Self-efficacy in four language skills of Indonesian L2 learners of English: A comparative survey study

Yohanes Septian Sinaga, Adaninggar Septi Subekti*
Universitas Kristen Duta Wacana, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: adaninggar@staff.ukdw.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The self-efficacy (SE) of second or foreign language (L2) learners, or their belief in their ability to successfully carry out language tasks, can affect their communication behaviours and learning outcomes. This study seeks to explore L2 learners' SE levels in listening, reading, writing, and speaking, and to determine whether there are significant differences in SE across these four skills. A survey method was used, involving 144 Indonesian L2 learners from non-English departments. The survey included Likert-scale items measuring SE in the four language skills. Descriptive statistics revealed that learners had moderate-to-high SE in reading, listening, and writing, while reporting a higher level of SE in speaking. The mean scores range from 3.2 to 4.6 on a 1-5 scale. Paired-sample t-tests showed that speaking SE was significantly greater than that of reading, listening, and writing, whilst no significant differences were found among the SE of the latter three skills. Based on these findings, it is recommended that teachers promote more balanced development across all four language skills in integrated-skill classes where teachers build learners' confidence in skills they feel less capable of. Potential contributions include mapping learners' perceived strengths and weaknesses in L2 learning.

Keywords: Listening, reading, self-efficacy (SE), speaking, writing

INTRODUCTION

The role of learners' individual differences is getting more widespread acknowledgement in the second/foreign language (L2) context. Dornyei (2005) reiterated that it is the differences among learners that eventually affect the ultimate achievements of language learners. These differentiating factors include, among others, gender, aptitude, motivation, and how learners perceive their ability, known as self-efficacy (SE) (Ortega, 2009). The concept of self-efficacy in language learning is drawn from the work of Bandura (1997). He defined it as one's belief in being able to organise and execute required actions to produce the desired attainment. He further explained that individuals evaluate their SE by interpreting information from four main sources, which are mastery experience (experience of success or failure in specific task performance), vicarious experience (their observation of the performances of others), social persuasion (feedback from others), and psychological and affective states. Among these main sources, mastery experience is the most dominant (Bandura, 1997). That may explain why SE tends to increase as learners can execute tasks successfully (Mahyuddin et al., 2006) and tends to decrease as learners perceive failure in executing tasks (Shehzad et al., 2019).

Furthermore, SE can be an important predictor of the extent of efforts individuals make, their perseverance when facing obstacles, and how effectively they regulate their choice, motivation, and achievement (Schunk et al., 2014). It greatly affects the quality and quantity of effort one puts into any given task (Wyatt & Dikilitaş, 2019). The higher the SE, the higher the effort, tenacity, and resilience (Mahyuddin et al., 2006). In the language learning context, this perceived competence is at times more determinant of language performance than learners' actual competence (Dewaele & Dewaele, 2018; Raoofi et al., 2012; Subekti, 2020).

With the more widespread acknowledgement of the roles of individual learner differences and Bandura's conceptualisation of the construct, studies on SE also seem to be flourishing in the last three

decades. Studies on language learners' SE have been conducted, among others, in Iran (Baleghizadeh & Masoun, 2014; Fatemi & Vahidnia, 2013a, 2013b; Fathi et al., 2020; Heidari et al., 2012; Zarei, 2018), Türkiye (Doğan, 2016), China (Li & Wang, 2010; Shang, 2010; Wang & Pape, 2007; Zhang & Ardasheva, 2019), Japan (Burrows, 2012; Todaka, 2016), Hong Kong (Bai & Guo, 2018), Taiwan (Tsao, 2021), Thailand (Hetthong & Teo, 2013), Malaysia (Khatib & Maarof, 2015), and Indonesia (Anam & Stracke, 2020; Hermagustiana et al., 2021; Ningias & Indriani, 2021; Paradewari, 2017).

The following is an overview of several SE studies in the Middle East on general SE, reading, listening, and writing SE beliefs. A quantitative study involving 52 Iranian L2 learners by Fathi et al. (2020) found that listening strategy and listening instruction increased learners' listening self–efficacy. Earlier, a study involving 50 Iranian learners reported that learners with a higher level of SE tended to use more learning strategies than those with a lower level (Heidari et al., 2012). Involving 93 L2 learners, studies in Iran found a significant relationship between writing SE and motivation, as well as writing performance, whilst amotivation negatively correlated with SE (Fatemi & Vahidnia, 2013a, 2013b). In line with that, an experimental study involving 57 Iranian learners by Baleghizadeh and Masoun (2014) reported that self-assessment facilitated the improvement of SE. The study pointed out the importance of SE on successful learning. A study in Türkiye involving 150 L2 learners by Doğan (2016) found, among others, that learners' SE significantly correlated with their anxiety negatively. This implied that learners with a low level of SE tended to be anxious in L2 learning. Furthermore, in investigating reading SE, Zarei (2018) involved 150 Iranian L2 learners. The study found that reading SE significantly correlated with reading strategies as well as reading comprehension. These studies generally suggested the positive role of SE on language learning.

Existing studies on reading and listening SE beliefs in the East Asian context can be outlined as well. A rather early case study by Wang and Pape (2007) involved three Chinese L2 learners. The participants in the study reported low reading SE for reading tasks requiring advanced vocabulary mastery. Several factors were identified: self-perceived proficiency, level of task difficulty, and interest. Shang (2010) involved 53 L2 learners in China and reported a significant relationship between learners' reading SE and their reported use of reading strategies. A similar finding was also reported in a study involving 139 L2 learners (Li & Wang, 2010). An experimental study involving 322 Japanese L2 learners by Burrows (2012) reported that extensive reading groups reported higher SE levels than the intensive reading groups. The former also outperformed the latter in reading comprehension tests. These findings suggested that extensive reading characterised by exposure to various texts based on learners' interests may be more effective in positively affecting learners; SE and reading skills than intensive reading. A later study in China also suggested similar findings (Liu, 2013). The study reported that learners who often visited an English Bar, a self-access centre to practice spoken English, tended to have higher levels of SE than those who seldom did, suggesting the role of exposure and practice on SE beliefs. Furthermore, self-regulated learning was also found to be a determinant in affecting SE, as reported in studies on listening SE by Todaka (2016) involving 200 Japanese learners at the university level, and by Yabukoshi (2021) involving four learners in a case study. Todaka (2016) also reported that learners' SE was significantly related to listening achievement.

The following is an overview of speaking and writing SE studies in East Asia. In the field of speaking SE, a one-year longitudinal study involving 77 Japanese learners found that learners' SE grew albeit at different rates for individuals as they became used to their English classes (Leeming, 2017), suggesting familiarity as a contributing factor to SE. Furthermore, a study involving 263 Chinese L2 learners by Zhang and Ardasheva (2019) investigated the extent to which components of SE proposed by Bandura (1997) could predict learners' public speaking SE. The study reported that mastery experience, vicarious experience, and verbal persuasion could significantly predict it. In the field of writing SE, a study involving 227 Taiwanese Senior High School learners Tsao (2021) reported that learners with higher SE tended to be more engaged with their teachers and paid more attention to peer-written corrective feedback.

Furthermore, SE studies in the Southeast Asian context have been conducted in Thailand (Hetthong & Teo, 2013), Malaysia (Khatib & Maarof, 2015), and Indonesia (Anam & Stracke, 2020; Hermagustiana et al., 2021; Ningias & Indriani, 2021; Paradewari, 2017). In Thailand, a study involving 51 learners from the English department reported that writing SE significantly correlated with writing performance (Hetthong & Teo, 2013). Furthermore, involving 60 technical college learners of English in Malaysia, Khatib and Maarof (2015) found that generally, the participants reported a low level of

speaking SE. However, learners from semester 5 seemed to possess a higher level of SE than those in semester 1, perhaps highlighting the role of practices and duration of study on speaking SE. The more they practised and were exposed to college English, the more confident of their capability they became. In line with that, a study involving 516 Indonesian primary school learners of English by Anam and Stracke (2020) also suggested a relationship between SE and language ability. An earlier study involved 43 learners from an English department (Paradewari, 2017). It reported the majority of learners had a high level of public speaking SE. The fact that they chose English as their future career may play a part in affecting their beliefs. A similar finding was also reported in a study by Ningias and Indriani (2021) involving 35 learners from another English department. Another recent study involving 70 sixth-semester learners by Hermagustiana et al. (2021) reported that SE was associated with low anxiety and high-level speaking performance. These aforementioned findings, relatively similar to those of studies in other learning contexts, suggested the merits of having higher levels of SE for language learning. That being said, studies on SE are very important to be conducted.

Furthermore, despite the possible contributions of the existing studies in the plethora of SE literature, some aspects still need to be investigated. For example, studies mostly investigated exclusively a certain type of SE, for example, SE in reading (Burrows, 2012; Li & Wang, 2010; Shang, 2010; Zarei, 2018), listening (Fathi et al., 2020; Todaka, 2016; Yabukoshi, 2021), writing (Fatemi & Vahidnia, 2013a, 2013b; Tsao, 2021), and speaking (Hermagustiana et al., 2021; Hetthong & Teo, 2013; Khatib & Maarof, 2015; Leeming, 2017; Liu, 2013; Ningias & Indriani, 2021; Paradewari, 2017; Zhang & Ardasheva, 2019). For this reason, it is important to conduct a single study investigating L2 learners' SE in four language skills. It is also strategic to see whether they have relatively balanced levels of SE or SE in a certain skill that is significantly higher than the other skills. The findings can inform practitioners on which aspects need to be boosted more. Specifically in Indonesia, since a study involving university learners thus far involved a relatively small number of participants, a quantitative study involving more participants may produce more meaningful results. Overall, this study may offer a general overview of Indonesian L2 learners' SE levels across the four language skills and comparison among them, which may not have been available in the existing literature. The results may also help identify learners' perceived strengths and weaknesses in L2 learning. Language teachers can use this information to focus on the skills which learners feel are still lacking. This may be especially true in the context of English as a foreign language such as Indonesia, where its use is largely limited to the classroom. In such situations, learners may be more prone to feelings of inadequacy regarding their English abilities.

With the rationales in mind, the present study aimed to answer two research questions. First, what are L2 learners' levels of reading, listening, writing, and speaking SE? Second, is there a significant difference among the levels of learners' SE in the four language skills?

The present study was conducted in parallel with two other studies involving similar participants (Sinaga & Subekti, 2024; Subekti & Sinaga, 2024). As far as SE is concerned, the study by Sinaga and Subekti (2024) reported that learners' SE was significantly predicted by their instrumental motivation. The other study by Subekti and Sinaga (2024) reported that male learners reported marginally higher levels of SE than female learners. However, the difference was not statistically significant.

METHOD

The present study employed a quantitative design. It conducted a survey by distributing paper-based questionnaires to target participants. This study employed convenience sampling, where a sample of the population was selected based on easier access to the available group of the target participants (Gray, 2022).

The target participants of this study were L2 learners enrolled in General English Level 3 at a university in Yogyakarta Province, Java Island, Indonesia. For the context, General English Level 3 was a non-credited mandatory course taken by non-English learners at the university. They had three General English courses: Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. When learners enrolled at the university, they had to take a placement test to determine the level at which they would start the General English courses. Each level consisted of 16 meetings and could be completed in a semester. The courses implemented integrated-skill methods of instruction. After learners passed General English Level 3, they could take credited English for Specific Purposes classes in their respective departments. That being said, learners

taking General English Level 3 had been exposed to English courses at university for quite a while and considered it strategic to be involved in an SE study.

The participants of this study were 144 non-English major university learners taking General English Level 3. Although they had not taken any standardised proficiency tests at the time of data collection, their language proficiency was estimated to be at an intermediate level, considering they had taken three GE levels in the last three semesters.

The data were collected from 13 February to 24 February 2023. Of the 144 participants, 76 (52.8%) were males and 68 (47.2%) were females. They were from seven different departments. The details can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. The participants' departments

No	Departments	Number of participants	Percentage
1.	Accounting	13	9.0%
2.	Architect	16	11.1%
3.	Informatics	45	31.3%
4.	Information System	16	11.1%
5.	Management	37	25.7%
6.	Medical	13	9.0%
7.	Product Design	4	2.8%
	Total	144	100.0%

The instrument employed in this study was a 12-Likert-scale-item questionnaire on SE adapted from several previous works. Items 1, 2, and 3 on writing SE were adapted from the work of Teng et al. (2017). Items 4, 5, and 6 on reading SE were adapted from the work of Mills et al. (2006). Items 7, 8, and 9 on listening SE were adapted from the work of Smith et al. (2011) whilst items 10, 11, and 12 on speaking SE were adapted from the work of Asakereh and Dehghannezhad (2015). Five possible responses were provided for each of the items: "Strongly Agree", "Agree", "Undecided", "Disagree", and "Strongly Disagree", where "Strongly Agree" indicated a high level of SE and "Strongly Disagree" indicated a low level of SE. The questionnaire items were translated into Indonesian and then back-translated into English to ensure the accuracy of the translation. The Indonesian version of the questionnaire was the one distributed to the target participants. Before being distributed to the participants, the Indonesian version of the questionnaires was piloted on 15 university students and reviewed by three lecturers of English for suitability in the research context. Based on the feedback from the students and lecturers, minor changes were made to ensure that all the questionnaire items were accurate and simple to fill out (Gray, 2022).

The validity of the questionnaire items was assessed using Pearson's correlations. The individual items were correlated with the overall construct. For example, the three items on reading SE were correlated with overall reading SE. All the items were found to be valid, indicated by the correlation coefficient being bigger than the critical value of Pearson's correlation coefficient *(N = 144, df = 142)* at approximately ±0.22. In this study, the coefficients ranged from .48 to .86, *p < .01*.

To analyse the questionnaire data, SPSS 25 was used, and the following steps were conducted. "Strongly Agree" responses were recorded as 5 points, "Agree" as 4 points, "Undecided" as 3 points, "Disagree" as 2 points, and "Strongly Disagree" as 1 point. After that, descriptive statistics were conducted to find out learners' levels of SE in four different language skills. The data are presented in the form of percentages, means, and standard deviations. Next, to determine whether there was a significant difference among learners' reading, listening, writing, and speaking SE, paired-sample t-tests were conducted, pairing each of the four constructs with the others. This would result in six pairs, and the results can be seen from the significance levels (p-values).

Ethical principles were adhered to before, during, and after the research. First, this study secured the permission of the Head of the Language Centre managing the General English classes at the university. This permission indicates the gatekeeper's consent (Ramrathan et al., 2016). The autonomy principle was implemented using the consent form attached to the first page of the questionnaire. It detailed the objectives of the study, the researchers' identities, as well as the prospective participants' rights and responsibilities if they decided to participate (Davis & Lachlan, 2017). At this stage, it can be seen that despite securing the gatekeeper's consent, the researchers did not coerce participation from

any prospective participants. Participation was voluntary. Learners could freely decide whether to participate in this study, suggesting the implementation of autonomy (Israel & Hay, 2006).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present study aims to investigate L2 learners' SE in four language skills and to see whether there is a significant difference among these SE beliefs. It employed a survey method of distributing a paper-based questionnaire and analysed the data using descriptive statistics and paired sample t-tests. The twelve items produced an .81 Cronbach's alpha coefficient and an .82 McDonald's omega coefficient, both suggesting a high internal reliability.

L2 Learners' Self-Efficacy in Four Language Skills

For easier data presentation and discussion in this report, the twelve items were divided into four categories based on language skills: learners' reading self-efficacy, listening self-efficacy, writing self-efficacy, and speaking self-efficacy. The results regarding learners' reading SE are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Learners' reading self–efficacy

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score	*SD*
4	I can understand the English subtitles in a movie.	14.6%	68.8%	0%	16%	0.7%	3.8	0.90
5	I can understand an English passage or text very well.	11.8%	77.8%	0%	10.4%	0%	3.9	0.72
6	I can identify the topic of an English text or passage.	16%	73.6%	0%	10.4%	0%	3.7	0.83

As seen in Table 2, items 4, 5, and 6 produced mean scores of 3.8, 3.9, and 3.7 respectively resulting in the average mean score of these three items being 3.83, suggesting a moderate-high level of reading SE. Item 4, "I can understand the English subtitle in a movie," produced a mean score of 3.8 and obtained support from 120 participants (83.4%). This finding was different from a study involving 322 in Japan by Burrows (2012). They reported that participants had low beliefs about their language abilities. They reported difficulty understanding movies or lyrics due to the grammatical rules. This may also be the case for 24 participants (16%) in this study who disagreed with the questionnaire statement. Another possibility could be the pace of the speech in movies, which compels learners to read the English subtitles at the same pace. In the case of the majority of the participants in the present study, they may have been familiar with watching movies with English subtitles. The availability of various movie streaming services, allowing learners to watch more English movies at will, may also play a part in increasing the level of their familiarity.

Item 5, "I can understand an English passage or text very well," produced a mean score of 3.9. 129 participants (89.6%) supported the statement, with 15 participants (10.4%) not supporting it. This finding had similarities with a study involving 139 Chinese learners by Li and Wang (2010). They found that participants were highly self-efficacious in terms of their ability to read and understand English texts or passages. The study also reported that the participants tended to be more confident in their ability to execute reading tasks as they practised regularly. This suggested the importance of exposure to reading activities and reading techniques, allowing them to comprehend reading content. In turn, this may boost their SE.

As for item 6, "I can identify a topic of English text or passage," produced a mean score of 3.7. 121 participants (89.6%) expressed their agreement, whilst 23 participants (10.4%) expressed their disagreement. The finding indicated that most of the participants believed in their reading skills to identify the topics of English reading texts. Regarding this, a study by Zarei (2018) found that there was a relationship between learners' self–efficacy and their reading comprehension, including their ability to identify the topics of texts. Another study involving 217 participants in Norway indicated that participants' level of efficacy affected their understanding of reading tasks (Solheim, 2011). The findings of the present study and those of the aforementioned previous studies may suggest that learners'

reading SE could be an indicator of reading skills. In the case of the present study, the General English classes implementing integrated-skills teaching may have facilitated them to practice reading techniques, allowing them to identify the main ideas of reading passages. Besides, item 6 also relates to identifying the main ideas of reading passages. Despite challenges such as limited vocabulary mastery, learners may still be able to grasp the general idea by connecting the words they already know with the context provided in the passages. This possibility may explain why most participants felt self-efficacious in this specific area. Connecting the findings to the concept of self-efficacy by Bandura (1997), it could be seen that learners' fairly high reading SE may be linked to his concept of mastery experiences, resulting from continuous exposure to L2 reading in integrated L2 classes. The detailed findings on the participants' listening SE can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Learners' listening self–efficacy

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score	SD
7	I can listen and understand the audio being played through the speaker quite well.	11.1%	59%	0%	28.5%	1.4%	3.5	1
8	I can listen and understand the instructions given by the teacher.	16%	75.7%	0%	8.3%	0%	3.9	0.70
9	I can understand a short conversation in the English language quite well.	25.7%	70.8%	0%	3.5%	0%	4.1	0.60

As presented in Table 3, items 7, 8, and 9 respectively produced mean scores of 3.5, 3.9, and 4.1. The average mean score of these three items was 3.83, suggesting a moderate-high level of listening SE, though rather unequally across items. Item 7, "I can listen and understand the audio being played through the speaker quite well", produced a moderate mean score of 3.5 and obtained support from only 101 of the participants (70.1%). In comparison, item 8, "I can listen and understand the instructions given by the teacher", produced a relatively high mean score of 3.9. 132 of the participants (91.7%) expressed their agreement with the statement. Similarly, item 9, "I can understand a short conversation in the English language quite well," produced a mean score of 4.1. This statement was endorsed by 138 of the participants (96.5%). From this, it can be seen that learners seemed to be rather unconfident in their ability when they dealt with pre-recorded listening materials. In contrast, they seemed to be more self-efficacious in understanding their teachers' instructions or short conversations. In this case, they may perceive that understanding English native speakers' speeches typically found in pre-recorded listening materials was more difficult for them than understanding English speeches spoken by fellow L2 speakers, for example, their teachers.

Related to these findings, there was a possibility that learners compared their understanding of pre-recorded listening materials, typically having native speakers speaking, and that of their teachers' or friends' speech. When they realised they understood their teachers' or friends' speeches better than they did the native speakers, they may have formed a belief that they could understand fellow L2 speakers' speeches better. This realisation forms what Bandura (1997) called mastery experience. Related to this, a study involving 200 Japanese learners by Todaka (2016) reported that learners' SE significantly increased after being taught in the relevant area. This implied that a certain amount of practice could positively affect learners' SE. For example, class instructions could be designed in such a way as to accommodate pre-recorded listening materials, for example, at the beginning of the lesson. This is to familiarise learners with such materials, increase exposure, and facilitate learners to master the listening strategies necessary to understand them. In turn, it possibly increases their listening SE. Moreover, a recent study in Japan by Yabukoshi (2021) reported that learners who had high self–efficacy obtained higher listening scores than those with low self–efficacy, suggesting the importance of learners' efficacy beliefs in their actual language performances. However, an experimental study in Iran by Fathi et al. (2020) implied that increasing learners' SE may need a process until they possess mastery experience. The study revealed that listening strategy instruction, albeit being able to significantly improve listening comprehension and reduce listening anxiety, could not significantly improve learners' listening SE.

Furthermore, the results regarding learners' writing self-efficacy are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Learners' writing self-efficacy

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score	*SD*
1	I can write sentences using the English language.	25.7%	70.1%	0%	4.2%	0%	4.1	0.62
2	I can complete a writing task using the English language quite well.	16%	72.2%	0%	11.8%	0%	3.9	0.79
3	I can use correct grammar in writing.	12.5%	63.2%	0%	23.6%	0.7%	3.6	1

As shown in Table 4, items 1, 2, and 3, respectively, yielded mean scores of 4.1, 3.9, and 3.6. The average mean score was 3.87, indicating a moderate to high writing SE. Item 1, "I can write sentences using the English language," obtained support from 138 participants (95.8%). Similarly, item 2, "I can complete a writing task using the English language quite well," obtained support from 127 participants (88.2%). This finding corresponded with a finding of a quantitative study involving 93 Iranian learners by (Fatemi & Vahidnia, 2013b) reporting that learners were capable of writing successfully. The study also revealed that learners with a high level of writing SE tended to be good writers, resulting in good and high scores in L2 writing. This finding, however, was rather in contrast with a finding of a study involving 187 Taiwanese learners by Tsao (2021). Learners in the study reported a low to moderate level of L2 writing SE. Nevertheless, they tended to be self-efficacious in terms of writing conventions. The styles of L2 instruction that learners have, in this case, may play a role. For example, L2 instructions focusing on fluency and getting meaning across may have contributed to learners' higher SE, perhaps despite their possible lack of language accuracy. In comparison, L2 instructions focusing heavily on language accuracy may lead learners to set a higher standard of proficiency, leading to lower SE, perhaps regardless of their real ability. The combination of intertwined factors of SE: mastery experience, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and affective states (Bandura, 1997) could be at play in such a possibility. That is because class activities make it possible for these SE factors to continually shape learners' SE in their learning process.

Next, item 3, "I can use correct grammar in writing," with a mean score of 3.6, only obtained support from 109 participants (75.7%), with 35 participants (24.3%) disagreeing with the statement. The majority of the participants indicated their efficacious beliefs in their ability to write with correct grammar. Nevertheless, the finding in this particular item suggested that, albeit a minority, quite many learners were not confident in their ability in this particular area. This finding corresponded with that of a study by Tsao (2021) in Taiwan. The study suggested that though learners were able to write English sentences, they were not confident in the grammatical accuracy of their writing. Related to this, a study involving 155 L2 learners at the primary school level in Hong Kong by Bai and Guo (2018) reported that learners' writing SE developed as a result of the use of a self-regulating learning strategy. To achieve better L2 writing performance, learners should treat writing as a planned and step-by-step activity rather than an abrupt one. By doing so, learners can have more time to revise, which likely results in a better-written product. This, in turn, could allow learners to obtain the mastery experience necessary for SE.

The fourth category of SE presented in this report is speaking SE. The detailed results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Learners' speaking self-efficacy

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score	*SD*
10	I'm sure I can speak English quite well.	11.8%	47.9%	0%	36.8%	3.5%	3.2	1.1
11	I can introduce myself using the English language.	29.9%	68.1%	0%	2.1%	0%	4.2	0.56
12	I'm sure if I practice speaking, I can speak English very well.	63.9%	34.7%	0%	1.4%	0%	4.6	0.56

As seen in Table 5, items 10, 11, and 12 produced mean scores of 3.2, 4.2, and 4.6, respectively. Collectively, the average mean score of this category was 4, indicating a high level of SE. With a mean score of 3.2, item 10, "I'm sure I can speak the English language quite well", obtained support from *only* 86 participants (59.7%). Fifty-eight participants (40.3%) disagreed with the statement. A study involving 60 L2 learners in Malaysia by Khatib and Maarof (2015) also reported that participants had a moderate level of speaking SE among learners. Furthermore, a small-scale quantitative study involving Indonesian L2 learners of English in an online learning setting by Ningias and Indriani (2021) also reported that only 66.3% of the participants believed in their ability to speak English in front of the class during online classes. Item 10 concerns SE in L2 speaking in general. As such, it involves many aspects of L2 speaking, for example, but not limited to accurate grammar and pronunciation, vocabulary mastery, and fluency. This may partly explain why a considerable number of participants in the present study seemed to be unsure of their abilities.

In contrast, item 11, "I can introduce myself using the English language", produced a high mean score of 4.2. 141 participants (98%) expressed their agreement, suggesting learners' confidence in their ability to introduce themselves in English. This staggering percentage may lend an explanation for the familiarity of self-introduction among learners. They may perceive it as a familiar speaking context that they often practiced and did not require extensive language mastery to perform well. In line with this finding, a study involving 43 Indonesian L2 learners by Paradewari (2017) also reported that 81.4% of the participants believed in their speaking ability and that they could speak English in front of their friends.

Furthermore, item 12, "I'm sure if I practice speaking, I can speak the English language very well," produced a high mean score of 4.6 with support from 142 participants (98.6%). This indicates that, given sufficient exposure or practice, participants believed they could speak English well—aligning with Bandura's emphasis on the significance of mastery experiences in shaping self-efficacy (SE). The more exposure learners have, the higher their SE may become, as they accumulate more moments of achievement that contribute to mastery experiences, which in turn strengthen their SE. This specific finding also resonated with a finding of a mixed-method study by Leeming (2017). Through the interview, participants in the study reported that their speaking skills improved over the semester due to continuous practice. Earlier, in another mixed-method study involving Chinese learners, Liu (2013) found learners who often attended a self-access centre to practice oral English had higher self–efficacy in speaking skills (mean = 3.96) than those who did not (3.10). It indicated that learners who were given exposure for a certain length of time could increase their self–efficacy beliefs and their ability to speak.

Learners' reading, listening, writing, and speaking self-efficacy: Comparison
Learners' SE in four different skills can be summarised in Table 6.

Table 6. Summary of learners' self-efficacy in four different skills

	N	Mean	*Std. Dev.*
Reading Self-Efficacy	144	11.50	1.89
Listening Self-Efficacy	144	11.68	1.83
Writing Self-Efficacy	144	11.73	1.89
Speaking Self-Efficacy	144	12.15	1.63

Using paired-sample t-tests, the study compared the means of learners' SE in four language skills. The results can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Results of pair-sample t-test of learners' self-efficacy

		T-Test (t)	*Sig. (p)*	*Cohen's d (Effect Sizes)*
Pair 1	Reading – Listening SE	-1.17	.25	.28
Pair 2	Reading – Writing SE	-1.36	.18	.11
Pair 3	Reading – Speaking SE	-4.18	.000	.35
Pair 4	Listening – Writing SE	-.31	.76	.03
Pair 5	Listening – Speaking SE	-3.30	.001	.27
Pair 6	Writing – Speaking SE	-2.80	.006	.23

From Table 6 showing the mean scores of SE and Table 7 showing the results of the paired-sample t-tests, it can be seen that learners' speaking SE was significantly higher than their reading SE *(p = .000)*, with a medium effect size. Learners' speaking SE was significantly higher than their listening SE *(p = .001)*, and significantly higher than their writing SE *(p = .006)*, with small effect sizes. In comparison, their reading, listening, and writing SE were not significantly different from one another.

These findings can be approached in at least two different ways. First, the findings suggested that learners' speaking SE level was sufficiently high. Many studies suggested that speaking is often thought to be the most anxiety-provoking in language classes (Subekti, 2018; Tran, 2012; Tran et al., 2013). Hence, the finding on the high level of speaking SE could be seen as 'good news'. It could be used to leverage learners' speaking performance (Hermagustiana et al., 2021). As studies suggested, learners' perceived competence at times is more crucial than their actual ability when it comes to learners' risk-taking behaviours in L2 classes (Clement et al., 2003; Subekti, 2020). Hence, a high level of speaking SE in this study may give some kind of support to the success of the General English courses in promoting communicative language instructions, emphasising learners' communicative behaviours, mostly manifested in speaking.

As in a two-sided coin, however, this finding may also suggest that learners' SE and very probably their skills in reading, listening, and writing need more attention than what they may have received thus far. Though their SE levels were not at all low, there were discrepancies compared to those of speaking SE. Several possible factors may have contributed to it. First, learners probably lacked exposure to listening, reading, and writing activities in class. This could have compromised their mastery experience as they had little success experience in these three language skills. Studies have also suggested that continuous practices are paramount in developing one's SE (Khatib & Maarof, 2015; Liu, 2013). Second, language instructions heavily focusing on (spoken) fluency may at times compromise several other aspects, such as learners' development of language accuracy and receptive skills, especially writing. This calls for better practice in integrated-skill language classes, allowing all four language skills to equally develop hand-in-hand.

CONCLUSION

This study contributes to providing a general overview of Indonesian L2 learners' levels of SE in four language skills and a comparison among them. The findings could be used, to a certain extent, to map learners' perceived strengths and weaknesses in L2 learning. L2 teachers can pay attention to language skills learners perceive as lacking.

Possible implications can also be outlined. It is important to leverage learners' relatively high self–efficacy beliefs by providing them with new or challenging tasks that challenge their beliefs in their ability to overcome the difficulties in L2 learning. The teachers could also maintain learners' self–efficacy by giving frequent practice and a certain amount of exposure to learners so that they can develop mastery experience step-by-step, boosting their efficacy. Furthermore, that learners' speaking SE is significantly higher than learners' reading, listening, and writing SE calls for evaluation on the implementation of integrated-skill language classes to ensure that the development of all four skills can be equally facilitated in class. Balanced skills development should be encouraged. Teachers should also build learners' confidence in skills they feel less capable of, for example, reading and listening. They could also help learners set manageable targets in these skills to encourage gradual improvement.

The limitations of the present study lend to at least three possible factors. The survey, as the only method of collecting data, inherently leads to rather superficial findings. The data also solely depended on learners' self-reports and honesty in responding to the questionnaire items, without any triangulation. Secondly, the participants of this study were recruited using convenience sampling from a university. Hence, it may be rather unconvincing to state the generalisability of the findings of this study. Third, each SE construct in this study was represented by only three questionnaire items. This, to a certain extent, may limit the nuance of the findings.

Furthermore, recommendations for future directions of relevant studies can be outlined as follows. Conducting a quantitative study involving participants using probability sampling and using more questionnaire items may be strategic. The findings can potentially mirror a wider population sharing the same characteristics. Next, future studies can also investigate the implementation of integrated-skill language classes to see the extent to which all the skills are accommodated and facilitated in L2

instruction. For example, a classroom action research study can be conducted to assess the effectiveness of integrated teaching on the development of SE in the four language skills.

REFERENCES

Anam, S., & Stracke, E. (2020). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in learning English as a foreign language among young Indonesians. *TESOL Journal*, *11*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.440

Asakereh, A., & Dehghannezhad, M. (2015). Student satisfaction with EFL speaking classes: Relating speaking self-efficacy and skills achievement. *Issues in Educational Research*, *25*(4), 345–363. http://www.iier.org.au/iier25/asakereh.pdf

Bai, B., & Guo, W. (2018). Influences of self-regulated learning strategy use on self-efficacy in primary school students' English writing in Hong Kong. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, *34*(6), 523–536. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2018.1499058

Baleghizadeh, S., & Masoun, A. (2014). The effect of self-assessment on EFL learners' self-efficacy. *TESL Canada Journal*, *31*(1), 42–58. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v31i1.1166

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman and Company

Burrows, L. (2012). *The effects of extensive reading and reading strategies on reading self-efficacy* [Temple University]. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED549086

Clement, R., Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The effects of context, norms, and vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *22*, 190–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X03022002003

Davis, C. S., & Lachlan, K. A. (2017). *Straight talk about communication research methods* (3rd ed.). Kendall Hunt Publishing.

Dewaele, J., & Dewaele, L. (2018). Learner-internal and learner-external predictors of willingness to communicate in the FL classroom. *Journal of European Second Language Association*, *2*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22599/jesla.37

Doğan, C. (2016). Self-efficacy and anxiety within an EFL context. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *12*(2), 54–65. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1117949.pdf

Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fatemi, A. H., & Vahidnia, F. (2013a). An investigation into Iranian EFL learners' level of writing self-efficacy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *3*(9), 1698–1704. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.9.1698-1704

Fatemi, A. H., & Vahidnia, F. (2013b). Self-efficacy and motivation among Iranian EFL learners: An investigation into their relationships. *International Journal of English Language Education*, *1*(3), 79–89. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v1i3.3771

Fathi, J., Derakhshan, A., & Torabi, S. (2020). The effect of listening strategy instruction on second language listening anxiety and self-efficacy of Iranian EFL learners. *SAGE Open*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020933878

Gray, D. E. (2022). *Doing research in the real world* (5th ed.). Sage Publications, Ltd.

Heidari, F., Izadi, M., & Ahmadian, M. V. (2012). The relationship between Iranian EFL learners' self-efficacy beliefs and use of vocabulary learning strategies. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(2), 174–182. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n2p174

Hermagustiana, I., Astuti, A. D., & Sucahyo, D. (2021). Do I speak anxiously? A correlation of self-efficacy, foreign language learning anxiety and speaking performance. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching*, *6*(1), 68–80. https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v6i1.696

Hetthong, R., & Teo, A. (2013). Does writing self-efficacy correlate with and predict writing performance? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *2*(1), 157–167. https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.2n.1p.157

Israel, M., & Hay, I. (2006). *Research ethics for social scientists*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Khatib, F. M. M., & Maarof, N. (2015). Self-efficacy perception of oral communication ability among English as a second language (ESL) technical students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *204*(November 2014), 98–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.121

Leeming, P. (2017). A longitudinal investigation into English speaking self-efficacy in a Japanese language classroom. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *2*(1), 18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-017-0035-x

Li, Y., & Wang, Ch. (2010). An empirical study of reading self-efficacy and the use of reading strategies in the Chinese EFL context. *Asian EFL Journal*, *12*(2), 144–191. https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/main-editions-new/an-empirical-study-of-reading-self-efficacy-and-the-use-of-reading-strategies-in-the-chinese-efl-context/index.htm

Liu, M. (2013). English bar as a venue to boost students' speaking self-efficacy at the tertiary level. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(12), 27–37. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n12p27

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. http://apjee.usm.my/APJEE_21_2006/4 Rahi (61-71).pdf

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety: Self-efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, *39*(2), 276–295. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02266.x

Ningias, R. A., & Indriani, L. (2021). EFL Students' perspectives on their self-efficacy in speaking during online learning process. *English Learning Innovation*, *2*(1), 28–34. https://doi.org/10.22219/englie.v2i1.14965

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Routledge

Paradewari, D. S. (2017). Investigating students' self-efficacy of public speaking. *International Journal of Education and Research*, *5*(10), 97–108. https://www.ijern.com/journal/2017/October-2017/09.pdf

Ramrathan, L., Grange, L., & Shawa, L. B. (2016). Ethics in educational research. In L. Ramrathan, L. Grange, & P. Higgs (Eds.), *Education studies for initial teacher development* (pp. 432–443). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312069857_Ethics_in_educational_research

Raoofi, S., Tan, B. H., & Chan, S. H. (2012). Self-efficacy in second/foreign language learning contexts. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(11), 60–73. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p60

Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. R., & Pintrich, P. R. (2014). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Shang, H. F. (2010). Reading strategy use, self-efficacy and EFL reading comprehension. *Asian EFL Journal*, *12*(2), 18–42. https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/main-editions-new/reading-strategy-use-self-efficacy-and-efl-reading-comprehension/index.htm

Shehzad, M. W., Lashari, S. A., Alghorbany, A., & Lashari, T. A. (2019). Self-efficacy sources and reading comprehension: The mediating role of reading self-efficacy beliefs. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *25*(3), 90–105. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2019-2503-07

Sinaga, Y. S., & Subekti, A. S. (2024). Interaction between self-efficacy and instrumental motivation among Indonesian L2 learners of English. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, *10*(1), 83. https://doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v0i0.7828

Smith, S. L., Kathleen Pichora-Fuller, M., Watts, K. L., & La More, C. (2011). Development of the listening self-efficacy questionnaire (LSEQ). *International Journal of Audiology*, *50*(6), 417–425. https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2011.553205

Solheim, O. J. (2011). The impact of reading self-efficacy and task value on reading comprehension scores in different item formats. *Reading Psychology*, *32*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710903256601

Subekti, A. S. (2018). Investigating the relationship between foreign language anxiety and oral performance of non-English major university students in Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu*, *18*(1), 15–35. https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v18i1.880

Subekti, A. S. (2020). Self-perceived communication competence and communication apprehension: A study of Indonesian college students. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, *5*(1), 14–31. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.5.1

Subekti, A. S., & Sinaga, Y. S. (2024). Instrumental motivation and L2 speaking achievement of Indonesian L2 learners of English: A survey study. *VELES: Voices of English Language Education Society*, *8*(2), 512–521. https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v8i2.24793

Teng, L. S., Sun, P. P., & Xu, L. (2017). Conceptualizing writing self-efficacy in English as a foreign language contexts: Scale validation through structural equation modeling. *TESOL Quarterly*, *52*(4), 911–942. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.432

Todaka, Y. (2016). Self-efficacy of English listening skills in Japanese college EFL learners. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, *4*(1), 21–36.

https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61/2016.4.1/61.1.21.36

Tran, T. T. T. (2012). A review of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's theory of foreign language anxiety and the challenges to the theory. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(1), 69–75. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n1p69

Tran, T. T. T., Baldauf, R. B., & Moni, K. (2013). Foreign language anxiety: understanding its status and insiders' awareness and attitudes. *TESOL Quarterly*, *47*(2), 216–243. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.85

Tsao, J. J. (2021). Effects of EFL learners' L2 writing self-efficacy on engagement with written corrective feedback. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *30*(6), 575–584. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00591-9

Wang, C., & Pape, S. J. (2007). A probe into three Chinese boys' self-efficacy beliefs learning English as a second language. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *21*(4), 364–377. https://doi.org/10.1080/02568540709594601

Wyatt, M., & Dikilitaş, K. (2019). English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for grammar instruction: Implications for teacher educators. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1642943

Yabukoshi, T. (2021). Self-regulation and self-efficacy for the improvement of listening proficiency outside the classroom. *Language Learning Journal*, *49*(1), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1472626

Zarei, A. A. (2018). On the relationship between metacognitive reading strategies, reading self-efficacy, and L2 reading comprehension. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *22*(22), 158–181. https://journals.tabrizu.ac.ir/article_8342_10be724c744e3fa88adea953c1387402.pdf

Zhang, X., & Ardasheva, Y. (2019). Sources of college EFL learners' self-efficacy in the English public speaking domain. *English for Specific Purposes*, *53*, 47–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.09.004