarang, Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200620.081>
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Self-Efficacy in the Workplace: Implications for Motivation and Performance. *International Journal Of Management, Business, And Administration*, Volume 14, Number 1, 2011.

- Masitoh, L. F., & Fitriyani, H. (2018). Improving students' mathematics self-efficacy through problem based learning. *Malikussaleh Journal of Mathematics Learning (MJML)*, 1(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.29103/mjml.v1i1.679>
- Nunan, D. (2003). The Impact of English as a Global Language on Educational Policies and Practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588214>
- Paradewari, D. S. (2017). Investigating students' self-efficacy of public speaking. 5(10).
- Rex, K., & Roth, R. M. (1998). The Relationship of Computer Experience and Computer Self-Efficacy to Performance in Introductory Computer Literacy Courses. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 31(1), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08886504.1998.10782238>
- Schunk, D. H. (1985). Self-efficacy and classroom learning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 22(2), 208–223. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6807\(198504\)22:2<208::AID-PITS2310220215>3.0.CO;2-7](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6807(198504)22:2<208::AID-PITS2310220215>3.0.CO;2-7)
- Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students' Speaking Abilities. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching* (1st ed., pp. 204–211). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190.028>
- Thompson, A. S., & Lee, J. (2014). The Impact of Experience Abroad and Language Proficiency on Language Learning Anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 252–274. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.125>
- Tilfarlioğlu, F. Y. (2009). Self- Efficacy In Efl: Differences Among Proficiency Groups And Relationship With Success. 3.
- Urban, B. (2006). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy in a multicultural society: Measures and ethnic differences. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v32i1.221>
- Zhang, X., & Ardasheva, Y. (2019). Sources of college EFL learners' self-efficacy in the English public speaking domain. *English for Specific Purposes*, 53, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.09.004>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-Efficacy: An Essential Motive to Learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 82–91. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1016>

Advisor I,

Henny Rahmawati, S.Pd., S.S., M.Pd
NPP. 140908198832225