ATLANTIS PRESS

Self-Efficacy of Indonesian Non-English Lecturers in Writing English Academic Papers for International Publication

Hartono
English Language Education Department
Universitas Islam Sultan Agung
Semarang, Indonesia
hartono@unissula.ac.id

Ruseno Arjanggi
Psychology Department
Universitas Islam Sultan Agung
Semarang, Indonesia
ruseno@unissula.ac.id

Destary Praptawati
English Literature Department
Universitas Islam Sultan Agung
Semarang, Indonesia
destary@unissula.ac.id

Abstract — **As the ability to publish academic papers in international journals is getting more and more demanding for Indonesian lecturers today, investigating self-efficacy of Indonesian lecturers in writing English academic papers is urgent. This study involved 66 randomly selected non-English lecturers of various departments and programs of a university in Semarang Indonesia. Data of the self-efficacy beliefs were collected using questionnaire of Likert-type with 5 scales of agreement then were analyzed descriptively. The results show that Indonesian non-English lecturers had moderate level of self-efficacy. In addition, gender and functional grades were found not significantly correlated with self-efficacy. As recommendation, efforts to increase productivity of Indonesian lecturers' international publication must also address the issue of self-efficacy beliefs of the lecturers.**

Keywords- self-efficacy, writing, academic papers, gender, functional grade

I. INTRODUCTION

As the ability to publish academic papers in international journals is getting more-more demanding for Indonesian lecturers today, discussing self-efficacy belief of Indonesian lecturers in writing English academic papers is urgent. Self-efficacy has been found to be strongly predictive of academic performance (Bandura, 1997). Some previous studies also confirm that self-efficacy and writing performance are related in which self-efficacy serves as a predictor of actual writing performance (Erkan & Saban, 2011), and self-efficacy writing is positively and significantly correlated with writing performance (Tanyer, 2015). When writing is the case, it was also found that self-efficacy is a strong predictor of performance in different language skills and tasks (Raoofi, Tan, & Chan, 2012). Besides, self-efficacy also found to affect motivation (Pajares, 1996; Schunk, 2003). For example, a study by Husain involving 135 participants from various business schools in Karachi concluded that there was a significant correlation between self-efficacy and motivation (Husain, 2014). In the Indonesian context, a study by Murtinigsih involving 89 university students of non-English department revealed that self-efficacy in English speech delivery correlated with academic achievement (Murtiningsih, 2011). Thus, it can be expected that lecturers with high self-efficacy in writing English academic papers are more likely to be successfully able to write English academic papers than their counterparts with lower self-efficacy do.

Derived from the socio-cognitive theory, self-efficacy is defined as an individual's judgment on his/her ability to accomplish a certain task at hand successfully (Bandura, 1997). It has a strong influence on levels of persistence and the choices made by an individual. An individual with a strong sense of efficacy believes that he will be able to accomplish a certain task successfully even though it may be difficult for him. On the contrary, somebody having a weak sense of self-efficacy will see tasks as threats to be avoided.

Self-efficacy is not a fixed trait from birth, rather it develops through time and experience from 4 primary constructs which serves the four primary sources of it (Bandura, 1997, 2004), and is related to different areas of human functioning (Mazaheri & Yazdani, 2016). The first construct is inactive mastery experience. It is the direct experience of an individual with the task that the person has to accomplish. A sense of success increases confidence, whereas a sense of failure will decrease it. The second construct is vicarious experience. It is social modeling, the experience of observing others' success or failure in doing similar tasks. For example, seeing that a colleague is successful in writing and publishing an English article, an individual will have a belief that he will be able to succeed too if he tries. Similarly, observing someone else's failure will threaten or decrease self-efficacy.

Verbal or social persuasion and somatic and emotional states are the third and the fourth factors affecting self-efficacy. If an individual is persuaded verbally that he will be able to accomplish a given task, he will likely do the task. Verbal supports for an attainment or mastery will increase someone's belief in his / her abilities to accomplish the task. The study by Brown & Malouff involving 111 adolescents of netball and soccer players shows that coach's verbal reaction help improve the players' self-efficacy (Brown, Malouff, & Schutte, 2005). The last construct, somatic and emotional states, suggests that being stressful, anxious, worried and even fearful when performing a certain task will create low self-efficacy which will lead to failure or inability to perform a certain task at hand. Stressful situations create emotional arousal which affects person's self-efficacy in coping with the situations (Bandura & Adams, 1977)

Indonesian international publication record is still relatively low (Wiryawan, 2014). Until the end of 2017, in ASEAN region, Indonesia ranked third after Malaysia as the most productive country and Singapore as the second most productive one (www.scimagojr.com). At a glance, it seems fine to be the third, however, Indonesians need to remember that it is the biggest country in ASEAN with the biggest number of universities (Dikti, 2018; Elfindri, Rustad, Nizam, & Dahrulsyah, 2015), and consequently the

biggest number of lecturers (Ahmar, Kurniasih, & Irawan, 2018). Some factors may be blamed for this situation as language barrier, limited access to international publications, historical context, and structural problems inherent within state universities and research institutions (Rakhmani & Siregar, 2016).

Writing academic papers in English for many Indonesian lecturers can be a new experience since in Indonesia English is a foreign language. Though the language has been the most taught foreign language in the country as it is taught at elementary schools, high schools and universities, many Indonesians, including lecturers, have a poor competence of this foreign language. The English proficiency of Indonesians in general is low (Lie, 2007), moreover when it is about English academic writing. In learning English, many Indonesians face not only language problems, but also cognitive as well as psychological problems (Rahmatunisa, 2014).

Based on the above reasons and the fact that such study is still rare nowadays, a study on Indonesian lecturers' self-efficacy especially in writing English academic papers was conducted. It was directed to answer the following research questions:

1. How is the level of self-efficacy of Indonesian lecturers in writing English academic papers?
2. Is there any significant difference of the self-efficacy level of Indonesian lecturers in writing English academic papers across gender?
3. Is there any significant difference of the self-efficacy level of Indonesian lecturers in writing English academic papers across functional grades?

II. METHOD

A. Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive research design. As Gay & Airasian suggest quantitative descriptive research is conducted to obtain information about the preferences, attitudes, practices, concerns, or interest of some groups of some group of people (Gay & Airasian, 2000).

B. Participants

Participants for the research were permanent lecturers working at *Universitas Islam Sultan Agung* which is domestically known as UNISSULA. It is located in Semarang city of Central Java, Indonesia. Sixty six lecturers were drawn randomly from population to be samples for the study. They were from four different clusters namely Medicine and Health (Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, and Psychology) as many as 31.82%, Engineering (Civil, Electrical, Industrial) as many as 24.24%, Social & Humanities (Law, Management, Accounting, Islamic Studies, communication) as many as 19.70%, and Education (Mathematics, Indonesian Language, Elementary School Teachers) as many as 24.24%. The lecturers of English Literature and English Education were excluded because in general they had a better competence and skill of writing in English than their colleagues from other programs did. Based on their ages, 31 lecturers were as old as 40 years or younger, and the rest 35 persons were above 40 years old, 26 lecturers were male and 40 female. Ninety percent of them hold Graduate/Master degrees, while the rest (10%) had Postgraduate/Doctoral degrees.

C. Instrument

Instrument of the study was a questionnaire of self-efficacy belief consisting of 17 items especially designed to measure lecturers' self-efficacy in writing English academic papers. The instrument was written in Bahasa Indonesia to assure its intelligibility. Most of the

items in the questionnaire were worded using subject + finite construction of "*I can ....*" which asked respondents to measure confidence in their ability to do the target behavior specified in the item (Pajares, 1996). Respondents were to measure their perceived ability in Likert-typed questionnaire of 5 scales from "Strongly Disagree", "Disagree", "Neutral", "Agree", and "Strongly Agree". To measure its validity, Pearson correlation coefficient analysis with 5% level of confidence was applied. With 66 respondents, the value of r_{table} is 0.244 which means that, in order to be considered valid, the correlation coefficient of each item must be above 0.24. From the 17 items used in the questionnaire, it was found that 5 of them had scores lower than 0.244, therefore those items were excluded. To assure the reliability, the questionnaire was then analyzed using alpha cronbach and it was found that the score was 0.946 which suggests that it was very reliable.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Result

The first step in analysis was putting data into percentage in line with the scales namely "Strongly Disagree (SD)", "Disagree (D)", "Neutral (N)", "Agree (A)", and "Strongly Agree (SA)". "Disagree" reflects the respondents' negation of the ability of doing things specified in the items, while "Agree" reflects their positive belief that they could do the task. The result is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1: RESPONDENTS' RESPONSES IN PERCENT

No	STATEMENTS	SD (%)	D (%)	N (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
1	I can write academic papers in English with a clear and focused topic.	0	31.8	16.7	42.4	9.1
2	I can write well-developed English academic papers using data and supporting details.	0	31.8	9.1	56.1	3.0
3	I can write a well-organized academic paper in English.	3	36.4	6.1	50	4.5
4	I can write paragraphs in English using appropriate formats and styles.	0	33.0	13.6	45.5	7.6
5	Even though it is in English, I can write interesting sentences.	4.5	37.9	19.7	34.8	4.5
6	I can always put my ideas in English using correct and effective sentences.	4.5	31.8	16.7	37.9	9.1
7	I can write papers in English using appropriate terms and vocabulary.	1.5	37.9	13.6	37.9	6.1
8	When I have decided to write papers in English, I will do it directly.	4.5	24.2	30.3	36.4	7.6
9	I can write in English using correct grammar.	4.5	36.4	15.2	40.9	3.0
10	I can write English papers with accurate spelling.	4.5	27.3	10.6	51.5	6.1
11	I can write papers in English with correct punctuations.	4.5	22.7	15.2	51.5	6.1
12	Even though it is in English, I can write good academic papers.	4.5	33.3	15.2	39.4	7.6

N: 66

The first highest percentage of the responses goes to "Agree" which ranges between 34.8% (item 5) and 56.1% (item 2). The second highest percentage goes to "Disagree" in which 37.9% in item 5 and 7 as the highest and 22.7% in item 11 is the lowest. While the lowest percentage goes to "Strongly Disagree" in which 3 items (item 1, 2, and 4) have zero percentages.

To group the data into levels of low, moderate and high, the hypothetical mean was applied. Since there were 12 items with 5 scales, the hypothetical mean was 36 and the standard deviation was 8. Respondents having total score of lower than 28 were categorized as having low self-efficacy, and those who had score 44 and higher were categorized as having high self-efficacy. The result of descriptive statistics analysis found that the actual mean score of self-efficacy is 38.18 with standard deviation 9.83. The finding, as presented in Table 2, suggests that self-efficacy of non-English lecturers in writing English academic papers was moderate.

TABLE 2: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF SELF-EFFICACY AND ITS CATEGORY

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Self-Efficacy	66	19.00	60.00	38.1818	9.83074
Valid N (list wise)	66				

Self-Efficacy Category					
		F	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Valid	low self-efficacy	13	19.7	19.7	19.7
	moderate self-efficacy	32	48.5	48.5	68.2
	high self-efficacy	21	31.8	31.8	100.0
	Total	66	100.0	100.0	

Majority of the lecturers surveyed had moderate self-efficacy in writing English academic papers (48.5%), 21 lecturers had a high self-efficacy (31.8%), and the rest 13 lecturers had low self-efficacy (19.7%).

To see whether gender has an effect on self-efficacy belief, the mean score of self-efficacy of male respondents were compared to the ones of female respondents. The mean score of male respondents was 37.846, while the ones of female respondents was 38.400. Female respondents had a slightly higher self-efficacy than the male did but further analysis using t-test to compare means found that the difference is not significant since the value of sig. (2-tailed) in independent sample test is 0.825.

TABLE 3: MEAN SCORE OF MALE AND FEMALE RESPONDENTS

	Sex	N	Mean	SD
Self-Efficacy	Male	26	37.85	10.72
	Female	40	38.40	9.34

To see whether there was a difference on the level of self-efficacy across functional grades, respondents were grouped into 4 categories based on the level of their grades namely Teaching Assistant, Junior Lecturer, Assistant Professor, and Associate Professor and Professor. Teaching assistant is a newly recruited lecturers who have got a National Lecturer Registration Number (NIDN), yet they are not qualified for doing independent teaching

tasks. Junior lecturer is one grade higher than teaching assistants, who, besides having obtained NIDN, have got a license from the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education qualifying them as lecturers but in doing teaching they still have to work under the supervision of a higher ranked lecturers. They are not yet permitted to teach independently. Assistant Professor refers to lecturers who have got a license to teach independently which is Indonesia they are called as *Lektor* while Associate Professor refers to *Lektor Kepala*. Associate Professors and Professors in this study were grouped into one group because the number of them in this study was very small. The result of analysis is presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4: RESPONDENTS' SELF-EFFICACY WITH DIFFERENT FUNCTIONAL GRADES

	N	Mean	SD	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max.
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Teaching Assistant	27	42.04	9.91	38.12	45.96	19.00	60.00
Instructor/Junior Lecturer	19	36.05	9.90	31.28	40.83	24.00	55.00
Assistant Professor	16	34.56	8.52	30.02	39.11	24.00	49.00
Associate Professors / Professors	4	36.75	7.45	24.89	48.61	28.00	46.00
Total	66	38.18	9.83	35.77	40.60	19.00	60.00

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	705.22	3	235.07	2.61	.059
Within Groups	5576.60	62	89.95		
Total	6281.82	65			

The data show that there are differences on the level of self-efficacy among lecturers with different functional grades. Although all of them belong to moderate level, Teaching Assistants had the highest level followed by the group of Associate Professor/Professor. Assistant professor had the lowest level having mean score of 34.56. However, further analysis using ANOVA shows that those differences are not significant because the sig. score is above 0.05.

B. Discussion

Self-efficacy is central in socio-cognitive theory which suggests that human beings can control and regulate their behavior. It involves a triadic reciprocal determinism (Bandura, 1989; Pajares, 1996) in which behavior, personal factors and environments influence each other bi-directionally. People with high self-efficacy beliefs will be likely able to exert higher effort to accomplish a targeted behavior than those who have lower level of efficacy. As it is found that non-English lecturers have a moderate level of self-efficacy in writing English academic papers, people may expect that they will likely exert a moderate effort to do so. This can be one of the reasons why Indonesian lecturers have low records of international publication (Wiryawan, 2014).

The data of this study show that the female respondents had slighty higher self-efficacy than the male respondents did, yet the difference is not significant. This means that gender was found not significantly correlated with self-efficacy. This result is in line with

functional grades. Gender and functional grades were not significantly corrrelated with self-efficacy.

As previous studies found that self-efficacy is correlated with writing performance and even it serves as predictor of writing performance (Erkan & Saban, 2011), then it can be expected that Indonesian non-English lecturers have moderate level of writing performance. Efforts to enhance writing performance of non-English lecturers, therefore, are needed to improve Indonesia lecturers' international publication.

IV. CONCLUSION

The study was aimed at measuring the level of Indonesian non-English lecturers in writing English academic papers for international publication since now the demand for doing so is increasing. Besides, it was also meant to measure whether gender and functional grades affected self-efficacy in writing. However, the study found that Indonesian non-English lecturers had a moderate level of self-efficacy in writing Englsih academic papers. Gender and functional grades were not associated with the levels of self-efficacy. Since it was proven that self-efficacy was a predictor of success in writing performance, efforts of increasing it for improving lecturers' ability to write English academic papers in English is worth doing.

REFERENCES

[1] Ahmar, A. S., Kurniasih, N., & Irawan, D. E. (2018). Lecturers ' Understanding on Indexing Databases of SINTA , DOAJ , Google Scholar , SCOPUS , and Web of Science : A Study of Indonesians. *Journal of Physiscs: Conference Series*. https://doi.org/doi :10.1088/1742-6596/954/1/012026

[2] Bandura, A. (1989). Social Cognitive Theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of Child Development* (Vol. 6, pp. 1–60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

[3] Bandura, A. (1997). *Self Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. W.H. Freeman and Company*. W.H. Freeman and Company. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957154X9400501708

[4] Bandura, A. (2004). Swimming against the mainstream: The early years from chilly tributary to transformative mainstream. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *42*(6), 613–630. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2004.02.001

[5] Bandura, A., & Adams, N. E. (1977). Analysis of Self-Efficacy Theory of Behavioral Change. *Cognitive Theory and Research*, *1*(4), 287–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1081-602X(01)00088-4

[6] Brown, L. J., Malouff, J. M., & Schutte, N. S. (2005). The effectiveness of self-efficacy intervention for helping adolescents cope with sport competition loss. *Journal of Sports Behavior*, *28*(2), 136–150. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-6868-5

[7] Dikti. (2018). Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi Kementerian Riset, Teknologi dan Pendidikan Tinggi. Retrieved September 9, 2018, from https://forlap.ristekdikti.go.id/perguruantinggi/homegraphpt

[8] Elfindri, Rustad, S., Nizam, & Dahrulsyah. (2015). Lecturer performances in Indonesia higher education. *International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, *I*(1), 26–36. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18768/ijaedu.09134

[9] Erkan, D. Y., & Saban, A. I. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL. *Asian EFL Journal*, *13*(1), 164–192.

[10] Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. W. (2000). *Educational research : competencies for analysis and application*. Merill. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.id/books?id=0TB01QdR2RIC

[11] Husain, U. K. (2014). Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Academic Motivation. In *International Conference on Economics, Education and Humanities* (pp. 18–22).

[12] Lie, A. (2007). Education Policy and EFL Curriculum in Indonesia: Between the Commitment to Competence and the Quest for Higher Test Scores. *TEFLIN Journal*, *18*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.15639/TEFLINJOURNAL.V18I1/1-15

[13] Mazaheri, S. H., & Yazdani, S. (2016). A Comparison of Self-efficacy and oral presentation ability between TEFL students in the class. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, (Special Issue), 2009–2025.

[14] Murtiningsih, S. R. (2011). A STUDY ON CORRELATION BETWEEN SELF-EFFICACY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN INDONESIAN CONTEXT. *Leksika*, *5*(2), 21–26.

[15] Pajares, F. (1996). Self-Efficacy Beliefs in Academic Setting. *Review of Educational Research*, *66*(4), 543–578.

[16] Rahmatunisa, W. (2014). Problems faced by Indonesian EFL learners in writing argumentative essay. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *3*(1), 1–9. Retrieved from http://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE

[17] Rakhmani, I., & Siregar, F. (2016). Reforming Research in Indonesia : Policies and Practice (Working Paper Series). *GDN Working Paper*, (92).

[18] Raoofi, S., Tan, B. H., & Chan, S. H. (2012). Self-Efficacy in Second/Foreign Language Learning Contexts. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(11), 60–73. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p60

[19] Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-Efficacy for Reading and Writing: Influence of Modeling, Goal Setting, and Self-Evaluation. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, *19*(2), 159–172.

[20] Tanyer, S. (2015). The Role of Writing and Reading Self-efficacy in First-year Preservice EFL Teachers' Writing Performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *199*, 38–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.484

[21] Wiryawan, K. G. (2014). The current status of science journals in Indonesia. *Science Editing*, *1*(2), 71–75. https://doi.org/10.6087/kcse.2014.1.71