

AN EXPLORATION OF THE LEVEL OF ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY (ASE) AMONG MALAYSIAN ADOLESCENTS BASED ON SOCIOECONOMIC, DIFFERENT ACADEMIC SETTINGS AND GENDER

Agnes Indra Chokkalingam
Department of Educational Administration,
Faculty of Education
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia
Email: agnesindra07@gmail.com

Puspalathaa Armum
Department of Educational Psychology,
Faculty of Education
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia
Email: laths1207@gmail.com

Tan Shiu Kuan
Department of Curriculum & Pedagogy,
Faculty of Education
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia
Email: shiukuan@gmail.com

Kalaivani Chellappan
Department of Electrical, Electronics & Systems Engineering,
Faculty of Engineering & Built Environment
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia
Email: kckalai@ukm.edu.my

ABSTRACT

It is an acknowledgement that the level of individual academic self-efficacy is influenced by various external factors. Low academic achievement among the adolescences is referred to the low level of self-efficacy in this group. The challenges caused by this scenario have encouraged a great deal of research interest over the problems faced by the Malaysian adolescences in academic performance. Therefore, the core purposes of this research was, to measure the level of academic self-efficacy between 169 adolescents by survey intervention and analysing the inter-dependencies across socioeconomic status. The participants of this study are from three different socioeconomic groups consist of adolescents from low, moderate and high household income. The study was extended to observe the differences the academic self-efficacy level across different academic settings where, the participants are grouped into three categories which include, low, moderate and high academic achievers. Lastly, the research attempted to measure the level of academic self-efficacy among adolescence considering gender differences. The data was analysed using Statistical Program for the Social Science (SPSS) version 22 adopting 2 ways Anova and Reliability Test which produced cronbach alpha .806 and p value of (socioeconomic status = .002, different academic settings = .004 and gender differences = .039). The results showed that the level of academic self-efficacy among the Malaysian adolescents is significantly affected by socioeconomic status, different academic settings and gender differences. This finding is expected to contribute and provide guidance to researchers in designing their future research in adolescent's academic self-efficacy measurement.

Keywords: Academic self-efficacy, Academic setting, Adolescents, Gender differences, Socioeconomic status

Introduction

Adolescence is the period between the ages of 10 to 19 years which is consistent with the World Health Organisation's definition of adolescence. Where, United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF) in The State of the World's Children 2011 has divided adolescents in two groups. Early adolescence was referred as the ages between 10 to 14 and late adolescence as teenagers between the age stretch of 15 to 19. According to United Nations' database (2008), overall 1.2 billion adolescents occupy the world. Adolescence is the age phase which is essential to the crucial transition from childhood dependency to adulthood independence and self-reliance (Smith, Cowie and Blades 1998).

During their teenage years, adolescents face an upmost conflict in acquiring a sense of personal agency. According to Zimmerman BJ and Cleary Tj (2006), personal agency refers to an individual's proficiency to complete a given task and it is determined by the belief in one's performance which is termed as self-efficacy. Bandura (1977) stated that self-efficacy is the main aspect in bringing about noteworthy outcomes in the lives of people. In term of academic achievement, again Bandura

explained self-efficacy as the affect behaviour of the students through how they feel, think, motivate and act. It also directs what activities students select, how determined they are in facing difficulties.

Self-efficacy as the vital factor of social cognitive theory seems to be an important variable in adolescence academic achievement, because it affects adolescence motivation in learning (Pajares, 1996, 2006; Schunk 1995, 2003). Other table researches revealed that self-efficacy affects adolescents' conduct, learning behaviour, their effort, persistence and performances (Schunk, 1995, 2003). It is impossible to clarify academic achievement without bringing the character played by self-efficacy beliefs into the discussion (Pajares and Urdan, 2006). Bandura (1986), figured out that self-efficacy helps adolescents to decide how much hard work they will invest on a mission. He reasoned his assumption as, the stronger their notion of self-efficacy, the higher their effort and the individual with weaker notion of self-efficacy the lower their effort will be in completing a task as it seems more difficult than what it actually is.

According to Mbathia (2005), academic provides people with certain skills and enables them to execute effectively. The better the presentation of an individual is, the more competitive and rewarded the individual will be in their personal life and also employment. Hackett and Betz (1989), concluded that self-efficacy determines the level of one's performance. In conjunction with that, self-efficacy is understood as social cognitive development derived from family, schooling and peers (Schunk and Meece, 2005). Bandura (1986, 1997) stated that self-efficacy affects one's behaviours and the environments with which one interacts, and is influenced by one's actions and conditions in the environment. For example, family provides experiences that influence children's self-efficacy. This is agreed in a research by Bradley and Crowyn (2002), Putnam (2002), by stating that families with greater capital and social resources provide richer experiences that raise children's self-efficacy by shaping perceptions of their ability to succeed. So, it can be concluded that self-efficacy development in adolescents plays a key role in cognitive process supported by socioeconomic factors such as family background, capital and environment.

Literature Review

The focus of this research is on academic self-efficacy among Malaysian students from different socioeconomic settings. The key areas of analysis will be based on gender in Asian cultural, socioeconomic status based on household income and different academic settings. The expectation of the above analysis is to acquire in depth understanding of the academic self-efficacy development in Malaysian adolescents. In support of Bandura (1977) that states self-efficacy affects the choices people make such as their effort, their determination and flexibility in their personal development. In his argument he further emphasises the importance of self-efficacy in obtaining the staying power in unfavourable conditions. Self-efficacy is termed as one's level of self-belief and trust (Ahmad, Qazi & Jabeen, 2011). Bandura (1986), however solidifies the statement that the stronger one's belief in self-efficacy the higher his or her effort will be.

Academic self-efficacy is based with Bandura's self-efficacy theory (1977). Referring to self-efficacy theory, it is one's believe in their strength to set and put into action a given task to complete a mission, (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002). According to Bandura (1997), Eccles and Wigfield (2002), Linenbrink and Pintrich (2002a) academic self-efficacy is indicated by one's conviction that they can auspiciously achieve on a given academic task or on certain academic goal. Another desk research also state the similar definition "academic self-efficacy refers to students' perceptions of their competence to do their classwork", Midgley et al (2000). Largely, researchers found various studies have indicated that academic self-efficacy is a vital element in academic achievement (Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2007; Pajars, 2000; Zimmerman, 2000).

According to Bandura (1986) there is a major difference in the way individuals feel and act between those with low self-efficacy and those with a high level of self-efficacy. Individuals suspicious of their own abilities tend to avoid challenges and difficult tasks. As Bandura described (1989), people who doubt their abilities tend not to get engaged in difficult tasks. As stated above, individuals with a high level of self-efficacy cope with challenging situations in a more matured way, while not considering these as a threat. According to the Social Cognitive theory, self-efficacy is one of the most important variables that influences the academic performance and achievement. Collins (1982) demonstrated in a clear way the importance of self-efficacy beliefs and skill application on academic performance. The study showed that people may perform poorly on tasks not necessarily because they lack the ability to succeed, but because they lack belief in their capabilities.

Different researches indicate that the way learners make use of the learning strategies increases their academic achievements (Hwang and Vrongistinos 2002; McKenzie, Gow, and Schweitzer 2004; Pressley, Borkowski, and Schneider 1987; Rollnick et al. 2008; Yip and Chung 2005). Bandura (1989) has also found that the perceived self-efficacy increases academic achievement in a direct and an indirect way, by influencing individuals' goals. Self-efficacy, together with the goals, influences academic performance. Individuals with a high level of self-efficacy assign higher goals to them and exercise more effort and willingness to have them accomplished. Locke and Latham (1990) defined that the more challenging the goals are, the more motivation they stimulate. A high level of motivation and willingness bring about higher academic accomplishments.

Self-efficacy development is an essential factor in one's life process to succeed. In a previous desk research, Bandura (1977) stated that self-efficacy development is opposed among different personage as they assort under various environment conditions. Bandura's Social Learning Theory (1977, 1986) claims that individual's confidence in his or her strengths build up the level of one's self-efficacy development.

Self-efficacy development begins at home when a family equips experiences that impact an infant's self-efficacy (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Putnam, 2000). The research also says that, family's socioeconomic status influences the experience provided to children to develop self-efficacy in them. Family with greater capital such as higher household income, effective human

resources and social resources (e.g. social network, education and good residency) furnishes conducive environment to raise children's self-efficacy.

Schunk (1991) stated that academic self-efficacy indicated one's ability to successfully execute a given academic task at expected level. It also shows one's confidence level in performing the given task (Lorsbach & Jinks, 1999; Schunk, 1991). Another research by Pajares (1996) and Schunk (1991) explains that students with high level of academic self-efficacy tend to address a difficult task steadily compare to students with lower level of academic self-efficacy.

According to Bandura and Meece (1997), home environment that stimulate effective interaction influences one's academic self-efficacy. Where Meece (1997) added that exciting activities in home environment contain of substance as games, books and computer encourage adolescents to explore and master new skills. Meece also explains, parents who furnish supportive home conditions as learning materials are becoming the key for stimulating academic self-efficacy among adolescents. Besides that, Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara and Pastorelli (1996) reported that adolescents' academic self-efficacy level is influenced by parents' academic aspirations for their children.

Another research done by Titma et al. (2007) concluded that one's socioeconomic background has an important effect on her or his academic self-efficacy level. The researcher proved it in a longitudinal study on Estonians. The study revealed that those from lower socioeconomic environment have lower levels of self-efficacy compared to those from higher socioeconomic environment. Griffiths (2006) also explained in the same way that those who experienced good socioeconomic status have higher self-efficacy level. Studies by Eccles (2005); Lytton & Pyryt (2008) reported that adolescents' academic self-efficacy level is determined by the socioeconomic status of family such as household income and other home resources which have affected on their belief. In similarity with the above finding, Snow, Burns and Griffin (1998) also stated that number of books at home, frequency of buying newspapers and income level of the family stimulate one's belief in own ability to perform academically. Gottfried, Fleming & Gottfried (1998); Pintrich & Schunk (2002) suggested that such stimulating socioeconomic environment motivates the adolescents to be more efficacious.

Furthermore, socioeconomic status is seen as the individual's opportunities to learn and develop self-efficacy (Blustein et al., 2002; McWhirter, Hackett & Bandalos 1998; Turner & Lapan, 2003). Adolescents from higher income group are exposed to good educational funds and greater access to parental support. In contrast to this statement, C. Brown, Darden, Shelton & Dipoto (1999) stated that adolescents from lower socioeconomic status experienced poorer schooling quality and financial problems which will decrease one's academic self-efficacy level.

Conversely, a study on Asian American college students conducted by Tang, Fouad and Smith (1999) revealed that there is no significant difference on self-efficacy level and socioeconomic status. Another similar research by Ali et al. (2005) also says that there is no significant impact between adolescents from lower socioeconomic status and the level of self-efficacy.

Another factor discussed in academic self-efficacy is gender differences. According to Bandura (1997) he marked gender as an influential factor for some people's self-efficacy beliefs. Where, in a research by Meece (1991), Pajares and Miller (1994), Wigfield, Eccles and Pintrich (1996) it is reported that males incline to be confident than females in academic achievement. Wigfield et al., (1996) also observed that males have higher level of self-efficacy compared to females in academic areas.

Other than the factors discussed, academic self-efficacy is further discussed by Pintrich and Schunk (1996). It is explained that academic setting influences academic self-efficacy which is determined by the factors such as competition among students, less teachers' attention to individual improvement and pressure due to school transition. Besides that, in a research by Hymel, Comfort, Schonert-Reichl and McDougall (1996) see academic self-efficacy level among students to be persuaded by the institution's environment in encouraging the involvement of the students in given tasks and activities which in return influence their academic achievement. At this academic level, adolescents face transitional influences as they are exposed to expanded social group and less attention from the supervisors to individual progress which affected their academic self-efficacy level. Besides, Sander & Sanders (2006) observed academic self-efficacy as a student's ability to carry out a given task and achieve success. They further explain that students with higher level of academic self-efficacy tend to perform well and they are more determined in achieving academic goal. This statement is agreed by Elias & MacDonald (2007); Lent, Brown & Gore (1997) whereby it is stated that one's academic self-efficacy level influences their persistency in academic achievement.

Pertaining to a college or university, various factors may influence students to be successful and persist in college or to leave, and among these are self-efficacy achievement (Choi, 2005; Pajares & Schunk, 2001). Bandura (1986) refers self-efficacy as a judgement made by adolescents on their capability to get done a given task.

According to Solberg, O'Brien, Villareal, Kennel, and Davis (1993), college self-efficacy is operationally defined as a student's level of confidence in performing various college related tasks to generate a required outcome, such as passing an examination. College students with towering self-efficacy see complicated tasks as challenges to be achieved rather than as pressure to be avoided (Pajares & Schunk, 2001). In contrary, college students who uncertain on their potential may believe that the matter is too complicated to accomplish. Such a belief often cultivates pressure and depression, and thus these individuals narrow their vision to effectively solve problems. Academic self-efficacy has been initiated to persuade academic domains including college student academic achievement and thus is relevant to postsecondary academic success as it is found to influence how much effort is put into performing a task, persevering on the task, and as a result, affecting the level of one's achievement (Choi, 2005; Pajares & Schunk). It is clearly stated that, the confidence that college students have in their academic capability becomes a critical component of their academic success.

Besides, academic self-efficacy has its advantage and disadvantage elements. Bandura (1993), sketched the advantages as students holding high academic self-efficacy are likely:

- See problems as challenges to overcome instead of threats and set target to meet the challenges
- Being very committed to the academic goals set
- Task-diagnostic orientated which improve their performance.
- See failure as the result of their own inadequate effort.
- Improve their effort after failure to achieve the goals the have set earlier.

Whereas, according to Bandura (1986) the disadvantage side of academic self-efficacy occurs when one's result on previous task would be misleading for the current task. Moreover, one might have low efficacy level following the failure that would cause them to lose confidence in their capabilities and increases stress, Bandura (1984).

Methodology

Samples

The population of the study was Malaysian adolescents. In the present research, the targeted sample were the adolescents from 17 to 19 years old. This research stands of 169 samples and they were divided into 3 socioeconomic groups. First group adolescents were those from low household income, second group from moderate household income and the last group were those from high household income. The respondents were including both male and female. Besides that, respondents were also divided according to different academic setting consist of low, moderate and high academic achievers. Regarding the sampling method, random sampling method was used in the process of choosing samples from the targeted population.

Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents including gender, socioeconomic status and adolescents from different academic setting. Female respondents lead the research with 55.6% and male respondents consist of 44.4%. The respondents are grouped into 3 socioeconomic statuses. 36.3% of the respondents belong to low household income group followed by 32.5% of the respondents in moderate household income group and 31.2% respondents of high household income group. Table 1 also explains that moderate academic achievers have the highest participation of 36.1% respondents followed by 34.3% high academic achievers and 29.6% low academic achievers.

Table 1: Frequencies of demographic profile

Variables		N	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	75	44.4
	Female	94	55.6
Socioeconomic Status	Low Household Income	58	36.3
	Moderate Household Income	52	32.5
	High Household Income	50	31.2
Academic Setting	Low Achiever	50	29.6
	Moderate Achiever	61	36.1
	High Achiever	58	34.3

n= 169

Procedures

Researcher used Self-efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C) to conduct the survey. Researcher went to the field to gather the data from the respondents. The instrument consists of two parts, Part A and Part B. Part A was designed on demographic variables such as gender, age, place of residence, academic qualification and socioeconomic status. Part B contains 8 items to measure academic self-efficacy level among adolescents from different academic settings. Likert Scale of 5 points was provided for each question (1=Not at all 2=With difficulty, 3=Moderate, 4=Well, 5=Very well). Each respondent took approximately 5 minutes to complete the survey form. 169 respondents were finalised and the data gathered were analysed in Statistical Program for the Social Science (SPSS).

Measures

Data gathered from the quantitative method were later analysed by switching the raw data into numeric values. The data obtained on demographic profile were analysed using frequency and percentage with the access of (SPSS) version 22. Cronbach Alpha

was used to measure the reliability of the items in the questionnaire. Finally Anova test was used to measure the significant differences in academic self-efficacy level across gender, socioeconomic status and different academic settings.

Results

Cronbach Alpha was used to test the reliability of SEQ-C in the current study. The reliability of 8 items related to academic self-efficacy was tested and the result in Table 2 shows a high reliability with .806 Cronbach Alpha. It is proven that the items in the instrument are suitable to be used to the samples of the current research.

Table 2: Reliability of self-efficacy questionnaire for children (SEQ-C) in current study

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Academic Self-Efficacy	.806

Table 3 shows significant difference in academic self-efficacy level across gender (p = .039). Female respondents seem to have higher level of academic self-efficacy with mean score 3.70 compared to their counterpart with 3.24 mean score.

Table 3: Academic self-efficacy between gender

	Male (75)	Female (94)	df	F	p
Scale	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)			
ASE	3.24 (1.303)	3.70 (1.530)	167	4.333	.039

p< 0.05

In order to examine whether or not there are significant differences between socioeconomic status on academic self-efficacy, ANOVA shows significant differences between low, moderate and high income groups in Table 4. Respondents from moderate household income show the highest level of academic self-efficacy with the mean score 3.94 and followed by the respondents from high household income with the mean score 3.74. The results show that respondents from low household income have the least level of academic self-efficacy.

Table 4: Academic self-efficacy between socioeconomic status

Scale	Household Income			df	F	p
	Low Mean (SD)	Moderate Mean (SD)	High Mean (SD)			
ACADEMIC SELF- EFFICACY	3.03 (1.256)	3.94 (1.552)	3.72 (1.429)	157	6.237	.002

p< 0.05

Table 5 shows that significant difference is also found in academic self-efficacy level across different academic setting. P =0.004 shows a significant difference between low, moderate and high academic achievers in the level of academic self-efficacy. Adolescents with high academic achievement have higher mean score compared to those with low and moderate academic achievement.

Table 5: Academic self-efficacy between different academic settings

	Low Academic Achiever (n=50)	Moderate Academic Achiever (n=61)	High Academic Achiever (n=58)	df	F	p
Scale	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)			
ASE	22.7 (5.881)	24.89 (3.693)	26.17 (6.429)	166	5.587	.004

$p < 0.05$

Discussion

The results of this research show that there are significant differences in academic self-efficacy level among adolescents across gender, socioeconomic status and different academic settings. Besides, the reliability is also high for the items in the instrument.

Discussion On The Reliability Of The Instrument

The instrument in this research was tested on 169 adolescents from 3 different socioeconomic status and academic background. Cronbach Alpha was used to confirm the reliability of the items in the instrument. [Table 2 in appendix] shows that the Cronbach Alpha coefficient found for this research was .806 which is a high reliability. Based on George and Mallory (1999), Cronbach Alpha equals to or higher than .70 is acceptable in a social science research.

Discussion On Demographic Profile

This research stands of 169 samples, covered the adolescents from the age range from 17 to 19 years old and they were divided into 3 socioeconomic groups. First group adolescents were those from low household income, second group from moderate household income and the last group were those from high household income. The respondents were male and female and they were from three academic setting included of low, moderate and high academic achievers.

Overall, the dominant respondents were female adolescents. Out of 169 respondents, 94 or 55.6% were female participants. Balance 75 or 44.4% were the males. The statistic shows that most of the adolescents participated in this research were those with high and moderate academic qualification. Only 29.6% of the participants fell into low achievers group. This situation can be explained as, the adolescents in Malaysia are exposed to wide education opportunities. Majority adolescents managed to access to higher education. However it is also shown that a small group of adolescents failed to attained higher education due to various factors.

However, low income group had the most participants followed by the moderate income group with 32.5% and 31.2% from high income group. It can be explained that those who are from low and moderate income groups chose to study locally and those who are from high income group have the opportunities to study abroad.

Discussion On Gender Differences

The previous related studies revealed that mixed findings occurred with regards to gender. Different research has various results on gender impact towards the level of academic self-efficacy. Some results showed significant differences in gender where there were studies showed male are more significant to academic self-efficacy and other research showed that the level of academic self-efficacy is higher among female. However, some studies showed that there were no significant differences between male and female in measuring academic self-efficacy.

Anova Test was used in this study to examine the significant differences across gender. The current research conducted in Malaysia setting determined that female adolescents have higher level of academic self-efficacy. It is shown in [Table 3 in appendix], where female respondents have higher mean score, 3.70 and male respondents show a difference of 0.46 mean score compared to their counterpart.

This is agreed by a research carried out by Britner & Pajares (2001) showed that female adolescents have higher self-efficacy belief than the male. A similar result was found by Bandura et al. (1999) with female adolescents scored higher level of academic self-efficacy than male adolescents. In 2004, Saunders et al. also stated the same result, where female attained higher level of academic self-efficacy compare to their counterpart.

In opposition to the above finding, Anderman & Young (1994), Meece & Jones (1996), Pintrich & De Groot (1990) and Zimmerman & Matinez-Pons (1990) reported that self-efficacy is higher among male adolescents. Pintrich & De Groot further explained that in a research done with Albanian society; gender stereotypes affect the level of belief and capacities among the female counterpart. It was proved in a study by Muris (2002) female respondents reported a lower level of self-efficacy compared to male respondents.

Contrary to these results, it was proved that no gender differences in self-efficacy level (Pajares, 1996b; Pajares & Graham, 1999; Roeser, Midgley & Urdan, 1996; Smith, Sinclair and Chapman, 2002). Wettersten et al. (2005) agreed to this statement as his study found no significant differences across gender in the level of academic self-efficacy. A part from the various finding, the result of the current study verified that significant differences occurred across gender and it is shown that female have higher level of academic self-efficacy compared to their counterpart. This is because, naturally female has higher self-motivation that cultivate the level of academic self-efficacy to succeed academically. However, p value for gender differences is low in this study, consistent with the different outcomes from various studies in the past.

Discussion On Socioeconomic Status

The discussion continued by looking into the effect of socioeconomic status in one's academic self-efficacy level. The respondents were divided into 3 household income groups consist of low household income, moderate household income and high household income. The study shows a significant difference of $p=0.002$ across the respondents' socioeconomic status. Adolescents from moderate and high household income showed a higher mean score than for the lower household income group with only 3.03 mean score. This is due to adolescents from poor income background experienced lack of facilities in term of social and economic to upgrade knowledge and personal appearances which keep their level of academic self-efficacy low. Plus, uncondusive house environment and poor school system failed to cultivate academic self-efficacy among this group of adolescents to achieve academically.

Putnam (2000) defines socioeconomic status as capital differences in families. Bradley & Corwyn, (2002); McLoyd, (1990) see families with low socioeconomic status seem to fail in providing effective development and learning environment. This is because families with low household income are unable to provide facilities that help to stimulate adolescents' cognitive development such as books, computers and conducive living area. In acceptance of this statement, Shunck & Miller (2002) explained that adolescents from lower socioeconomic status showed lower level of academic self-efficacy due to learning problems at home and school environment.

Besides that, adolescents facing limited access to social capital such as community centres might sense unsuccessful self-efficacy development and poor personality formation (Kerpelman and Mosher, 2004). Furthermore, adolescents from lower socioeconomic status tend to have poor financial support to access to good quality schooling and this influences their level of academic self-efficacy.

Discussion On Different Academic Settings

From the data analysis, the respondents were grouped into 3 include of low, moderate and high academic achievers. The adolescents from these 3 areas showed significant difference in academic self-efficacy level. It is clearly shown in the result that the high academic achievers were more efficacious compared to those low and moderate academic achievers. [Table 5 in appendix] shows a mean score of 22.17 among high academic achievers and 24.89 for moderate and 22.7 for low academic achievers.

Based on previous research by, Multon, Brown and Lent (1991), it was stated that academic achievement and the level of academic self-efficacy connectedly influence one another. It is also agreed in a research by Arslan (2013), where the result showed that students' level of academic self-efficacy depends on their academic achievement. The high achievers seemed to be more efficacious compared to those moderate and low achievers. Another similar research indicated that high achievers have higher level of academic self-efficacy compare to moderate achievers and moderate achievers were more efficacious compared to low achievers (Pavani, 2013).

Conclusions And Recommendations

The purpose of the study was to measure the level of academic self-efficacy among the adolescents from 3 different socioeconomic status and 3 different academic settings. Apart from that the importance of this study is to explore academic self-efficacy role in higher education and this study is supporting the current scenario. From the result it is obvious that level of academic self-efficacy is higher among female adolescents compare to male adolescents. It also revealed that adolescents from higher socioeconomic status perform better than those from lower socioeconomic background. Based on these outcomes it can be concluded that employability competency is greater among high academic achievers compare to their counterpart. As the results showed significant differences in academic self-efficacy across gender, socioeconomic status and different academic settings, it is recommended that future researchers aim to investigate based on the tested variables.

This research is believed to contribute to the knowledge bodies such as schools, skill training centres, colleges and universities to understand better the needs of the adolescents and to help them to achieve in academic. This may lead the adolescents to be successful in academic and secure a job in future.

Besides, it is also suggested to address the additional variables such as place of residence and parents' education level that might affect the academic self-efficacy levels among adolescents in local academic setting. Besides, in future a larger sample is to be recruited as the gender significance is low and has contradicting literature outcome. Finally, the researcher would like to suggest increasing the number of institution in each academic setting to have more realistic outcome.

References

- Arslan, A. (2013). Investigation of relationship between sources of self-efficacy beliefs of secondary school students and some variables. *Educational Science: Theory & Practice* 13(4), 1983-1993.
- Ahmed, I., Qazi, T. F. & Jabeen, S. (2011). Self-efficacy: The predictor of educational performance among university students. *Information Management and Business Review*, 3(2), 57-62.
- Ali, S. R., McWhirter, E. H., & Chronister, K. M. (2005). Self-efficacy and vocational outcome expectations for adolescents of lower socioeconomic status: A pilot study. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 13(1), 40–58.
- Anderman, E. M., & Young, A. J. (1994). Motivation and strategy use in science: Individual differences and classroom effects. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 31, 811-831.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. *Child Development*, 67, 1206-1222.
- Birch & Dianne. (1987). *Adolescents whose parents are divorced: An interview study and ethnographic analysis*. Black Burg, Virginia: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
- Blustein, D. L., Chaves, A. P., Diemer, M. A., Gallagher, L. A., Marshall, K. G., Sirin, S., & Bhati, K. S. (2002). Voices of the forgotten half: The role of social class in the school-to-work transition. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49, 311–323.
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 371-399.
- Britner, S. L., & Pajares, F. (2001). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, race, and gender in middle school science. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, 7, 271-285.
- Brown, C., Darden, E. D., Shelton, M. L., & Dipoto, M. C. (1999). Career exploration and self-efficacy of high school students: Are there urban/suburban differences? *Journal of Career Assessment*, 7, 227-237.
- Choi, N. (2005). Self-efficacy and self-concept as predictors of college students' academic performance. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(2), 197-205.
- Collins, J. L. (1982). Self-efficacy and ability in achievement behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Eccles, J.S., (2005). Influences of parents' education on their children's educational attainments: The role of parent and child perceptions. *London Review of Education*, 3, 191-204.
- Elias, S. M., & MacDonald, S. (2007). Using past performance, proxy efficacy and academic self-efficacy to predict college performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37 (11), 2518-2531.
- George, D., & Mallory, P. (1999). *SPSS for Windows step-by-step guide: A simple guide and reference*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon
- Gottfried, A.E., Fleming, J.S. and Gottfried, A.W. (1998). Role of cognitively stimulating home environment in children's academic intrinsic motivation: A longitudinal study. *Child Development* 69, 1448–1460.
- Hackett, G., N. E. Betz. (1989). An exploration of the mathematics self-efficacy/mathematics performance correspondence. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 20, 261-273.
- Hymel, S., Comfort, C., Schonert-Reichl, K., & McDougall, P. (1996). Academic failure and school dropout: The influence of peers. In J. Juvonen & K. R. Wentzel (Eds.), *Social motivation: Understanding children's school adjustment*, 313-345. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Kerpelman, J. L., & Mosher, L.S. (2004). Rural African American adolescents' future orientation: The importance of self-efficacy, control and responsibility and identity development. *An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 4(2), 187-208.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lorsbach, A. W., & Jinks, J. L. (1999). Self-efficacy theory and learning environment research. *Learning Environments Research* 2, 157–167.
- Lytton, H. & Pyryt, M. (1998). Predictors of achievement in basic skill: A Canadian effective school study. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 23, 281-301.
- Mahyuddin, R., Elias, H., Cheong, L. S., Muhamad, M. F., Noordin, N., & Abdullah, M. C. (2006). The relationship between students self-efficacy and their English language achievement. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, 21, 61–71.
- Markstrom, C., Marshall, S., & Tryon, R. (2000). Resiliency, social support and coping in rural low-income Appalachian adolescents from two racial groups. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 693-703.
- Mbathia, M. (2005). *Cream for law and medicine*. The Standard. Nairobi: The Standard Ltd.
- McLoyd, V. (1990). The impact of economic hardship on black families and children: Psychological distress, parenting, and socioeconomic development. *Child Development*, 61, 311-346.
- McWhirter, E. H., Hackett, G., & Bandalos, D. L. (1998). A causal model of the educational plans and career expectations of Mexican American high school girls. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 45, 166–181.
- Meece, J. L. (1997). *Child and adolescent development for educators*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Meece, J. L., & Jones, G. (1996). Gender differences in motivation and strategy use in science: Are girls rote learners? *Journal of Research on Science Teaching*, 33, 407-431.
- Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2007). Self-efficacy of college intermediate French students: Relation to achievement and motivation. *Language Learning*, 57(3), 417–442.
- Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 18, 30-38.

- Muris, P. (2002). Relationship between self-efficacy and symptoms of anxiety disorders and depression in a normal adolescent sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32(2), 337-348.
- Noran, F. Y. Habibah, E., & Mahyuddin, R. (1993). Psychological factors influencing English language learning among university students. Research report, Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 543-578.
- Pajares, F. (1996b). Self-efficacy beliefs and mathematical problem-solving of gifted students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21, 325-344.
- Pajares, F. (2006). Self-efficacy during childhood and adolescence: Implications for teachers and parents. In F. Pajares, & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*, (339-367). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Pajares, F., & Graham, L. (1999). Self-efficacy, motivation constructs, and mathematics performance of entering middle school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 24, 124-139.
- Pajares, F., and Shunk, D. H. (2001). Self beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and school achievement. In R. Riding and S. Rayner (eds.). *Perception* London: Ablex Publishing, 239-266.
- Pajares, F., & Urdan, T. (2006). Foreword. In F. Pajares, & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*, ix-xii. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Pavani, S. (2013). A Study of self-efficacy and academic achievement among college students. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Psychology* 1(1), 17-24.
- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 33-40.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (Second edition). Pearson education, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Roeser, R. W., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. C. (1996). Perceptions of the school Psychological environment and early adolescents' psychological and behavioural functioning in school: The mediating role of goals and belonging. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88, 408-422.
- Roscigno, V. J., & Crowley, J. L. (2001). Rurality, institutional disadvantage, and achievement/attainment. *Rural Sociology*, 66, 268-298.
- Sander, P., & Sanders, L. (2006). Understanding academic confidence. *Psychology Learning and Teaching*, 12(1), 29-39.
- Saunders, J., Davis, L., Williams, T., & Williams, J. H. (2004). Gender Differences in self-perceptions and academic outcomes: A study of African high school students. *Journal of youth and Adolescence*, 33(1), 81-90.
- Schunk, D. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist* 26, 207-231. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep2603&4_2.
- Schunk, D. H. (1995). Self-efficacy and education and instruction. In J. E. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation and adjustment: Theory, research and application*, 281-303. New York: Plenum Press.
- Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modelling, goal setting and self-evaluation. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming learning difficulties*, 19(2), 159-172.
- Schunk, D. H., & Miller, S. D. (2002). Self-efficacy and adolescents' motivation. In Pajares, F., & Urdan, T. (Eds.), *Academic motivation of adolescents*, 29-52. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Smith, L., Sinclair, K. E., & Chapman, E. S. (2002). Students' goals, self-efficacy, self-handicapping, and negative affective responses: An Australian senior school student study. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27, 471-485.
- Smith, P. K., Cowie, H., & Blades, M. (1998). *Understanding children's development* (3rd ed.). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Tang, M., Fouad, N. A., & Smith, P. L. (1999). Asian Americans' career choices: A path model to examine factors influencing their career choices. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 142-157.
- The State of the World's Children. (2011). *Adolescence: An age of Opportunity*, UNICEF.
- Titma, M., Tuma, N. B., & Roots, A. (2007). Adolescent agency and adult economic success in a transitional society. *International Journal of Psychology*, 42, 102-109.
- Turner, S. L., & Lapan, R. T. (2003). The measurement of career interests among at-risk inner-city and middle-class suburban adolescents. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 11, 405-420.
- World Health Organisation. (2002). *World Report on Violence and Health*.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Cleary, T. J. (2006). Adolescents' development of personal agency. In Pajares, F., & Urdan, T. (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*, 45-69. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 51-59.