

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Career decision self-efficacy of Indonesian students

 <https://doi.org/10.32505/inspira.v3i1.4131>

 Khatijatusshalihah,  Irin Riamanda,  Eka Dian Aprilia,  Haiyun Nisa

Department of Psychology, Universitas Syiah Kuala, Aceh, Indonesia

Corresponding Author:

Khatijatusshalihah (email: khatijatusshalihah@unsyiah.ac.id)

ABSTRACT

Early adulthood is one of the crucial moments of an individual's life since it marks a person's thinking seriously regarding the future, especially in careers. An individual will firstly make a series of career decisions before choosing a career. Self-efficacy is the best predictor of students' academic and social integration. This study used a quantitative method with a descriptive analysis approach to describe and identify the status of career decision-making self-efficacy students in preparing for career decisions. Participants of the current study were 196 students from different backgrounds such as genders, choice of majors, domiciles, and types of accommodation. Participants were selected using a simple random sampling technique. The instrument used is Career Decision Self Efficacy. The findings revealed that 70.9 % of the students are in a high level of Career Decision Self Efficacy ($M=98.9$), and there were no differences in Career Decision Self Efficacy among students reviewed based on genders, and choice of majors, domiciles, and types of accommodations.

Article History:

Received 26 May 2022

Revised 17 June 2022

Accepted 24 June 2022

Keywords: *career decision self-efficacy; career planning; CDSE; Indonesian students*

INTRODUCTION

Late adolescence or early adulthood is one of the crucial moments of an individual's life. It is when a person starts thinking seriously regarding their futures, especially their careers. Erikson in Santrock (2011) suggest that at this stage, adolescents begin to search for their identity by exploring different fields and roles since this is a transition period between childhood and early adulthood, in which adolescents are liberated to develop various identities. As stated by Cote in Santrock (2011), a career is part of the self-identity that individuals want to take. Teenagers explore career options more specifically (Patton & McMahon, 2021). However, before pursuing a chosen career field, an individual will make a series of career decisions. According to career development theory by Super (Osipow, 1983), there are five stages of career development tasks that begin with crystallization (14 – 18 years) when individuals formulate ideas about appropriate work for themselves. The next stage is called specifications (18-21 years), when individuals are required to focus on one career direction and take the necessary steps to implement the decision that has been taken. The third stage is stabilization (25-35 years); an individual is expected to stay at work and use the talents to demonstrate the suitability of previous career decisions; the next stage is consolidation (35-40 years), when individuals will strengthen their beliefs toward the current career as a right decision. The last stage (55 years and

How to cite (APA 7th Edition)

Khatijatusshalihah, K., Riamanda, I., Aprilia, E. D. & Nisa, H. (2022). Career decision self-efficacy of Indonesian students. *INSPIRA: Indonesian Journal of Psychological Research*, 3(1), 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.32505/inspira.v3i1.4131>



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

Copyright ©2022 by Khatijatusshalihah, Irin Riamanda, Eka Dian Aprilia, & Haiyun Nisa

over) is a readiness to face retirement. Based on these stages, the initial decision-making process related to a career begins to be experienced from adolescence since, at this stage, individuals have to focus on making direction regarding their careers.

Since the high school era, adolescents have been faced with choices of specialization and are required to decide on their career choices after graduation, either continuing their education at the university level or going straight to work (Jessyca, Tommy, Suyasa, 2021). In both cases, they will undoubtedly have to go through the whole process of career decisions. As known, before individuals make career decisions, they will undergo a process of seeking information through various activities that support their choices. This process is called career decision-making. Career decision-making is a determination process that begins with the selection of alternatives through comparing and evaluating available alternatives in which students develop an understanding of critical thinking processes that are suitable for application in career decision-making skills (Patton & McMahon, 2001).

Accordingly, good career planning is needed to help individuals map out the desired career path suitable to their interests (Humaira & Kumala, 2021). Without good planning, it can result in a loss of income due to the gap between skills and the work undertaken. In the long term, difficulty in career planning can cause difficulties for an individual in getting a job, resulting in increasing unemployment (Yunitri & Jatmika, 2015).

According to Bandura (1986), to perform successfully given tasks or behaviors, an individual must have a certain degree of belief and confidence named self-efficacy expectations. This expectation is believed to be the primary mediator of behavior changes. In addition, Hackett and Betz (1981) developed the career decision-making theory by using the self-efficacy theory as the basis since it is argued as one of the significant factors in choosing careers. A recent study mentions that the higher the confidence level of the final year's students, the lower their tendency to experience career indecision (Dharma & Akmal, 2019). Peterson (in Chaney, Betz, and Multon, 2007) found that career decision self-efficacy (CDSE) relates to the academic hardiness versus dropping out in unprepared university students. Individuals unable to decide on a career indicate low CDSE levels and generally face many difficulties in decision-making (Yowell, McConell, & Schedin, 2014). Therefore, this variable also serves as the best predictor of academic and social integration of college students.

The original scale of CDSE was retracted from Bandura's hypothesis on understanding and career uncertainty by Taylor and Betz (1983). Initially, the career choice Self-Efficacy Scale (CDESES) was called the scale, which was intended to measure individuals' trust to fulfill their duties in their professional work. Since the length of the original scale, Betz, Klein, and Taylor (1996) developed a shorter version of the CDESES by eliminating 5 of the ten items from each of the five subscales (a) accurate self-appraisal, (b) gathering occupational information, (c) goal selection, (d) making plans for the future, and (e) problem-solving. The Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale-Short Form (CDESES-SF) contains 25 items with the same five subscales (Gaudron, 2011).

Based on the explanation above, this study explored the status of career decision self-efficacy in Indonesian students. The result is expected to be the basis for providing frameworks to overcome career planning-related problems for Indonesian students.

METHOD

This study used a quantitative method with a descriptive analysis approach that aims to describe and identify the initial conditions (preliminary research) to reveal the status of career decision-making self-efficacy of Indonesian students in preparing for their careers. Participants were 196 high school and university students in Indonesia. Highschoolers were 45 (23%), 80 Psychology students (40.8%),

13 Economics students (6.6%), 7 Natural Science students (3.6%), 4 Agriculture students (2%), 11 Medical students (5.6%), 4 Political Science Students (2%), 6 Engineering students (3.1%), 10 Teacher Training students (5.1%), 2 Law students (1%), and 14 undisclosed students (7.1%) and 176 juniors (27%). Thirty-four (17.3%) were male, and 162 (82.7%) were female. Their age ranged from 15 to 20 years (M 18.09, SD 13.37). Forty resided on Java Island (20.4%), and 156 lived outside Java (79.6%). The accommodation they lived in was parent's houses 179 (91.3%), rented rooms (7.1%), and three shared houses with spouses (1.5%). Research participation was voluntary.

According to CDESES (Taylor & Betz, 1983), the scale assesses individuals' belief that they can complete tasks necessary for making career decisions. The CDESES-SF contains 25 items measuring five career choice competencies of Crites' (1961, 1978) model of career maturity: (a) accurate self-appraisal, (b) gathering occupational information, (c) goal selection, (d) making plans, and (e) problem-solving. Respondents rate their confidence on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (no confidence at all) to 5 (complete confidence). This scale gives a possible range for each subscale of 5–25 and the full scale of 25–125, with higher scores indicating greater levels of career decision self-efficacy. The scale was administered in Indonesian. The data was collected through Google Form and tabulated and analyzed with Crosstab Analysis. SPSS version 20.0 for Windows was operated to simplify all the statistical calculation processes within this research.

RESULT

Descriptive analysis was carried out to describe hypothetical data (statistical data that might occur) and empirical data (statistical data in the field) from the career decision self-efficacy variable. The description of the research data can be seen in Table 1:

Table 1. Descriptive statistic of career decision self-efficacy

Variable	Hypothetical Data				Empirical Data			
	Xmax	Xmin	Mean	SD	Xmax	Xmin	Mean	SD
Career decision self-efficacy	125	25	75	16.66	125	58	98.9	12.89

The division of categorization of subjects is ordinal level categorization. This categorization aims to place individuals into groups whose positions are tiered according to a continuum based on the measured attributes (Azwar, 2013). Furthermore, Azwar (2013) also states that the number of category levels is usually no more than five levels and no less than three; in addition, subjects grouped in two levels are less efficient and will face a relatively large risk of error for scores located at around the group mean. Therefore, the researcher decided to make three limitations from the description of the research data consisting of three categories: low, medium, and high. The formula for determining the level categorization (ordinal) is based on the categorization formula Azwar (2013) and can be seen in the following Table 2:

Table 2. Career decision self-efficacy norm categorization

Ordinal Categorization	Category
$x < (\mu - 1,0 \sigma)$ $x < (75 - 1,0 (16,66))$ $x < 58$	Low
$(\mu - 1,0 \sigma) \leq x < (\mu + 1,0 \sigma)$ $(75 - 1,0 (16,66)) \leq x < (75 + 1,0 (16,66))$ $58 \leq x < 92$	Medium
$x \geq (\mu + 1,0 \sigma)$ $x \geq (75 + 1,0 (16,66))$ $x \geq 92$	High

Based on the categorization formula above, the low, medium, and high score limit starts from 25–57, 58–91, and 92–125, respectively. In addition, the categorization norm on the scale can be seen in the following Table 3:

Table 3. Descriptive statistic of ordinal categorization

Ordinal Categorization Formula	Categorization	n (%)
$x < 58$	Low	0 (0%)
$58 \leq x < 92$	Medium	57 (29,1%)
$x \geq 92$	High	139 (70,9%)
Total		196 (100%)

In this study, descriptive analysis was also used to see the distribution and amount of demographic data and the level of career decision self-efficacy in the entire research sample. The crosstab test was conducted to investigate the details of demographic data such as gender, major, domicile, and accommodation as prescribed below:

Table 4. Crosstab analysis of CDSE and demographic data

Variable	CDSE Categorization		Total
	Medium	High	
Age			
Mean SD	17,89 ± 1,73	18,17 ± 1,19	18,09 ± 13,37
Gender			
Male	8 (4,1%)	26 (13,3%)	34 (17,3%)
Female	49 (25%)	113 (57,7%)	162 (82,7%)
Majors			
High school/Vocational school	15 (7,7%)	30 (15,3%)	45 (23%)
Psychology	25 (12,8%)	55 (28,1%)	80 (40,8%)
Economics	4 (2%)	9 (4,6%)	13 (6,6%)
Natural science	1 (0,5%)	6 (3,1%)	7 (3,6%)
Agriculture	0 (0%)	4 (2%)	4 (2%)
Health and medicine	1 (0,5%)	10 (5,1%)	11 (5,6%)
Political science	1 (0,5%)	3 (1,5%)	4 (2%)
Engineering	2 (1%)	4 (2%)	6 (3,1%)
Teacher training	4 (2%)	6 (3,1%)	10 (5,1%)
Law	1 (0,5%)	1 (0,5%)	2 (1%)
Undisclosed Majors	3 (1,5%)	11 (5,6%)	14 (7,1%)
Domiciles			
Java Island	13 (6,6%)	27 (13,8%)	40 (20,4%)
Non-Java Island	44 (22,4%)	112 (57,1%)	156 (79,6%)
Types of Accommodation			
Parent's houses	52 (26,5%)	127 (64,8%)	179 (91,3%)
Rented Rooms	3 (1,5%)	11 (5,6%)	14 (7,1%)
A shared house with spouses	2 (1%)	1 (0,5%)	3 (1,5%)

DISCUSSION

This study's findings show that most participants are in the high category of CDSE. High self-efficacy in career decisions enhances computerized direct career programs (Fukuyama, Probert, Neimeyer, Nevill, & Metzler, 1988). Other studies also prove that the higher the level of students' CDSE, the more it will affect their career concept and career exploration that they will carry out (Gushue, Scanlan, Pantzer, & Clarke, 2006). More specifically, individuals with high CDSE levels increase the likelihood of dealing with it rather than avoiding it since they have the confidence and abilities to perform the required tasks in career decision-making (Taylor & Betz, 1983). Meanwhile, individuals who scored low on CDSE levels encourage themselves to avoid behavior or tasks appropriate to achieve their goals (Bandura, 1977). For instance, they tend to change their career goals when challenged (Burns, Jasinski, Dunn, & Fletcher, 2013).

One of the efforts to improve CDSE is by conducting a career planning program. Career planning training provides an understanding that builds students' awareness of their potential and limitations and offers various alternative career opportunities and skills in determining career choices (Damayanti & Widyowati, 2016). Therefore, it is suggested that students participate in such training programs to have an adequate level of CDSE to make career choices more confidently.

In addition, no difference was found in career decision self-efficacy in gender, as the analysis results obtained a p-value of 0.433 ($p > 0.05$), which indicates no significant difference. There was no difference in the career decision self-efficacy in differences of major chosen, as the analysis results obtained a p-value of 0.786 ($p > 0.05$). There was also no difference in the career decision self-efficacy in domiciles, as the analysis results obtained a p-value of 0.594 ($p > 0.05$), meaning no significant difference between the Java and non-Java students. Likewise, there was no difference in career decision self-efficacy in types of accommodations, as the analysis results obtained a p-value of 0.342 ($p > 0.05$), meaning no significant difference between the three groups. These findings indicate different findings from previous studies that show differences in self-efficacy between male and female students, in which male students have higher self-efficacy than female students (Löve et al., 2011; Firdaus & Arjungsi, 2020).

Difficulty and doubt in making career decisions indicate low self-efficacy, whereas self-efficacy has been proven to influence career maturity. Based on the study by Fadhila, Abdul, and Bustamam (2017) on self-efficacy and maturity, self-efficacy is believed to contribute to the career talent of high school students. The study result also placed most high school students in the medium category of CDSE, which is in line with this study.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that there were no differences in the career decision-making self-efficacy of students based on genders, majors, domiciles, and types of accommodation. Most of the students have a high level of career decision self-efficacy. Based on the findings of this study, it encourages future researchers to pay attention to other variables related to the career decision difficulty, for instance, parental support, seeking help behavior, and socioeconomic status of parents, as well as developing programs to support career planning for students.

REFERENCES

- Azwar, S. (2013). *Metode penelitian*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Betz, N. E., Klein, K. L., & Taylor, K. M. (1996). Evaluation of a short form of the career decision-making self-efficacy scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 4(1), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/106907279600400103>
- Chaney, D., Hammond, M., Betz, N., & Multon, K. (2007). The reliability and factor structure of the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale-SF with African Americans. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 15(2), 194–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072706298020>
- Damayanti, D., & Widyowati, A. (2018). Peningkatan Career Decision Making Self Efficacy (CDMSE) melalui pelatihan perencanaan karir pada siswa SMK. *Humanitas*, 15(1), 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.26555/humanitas.v15i1.7409>
- Dharma, G., & Akmal, S. (2019). Career decision making self-efficacy dan career indecision pada mahasiswa tingkat akhir. *Seurune Jurnal Psikologi Unsyiah*, 2(2), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.24815/s-jpu.v2i2.14203>
- Firdaus, W., & Arjungsi, A. (2020). Self-efficacy and career decision making difficulties in senior high school students. *Indigenous: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 5(2), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.23917/indigenous.v5i2.8941>

- Fukuyama, M. A., Probert, B. S., Neimeyer, G. J., Nevill, D. D., & Metzler, A. E. (1988). Effects of DISCOVER on career self-efficacy and decision-making of undergraduates. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 37(1), 56–62. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.1988.tb00801.x>
- Gaudron, J. (2011). A psychometric evaluation of the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale–Short Form among French university students. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 19(4), 420-430. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711409713>
- Gushue, G. V., Scanlan, K. R. L., Pantzer, K. M., & Clarke, C. P. (2006). The relationship of career decision-making self-efficacy, vocational identity, and career exploration behavior in African American high school students. *Journal of Career Development*, 33(1), 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845305283004>
- Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 18(3), 326–339. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(81\)90019-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(81)90019-1)
- Humaira, P., & Kumala, I. (2021). Otoritas pengasuhan dan efikasi keputusan karier pada remaja di Aceh. *Seurune: Jurnal Psikologi Unsyiah*, 4(1), 75–100. <https://doi.org/10.24815/s-jpu.v4i1.19721>
- Jessyca, J., & Y. S. Suyasa, P. (2021). Uji validitas isi Tarumanagara Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora, dan Seni*, 5(1), 189–198. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmishumsen.v5i1.9987.2021>
- Löve, J., Moore, C. D., & Hensing, G. (2011). Validation of the Swedish translation of the general self-efficacy scale. *Quality of Life Research*, 21(7), 1249–1253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-011-0030-5>
- Metheny, J., & McWhirter, E. (2013). Contributions of social status and family support to college students' career decision self-efficacy and outcome expectations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 21(3), 378–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072712475164>
- Osipow, S. (1983). *Theories of career development*. Prentice-Hall.
- Patton, W., & McMahon, M. (2001). *Career development programs: Preparation for lifelong career decision making*. ACER Press.
- Patton, W., McMahon, M. (2021). *Career development and systems theory: Connecting theory and practice* (4th ed.). BRILL.
- Santrock, J. W. (2011). *Perkembangan anak* (7th ed.) (Sarah Genis B, Trans.). Erlangga.
- Taylor, K. M., & Betz, N. E. (1983). Applications of self-efficacy theory to the understanding and treatment of career indecision. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 22(1), 63–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(83\)90006-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(83)90006-4)
- Yunitri, K., & Jatmika, D. (2016). Tipe kepribadian OCEAN dengan career decision self-efficacy pada mahasiswa tingkat akhir di Jakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Terapan*, 3(2), 401–415. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jipt.v3i2.3540>