

SELF-EFFICACY LEVEL OF LECTURERS IN A CENTRE OF FOUNDATION STUDIES, SELANGOR, MALAYSIA

Nurhamizah Ishak^{1*}, Leele Susana Jamian²

¹*Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi Mara UiTM Melaka, 78000 Alor Gajah*

²*Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Mara UiTM Selangor, 42300 Bandar Puncak Alam*

*Corresponding author: hamizahishak@uitm.edu.my

Abstract: This study examines the level of self-efficacy among lecturers in a centre of foundation studies in Selangor. Questionnaires were used to collect data on the sample of 86 lecturers. It was found that the sample has high overall self-efficacy level as well as high self-efficacy level in all three main dimensions that were measured such as teaching, research, and other academic or service-related activities. In addition, the study revealed that there is a significant difference between self-efficacy and academic qualifications. As for the implications of this study, it contributes to the corpus of knowledge in the area of self-efficacy in the local context and provides empirical data to assist the Ministry of Higher Education in conducting strategic planning to enhance self-efficacy amongst lecturers in institutions of higher educations (IHE).

Keyword: Self-Efficacy, Lecturers, Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), Foundation Studies, Malaysia

INTRODUCTION

Since the past decade, Malaysia has been aiming to be a hub of higher education excellence in the region. To support the aim, “Strategic Plan for Higher Education: Laying the Foundation Beyond 2020” (Ministry of Higher Education, 2007) was launched in 2007. Under this plan, lecturers were incorporated as the main driving force to execute the strategies. This later leads universities to place more stringent requirements in recruiting new lecturers as compared to before. Furthermore, this is evidenced in the National Higher Education Blueprint 2015-2025 via Shift 2: Talent Excellence that addresses this matter in detail. It emphasizes the critical needs of recruiting, producing, and retaining excellent lecturers to ensure the competitiveness and relevance of the higher education institutions in Malaysia.

Sampson et al. (2010) also once stated lecturers’ performance as the most crucial input in the growth and development of the higher education sector. This is due to the fact that lecturers are expected to fill in many roles in their daily tasks. These roles include teaching, assessing, planning curriculum, providing information, researching, facilitating, supervising, consulting, attending seminars, engaging in community service activities, and many other roles. Bright (2012) observed that for many lecturers, such workload demand can be overwhelming. Therefore, to facilitate the lecturers’ workload, it seems that self-efficacy attribute is highly crucial.

Self-efficacy is one of the key aspects of Bandura’s social cognitive theory that has been linked and contributed to high job performance. Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as peoples’ belief about their capability to produce assigned levels of performance in various life events such as academic performance and job performance. Norton (2013) also stated that self-efficacy leads to how much effort people yield and how long the time duration they spend in accomplishing a task despite obstacles or adverse experiences. Meanwhile, Virk and Malhotra (2016) perceived self-efficacy as a fecund drive by which cognitive, social, emotional, and behavioural skills are combined effectively to achieve goals. Later, these scholars further elaborated that in the context of the employee, those who have a strong sense of work self-efficacy are confident in carrying out their job specifications and exert greater effort to master the skills that they are lacking at which subsequently produce splendid job performance.

In Malaysia, most local published research on work self-efficacy involved teachers in the school setting (refer to Jaafar et al. 2019; Ismail & Wahid, 2018; Shamsudin & Majid, 2018; Berg & Smith, 2014; Jamaludin et al., 2014). After conducting an extensive search in various online academic databases, indexes, and search engines such as Scopus index, Web of Science index, JSTOR,

Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC), Directory of Open Access Journal (DOAJ), and Google Scholar, no recent published research between the year 2015 until 2020 about work self-efficacy among Malaysian lecturers could be found. Only three published research on work self-efficacy among local lecturers before the year 2015 could be found: Wan Kamarudin & Wan Ibrahim's (2010) study on the polytechnic lecturers, Chakravarthi, Haleagrahara & Judson's (2010) study on lecturers of a private medical university in Kuala Lumpur, and Shaari, Abdul Rahman & Rajab's (2014) study on public universities lecturers. Hence, to fill in the research gap, this research intends to identify and examine the level of self-efficacy amongst lecturers in a centre of foundation studies owned by a public university in Selangor, Malaysia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Significance of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is significant towards human behaviour. It has been claimed that people's level of self-efficacy affects their performances. In line with this, people generally avoid tasks where their self-efficacy is low, but will engage in tasks where their self-efficacy is high (Minniti, 2009).

Individuals with lower self-efficacy tend to have lower motivation and weaker dedication to achieve the targets they set earlier. They do not concentrate on how to perform well and instead, they are too preoccupied with limitations and failures (Bandura, 1994). They see difficult tasks as a personal threat and will avoid attempts to conquer them. Later, when they faced unavoidable demanding tasks, they are beleaguered by their personal deficiencies, the obstacles they might confront, and all kinds of adverse outcomes that they might encounter rather than pondering on how to perform successfully (Bandura, 1994). They slacken their efforts and quickly give up in the face of difficulties. They are also slower in regaining their sense of efficacy upon encountering setbacks because they deem their deficient performance as a manifestation of their lacking abilities. This sense of helplessness and hopelessness about their ability subsequently fosters stress and depression amongst those with lower self-efficacy (Heslin & Klehe, 2006; Pajares & Schunk, 2001).

On the contrary, people with high efficacy beliefs consider difficult tasks as challenges to be overcome rather than reckon all the limitations (Bandura, 1994). They maintain resilient commitment and are persistent with their efforts in the face of failure or setbacks, and they attribute failure to insufficient efforts or inadequate knowledge and skills that are achievable. In other words, they swiftly restore their sense of efficacy after failures or setbacks with the assurance that they can take control over them in the future (Bandura, 1994). As Schunk, Meece, and Pintrich (2014) discovered, those with higher levels of self-efficacy when faced with unresolved issues, will exhibit greater stability. People with a positive efficacious outlook produce personal accomplishments which, in turn, can reduce stress and lower depression (Pajares & Schunk, 2001).

Lecturers' Self-Efficacy

Major and Dolly (2003) stated that lecturers' self-efficacy refers to faculty members' perception of their current skills as teachers, researchers, and academic citizens as well as their beliefs about whether they can successfully carry out tasks in each of these areas. In line with the definition, lecturers' self-efficacy construct is comprised of 1) self-efficacy in teaching, 2) self-efficacy in research, and 3) self-efficacy in other academic or service-related activities (Hemmings & Kay, 2009). As the sample of this study comprised of lecturers; hence, lecturer's self-efficacy construct by Hemmings & Kay (2009) was used in measuring self-efficacy level of lecturers in the study.

METHODOLOGY

This research is a descriptive survey as it aims to examine the level of self-efficacy among lecturers in a centre of foundation studies in Selangor, Malaysia. To achieve this purpose, this research employed quantitative research design because it gives more accurate empirical data on the level of self-efficacy.

Sample

Due to its quite small population size, total population sampling technique is chosen for this study. All 140 lecturers who are currently serving in the centre of foundation studies were selected as the sample of this study. Nevertheless, after two weeks of data collection process, only 86 out of 140 lecturers responded to the questionnaires. These lecturers work in six different departments: Science, Engineering, Education, Law, Islamic Studies, and Language Studies.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was the main instrument used to collect data in this study. Cronbach's coefficient alpha for this questionnaire is .87 which indicates its reliability as very strong. The questionnaire was divided into two sections: Sections A and B. Section A focused on the demographic data of the lecturers. It consisted of four items regarding gender, academic qualification, course taught, and length of service. Section B focused on the self-efficacy variable. This section comprised close-ended and open-ended items. The close-ended items were adapted from Lecturer Self-Efficacy Questionnaire by Hemmings and Kay (2009). The original instrument consisted of 65 items concerning lecturers' self-efficacy. However, after the items have been extensively revised, rephrased, and restructured in terms of the sentence structures and vocabulary, as well as underwent pilot test; this section consisted of 69 items. The reason for the increasing number of items was because three items were found to be double-barrelled and were later split into six items while one new item was added to strengthen the findings of the lecturers' self-efficacy. These items attempted to assess seven dimensions of self-efficacy: 1) course content, instructions, and assessment, 2) tutorials and lectures, 3) reporting and supervising research, 4) conducting and managing research, 5) writing major works and reviewing research, 6) professional engagement activities and 7) internal executive tasks.

Besides that, two open-ended questions were also included in this section: i) Given the scale of 1 to 6, how do you rate your overall self-efficacy? and ii) Please provide reasons for the above ratings. The inclusion of these open-ended questions is to probe further on the respondents' justification of their emotional intelligence rating.

Data Analysis Procedure

The completed questionnaires were analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software (SPSS). Thus, in order to assist the interpretation of quantitative data, findings of the self-efficacy were collapsed into high and low self-efficacy.

Data which were rated as "1 = Not very confident", 2 = Moderately not confident" with the mean score of 1.00 to 3.49 were regarded as low self-efficacy while data which were rated as "4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident and 6 = Very confident" with the mean score of 3.50 to 6.00 were categorized as high self-efficacy.

Next, an independent sample t-test was also employed to find out whether there is a significant difference between self-efficacy of the respondents and their academic qualification.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Quantitative Findings of Self-Efficacy

RQ 1: What is the overall mean score of self-efficacy amongst the lecturers?

Overall Self-Efficacy Level

Table 4.1 Overall Mean Score of Self-Efficacy

Dimensions	N	Mean	SD	Level
Teaching	86	5.45	.423	High
Research	86	4.98	.619	High
Other academic or service-related activities	86	5.12	.545	High
Overall Total Mean Score	86	5.18	.481	High

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

Table 4.1 illustrates the overall mean score (M=5.18, SD=.481) of self-efficacy amongst the lecturers. In general, the findings revealed that self-efficacy level is rated high amongst the respondents. This is further supported by a similar finding of high self-efficacy level amongst lecturers of higher education institutions in the United Kingdom by Sharp et al. (2013).

The respondents also generally agreed that they have high level of self-efficacy in teaching, research, and other academic or service-related activities. The mean scores range from 4.98 to 5.45. The highest mean score was obtained from teaching dimensions (M=5.45, SD=.423). This was followed by other academic or service-related activities dimensions (M=5.12, SD=.545) and research dimensions (M=4.98, SD=.619) respectively. As the main responsibility of the instruction leaders' profession is teaching tasks, more than half of their working time is allocated for these tasks. Thus, lecturers are very confident in executing teaching tasks (Graham, 2015). In addition, lecturers might be confident in contributing regularly to the betterment of society from time to time through academic or service-related activities such as written opinions, giving professional talk and conducting collaboration with the industry (Abdullah et al., 2011). Lastly, lecturers probably are confident in conducting research as they are required to produce high-impact research to expand the corpus of knowledge of the subject matters that they are experts in from time to time (Jongbloed, Enders & Salerno, 2008).

Self-Efficacy in Teaching Dimensions

Table 4.2 Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy in Teaching Dimensions

Teaching dimensions	N	Mean	SD	Level
Dimension 1: Course content, instruction and assessment	86	5.43	.471	High
Dimension 2: Tutorial and lecture	86	5.46	.437	High
Overall Total Mean Score	86	5.45	.423	High

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

In view of self-efficacy in teaching dimensions, lecturers perceived themselves as having higher self-efficacy in the tutorial and lecture dimension (M=5.46, SD= .437) rather than in course content, instruction, and assessment dimension (M=5.43, SD=.471) (refer to Table 4.3). This could be attributed to the findings that most lecturers in this study have wide experiences in terms of conducting tutorials and lectures. Moreover, Fry, Kettridge & Marshall (2008) stated that despite having specific content and objectives to be achieved in each course, lecturers usually have full autonomy regarding their ways to execute the content in their tutorials and lectures according to the students' needs and competency. Subsequently, this autonomy might boost the lecturers' confidence in conducting tutorials and lectures.

Yet, the situation differs for course content, instruction, and assessment matters as the lecturers tend to have restricted personal freedom (refer to Table 4.3). Race (2013) stated lecturers need to be open to suggestions and ideas given by their colleagues as well as aware and ready to comply with the aspirations of the course coordinator, dean, and academic affairs department of the university regarding these matters. Subsequently, the restricted freedom and the complexity of these tasks that involve many individuals might lessen the lecturers' confidence in executing these tasks.

Self-Efficacy in Teaching: Course Content, Instruction and Assessment Dimension

Table 4.3 Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy in Teaching for Dimension 1: Course Content, Instruction and Assessment

Items	N	Mean	SD
B1 consulting students on academic matters	86	5.63	.486
B5 marking test/exam papers	86	5.58	.541
B4 marking assignments	86	5.57	.564

B2 setting assignments	86	5.55	.567
B8 providing feedback on assessment items	86	5.53	.547
B9 responding to student feedback regarding the courses	86	5.52	.646
B7 assigning grades	86	5.48	.608
B11 consulting with colleagues about coursework	86	5.48	.547
B3 preparing test/exam papers	86	5.47	.588
B6 assessing students' skills/knowledge in the area.	86	5.43	.624
B12 leading subjects/modules	86	5.22	.693
B10 developing subjects/modules	86	5.15	.712
B13 leading teams/wider academic coordination	86	5.05	.701
Total Mean Score	86	5.43	.471

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

Table 4.3 shows the mean scores of self-efficacy for individual items under the course content, instruction, and assessment dimension. Generally, among the thirteen items, the mean scores range from 5.05 to 5.63. Most lecturers regarded themselves as confident in consulting students on academic matters as well as in marking tests, exam papers, and assignments ($M=5.63$, $SD=.486$)(refer to Table 4.3). The lecturers may be already familiar with the subject matter; hence, they can cope with any questions related to the subject matter asked by the students during the consultations (Biggs, 2011). Meanwhile, the least number of lecturers regarded themselves as confident in leading teams in widening academic coordination ($M=5.05$, $SD=.701$) (refer to Table 4.3). Kennedy & Nilson (2008) stated that other than knowledge on subject matters, academic coordination will only be successful if there is good communication and cooperation amongst team members. Therefore, a lecturer must have good leadership skills to handle this matter successfully. In view of this, it is possible that the lecturers in the study feel that they do not have adequate leadership and communication skills to tackle this task.

Self-Efficacy in Teaching: Tutorial and Lecture

Table 4.4 Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy in Teaching for Dimension 2: Tutorial and Lecture

Items	N	Mean	SD
B15 delivering tutorials/lectures	86	5.66	.523
B14 preparing tutorials/lectures	86	5.65	.526
B22 facilitating student discussions in class	86	5.64	.592
B17 preparing handouts	86	5.49	.609
B21 revising lecture materials	86	5.49	.589
B20 keeping up to date with lecture materials	86	5.33	.583
B18 assigning reading materials	86	5.30	.670
B19 revising teaching strategies	86	5.30	.670
B16 using e-learning and ICT during tutorials/lectures	86	5.26	.617
Total Mean Score	86	5.46	.437

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

Table 4.4 displays the mean scores of self-efficacy in teaching for individual items under the tutorial and lecture dimension. Generally, among the nine items, the mean scores range from 5.26 to 5.66. Majority of the lecturers reported that they are confident in delivering and preparing tutorials and lectures as well as in facilitating students' discussion in class ($M=5.66$, $SD=.523$) (refer to Table 4.4). Fry, Kettridge & Marshall (2008) stated that lecturers tend to be more confident in delivering tutorials and lectures as they usually are familiar with the subject matter. Besides, lecturers often do thorough preparation and planning on what to teach prior to entering the classes and lecture halls which eventually

enable them to facilitate students' discussion (Race, 2013). Meanwhile, few lecturers reported that they are confident in using e-learning and ICT during tutorials and lectures ($M=5.26$, $SD=.617$) (refer to Table 4.4). As the students that they teach nowadays are digital native and internet savvy, lecturers probably feel reluctant to apply it for the fear of embarrassing themselves in front of the students due to their lacking skills in this area (Ocak, 2011).

Self-Efficacy in Research Dimensions

Table 4.5 Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy in Research Dimensions

Research dimensions	N	Mean	SD	Level
Dimension 3: Reporting and supervising research	86	5.05	.715	High
Dimension 4: Conducting and managing research	86	4.98	.638	High
Dimension 5: Writing major works and reviewing assessment	86	4.91	.588	High
Overall Total Mean Score	86	4.98	.619	High

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

In view of self-efficacy in research dimension, lecturers reported high self-efficacy in all three dimensions with the highest mean score was obtained from reporting and supervising research ($M=5.05$, $SD=.715$) which were followed by conducting and managing research dimension ($M=4.98$, $SD=.638$) and writing major works and reviewing research dimension respectively ($M=4.91$, $SD=.588$) (refer to Table 4.5). Hill (2011) stated that most lecturers tend to be confident in reporting and supervising research as prior research that they have supervised usually are related to their expertise areas. Meanwhile, in terms of conducting and managing research, lecturers generally have adequate research knowledge and skills that enable them to run their own research properly (Hemmings & Hill, 2009). As for writing major works and reviewing research, lecturers possibly feel less confident in executing these tasks due to time constraints that hamper lecturers from writing academic pieces and reviewing research constantly (Hemmings & Kay, 2010).

Self-Efficacy in Research: Reporting and Supervising Research

Table 4.6 Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy in Research for Dimension 3: Reporting and Supervising Research

Items	N	Mean	SD
B28 supervising students' research project	86	5.19	.775
B23 attending conference	86	5.15	.819
B27 delivering research findings in staff seminars	86	5.08	.843
B25 presenting conference papers	86	5.06	.817
B31 preparing research write-up/report	86	5.02	.782
B24 preparing conference papers	86	5.01	.833
B30 submitting papers for publication	86	5.01	.819
B26 presenting papers in other departments/institutions	86	5.00	.812
B29 supervising postgraduate students	86	4.88	.788
Total Mean Score	86	5.05	.715

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

Table 4.6 presents the mean scores of self-efficacy in research for individual items under the reporting and supervising research dimension. Generally, among the nine items, the mean scores range from 4.88 to 5.19. Most lecturers in this study reported that they are confident in supervising foundation

and undergraduate students' research projects ($M=5.19$, $SD=.775$) (refer to Table 4.6). It is possibly due to the fact that lecturers are usually assigned with supervisees whose researches are within their expertise area (Hill, 2011). Yet, the least number of lecturers reported that they were confident in supervising postgraduate students ($M=4.88$, $SD=.788$) (refer to Table 4.6). Blitzer (2011) stated that as postgraduate students comprise of those studying for Masters and Ph.D. degrees; their dissertation projects are of higher level than the usual research projects done by the Foundation students that these lecturers tend to monitor. As most of the lecturers in this study comprise either those who recently gained their Ph.D. or those who recently starting their Ph.D. journey, they might feel overwhelmed with the responsibility and eventually have low confidence in supervising postgraduate students.

Self-Efficacy in Research: Conducting and Managing Research

Table 4.7 Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy in Research for Dimension 4: Conducting and Managing Research

Items	N	Mean	SD
B42 collaborating with colleagues about research	86	5.17	.726
B38 collecting data	86	5.14	.754
B43 working with research assistants	86	5.13	.779
B32 generating research ideas	86	5.06	.802
B37 conforming to research ethics requirement	86	5.05	.810
B40 analysing research results	86	5.03	.710
B41 leading research projects	86	5.00	.812
B36 conducting pilot studies	86	4.88	.803
B33 designing research	86	4.88	.758
B39 using software to key-in data	86	4.88	.758
B35 preparing a research budget	86	4.81	.775
B34 applying for research grants	86	4.79	.738
Total Mean Score	86	4.98	.638

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

Table 4.7 shows the mean scores of self-efficacy in research for individual items under the conducting and managing research dimension. Generally, among the twelve items, the mean scores range from 4.79 to 5.17. Majority of the lecturers in this study reported that they are confident in collaborating with colleagues about research ($M=5.17$, $SD=.726$) (refer to Table 4.8). According to Hemmings and Hill (2009), lecturers perceive that sharing and exchange of research knowledge and skills during the research collaboration will produce more efficient and detailed researches. Nevertheless, few lecturers reported that they are confident in applying for research grants ($M=4.79$, $SD=.738$) (refer to Table 4.7). Bozeman (2015) mentioned that as the application for research grants usually involves lots of procedures and bureaucracy, certain lecturers prefer not to deal with it. In addition, the success of obtaining the research grants is highly determined by the impact of the research: the higher the impact of the research, the higher the chance that it will be selected (Hemmings & Kay, 2010; Bloch, Graversen & Padersen, 2014).

Self-Efficacy in Research: Writing Major Works and Reviewing Research

Table 4.8 Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy in Research for Dimension 5: Writing Major Works and Reviewing Assessment

Items	N	Mean	SD
B53 reviewing literature for a research project	86	5.21	.738
B52 keeping up to date with research literature	86	5.06	.802
B47 writing journal articles	86	5.06	.772
B44 writing for an academic audience	86	4.95	.750

B46 writing textbooks	86	4.87	.764
B51 examining theses (Degree, Master, PhD)	86	4.85	.728
B48 editing a journal	86	4.80	.647
B50 reviewing journal articles	86	4.79	.671
B45 writing research-based books	86	4.78	.726
B49 serving on editorial board	86	4.67	.583
Total Mean Score	86	4.91	.588

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

Table 4.8 displays the mean scores of self-efficacy in research for individual items under the writing major works and reviewing research dimension. Generally, among the ten items, the mean scores range from 4.67 to 5.21. Most lecturers reported that they are confident in reviewing literature for a research project and in keeping up to date with research literature (M=5.21, SD=.738) (refer to Table 4.8). Furthermore, Hemmings and Hill (2009) mentioned that lecturers are bound to read the latest information on the subject matter that they teach. Hence, these information are usually helpful while they are writing a literature review for their research project. Meanwhile, the least number of lecturers reported that they are confident in serving on the editorial board (M=4.67, SD=.583) (refer to Table 4.8). This might be due to the nature of this task that requires one to be as meticulous as possible and unbiased while selecting and editing journal articles to be published (Hemmings & Kay, 2010). Besides, most of the lecturers in this study are inexperienced researchers. Hence, they feel that their research knowledge and experience are still inadequate to edit fellow researchers' works.

Self-Efficacy in Other Academic or Service-Related Activities

Table 4.9 Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy in Other Academic or Service-Related Activities Dimensions

Other academic or service-related activities dimensions	N	Mean	SD	Level
Dimension 6: Professional engagement activities	86	5.01	.603	High
Dimension 7: Internal executive tasks	86	5.23	.573	High
Overall Total Mean Score	86	5.12	.545	High

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

In view of self-efficacy in other academic or service-related activities dimension, lecturers reported higher self-efficacy in the internal executive tasks dimension (M=5.23, SD=.573) compared to professional engagement activities dimension (M=5.01, SD=.603) (refer to Table 4.9). Furthermore, Jongbloed, Enders & Salerno (2008) stated that the lecturers probably feel more confident and comfortable dealing with the internal parties that they are well-acquainted with such as colleagues, administrative staffs, and higher management of the campus rather than dealing with unfamiliar external parties such as companies, charity organizations, government officers, media and society members.

Self-Efficacy in Professional Engagement Activities

Table 4.10 Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy in Other Academic or Service-Related Activities for Dimension 6: Professional Engagement Activities

Items	N	Mean	SD
B59 participating in courses outside the university (including external examining)	86	5.09	.760
B55 answering public queries	86	5.07	.779
B58 collaborating with external agencies about course-Work	86	5.06	.730

B61 expressing ideas/opinions related to your area of expertise via print media	86	5.03	.770
B56 participating in professional associations	86	5.01	.711
B57 collaborating with external agencies about research	86	4.99	.711
B54 consulting professionally	86	4.98	.719
B60 expressing ideas/opinions related to your area of expertise via broadcast media	86	4.88	.800
Total Mean Score	86	5.01	.603

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident.

Table 4.10 shows the mean scores of self-efficacy in other academic or service-related activities for individual items under the professional engagement activities dimension. Generally, among the eight items, the mean scores range from 4.88 to 5.09. Majority of the lecturers reported that they are confident in participating in courses outside the university ($M=5.09$, $SD=.766$) (refer to Table 4.10). Abdullah et al. (2011) inferred that most lecturers probably enjoy the knowledge exchange and interaction between members in the courses as well as the discovery of new knowledge steered by the moderator or instructor. Meanwhile, few lecturers reported that they are confident in expressing ideas or opinions related to their areas of expertise via broadcast media ($M=4.88$, $SD=.800$) (refer to Table 4.10). This is possibly due to the public scrutiny over the feasibility of their ideas or opinions (O'Neill, 2010). Besides, Gagliardone et al. (2015) mentioned that lecturers might face backlash if their ideas or opinions are out of the normality or contrast with the society's viewpoint.

Self-Efficacy in Internal Executive Tasks

Table 4.11 Mean Score of Self-Efficacy in Other Academic or Service-Related Activities for Dimension 7: Internal Executive Tasks

Items	N	Mean	SD
B64 participating in departmental activities	86	5.43	.642
B69 writing a reference letter for a student	86	5.43	.624
B63 advising prospective students	86	5.40	.674
B65 participating in university-wide committees	86	5.29	.648
B68 writing a reference letter for a colleague	86	5.27	.693
B67 entertaining visitors on campus	86	5.09	.761
B62 organising conferences/symposium	86	5.00	.782
B66 chairing academic meeting	86	4.95	.734
Total Mean Score	86	5.23	.573

*1= Not very confident, 2 = Moderately not confident, 3 = Slightly not confident, 4 = Slightly confident, 5 = Moderately confident, 6 = Very confident

Table 4.11 displays the mean scores of self-efficacy in other academic or service-related activities for individual items under the internal executive tasks dimension. Generally, among the eight items, the mean scores range from 4.93 to 5.43. Most lecturers reported that they are confident in participating in departmental activities and in writing a reference letter for a student ($M=5.43$, $SD=.642$) (refer to Table 4.11). As these two tasks are frequently required of the lecturers, they might feel confident in executing them (Rowley, 2015). Meanwhile, certain lecturers reported that they are less confident in chairing academic meetings ($M=4.95$, $SD=.734$) (refer to Table 4.11). Rowley (2015) stated that lecturers probably feel conscious of the magnitude of this responsibility and are worried that they might make wrong judgements during the academic meeting. Nevertheless, it is possible that lecturers' confidence in executing this task will flourish together with their experience.

Qualitative Findings of Self-Efficacy from Open-Ended Questions

Qualitative data gathered from open-ended questions validate the quantitative data further as most of the respondents agreed that they have high self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy in Teaching

Most respondents who rated '5' and '6' for their overall confidence level in teaching tasks perceived that they have acquired the necessary skills to be applied while executing the teaching tasks. This can be observed when respondent number 21 stated,

"I knew exactly what I'm teaching. Therefore, I am confident to teach".

Respondent number 77 also remarked,

"I have done my best in teaching so far as I make sure that everything that I taught is well comprehended by the students".

Next, there are several respondents who attributed their confidence in teaching due to their teaching experience. Respondent number 76 stated,

"The years of experience in teaching has influenced my confidence level".

Respondent number 44 also shared a similar notion,

"Prior to becoming a lecturer, I worked as a tutor. Thus, this experience boosted my confidence in teaching."

In addition, respondent number 36 added,

"After six years in teaching field, I am confident with my teaching, I do admit for the 1-2 years, it has been tough years to gain confidence, as the years go by, you'll get used to it and be confident about it".

Respondent number 52 also mentioned,

"I feel very confident in my teaching as I already taught the same course for the past five years. Nevertheless, I keep updated with the latest info regarding my course from time to time and revising my teaching strategies to suit my students' comprehension level".

Furthermore, there are respondents that claimed their passion for teaching affected their confidence in teaching. Respondent number 82 stated that,

"I have confidence in teaching because I enjoy teaching".

Respondent number 23 also shared a similar notion,

"I love teaching and the process of learning in order to teach."

Meanwhile, respondent 7 added,

"Teaching is my passion. So, I am constantly trying my best to improve, in theory, and practice. I am informed by research, experience, mine, and others."

Other than that, there are respondents who credited their confidence in teaching due to their thorough preparation prior to teaching. Respondent number 6 stated,

"I always feel confident walking into the classroom and delivering lectures since I know that I've prepared for that".

Meanwhile, respondent number 70 remarked,

"If I know what I need to teach, I can teach confidently regardless of my students' proficiency level".

Finally, one respondent claimed that the organizational culture and climate affect confidence in teaching. Respondent number 66 stated,

“Although I am a new lecturer and am still lacking in teaching, the supportive environment and colleagues in this campus motivate me to give my very best in teaching.”

The above findings indicate that despite most of the respondents agreed that they have high confidence in teaching, they disclosed that their confidence in teaching is affected by various factors.

Self-Efficacy in Research

Most respondents who rated ‘5’ and ‘6’ for their overall confidence level in research tasks claimed that they believe that they have acquired the necessary skills to be applied while executing the teaching tasks. This can be observed when respondent number 82 stated,

“I’m confident with my ability to conduct research. Yet, I still hope for guidance from more experienced researchers”.

Respondent number 74 also added,

“I will usually take my time to do a little bit of background reading before I carry out any research tasks to ensure that I am ready to tackle my research topic”.

Nevertheless, several respondents claimed time constraint as the main obstacle for them to delve further into research tasks. Respondent number 47 stated,

“Lack of time to focus on research make me less confident in executing it”.

Respondent number 72 also remarked,

“There are a lot of areas that I need to focus on especially when doing research, time would be the main reason for not doing it”.

Meanwhile, respondent number 80 added,

“I am involved with research but not at the level of an expert. I consider research as supplementary to my teaching. Since most of my time was spent on teaching, I have little time to spend on research”.

Next, some respondents who rated ‘4’ for their overall confidence level in research tasks mentioned that despite having basic research methodology knowledge, their confidence of their ability in executing research tasks is affected by lack of research experience. This can be seen when respondent number 6 responded,

“I tend to be cautious in research areas as I’m new in this field. Besides, I have not been exposed to research during my study time. Sometimes, I doubt whether my research is comprehensive or not”.

Respondent number 21 added,

“I understand the basic concepts in research. However, I feel there’s so much more than I don’t know. Sometimes, I can’t see the problem statement well. So, it affects my ability to carry out the research”.

Respondent number 52 added,

“I am still new in research and learning to become a good researcher from my colleagues. At the moment, I am trying to improve my research writing skills”.

The above findings indicate that despite most of the respondents agreed that they are confident in conducting research, they disclosed that their confidence in teaching is affected by various factors.

Self-Efficacy in Other Academic or Service-Related Activities

Most respondents who rated ‘5’ and ‘6’ for their overall confidence level in other academic or service-related tasks claimed that they believe that they have acquired the necessary skills to be applied while executing these tasks. This can be observed when respondent number 82 stated that,

“I’m very confident that I can cope with other academic and service-related tasks as I once was a member of Majlis Perwakilan Pelajar (MPP) during my undergraduate years. Hence, I’m able to cope with bureaucracy and attention from public and top management while accomplishing these tasks”.

Respondent number 71 shared a similar notion,

“I feel that these tasks resemble my teaching tasks. The only thing that differs is the audience that I need to cater to. So, I am confident when assigned with these tasks”.

Respondent number 25 further remarked that,

“I have done few of these academic and service-related tasks. So far, I enjoyed them and look forward to learning and do more”.

Meanwhile, respondent number 6 added,

“I can finish my task without supervision from others as long as I know what needed to be done. However, sometimes, the description and instruction for the tasks are vague. Hence, detailed explanations should be given prior to assigning the tasks”.

Furthermore, some respondents attributed promotion and working experience as the two aspects that affect their workload in other academic or service-related tasks. This can be observed when respondent number 72 mentioned,

“I believe that promotion always comes with responsibility in administration position in an academic institution”.

Respondent number 80 also added,

“As a senior lecturer, I am actively involved in the administration of academic matters at the mid-level onwards”.

All in all, the above findings indicate that most respondents have high confidence in executing other academic or service-related tasks.

Self-Efficacy and Academic Qualifications

RQ 2: Is there any significant difference in mean score of self-efficacy pertaining to academic qualifications?

Table 4.13 Independent Sample T-Test Results for Self-Efficacy and Academic Qualifications

	Qualifications	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Self-efficacy	PhD	19	5.51	.340	4.277	84	.000
	Master	67	5.09	.476			

Table 4.13 shows that mean score of self-efficacy obtained by lecturers who possessed Ph.D. (M=5.51, SD=.340) is higher than lecturers who possessed Master's degree (M=5.09, SD=.476). To determine whether the mean scores are significantly different, an independent sample t-test was conducted. The results revealed that there is a significant difference in the mean scores of self-efficacy between lecturers who possessed Ph.D and Master degree [t(84)=4.277, p=.000]. It is a known fact that Ph.D. is the most difficult and rigorous educational qualification to be attained. Lecturers who are Ph.D. holders have learnt lots of things and gained various valuable experiences while pursuing their studies which contributes to their higher self-efficacy in performing their jobs as lecturers compared to lecturers who are Master's Degree holders.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the study revealed that lecturers in the centre of foundation studies have high overall self-efficacy level as well as high self-efficacy level in all three main dimensions that consist of teaching, research and other service-related activities. In addition, it was found that there is a significant difference between self-efficacy and academic qualifications

Next, there are several implications that could arise from the findings of the study. Firstly, the findings of the study contribute to the existing corpus of knowledge in the area of self-efficacy in local context. Secondly, the findings also provide some empirical data that could support the Ministry of Higher Education and administrators of higher education institutions to delve into strategic planning regarding initiatives in enhancing high self-efficacy among lecturers.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, N. L., Hamzah, N., Arshad, R., Isa, R. M., & Ghani, R. A. (2011). Psychological contract and knowledge sharing among academicians: mediating role of relational social capital. *International Business Research*, 4(4), 231.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V.S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of human behaviour* (Vol. 4) (pp. 71–81). New York: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Berg, D. A., & Smith, L. F. (2014). Pre-service teachers' efficacy beliefs and concerns in Malaysia, England and New Zealand. *Issues in Educational Research*, 24(1), 21–40.
- Biggs, J. B. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does*. London: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Bloch, C., Graversen, E. K., & Pedersen, H. S. (2014). Competitive research grants and their impact on career performance. *Minerva*, 52(1), 77–96.
- Bozeman, B. (2015). *Bureaucratization in Academic Research Policy: Perspectives from Red Tape Theory*. Center for Organization Research and Design, Arizona State University. Retrieved from http://cord.asu.edu/wpcontent/uploads/2015/09/0Final_Bozeman_LuganoKeynotePaper2015-2.pdf
- Bright, S. (2012). eLearning lecturer workload: Working smarter or working harder? Retrieved from <http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10289/6729/ASCILITE%202012%20Concise%20paper%20final.pdf?sequence=1>
- Chakravarthi, S., Haleagrahara, N., & Judson, J. P. (2010). Enhancing the efficacy of lecturers in educating student cohorts consisting of culturally diverse groups in a Medical University. *International Education Studies*, 3(2), 161.
- Fry, H., Ketteridge, S., & Marshall, S. (2008). *A handbook for teaching and learning in higher education: Enhancing academic practice*. London: Routledge.
- Gagliardone, I., Gal, D., Alves, T., & Martinez, G. (2015). *Countering online hate speech*. New York: UNESCO Publishing.
- Graham, A. T. (2015). Academic staff performance and workload in higher education in the UK: The conceptual dichotomy. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 39(5), 665–679.
- Hemmings, B., & Kay, R. (2009). Lecturer Self Efficacy: Its related dimensions and the influence of gender and qualifications. *Issues in Educational Research*, 19(3), 243–254.
- Hemmings, B., & Hill, D. (2009). The development of lecturer research expertise: Towards a unifying model. *Issues in Educational Research*, 19(1), 14–24
- Hemmings, B., & Kay, R. (2010). Journal ratings and the publications of Australian academics. *Issues in Educational Research*, 20(3), 234–243.
- Hemmings, B., & Kay, R. (2010). University lecturer publication output: qualifications, time and confidence count. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32(2), 185–197.
- Heslin, P.A., & Klehe, U.C. 2006. Self-efficacy. In S.G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia Of Industrial/Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 705–708). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hill, Geof W. (2011). Diffracting the practices of research supervision. In Mallan, Vijay Kumar & Lee, Allison (Eds.) *Connecting the Local, Regional and International in Doctoral Education* (pp.154–171). Serdang: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.
- Ismail, N. A., & Wahid, N. A. (2018). Empowering the self-efficacy of teachers in Malaysia through the Academic Revolution 4.0. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(11), 894–901.

- Jaafar, N., M, N.A.F, Tamuri, A.H, Ahmad, A.,Hussin, N.H., Md. Daud, M.K., & Ishak, M. (2019). The significant correlation between self efficacy and the role of Islamic Education teachers as a society change agent. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 10 (3), 83-89.
- Jamaluddin, R., Abu, R., Ismail, H., & Mat Rashid, A. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy in teaching family life education. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 22 (3), 775-784.
- Jongbloed, B., Enders, J., & Salerno, C. (2008). Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher education*, 56(3), 303-324.
- Kennedy, F. A., & Nilson, L. B. (2008). *Successful strategies for teams*. Team Member Handbook. London:Routledge.
- Major, C. H., & Dolly, J. P. (2003). The importance of graduate program experiences to faculty self-efficacy for academic tasks. *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 19(2), 89-100.
- Minniti, M. (2009). *Gender issues in entrepreneurship*. Boston: Delft.
- Ministry of Higher Education. (2007). *Strategic Plan for Higher Education: Laying the framework beyond 2020*.
- Ministry of Higher Education. (2015). *National Higher Education Blueprint 2015-2025*.
- Norton, S. M. (2013). *A phenomenological investigation into the Self-Efficacy beliefs of teachers who have persisted in the teaching profession* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Liberty University, Virginia, United States of America.
- Ocak, M. A. (2011). Blend or not to blend: a study investigating faculty members perceptions of blended teaching. *World Journal on Educational Technology*, 2(3), 196-205
- Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. H. (2001). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and school achievement. In R. Riding, & S. Rayner (Eds.), *Perception* (pp. 239-266). London: Ablex Publishing.
- Race, P. (2014). *The Lecturer's Toolkit: A practical guide to assessment, learning and teaching*. London: Routledge.
- Rowley, J. (2015). The experience of being a lecturer in further and higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 39 (5).
- Shaari, R., Abdul Rahman, S.A., & Rajab, R. (2014). Self-efficacy as a determined factor for knowledge sharing awareness. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 5(1), 39-46.
- Sampson Jr, J. P., Driscoll, M. P., Foulk, D. F., & Carroll, P. S. (2010). *Successful faculty performance in teaching, research and original creative work, and service*. Retrieved from <http://www.erp.fsu.edu/content/download/25448/163336/file/performance.pdf>
- Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (2014). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (4th edition). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Schwarz, N. (2011). Feelings-as-information theory. *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, 1, 289-308.
- Shamsudin, A. & Abd Majid, R. (2018). Self- efficacy of School In-Hospital teacher in Malaysia. *e-Bangi Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 13 (3), 20-28.
- Sharp, J. G., Hemmings, B., Kay, R., & Callinan, C. (2013). An application of the revised 'Lecturer Self-Efficacy Questionnaire': an evidence-based route for initiating transformational change. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 37(5), 643-674.
- Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. J. (2007). *Positive psychology: The scientific and practical explorations of human strengths*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Virk, A. G. & Malhotra, M. (2016). The relationship between emotional intelligence and personal efficacy of managers in selected Indian organizations. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication*, 6 (8): 383-389.
- Wan Kamaruddin, W.N., & Ibrahim, M.S. (2010). Enhancing Malaysian Polytechnic technical lecturers' competency through the identification of professional development programs. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7, 446-454.