

Towards a University Branding: The Effect of Self-Efficacy on Student Development in Asian Higher Institutions

Zulhamri Abdullah, PhD, Mohd Fauzi Ramlan, PhD, Mohammad Shatar Sabran, PhD, and Syed Agil Alsagoff, MA

Abstract—The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of self-efficacy on student development in the higher institutions. There is an increase in figures in the unemployment rate of graduates was mainly due to the fact that most of the graduates were released to the labor market well trained in their areas of specialization but without being fully equipped with skills that are required in the highly competitive business environment. We used a Bandura's self-efficacy as a measured framework of this study. A quantitative survey approach will be employed in this study in Malaysia, Cambodia and Vietnam. The sampling frame will be from a university's database provided by the Academic Department 2013. The findings show that self-efficacy beliefs influence the goals which people set for themselves. Student-centered learning approaches employ activities that are intended to assist students to construct their own understandings and develop skills relevant to problem solving. These approaches are intended to promote development of learning skills, knowledge, attitudes and competencies for lifelong learning

Keywords—student development, graduate employability, soft skills

I. INTRODUCTION

STUDENT development refers to the way that a student grows, progresses, or increases his or her developmental capabilities as a result of enrollment in an institution of higher learning or education (Rogers, 1990, as cited in Karpilo, n.d). Educational efforts are directed at developing both intellect and character of students. The focus of student development is to ensure that students will be equipped with relevant skills and be market-ready to face the challenging working environment in the future. Student development is aimed at the development of students' leadership, creativity, and innovation along with the essential elements of entrepreneurship. In other words student development refers to how students grow, change, and learn based on the influences of their surrounding environment.

Abdullah Z is with the Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. (corresponding author's phone: 60389471336; zulhamri@upm.edu.my)

Ramlan M.F. is with the Faculty of Agriculture, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. (nc@putra.upm.edu.my)

Sabran M.S. is with the Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. (tnchepa@upm.edu.my)

Alsagoff S.A. is with the Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia. (s_agil@upm.edu.my).

According to the University of Calgary, student development theorists are interested in the process of development of a person who is participating in post-secondary education. Student development theories focus on human growth and environmental influences and designs that provide environments to promote students' learning and maturation, both in and outside of class. It "enables student affairs professionals to proactively identify and address student needs, design programs, develop policies, and create healthy college environments that encourage positive growth in students" (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998, as cited in Karpilo n.d). As both a theory base and a philosophy about the purposes of higher education, student development encourages educational interventions that strengthen skills, stimulate self-understanding and increase knowledge.

In addition, the University of Calgary posits the basic assumptions of student development entail that:

1. The individual student must be considered as a whole person.
2. Each student is a unique person and must be treated as such.
3. The student's total environment is educational and must be used to help the student achieve full developmental potential.
4. The major responsibility for a student's personal and social development rests with the student and his/her personal resources.

Psychosocial Theories focus on the personal and interpersonal aspects of students' lives as they accomplish various developmental tasks, or resolve the inevitable crises that arise. *Typology and Adult Theories* examines individual differences in how people view and relate to the world. *Cognitive-structural Theories* focus on the intellectual development of students-how they think, reason, and make meaning of their lives. *Person-environment Interactive Theories* address conceptualizations of the student, the educational environment and the degree of congruence that occurs when the student interacts with the educational environment. Many person-environment interactive theories are used in career planning. *Humanistic Existential Theories* address the philosophy of the human condition. Humans-including students- are responsible, self-aware, potentially self-actualizing, and capable of being fully functioning.

Identity Development Theories examines the complexities of race, class, gender, sexual orientation in personal and social development.

On the whole, this paper seeks to highlight not only the effect of self-efficacy, but also its necessity on student development. According to Albert Bandura, a person's attitudes, abilities, and cognitive skills comprise what is known as the self-system. This system plays a major role in how we perceive situations and how we behave in response to different situations. Self-efficacy plays an essential part of this self-system. Therefore, it is of great necessity for institutions of higher learning to promote or encourage self-efficacy because of the impact it has on students overall development.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Primarily, data will be collected through survey questionnaire. An initial list of survey questionnaire will be developed based on the literature review on the key facets of student development practices and from the direct observation and literature analysis. These questionnaire will be tested for reliability by conducting a pilot study on 30 participants. The items in the scale will be refined until a reliability of at least 0.8 is achieved. The sample will be selected from public in the respective reputable universities.

A. Target population and sample

Target population will be students from major universities. Approximately 30,000 undergraduate students would be a population of this study in Malaysia, Vietnam and Cambodia which are identified from the student affairs management personnel levels respectively. The population of study varies depending on countries. A sample of 1500 respondents will be randomly selected in Malaysia, Vietnam and Cambodia. In this first phase, we were distributed 500 questionnaires to university students. However, only 368 usable responses are valid to be analysed.

III. RESULTS

A. Respondent Profile

Background detail of 368 respondents that is being the real sample of the CLMV research summarized at Table I. Based on Table I, analysis shows that the respondent involved in this research represent both types of their study institution. In terms of gender, male and female proportions are disproportionate to their percentage of 57.3% and 42.7%. Analysis also shows that more respondent at ages 21-24 years (59%), followed by the under 20 years old (34%), 25-28 years (5.2%), 29-34 years (1.3%), and over 35 years (0.5%).

Found almost all (99.7%) respondents were Malaysian citizens and 77.4% of the respondents use Malay as the preferred language used. In terms of highest academic qualification furthermore, it was found 50.8% of respondents who graduated from secondary school, followed by a Bachelor's degree (20.7%), Diploma (19.8%), Other (6.5%), Masters (1.4%), PhD (0.5%) and one (0.3%) respondent did not answer this question. The majority of students (77.2%) is

where the family income yearly is less than RM10, 000 this year followed by family income of RM10,000-RM19, 999 (12.5%), RM20,000-RM40, 000 (6.3%), RM41,000 -RM79, 000 (3.0%), more than RM80, 000 (0.8%) and as above one (0.3%) respondent did not answer this part.

TABLE I
RESPONDENTS PERSONAL BACKGROUND AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION

		Numbers (Percentage)		
		Total (n = 368)	IPTA (n = 362)	IPTS (n = 6)
Gender	Male	211 (57.3%)	207 (57.2%)	4 (66.7%)
	Female	157 (42.7%)	155 (42.8%)	2 (33.3%)
Age	Below 20	125 (34.0%)	121 (33.3%)	4 (66.6%)
	21 - 24	217 (59.0%)	215 (59.4%)	2 (33.4%)
	25 - 28	19 (5.2%)	19 (5.3%)	0 (0%)
	29 - 34	5 (1.3%)	5 (1.4%)	0 (0%)
	Above 35	2 (0.5%)	2 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
Nationality	Malaysian	367 (99.7%)	361 (99.7%)	6 (100.0%)
	Cambodian	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Vietnamese	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Others	1(0.3%)	1(0.3%)	0 (0%)
Preferred Language Used	English	22 (6.0%)	21 (5.8%)	1 (16.7%)
	Malay	285 (77.4%)	281 (77.6%)	4 (66.6%)
	Mandarin	53 (14.4%)	52 (14.4%)	1 (16.7%)
	Tamil	8 (2.2%)	8 (2.2%)	0 (0%)
	Khmer	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Vietnamese	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Highest Education	High School	187 (50.8%)	186 (51.4%)	1 (16.7%)
	Diploma	73 (19.8%)	70 (19.3%)	3 (50.0%)
	Bachelor Degree	76 (20.7%)	74 (20.4%)	2 (33.3%)
	Master Degree	5 (1.4%)	5 (1.4%)	0 (0%)
	PhD	2 (0.5%)	2 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
	Others	24 (6.5%)	24 (6.6%)	0 (0%)
	99(No Answer)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
	Family Income Yearly	Less RM10,000	284 (77.2%)	278 (76.8%)
	RM10,000 - RM19,999	46 (12.5%)	46 (12.7%)	0 (0%)
	RM20,000 - RM40,000	23 (6.3%)	23 (6.4%)	0 (0%)
	RM41,000 - RM79,000	11 (3.0%)	11 (3.0%)	0 (0%)
	Greater RM80,000	3 (0.8%)	3 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
	99 (No Answer)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)

B. Individual Construct Mean Score

Mean total score for individual construct shown as at the Table II. According to the section, Section B: Social Context shows the highest mean 49.92 and the standard deviation (s.d) 5.254. This is follows by Section D: Influential Factors (Managing Problem Solving and Critical Thinking) with mean 23.21 (s.d.=3.230), Section D: Influential Factors (Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationship) with mean 20.39 (s.d.=2.606), Section D: Influential Factors (Developing Purpose) with mean 20.36 (s.d.=2.700), Section D: Influential Factors (Developing Integrity) with mean 20.08 (s.d.=2.669), Section D: Influential Factors (Establishing Identity) with mean 19.92 (s.d.=3.063), Section D: Influential Factors (Moving Through Autonomy Towards Independence) with mean 19.83 (s.d.=2.631), Section D: Influential Factors

(Communication Effectively) with mean 19.80 (s.d.=3.002), Section D: Influential Factors (Managing Emotion) with mean 19.65 (s.d.=3.018), Section D: Influential Factors (Student Satisfaction) with mean 18.97 (s.d.=4.036), Section C: Self-Efficacy with mean 18.69 (s.d.=2.762), Section D: Influential Factors (Developing Competence) with mean 18.57 (s.d.=2.713), Section D: Influential Factors (Developing Purpose) with mean 20.36 (s.d.=2.700), and lastly with lowest mean score is Section D: Influential Factors (Institution's Image) with mean 15.64 (s.d.=3.290).

TABLE II
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE (N=368)

	Mean	s.d.
Section B: Social Context	49.92	5.254
Section C: Self-Efficacy	18.69	2.762
Section D: Influential Factors		
Developing Competence	18.57	2.713
Managing Emotion	19.65	3.018
Moving Through Autonomy Towards Independence	19.83	2.631
Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationship	20.39	2.606
Establishing Identity	19.92	3.063
Developing Purpose	20.36	2.700
Developing Integrity	20.08	2.669
Communicating Effectively	19.80	3.002
Managing Problem Solving and Critical Thinking	23.21	3.230
Student Satisfaction	18.97	4.036
Institution's Image	15.64	3.290

Table III below shows the mean score for each question in the Section B: Social Context. From the table we can see the highest mean at the question 8 "I have a strong family bond" with mean 4.43 (s.d.=0.742). This is show that the respondents agree and clear with this question and show that strong family bond its really important in the social context. Meanwhile the lowest mean score in the table III at the question 4 "I always felt lonely when I was in school" with mean score 1.89 (s.d.=1.031). Its show that feeling lonely when the respondent was at school does not affects the social context.

TABLE III
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION B: SOCIAL CONTEXT (N=368)

	Mean	s.d.
Section B: Social Context		
1. During my school years, many people in school like me for my ability	3.47	0.770
2. During my school years, the school surrounding made me felt that i was valued	3.66	0.843
3. During my school years, I always felt unhappy when I was in school	2.18	1.079
4. During my school years, I always felt lonely when I was in school	1.89	1.031
5. During my school years, I can easily told my school friend that I changed my mind after we agreed to do it together initially	3.04	1.136
6. I am usually provided with the opportunity to give my opinion in the family	3.96	0.809
7. I will tell my family whenever I disagree with them	3.86	0.809
8. I have a strong family bond	4.43	0.742
9. If I face a problem, I have difficulty in telling my family about it	2.91	1.274

10. I usually spend time with my family members	3.96	0.877
11. I usually feel isolated in my society	2.07	1.013
12. I feel so happy because the society understands	3.49	0.867
13. I usually participate in community activities like gotong royong together with people in my neighborhood	3.33	1.028
14. I know my next-door neighbors very well	3.79	0.943
15. I like to interact with people from different cultural background in my community	3.88	0.884

For the Section C: Self-Efficacy, the highest mean show as at the table IV are at the question 4 "I am willing to work harder in facing of difficulties", with mean 4.05 (s.d.=0.691) meanwhile the lowest mean score in this section at the question 2 "I have expertise needed to provide valuable knowledge in this discussion forum", with mean score 3.43 and the standard deviation 0.829.

TABLE IV
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION C: SELF-EFFICACY (N=368)

	Mean	s.d.
Section C: Self-Efficacy		
1. I have confidence in my ability to provide knowledge that others in this group discussion consider valuable	3.64	0.773
2. I have expertise needed to provide valuable knowledge in this discussion forum	3.43	0.829
3. I have confidence in my ability to accomplish an impactful task	3.68	0.772
4. I'm willing to work hard towards challenge	4.05	0.691
5. I have the expertise needed to achieve a higher goal	3.90	0.761
6. I have expertise needed to provide valuable knowledge in this discussion forum	3.43	0.829

For the Section D, Table V until Table XIII shows the significant results of student development and competence. For developing competence, the highest mean score as depicted in the table V are 3.80, for managing emotion, the highest mean score are 4.07, for Moving Through Autonomy Towards Independence, the highest mean score are 4.37, for Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationship, the highest mean score are 4.19, for Establishing identity, the highest mean score are 4.17, for Developing purpose, the highest mean score are 4.16, for Developing integrity, the highest mean score are 4.10, for Communicating effectively, the highest mean score are 4.10, for Managing Problem Solving and Critical Thinking, the highest mean score are 3.96.

TABLE V
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION D: INFLUENTIAL FACTORS-DEVELOPING COMPETENCE (N=368)

	Mean	s.d.
Section D: Influential Factors - Developing Competence		
1. I have developed physical competence	3.80	0.770
2. I have developed intellectual competence	3.69	0.706
3. I have developed interpersonal competence	3.71	0.768
4. I am more confidents after completing this program	3.73	0.781
5. I have high level of critical skills and	3.64	0.778

reasoning ability

TABLE VI
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION D: INFLUENTIAL FACTORS - MANAGING EMOTION (N=368)

	Mean	s.d.
Section D: Influential Factors - Managing Emotion		
1. I am able to balance my emotions	3.86	0.844
2. I have developed a sense of awareness	4.07	0.716
3. I am able to adapt my emotions to the situation	3.98	0.776
4. I am able to recognize my own emotion in most situation	3.94	0.721
5. I do not blow up my frustration when situation or people upset me	3.80	0.927

TABLE VII
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION D: INFLUENTIAL FACTORS - MOVING THROUGH AUTONOMY TOWARDS INDEPENDENCE (N=368)

	Mean	s.d.
Section D: Influential Factors - Moving Through Autonomy Towards Independence		
1. I am able to function independently	4.27	0.741
2. I respect the right of others and am able to give and take in relationships	4.37	0.655
3. I have high level of problem solving ability	3.83	0.753
4. I am very self-directed in my academic pursuit	3.88	0.704
5. I rarely depend on my classmate for approval/suggestion of class assignment	3.48	0.993

TABLE VIII
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION D: INFLUENTIAL FACTORS - DEVELOPING MATURE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP (N=368)

	Mean	s.d.
Section D: Influential Factors - Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationship		
1. I am able to appreciate and tolerate differences in others	4.13	0.633
2. I am able to develop healthy and mature relationships	4.12	0.615
3. I am able to develop relationship with people from different background	4.19	0.660
4. I have developed many friendships through social media	4.06	0.709
5. I actively connect myself with friends through social media	3.89	0.898

TABLE IX
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION D: INFLUENTIAL FACTORS - ESTABLISHING IDENTITY (N=368)

	Mean	s.d.
Section D: Influential Factors - Establishing Identity		
1. I am comfortable with my own image	4.12	0.778
2. I am comfortable interacting with opposite gender	3.77	0.965
3. I am happy with my own identity	4.17	0.712
4. I am happy and comfortable in leading, organizing and participating any events	3.81	0.918
5. I highly value interacting with my peers and lecturers in classroom	4.06	0.770

TABLE X
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION D: INFLUENTIAL FACTORS - DEVELOPING PURPOSE (N=368)

		Mean	s.d.
Section D: Influential Factors - Developing Purpose			
1.	I am able to appreciate and tolerate differences in others	4.16	0.654
2.	I am able to develop healthy and mature relationships	4.15	0.682
3.	I am highly committed to exploration of new areas or visit new sited	4.09	0.720
4.	I am high level of personal commitment to achieving my academic goal	3.99	0.706
5.	I am able to developed positive outlook on my professional life	3.98	0.721

TABLE XI
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION D: INFLUENTIAL FACTORS - DEVELOPING INTEGRITY (N=368)

		Mean	s.d.
Section D: Influential Factors - Developing Integrity			
1.	I have developed a better set of human values	4.05	0.689
2.	I have adopted the standard community values to suit my personality	3.86	0.740
3.	I will be more positive and proactive in my social behavior	4.01	0.694
4.	I highly respect the values and beliefs of others	4.10	0.707
5.	I highly value the importance of academic success	4.06	0.752

TABLE XII
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION D: INFLUENTIAL FACTORS - COMMUNICATING EFFECTIVELY (N=368)

		Mean	s.d.
Section D: Influential Factors - Communicating Effectively			
1.	I am able to communicate effectively	3.81	0.768
2.	I can speak effectively	3.87	0.772
3.	I am able to write clearly and concisely	4.04	0.754
4.	I am able to read and comprehend materials	4.15	0.752
5.	I am interact socially in a variety of situation	3.93	0.788

TABLE XIII
INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCT MEAN SCORE - SECTION D: INFLUENTIAL FACTORS - ESTABLISHING IDENTITY (N=368)

		Mean	s.d.
Section D: Influential Factors - Managing Problem Solving and Critical Thinking			
1.	I am able to analyze and evaluate experience	3.96	0.715
2.	I am able to think creatively to solve problems	3.85	0.680
3.	I am able to identify and manage new information	3.85	0.715
4.	I am able to summarize the concepts covered in class	3.80	0.717
5.	I am able to connect the learnt materials with other readings, class discussions and other experiences	3.86	0.714
6.	I am able to identify the theories and assumptions learnt in class	3.88	0.698

IV. IMPLICATION

Self-efficacy beliefs, as noted previously, influence the goals which people set for themselves. Student-centred learning approaches employ activities that are intended to assist students to construct their own understandings and develop skills relevant to problem solving. These approaches are intended to promote development of learning skills, knowledge, attitudes and competencies for lifelong learning (Tengku, Tengku, Furbish, 2010). Vision 2020 is a National Mission that has been translated into the developmental agenda in Malaysia. The success of Vision 2020 depends on the present students. This is because they are the key players of Vision 2020 and without them there is no continuation of this National Mission. As a result, preparing the students for Vision 2020 is a great challenge to the present government (Noh and Rafidah).

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, based on existing literature, there is evidence that student centred learning can nurture the students towards greater intrinsic motivated, self-expression and independence in their learning patterns and hence develop their lifelong learning process. The educational system must be able to carry out its function as a catalyst to produce human resource with soft skills aside from their specialization. In essence, it should be the goal of all institutions of higher learning to provide an environment for development for its diverse student population to reach their potential through inspiration, accessibility and support. When students are equipped with the necessary skills they will be able to effectively serve and make unique contributions to the society at large. The obvious weaknesses of most graduates are the lack of a good self-image and soft skill as required by the employers in the competitive job market.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The preferred spelling of the word “acknowledgment” in American English is without an “e” after the “g.” Use the singular heading even if you have many acknowledgments. Avoid expressions such as “One of us (S.B.A.) would like to thank” Instead, write “F. A. Author thanks” Sponsor and financial support acknowledgments are placed in the unnumbered footnote on the first page.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alderman, M. K. (1999). *Goals and goal setting. Motivation for achievement: possibilities for teaching and learning*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- [2] Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [3] Bandura, A., (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, p. 122-147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122>
- [4] Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

- [5] Cherry, K. (n.d). *What is self-efficacy?* Retrieved from http://psychology.about.com/od/theoriesofpersonality/a/self_efficacy.htm
- [6] Cherry, K. (n.d). *Social Learning Theory: An Overview of Bandura's Social Learning Theory*. Retrieved from <http://psychology.about.com/od/developmentalpsychology/a/sociallearning.htm>.
- [7] Dinthera, M.V., Dochyb, F., Seger, M. (2010). Factors affecting students' self-efficacy in higher education. *Educational Research Review* 6 (2011) 95–108.
- [8] Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S., Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from <http://www.ucalgary.ca/ses/studentdevelopmenttheory>
- [9] Karpilo, L. N. Working with College Students: Applying Student Development Theories to Practice. Retrieved from <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/studentaffairs/upload/Student-Development-Theory-final-version.pdf>
- [10] Margolis, H. and McCabe, P. (March 2006). *Intervention in School and Clinic* v 41 issue 4, p 218-227 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/10534512060410040401>
- [11] McLeod, S. A. (2011). Albert Bandura | Social Learning Theory - *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved from <http://www.simplypsychology.org/bandura.html>
- [12] Noh Bin Amit and Rafidah Aga Mohd Jaladin. (2006). The Importance of Psychological Development for Malaysian Students in Facing Vision 2020. Retrieved from http://eprints.utm.my/558/1/NohAmit2006_Theimportanceofpsychologicaldevelopment.pdf
- [13] Tengku Kasim, Tengku Sarina Aini and Furbish, Dale (2010). Encouraging lifelong learning through student-centred learning approaches in a Malaysian teacher education programme. In: *Lifelong Learning International Conference 2010 (3LInC '10)*, 10 - 12 November 2010, Seri Pacific Hotel, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. (Unpublished)

Zulhamri Abdullah is an Associate Professor in International Corporate Communication at the Department of Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia. He earned his PhD from Cardiff University, UK. He is also Director of the Centre for Entrepreneurial Development and Graduate Marketability (CEM).

Mohd Fauzi Ramlan is a Professor of Agriculture at the Faculty of Agriculture, Universiti Putra Malaysia. He is also a Vice Chancellor of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Mohammad Shatar Sabran is a Professor of Community Leadership at the Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia. He is also a Deputy Vice Chancellor (Student Affairs & Alumni) of Universiti Putra Malaysia.