

The Effectiveness of Self-management Strategy of Cormier & Cormier Model to Increase Academic Self-efficacy of High School Students

Muhammad Asrori¹, Awaluddin Tjalla^{2,*}

¹Department of Guidance and Counseling, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak, Indonesia

²Department of Guidance and Counseling, Faculty of Education, State University of Jakarta

*Corresponding author: asroriuntan@yahoo.com, awaluddin.tjalla@gmail.com

Abstract The common symptom experienced by high school students is the lack of ability to find the effective ways to complete the school work and tasks. They are generally lacking in self-efficacy, meaning that they are not quite sure about their capability to determine the ways that can make themselves a success in completing the tasks. This study aims to examine the effectiveness of self-management strategy, one of the contemporary behavior-changing strategies to improve the self-efficacy of high school students. There are three combination of techniques (1) a combination of self-monitoring with self-reward; (2) a combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control; and (3) a combination of self-monitoring with self-reward and stimulus-control. The present experimental study with a pretest-posttest-control group design found that the combination of self-monitoring with stimulus control techniques was the most effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students while the other combinations of techniques were less effective.

Keywords: *self-management, self-monitoring, self-reward, stimulus-control, self-efficacy*

Cite This Article: Muhammad Asrori, and Awaluddin Tjalla, "The Effectiveness of Self-management Strategy of Cormier & Cormier Model to Increase Academic Self-efficacy of High School Students." *American Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 6, no. 6 (2018): 816-821. doi: 10.12691/education-6-6-34.

1. Introduction

There have been many unsuccessful attempts to improve the academic self-efficacy of high school students at school. Most of these studies did not involve the systematic interventions that were based on the recent concepts and findings as well the research findings with the Indonesian school setting. There were actually some research findings potential to support the realization of a systematic intervention. Such research findings can be read from the research that involved motivational interventions. It is the research theme that is recently developing rapidly and has produced the findings that were replicable, comprehensive, and relevant to educational initiatives [1,2].

A literature review indicates that one of the most recent interventions that draw a lot of attention is "self-management intervention" [3,4,5]. The interventions that Cormier & Cromier think are easy to apply and have been proven to produce progressive development [6], particularly in the academic achievement [7] and more specifically in the academic self-efficacy improvement and less successful in the learning achievement [2,8,9,10,11].

Several studies show that the self-management strategy programs have similarities in addition to their variations. The similarity lies on which its conceptual principles are based on cognitive-behavioral schools [3,4]. The analysis of this view refers to whether or not the students

will be able to seek and obtain the ways that can make them a success in learning or a success in completing school tasks, depending on the students' self-ability in self-management to have high confidence in finding the ways that are required for it. In this context, students will tend to have difficulty in completing their learning tasks when they lack in self-efficacy [12,13,14] because "self-efficacy affects choice, initiation, effort, persistence, and hence level of performance accomplishment" [12]. Such an analysis is also supported by numbers of research findings [15].

An important question to raise here is "What strategies and techniques are effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students?" It is important to answer this question because the development strategies offered by the experts to improve the self-efficacy of high school students are still general and recommendatory. The specific techniques and the steps that can make people easier to use them are still not offered clearly.

On this basis, this study concerns a self-management strategy of Cormier and Cormier model [3] that will be applied systematically to improve the self-efficacy of high school students. A self-management strategy is one of the common strategies used in the tradition of guidance and counseling practices. It can be applied to various targetted behaviors including in improving the self-efficacy of high school students [3,4].

The self-management strategy is a process that individuals perform in directing their behavior by employing a

technique or a combination of techniques [3] to manipulate internal and external events [16]. Self-management is a form of behavioral change in which the process is mostly carried out by the concerned individuals, not directed or pushed by the counselor. Self-management is based primarily on the responsibility of individuals to act through the manipulation of internal and external events [16].

The self-management strategy of Cormier and Cormier model [3] applies three techniques, namely, (1) self-monitoring (2) stimulus-control and (3) self-reward. The present study applied three combined techniques to examine their effectiveness namely, (1) a combination of self-monitoring with self-reward; (2) a combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control; and (3) a combination of self-monitoring, self-reward and stimuli-control.

According to Bandura [17], self-efficacy defined as one's belief in one's ability to succeed in specific situation. Moreover, Bandura [12] emphasizes that self-efficacy is the belief in one's capabilities to organize and to execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations. In other words, self-efficacy is a person's belief in his or her ability to succeed in a particular situation. Ryckman, et al., [14] described that beliefs as determinants of how people think, behave, and feel. Bandura [17] explained that "Self-efficacy affect choice, initiation, effort, persistence, and hence level of performance accomplishment." Moreover, Bandura [17] also emphasize that "Efficacy expectations are a major determinant of people's choice of activities, how much effort they will expend, and how long they will sustain effort in dealing with stressful situation."

In this context, Graham (2011) [18] and Kirk (2013) [19] explained that individual's self-efficacy plays a major role in how goals, tasks, and challenges are approached. People with a strong sense of self-efficacy tend to view challenging problems as tasks to be mastered, develop deeper interest in the activities in which they participate, form a stronger sense of commitment to their interests and activities and recover quickly from setbacks and disappointments. On the contrary, people with a weak sense of self-efficacy tend to avoid challenging tasks, believe that difficult tasks and situations are beyond their capabilities, focus on personal failings and negative outcomes and quickly lose confidence in personal abilities.

The self-efficacy variables of the present study take the concept developed by Sanna [13] and Bandura [12] which contains two dimensions (1) efficacy expectancy namely, ones believe that they are capable of displaying certain behaviors required to achieve certain goals; and (2) outcome expectancy namely, ones believe that the behaviors displayed can lead to achieving the intended goals.

Based on the above background, the present research problem be formulated into the following research questions: (1) How effective is the self-management strategy of self-monitoring combined with self-reward to improve the self-efficacy of high school students?; (2) How effective is the self-management strategy of self-monitoring combined with stimulus-control to improve the self-efficacy of high school students?; (3) How effective is the self-management strategy of self-monitoring combined with self-reward and stimulus-control to improve the self-efficacy of high school students?; and (4) Which

self-management strategy is the most effective of these combinations to improve the self-efficacy of high school students?

The objective of this study is to obtain the empirical evidence of the effectiveness of self-management strategy to improve the self-efficacy of high school students. The effectiveness of this self-management strategy will be compared between the combination of self-monitoring with self-reward techniques; the combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control; and the combination of self-monitoring, self-reward and stimulus-control; also compared with the high school students who do not get treatment.

The results of this study are theoretically intended to function as (1) giving insights of good counseling, educational psychology, learning psychology, and learning strategies in schools, in particular, the reliability of the strategy that can be used to improve the self-efficacy of high school students, namely, the self-management strategy; and (2) giving insights of how to apply the self-management strategy of the Cormier and Cormier model for educational research particularly in guidance and counseling and learning strategies for the Indonesian school setting which so far has not been done yet.

In addition, practically it is useful for (1) offering self-management as an alternative strategy to improve the self-efficacy of high school students so that this self-management strategy can enrich the strategies that have been possibly practiced and commonly used; (2) providing an input for counseling and counseling programs in schools and counseling education curricula to include the self-management strategy as a field of study.

2. Method

This research involves two variables. They are (1) self-management strategy as an independent variable and (2) self-efficacy as a dependent variable. The self-management strategy has three techniques. They are self-monitoring, self-reward and stimulus-control. There are three technical combinations namely, (1) combination of self-monitoring with self-reward techniques; (2) combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control techniques; and (3) combination of self-monitoring with self-reward and stimulus-control. The purpose of combining these techniques is to gain the effective way to develop the behaviors in target [3]. The self-efficacy in this study was developed by Sanna [13] and Bandura [12]. It covers two dimensions: (1) efficacy expectancy, believing that one is capable of displaying certain behaviors required to achieve certain goals; and (2) outcome expectancy, believing that the behaviors that one displays can lead to achieving the intended goals.

The subjects of this research were high school students. The samples were 30 people for each experimental group and control group, using multistage proportional random sampling technique. This number of samples was considered sufficient for statistical analysis in a causal-comparative form. In reference to a methodological principle, a statistical analysis in a comparative causal form requires minimally 15 subjects for each group [20,21].

To examine the effect of independent variables on dependent variables, the most appropriate study was an experimental research [22,23,24]. Therefore, this research, of which the aim was to determine the effectiveness of self-management strategy to improve the self-efficacy of high school students, was conducted using an experimental method. The experimental method used here was a quasi-experimental study in "Pretest-Posttest-Control Group Design".

The research data were collected using (1) a guideline to run an experimental group treatment, (2) a self-monitoring log, and (3) a self-efficacy inventory. The guideline for the treatment of the experimental group was developed by examining and understanding the concept of self-management strategy and the three concerned techniques: self-monitoring, self-reward and stimulus-control. The self-monitoring format was adapted directly from the example of "Self-monitoring Log" presented by Cormier and Cormier [3]. The self-efficacy inventory was developed from the concept proposed by Sanna [13]. This inventory comprised 80 items distributed evenly into two aspects. Thus, each aspect had 40 items, but the questions were arranged spontaneously not clustered in every aspect.

Through build-in-try-out and then tested, its reliability showed that the Alpha Cronbach test result showed that the level of reliability was very high, that is, the efficacy expectancy was 0.870 and the outcome expectancy was 0.853. Therefore, it was eligible to be used as a tool for collecting the research data.

The research procedure covered administering a pre-test, giving a treatment, and administering a post-test. The pre-test was given to all research subjects to set the initial condition of self-efficacy quality of high school students before they were given the treatment using a self-management strategy. The pre-test was administered by the concerned teacher. The research setting was defined as natural as possible and the high school students were not made aware of being researched. The instrument used to perform the pre-test was a self-efficacy inventory.

The treatment with self-management strategy was done eight times. The first meeting covered the class discussion about the self-efficacy concept completed with its concrete examples. The second meeting involved the individual task, enlisting as many concrete self-efficacy behaviors as possible and establishing the number of the achievable self-efficacy. The third meeting dealt with the practice of fulfilling the form of self-efficacy record in accordance with their respective experimental groups and followed by giving tasks to perform by the students on the following days. The fourth meeting gave a feedback on the tasks that the students did in the previous week and a practice of computing the frequency of activities and displaying it in a graph. The fifth meeting evaluated the student's activity by comparing it with the target behavior. The sixth to the eighth meetings evaluated the previous activities and made the students motivated to improve the next activities.

After eight treatments the students were given a grace period of three weeks to see the development of their self-efficacy as a result of the given treatment. With the end of the grace period, the students were given the post-test using the Self-efficacy Inventory to know the effectiveness of the given treatment.

The data collected through the form or the self-monitoring checklist were computed in percentage. The students' attitudinal profile and self-efficacy were found out by computing the actual score percentage of the ideal maximal score based on the normal curve. The data of the pre-test and the post-test were analyzed using variance analysis. It was analyzed using SPSS for MS Windows Release 10.0.

3. The Results of Research

Based on the analysis of percentage, that is, dividing the number of students who performed each component of activities with the whole students in each experimental group, the results were presented for each experimental group as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The Ability of Self-Management of High School Students

Aspect of Ability	Experimental Group		
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Determining the target behaviors personally	100%	100%	100%
Using daily recording forms	100%	100%	100%
Drawing behavior development graphs	70%	85%	75%
Showing the graphs to other people	20%	70%	30%
Recording behaviors regularly	65%	75%	70%
Using verbal/symbolic rewards	45%	90%	45%
Using material rewards	75%	90%	70%
Using imaginary rewards	60%	80%	65%
Using current rewards	70%	75%	70%
Using potential rewards	65%	75%	70%
Seeking external reward sources	70%	70%	70%
Bringing positive person stimulus nearer	--	--	80%;
Bringing positive non-person stimulus nearer	--	--	90%;
Keeping the negative personal stimulus away	--	--	75%;
Keep the negative non-personal stimulus away	--	--	65%;
Changing the antecedent combination and behavior	--	--	65%;
Expanding good self-efficacy in other situations	--	--	65%

Notes:

Group 1: Combination of self-monitoring with self-reward

Group 2: Combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control

Group 3: Combination of self-monitoring with self-reward and stimulus-control

The self-efficacy profile of the students given a treatment using a combination of self-monitoring and self-reward technique is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Self-efficacy profile of High School: Students, Experimental Group 1 (Combination of Self-monitoring with Self-reward Technique)

Aspect of Variables	X _{ideal}	Pre-test		Post-test	
		X _{actual}	Level	X _{actual}	Level
A. Efficacy Expectancy	3600	540	15% (L)	1908	53% (M)
B. Outcome Expectancy	3600	504	14% (L)	1764	49% (M)

Notes: (L) = Low; (M) = Moderate; (H) = High.

Table 2 shows that before being given a treatment (the result of pre-test) the students' self-efficacy was categorized "low level". It was seen in all aspects. However, after they were given a treatment and they were given the post-test, the self-efficacy got improved, categorized "moderate level" in all aspects. It could be interpreted that the self-management strategy by combining self-monitoring with self-reward was less effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students due to none of the development aspects did reach the "high level."

The self-efficacy profile of the students given a treatment using a combination of self-monitoring with the stimulus-control technique was shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Self-efficacy Profile of High School Students: Experimental Group 2 (Combination of Self-monitoring with Stimulus-Control Technique)

Aspect of Variables	X_{ideal}	Pre-test		Post-test	
		X_{actual}	Level	X_{actual}	Level
A. Efficacy Expectancy	3600	612	17% (L)	2700	75% (H)
B. Outcome Expectancy	3600	509	14% (L)	2556	71% (H)

Notes: (L) = Low; (M) = Moderate; (H) = High.

Table 3 shows that before the students were given a treatment (the results of pre-test), their self-efficacy in all aspects was categorized "low level". After they were given a treatment and a post-test, their self-efficacy got improved and it was classified "high level". It could be interpreted that the self-management strategy that combined self-monitoring with stimulus-control technique was very effective, classified "high level" improving the self-efficacy of high school students.

The self-efficacy profile of the students given a treatment using the combination of self-monitoring with self-reward and stimulus-control techniques can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Self-efficacy Profile of High School Students: Experimental Group 3 (Combination of Self-monitoring with Self-reward and Stimulus-control Technique)

Aspect of Variables	X_{ideal}	Pre-test		Post-test	
		X_{actual}	Level	X_{actual}	Level
A. Efficacy Expectancy	3600	576	16% (L)	2664	74% (H)
B. Outcome Expectancy	3600	648	18% (L)	1836	51% (M)

Notes: (L) = Low; (M) = Moderate; (H) = High.

Table 4 shows that before the students were given a treatment (the result of pre-test) their self-efficacy in all aspects was categorized "low level". After the students were given a treatment and the post-test, the improvement of their self-efficacy was classified "moderate level" and one aspect was in a "high level." It could be interpreted that the self-management strategy that combined self-monitoring with self-reward and stimulus-control was also less effective.

The analysis of variance to test the significance of the effectiveness difference of the combination of three techniques can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Effectiveness Differences of Combination of Three Techniques to Improve Self-efficacy of High School Students

Source	Db	Sum of Quadrat	Average of Quadrat	F	P
Inter-group	2	57380,067	28690,033	169,874	0,000
In-group	87	14264,033	163,954	--	--
Total	89	71644,100	--	--	--

Table 5 shows that F-test = 169.874 was significant at $p < 0.00$. It means that there is a very significance difference in the academic self-efficacy of high school students among those who were treated with the combination of self-monitoring with self-reward techniques; the combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control techniques; the combination of self-monitoring with self-reward and stimulus-control techniques. The most effective combined technique was that of self-monitoring with stimulus-control techniques while the other two combinations were less effective.

4. Discussion

The research found that there was only one combined technique that was effective, that is, the combination of self-monitoring with the stimulus-control techniques while the combination of self-monitoring with self-reward technique and the combination of self-monitoring with self-reward and stimuli-controlling techniques were less effective.

The question that can be raised here is "What factors have made the combination of self-monitoring with self-reward techniques less effective in enhancing the self-efficacy of high school students?" There were several identifiable causes. Firstly, the individual was generally easier to self-punish than to self-reward [3]. Furthermore, Cormier & Cormier [3] claims that when ones are successfully doing something, they will not reward themselves straight off. It is sometimes not seen as something special. On the contrary, when ones fail in doing a task, they will immediately punish themselves, for example, self-repenting, self-blaming, and self-irritating.

Secondly, of the available rewards, namely, verbal/symbolic, material, imaginary, current, and potential rewards, there were rewards that were not quite common or even difficult for high school students to perform. This type of reward is commonly practiced by Westerners when making a success. Mike Tyson was a good example. Without reluctance, he expressed himself in public, "I am the strongest man on the planet" when he won the heavyweight title of WBC, IBF, and WBO all at once. Likewise, Diego Maradona also freely claimed, "I am still great" when this 33-year-old soccerroo was still able to play with his team-mates whose ages were still under the 20s and could make the soccer spectators amazed during the 1994 World Cup final match in the U.S.A.

The words that they uttered were verbal or symbolic self-rewards to increase their own self-motivation and assurance. However, if such words were expressed by a high school student when getting the first rank in his class,

shouting for example, "I am the greatest person in this classroom", he might be thought as an arrogant person. This cultural setting made it difficult for the students to reward themselves verbally or symbolically to improve their self-efficacy. Therefore, in this study, only 45% of students used verbal self-rewards.

Similarly, imaginary self-reward is like imagining oneself as a scientist when one succeeded in doing an experiment. A common metaphor among the Indonesian society is "Don't think outside the box!" This cultural metaphor can hamper students to use an imaginary self-reward when they can improve their self-efficacy well. Therefore, in this study, there were only 60% of students who used an imaginary self-reward. Students mostly rewarded themselves in a material form (75%) for example by buying a snack to increase their self-efficacy; and a current self-reward (70%) for example by chatting or jesting with friends when they increased their self-efficacy successfully.

Thirdly, the students were not diligent in recording their own self-efficacy progress regularly, and drawing the graph of their self-efficacy progress, and showing them to others. The data of this study indicated that there were only 20% of students that made the graphs of their self-efficacy improvement and showed them to others. In the meantime, there were only 65% of students that recorded their self-efficacy progress regularly.

Fourthly, the locus-control of Indonesian society including high school students is generally external [25] so it is difficult to reward themselves. The self-reward can be used effectively in the West because the locus-control of Westerners generally tends to be internal [26]. Therefore, self-reward is potentially very effective in the West but it is less effective to apply in Indonesia.

The present study also found that the combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control techniques was very effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students. It is a very interesting finding because the stimulus-control itself is theoretically less effective when applied alone: "Stimulus control methods are often insufficient to modify behavior without the support of other strategies" [3]. Here, of course, a question raises "Why is the combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control techniques found very effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students? Some possible causes can be identified. Firstly, the power of self-monitoring in combination with the stimulus-control is because the self-monitoring includes the element of re-evaluating the quality of self-esteem by recording the daily activities of the individual being aware of what he has done.

Secondly, the stimulus-control technique was applied by adjusting or changing the "cues" that were available in the surroundings either in the personal forms or in the impersonal ones. These cues were outside the individual, not within the individuals. Then, it made the students easier to do it rather than the self-reward that must control something inside. It suited the locus-control of Indonesian society including the high school students, who tended to be external. Here is the advantage of the stimulus-control as claimed by Yates [4], "One advantage of stimulus-control is that only minimal self-initiated steps required to trigger environmental changes that affect desired or undesired responses"

Thirdly, the basic principle of the stimuli-control, if the antecedent is consistently associated with the behaviors that are supported in their emergence (not in their absence), will be able to control these behaviors. If the antecedent is a stimulus to a certain behavior, it can be a stimulus-control. It means that the expected responses can emerge if a particular antecedent is present. Combining stimulus control and self-monitoring enables students to immediately record everything that is related to the emergence of the expected responses when a certain antecedent is present. The rapid response to recording the self-monitoring [3] enables individuals (high school students) to immediately get away from "cues" that may obstruct the self-efficacy and promptly bring nearer the "cues" that can enhance the self-efficacy. This factor enables the combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control techniques to be highly effective in enhancing the self-efficacy of high school students.

Fourthly, if the data of self-management activities were analyzed, the students of this group were almost all active in any aspects of the activity (70% and above). This students' activity can support their efforts to improve self-efficacy in a better direction.

Another research finding is that the combination of self-monitoring with self-reward, and stimulus control techniques were less effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students. Compared with the combination of self-monitoring with the stimulus-control techniques, this combination was very effective but the combination of self-monitoring with the self-reward techniques was less effective. It can be predicted that the less effective combination of the three techniques namely, self-monitoring and self-reward, and stimulus-control techniques was because of the inclusion of self-reward technique. Thus, the students' self-monitoring activities to improve self-efficacy by controlling various personal and impersonal stimuli within their environment are disrupted by the activities applying various types of rewards in order to raise happy feelings for self-efficacy improvement.

Moreover, it may be due to combining three self-monitoring with self-reward and stimulus-control is more difficult for the students to apply than combining two techniques: self-monitoring with self-reward or self-monitoring with stimulus-control. If the self-reward technique was not included, it can be assumed that its effectiveness is parallel to the combination of self-monitoring with the stimulus-control techniques. It is obviously evident when observing the students' self-management activities to this group: all aspects of the activity were carried out by 65% upwards of all participating students unless the aspects of which the graphs showed to other people (30%) and that applied verbally/symbolically (45%). This resembled the activity performed by the group combining self-monitoring with self-reward techniques.

5. Conclusion

Based on the research results and discussion, it can be concluded that (1) overall, the self-management strategies are effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students; (2) the self-management strategy of the combined

self-monitoring with the self-reward techniques is less effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students. This ineffectiveness is shown in the improvement of all its aspects that are categorized "moderate". (3) The self-management strategy of the combined self-monitoring with stimulus-control techniques is very effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students. This high effectiveness is shown from the development of all its aspects that are classified "high". (4) The self-management strategy combining self-monitoring, self-reward, and stimulus-control techniques is not effective to improve the self-efficacy of high school students. It can be seen when it is viewed from the improvement of its aspects, one of which is classified "high", and another one is classified "moderate". (5) Of these three combined techniques in the self-management strategy, the most effective way to improve the self-efficacy of high school students is the combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control techniques.

Based on the conclusion, it was recommended that: (1) The effectiveness of self-management strategy to improve the self-efficacy of high school students indicates that school counselors need to apply self-management strategies to improve students' self-efficacy. The self-management strategy can be applied following the procedures as the present research. (2) The school counselors are suggested to apply the combination of self-monitoring with stimulus-control techniques. (3) It is also suggested that the school counselors include the self-management strategy into the counseling education curriculum. (4) Since this research is conducted to Year-10 students of a high school, it may be difficult to gain the effectiveness of combining three techniques (self-monitoring, self-reward, and stimulus-control) at once. It may be difficult for them to administer these three techniques at once. Therefore, it is necessary to study Year-11 and Year-12 students to examine the effectiveness of combining the three techniques at once. The combination of self-monitoring with stimuli control techniques was very effective, but combining three techniques at once was not effective. Ideally, the combination of three techniques can improve the self-efficacy of high school students very effectively.

References

- [1] Elliot, E.S. & Dweck, C.S. (2008). "Goals: an approach to motivation and achievement." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 5-12.
- [2] Dweck, C.S. (2006). "Motivational processing affecting learning." *American Psychologist*, 41, 1040-1048.
- [3] Cormier, L.J. & Cormier, L.S. (2005). *Interviewing strategies for helpers*. Second Edition, Monterey: California, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- [4] Yates, B.T. (2005). *Self-management: the science and art of helping yourself*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, A Division of Wadsworth, Inc.
- [5] Wittrock, M.C. (2006). "Students' thought processes." *handbook of research on teaching*, New York: Macmillan.
- [6] Forsterling, F. (2006). "Attribution conception in clinical psychology." *American Psychologist*, 41, 275-285.
- [7] Weiner, B. (2002). "Motivation." dalam Marvin C. Alkin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research*, 3, 860-865.
- [8] Berk, L.E. (2002). *Child development*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [9] Gredler, M. (2002). *Learning and instruction: theory into practice*. New York: Macmillan.
- [10] Schunk, D.H. (2002). "Effect of effort attributional feedback on children's perceived self-efficacy and achievement." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 548-556.
- [11] Schunk, D.H.; Hanson, A.R.; & Cox, P.D. (2007). "Peer-model attributes and children's achievement behaviors." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 54-61.
- [12] Bandura, A. (2006). "Recycling misconceptions of perceived self-efficacy." *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 8, 235-255.
- [13] Sanna, L.J. (2002). "Self-efficacy theory: implication for social facilitation and social loafing." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 774-786.
- [14] Ryckman, R.M. et al., (2002). "Development and validation of a physical self-efficacy scale." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 754-766.
- [15] Juvonen, J.A. (2008). "Outcome and attributional disagreement between students and their teachers." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 330-336.
- [16] Shelton, J.L. (2006). *Behavior modification for counseling centers: a guide for program development*. Washington DC.: ACPA/APGA.
- [17] Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- [18] Graham, S. (2011). Self-efficacy and academic listening. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 10, 113-117.
- [19] Kirk, W.D. (2013). Self-efficacy: helping students believe in themselves. *Professional Development*, 14, 163-168.
- [20] Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D. (1993). *Educational research: an introduction*. New York: Longman.
- [21] Gay, L.R. (2007). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and application*. Third Edition, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- [22] Tuckman, B.W. (2008). *Conducting educational research*. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc.
- [23] Cozby, P.C. (2005). *Methods in behavioral research*. Third Edition, Hayfield Publishing Company.
- [24] Heppner, P.P. et al. (2002). *Research design in counseling*. Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- [25] Asrori, M. (2009). *Pengaruh locus-kendali terhadap perilaku proaktif remaja*. Pontianak: Laporan Penelitian.
- [26] Rotter J.B. (2009). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: a case history of a variable, *American Psychologist*, 4, 490-493.