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Differences in Student Self-Efficacy by Gender

ABSTRACT: Learning achievement cannot be separated from learning itself, because learning is a process; while learning achievement is the result of the learning process. In practical education, during the learning process, many students are not confident that they can do the task well or get good grades in each lesson, even it is believed before they do the task. Individuals who have low self-efficacy will make the individual doubt, divert, and slow in making decisions, experience difficulties and obstacles in the work process, lack of optimizing and negative understanding that hinders personal development, even to the level of anxiety that inhibits the learning process. This study aims to determine differences in self-efficacy based on the sex of students in SMAIT (Sekolah Menengah Atas Islam Terpadu or Integrated Islamic Senior High School) Miftahul Khoir in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. This study uses a quantitative approaches with Independent Sample T Test. The source of this research data is primary data. Data collection of this study uses a questionnaire. The sample of this study was SMAIT Miftahul Khoir students in Bandung, in the 2016/2017 school year, totaling 48 students. The results of this study found that overall these findings indicate that there is a difference in self-efficacy both from the dimensions of magnitude, strength, and generality of students between male and female students in SMAIT Miftahul Khoir. The findings of this study show that male adolescent self-efficacy is higher than female adolescents. Students can maximize their confidence through evaluation every daily test or every semester test, so as to achieve better learning achievement.
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INTRODUCTION

Learning achievement cannot be separated from learning, because learning is a process; while learning achievement is the result of the learning process. At the time of learning, learning achievement is a reflection of the level that can be reached by students in achieving the goals that have been set in each field of study. It can be said that the success or failure of a student in education depends on the learning process experienced by the student, so that his/her efforts will be reflected in achieving the desired goals through learning achievement (Ames & Archer, 1988; Usher & Pajares, 2008; and Ruzek et al., 2015).

Robert S. Feldman (2013) says that people with a high need for achievement seek out situations, in which they can compete again some standard – such as grades, money, or winning a game – and prove themselves successful (Feldman, 2013:272). But, they are not indiscriminate when it comes to picking their challenges: they tend to avoid situation...
in which success will come to easily, which would be unchallenging, and situations in which success is unlikely. Instead, people high in motivation generally choose tasks that are of intermediate difficulty (Rusznyak, 2008; and Feldman, 2013).

People with low motivation tend to be motivated primarily by a desire to avoid failure. As a result, they seek out easy tasks, being sure to avoid failure, or they seek out very difficult tasks for which failure has no negative implications, because almost anyone would fail at them. People with a high fear of failure will stay away from tasks of intermediate difficulty, because they may fail where others have been successful (Brunstein & Maier, 2005; and Cook & Artino, 2016).

In the practice of education, during the learning process, many students are not sure of themselves that they can do the task well or get good grades in each lesson, even if it is believed before they do the task. Based on research conducted by Nur Widayati (2015) on self-efficacy, the results of her research explained that when students were working on a task from the teacher on a case study, only 3 students from 32 students expressed their opinions about the case; while the other students had to be called new students to express their opinions (Widayati, 2015). From the results of the study, it can be concluded that students actually understand the problems that have been given by the teacher and have good ideas, but students feel less confident with the ideas they have (Widayati, 2015; and Blazar & Kraft, 2017).

Another study conducted by Dian Ratna Sawitri (2009) explained about doubts in making career decisions for first-year students at the UNDIP (Diponegoro University) in Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia. The research subjects amounted to 389 first-year students (class of 2008) at UNDIP. Measuring instruments in this study were the Scale of Doubt Making Career Decisions; Identity Status Scale; and Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale, each of which was modified from Career Decision Making Difficulties Questionnaire; Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status 2; and Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale Short Form (Sawitri, 2009).

The theoretical model explains the importance of career decisions taken in first-year students, but these things are not easy for teenagers with experience doubts before settling on career path. These doubts are manifested as difficulties faced by individuals when deciding on a career, so that some of the teenagers choose to move responsibilities to others, avoid, or delay that their decision making is not optimal. This has to do with identity status, with classification namely: achievement identity status, moratorium identity status, foreclosure identity status, and diffusion identity status (cf Skorikov & Vondracek, 1998; and Sawitri, 2009).

The results also stated that the model tested fit, of the four identity statuses, only achievement and diffusion identity status had a significant direct effect on self-efficacy of career decisions; while the moratorium and foreclosure identity status showed an insignificant effect on career decision self-efficacy. Several studies that discuss self-efficacy, conducted by Oki Tri Handono (2013) and Salwa Farihah (2013), who revealed that individuals who have low self-efficacy will make the individual doubt, divert and delay decisions, experience difficulties and obstacles in the work process, lack of optimizing self-potential, and negative understanding that hinders personal development, even to the level of anxiety which inhibits the learning process (Handono, 2013; and Farihah, 2013).

Other research by Farida Hanun (2013); Sri Wahyuni (2013); S. Wulandari (2013); Anggi Ajeng Widyaninggar (2014); Sulthon (2014); Yulia Evaliana (2015); and Hermansyah Amir (2016) prove that individuals with high self-efficacy feel confident in their actions, optimize their potential, and face challenges that are experienced, so that they can achieve their goals and have a positive impact on them, including: learning achievement, independence, performance, achievement motivation, and so on (Hanun, 2013; Wahyuni, 2013; Wulandari, 2013; Widyaninggar, 2014; Sulthon, 2014; Evaliana, 2015; and Amir, 2016).

The phenomenon that occurs in SMAIT (Sekolah Menengah Atas Islam Terpadu or Integrated Islamic Senior High School)
of Miftahul Khoir in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia, in the class of 2016/2017, based on initial observations through interviews conducted by researchers around 40% of students cannot adapt quickly to the surrounding environment and can learn well, most of the students complained about the situation and conditions they were living in, it took longer to make the students not focusing in learning, and felt that the people they just met were not friendly, this was indicated by not many students who knew their classmates and grouping students when they know some new friends and then form a group by placing close positions with each other while learning in class; on the other hand unknown friends are left alone, not invited to talk or reprimanded for greet (cf Alam, 2017; Purnamawati & Susandari, 2017; and interview with Respondent A, 28/10/2017).

It can be concluded that there are still many students who have difficulty adjusting, especially at the beginning of the learning year. Coupled with low self-efficacy, this is demonstrated when learning takes place in many students who are passive, when the teacher gives the opportunity to ask questions about things that have not been understood in the lesson, only a few students ask questions, and some students prefer places sitting in the back of the class (Alam, 2017; Purnamawati & Susandari, 2017; and Winda, Rizal & Afrariatin, 2017). Whereas according to theory, self-efficacy is needed by students to help encourage them to strive and not give up easily, so that they can achieve their goals and achievements, especially goals and achievements in learning. And a good adjustment from the beginning of learning is very important, so students can go through each stage of learning well (Schunk, 1990; McCormick, Tanguma & Lopez-Forment, 2002; Lai, 2011; and Davids, 2015).

On the Self-Efficacy. F. Fincham & K. Cain (1986), as cited also in M. Khan (2013), defined efficacy as self-confidence in the ability to perform an action needed for the desired outcome (Fincham & Cain, 1986; and Kahn, 2013:43). Self-efficacy, according to Stephen Robbins & Timothy A. Judge (2009), is a person’s belief or ability to succeed in a task. General self-efficacy describes an assessment of how well a person can perform an act in a variety of situations. Self-efficacy specifically relates to self-esteem, because both are aspects of the assessment of those relating to one’s success or failure as a human being. Nevertheless, both also have differences, namely self-efficacy does not have a component of self-esteem (cf Luszczynska & Gutierrez-Donna, 2005; Robbins & Judge, 2009:315; and Artino, Jr., 2012).

Self-efficacy must not be confused with an assessment of the consequences that will result from a behavior, but will help determine the expected results. Self-confidence in individuals will help achieve success (Hidayat, 2011:156). Then, it can be said that a person’s self-efficacy can direct one’s actions not only with others, but also with a wider environment. Self-efficacy has an adaptive function that allows individuals to meet socio-cultural requirements and cognitive demands (Bandura, 1997; and Hidayat, 2011).

Self-efficacy also allows individuals to be able to organize their world in ways that are psychologically consistent, make predictions, find similarities, and connect new experiences with past experiences, even bringing out the power of the mind that can be brought into his subconscious to make various efforts so that they can achieve the expected goals. Individual thoughts of self-efficacy determine how much effort will be devoted and how long individuals will survive in the face of obstacles or unpleasant experiences (Bandura, 1997; Barrett, 2009; and Lerner et al., 2014).

In this context, A. Bandura (1997), as cited also in Mustaqim (2011), distinguish the stages of development of self-efficacy into several stages (Bandura, 1997; and Mustaqim, 2011:29). Firstly, the Beginning of Development. The development of personal efficacy requires more than just realizing the action to produce an impact. But this action must be considered as part of self. The self becomes different from others through different experiences. As babies begin to become children, those around them pay attention and treat them as different people. Based on one’s growth and social experience, they form a symbolic representation of themselves as different selves.
Secondly, **Family Sources for Self-Efficacy**. Young children must get self-knowledge about abilities in a wider function area. They must build, assess, and test physical abilities, social abilities, language skills, and cognitive skills in understanding and managing the many situations they face every day. Families become the starting place for a child to know the difference between individuals both in terms of age, sex differences, and modeling.

Thirdly, **Expand Self-Efficacy through Peer Influence**. The experience of children’s efficacy testing changes substantially as they move towards a larger community. In relationships with peers, they expand self-knowledge about their abilities. Peers provide important efficacy functions. Those who are most experienced and competent become models of efficacy in thinking and behaving.

Fourthly, **Self-Efficacy in School**. Schools as intermediaries in fostering self-efficacy, during an important period in the formation of a child’s life, school has the main function to foster cognitive self-efficacy, and test it in social situations. Here, their thinking knowledge and skills are tested, evaluated and compared socially. When children master cognitive skills, they develop a sense of intellectual efficacy.

Fifthly, **Self-Efficacy in Adolescence**. The growth of self-efficacy through adolescent transitional experiences, each period of development brings with it new challenges for coping efficacy; as adolescents approach adult demands, they must learn to assume responsibility for themselves in every dimension of life. Teens expand and strengthen their sense of efficacy by learning how to succeed in dealing with problems they have not faced well.

Sixthly, **Self-Efficacy in Adulthood**. Early adulthood is a period when a person must learn to deal with many new demands that emerge from friendly relationships, marital relationships, parenthood, and job careers. In the initial phase self-efficacy determines how well they develop the basis of cognition, self-management, and interpersonal skills. Psychosocial skills contribute more to success in career than to technical skills.

Seventhly, **Reassess Self-Efficacy in Elder Age**. The issue of older self-efficacy centers on reappraisal and misappraisal regarding their abilities (Bandura, 1997; Barrett, 2009; Mustaqim, 2011; and Lerner et al., 2014).

**On the Self-Efficacy Factors**. Some things that affect self-efficacy in individuals, among others are: Gender, Age, Level of Education, and Experience. Its explanations are following here:

**Gender**. B.J. Zimmerman (2008) says the development of abilities and competencies between men and women has differences. In certain jobs, men have higher self-efficacy compared to women, and vice versa women have high self-efficacy in certain jobs compared to men (Zimmerman, 2008).

**Age**. During the lifetime, the social learning process is formed in individuals. Younger individuals are believed to have less time and experience than older individuals, because older individuals have many experiences and events in life. Older individuals will be better able to cope with a task compared to younger individuals, this is related to the experience that individuals have throughout the life span (Zimmerman, 2008; and Luong, Charles & Fingerman, 2011).

**Level of Education**. Self-efficacy can be formed from the learning process at the formal level. Individuals who have a high level of education are believed to have higher self-efficacy, because these individuals learn more in formal education. In addition, individuals who have a higher level of education will get more opportunities to learn in overcoming problems in life (Zimmerman, 2008; and Blazar & Kraft, 2017).

**Experience**. Through the learning process in an organization or company, self-efficacy can be formed. This can occur due to the adaptation and learning processes that exist in work situations. The longer a person works in a company or organization, the higher the self-efficacy of individuals, but does not rule out the possibility that self-efficacy can also be lower depending on how individuals face successes and failures experienced by individuals during the work (Zimmerman, 2008; and Rafiei & Davari, 2015).

**On the Self-Efficacy Dimensions**. Self-efficacy has several dimensions, which have important implications for performance;
meaning that self-efficacy is specific in the tasks and situations faced by each individual. According to A. Bandura (1997), as cited also in Mustaqim (2011), the dimensions of self-efficacy are three, namely: Magnitude or Level, Generality, and Strength. Its explanations are following here:

Magnitude or Level. It is the individual’s perception of his/her ability to produce behaviors that will be measured through the level of a task that shows a variety of task difficulties. The difficulty level of the task reveals the dimensions of ingenuity, power, accuracy, productivity, or self-regulation needed to mention some dimensions of performance behavior (Bandura, 1997; Mih & Mih, 2010; and Mustaqim, 2011).

Generality. Self-efficacy is also different in generalization, meaning that individuals judge their beliefs to function in certain activities thoroughly and well. Generalization has varying dimensions, namely: (1) degree of similarity of activities; (2) ability capital is shown in behavior, cognitive, and affective; (3) describe in real terms the situation; and (4) characteristics of individual behavior that are intended (Bandura, 1997; Radford, 2010; and Mustaqim, 2011).

Strength. This dimension is related to the power of judgment about individual skills. This dimension refers to the degree of individual stability towards the beliefs it makes. This stability determines the resilience and tenacity of individuals in business. This dimension is an individual’s belief in maintaining certain behaviors. This dimension relates to the dimension of the level where the higher the level of difficulty of the task faced, the weaker the perceived confidence to solve it (Bandura, 1997; Mustaqim, 2011; and Abridad, 2012).

On the Gender. Gender is a concept of analysis that is used to identify differences between men and women biologically since someone was born (cf Prince, 2005; Hungu, 2007; and Halpern, 2012).

METHOD
The approach used in the study is a quantitative approach with a cross sectional survey design type (Lee, 1994; NCOR, 2014; and Setia, 2016). CSR (Cross Sectional Research) is a type of research that emphasizes the time of measurement or observation of data at one time at a time carried out on the dependent and independent variables. This approach is used to see the relationship between one variable and another (cf Bethlehem, 1999; Zheng, 2015; and Kaewmanee, 2016).

The population of SMAIT (Sekolah Menengah Atas Islam Terpadu or Integrated Islamic Senior High School) Miftahul Khoir students in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia, in the 2016/2017 school year, was 48 students. According to Suharsimi Arikunto (2008), if the subject is less than 100 people, then for the sample, it is better taken entirely so that the research is population research. Because the sample in this study is less than 100 people, the type of sample in this study is the population. So the entire population is used as a respondent (Arikunto, 2008:134).

This research instrument uses a questionnaire. Then, the validity and reliability of the instrument is tested. The calculation of the validity and reliability tests in this study is to use the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 23 program (Arkkelin, 2014; and Taherdoost, 2016). Correlation coefficient value obtained is interpreted according to Muhammad Nisfiannoor (2009) that each item worth more than 0.2 means that the instrument item is valid (Nisfiannoor, 2009:204).

Based on the product moment correlation value on 60 questions on the Self-Efficacy variable shows a value greater than 0.2, thus each question is declared valid. While the reliability test with Cronbach’s Alfa on self-efficacy variable shows a value of 0.988 with very high criteria. So the question on the Self-Efficacy variable is reliable and has high accuracy to be used as a variable in a study
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Data analysis used in this study is the independent t-test, which serves to examine the differences in two data groups in this case are two categories of sex. Hypothesis testing with the t-test provided that the data is normally distributed and homogeneous. The software used for analysis is SPSS version 23 (Nisfiannoor, 2009; Arkkelin, 2014; and Taherdoost, 2016).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the objectives to be achieved in the study was to determine differences in self-efficacy based on the sex of students in SMAIT (Sekolah Menengah Atas Islam Terpadu or Integrated Islamic Senior High School) Miftahul Khoir in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia, in the 2016/2017 school year. Self-efficacy in this study includes: (1) Magnitude or Level, namely students’ perceptions of their abilities; (2) Strength, which is related to the strength of assessment of students’ self-skills, this dimension refers to the degree of individual stability towards the beliefs they make; and (3) Generality is how students assess their beliefs to function in a variety of specific activities thoroughly and well (cf. Bandura, 1997; Mustaqim, 2011; Alam, 2017; Purnamawati & Susandari, 2017; and Winda, Rizal & Afriatin, 2017).

Before the independent t-test was carried out, normality and homogeneity tests were carried out. The normality test of this study using the data normality test could be done by comparing the probability of A. Kolmogorov (1933) and N. Smirnov (1948)'s value with α of 0.05 or 5%. The test criteria are if the probability or significance value (Sig) is greater than 0.05, then H0 is accepted or the data is normally distributed (cf. Kolmogorov, 1933; Smirnov, 1948; Razali & Wah, 2011; and Jantschi & Bolboaca, 2018). The results of the test of the normality of data distribution in each dimension of efficacy can be seen in the table 1.

Before the independent t-test was carried out, normality and homogeneity tests were carried out. The normality test of this study using the data normality test could be done by comparing the probability of A. Kolmogorov (1933) and N. Smirnov (1948)'s value with α of 0.05 or 5%. The test criteria are if the probability or significance value (Sig) is greater than 0.05, then H0 is accepted or the data is normally distributed (cf. Kolmogorov, 1933; Smirnov, 1948; Razali & Wah, 2011; and Jantschi & Bolboaca, 2018). The results of the test of the normality of data distribution in each dimension of efficacy can be seen in the table 1.

Based on the results of statistical calculations with SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 23, calculations by using A. Kolmogorov (1933) and N. Smirnov

---

**Table 1:** Normality Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of Normality</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov*</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude Female</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength Female</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generality Female</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy Female</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is a lower bound of the true significance
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

**Table 2:** Homogeneity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test of Homogeneity of Variances</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>2.158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>2.837</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generality</td>
<td>3.823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1948)'s test can be seen that the data in each dimension obtained a significance value greater than the real level (α) 0.05, then H0 is accepted means the pretest and posttest data both in the control class and class the experiment is normally distributed. So that we can meet assumption of data normality (Kolmogorov, 1933; Smirnov, 1948; Arkkelin, 2014; and Taherdoost, 2016).

Further analysis to determine the variance population, homogeneity test was first carried out. If the variant is the same then the t test uses the Equal Variance Assumed column, if a different variant of the t test uses the Equal Variance Not Assumed column (Folland, 1999; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2006; and Kerns, 2018). The results of the data homogeneity test on each dimension of efficacy can be seen in the table 2.

Based on the normality and homogeneity test, the required assumptions have been fulfilled, then hypothesis testing will be conducted using independent t-test to determine differences in self-efficacy based on sex. The results of the independent t-test are shown with the following SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 23 output in the table 3.

To determine differences in self-efficacy based on the sex of students in SMAIT (Sekolah Menengah Atas Islam Terpadu or Integrated Islamic Senior High School) Miftahul Khoir in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia, the hypothesis tested was: H0: (μ1 - μ2 = 0), there is no difference between the two groups of sex data; H1: (μ1 - μ2 ≠ 0), there is a difference between the two groups of sex data; α: 5% (0.05). Test criteria: Reject H0 if sig (2-tailed) <0.05.

Based on table 3, Magnitude dimensions obtained by sig values (2-tailed) of 0.00, the strength dimension is obtained by the sig value (2-tailed) of 0.012, and the Generality dimension is obtained by the sig value (2-tailed) by 0.00, thus the three sig values. It is greater than 0.05, then H0 is rejected. Likewise, overall the student self-efficacy variable shows the sig value (2-tailed) 0.00, so that H0 is rejected. Based on the testing criteria mentioned earlier, it can be concluded that H0 is rejected which means that there is a difference between students’ self-efficacy between male and female students in SMAIT (Sekolah Menengah Atas Islam Terpadu or Integrated Islamic Senior High School) Miftahul Khoir in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia.

Thus, it shows that there are differences between male and female students regarding the level of problems faced in relation to the academic seen from the sig value in the Magnitude dimension of 0.00 (p<0.05), the average Magnitude dimension is the
highest in men. According to V.E. Akmal (2013), women tend to have lower levels of procrastination than men (Akmal, 2013). According to Nadia Rizqi Harsyah & Annastasia Ediati (2015), this is because when male students delay, they will show a relaxed response, be more calm than female students and very rarely do male students pay attention to their moods (Harsyah & Ediati, 2015).

Most male students enjoy delays by switching to other jobs, engaging in more enjoyable activities, and tend to lead to negative attitudes such as ignoring their academic assignments (Soedarwo & Sulistyowati, 2010; Akmal, 2013; and Harsyah & Ediati, 2015).

Unlike male students, female students when doing procrastination tend to blame themselves, regret the situation, and so on; so, female students still have a higher desire and effort to complete their academic assignments. The difference in significance between male and female students is found in the students’ confidence in their ability to be seen from the sig value in the strength dimension of 0.012 (p<0.05), the highest average strength dimension score in men. This is in line with N.P. Friedman et al. (2006) and Diane F. Halpern et al. (2007), who argued that boys have better abilities while girls are more proficient in doing reading and writing tasks (Friedman et al., 2006; and Halpern et al., 2007).

The findings also indicate that there are differences between male and female students regarding student behavior seen from the sig value in the generality dimension of 0.00 (p<0.05), the average score of the highest generality dimension in men. Overall these findings indicate that there is a difference in students’ self-efficacy between male and female students in SMAIT (Sekolah Menengah Atas Islam Terpadu or Integrated Islamic Senior High School) Miftahul Khoir in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia.

Many opinions say that although men and women have differences in physical, emotional, and intellectual development, there is actually no evidence that relates between physical differences and intellectual abilities. The results of this study in line with Dinni Jufita Putri (2013)’s opinion and others, who showed that self-efficacy in male adolescents was higher than female adolescents (cf. Ngun et al., 2011; Putri, 2013; and Ifdil et al., 2016).

**CONCLUSION**

The findings of this study indicate that the magnitude dimension is statistically significantly different in terms of gender seen from the sig value 0.00 (p<0.05), where the average of Magnitude dimension is the highest in men. Women tend to have lower Levels of Academic-related problems than men.

The difference in significance between male and female students is found in the visible strength dimension of the sig value in the amount of 0.012 (p<0.05), the mean score of the highest strength dimension in men. Men have better abilities, while girls are more adept at doing reading and writing tasks.

There is a difference between male and female students regarding the Generality dimension seen from the sig value of 0.00 (p<0.05), the average score of the highest Generality dimension in men.

Overall these findings indicate that there is a difference in students’ self-efficacy between male and female students in SMAIT (Sekolah Menengah Atas Islam Terpadu or Integrated Islamic Senior High School) Miftahul Khoir in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. The findings of this study are self-efficacy of male adolescents higher than female adolescents. In fact, it was found that men receive learning faster than female students.

Students can maximize their confidence through evaluation every daily test or every semester test, so as to achieve better learning achievement. The aim of the research is expected to broaden the knowledge and understanding of how the students’ self-efficacy is by paying attention to the self-confidence of students both male and female students so as to achieve maximum learning outcomes.²

---
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