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Abstract

This study aimed at identifying the goal orientation of students at the faculty of Educational Sciences in Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, and its relationship to their self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. A random sample of 460 male and female students at the faculty of educational sciences was chosen. Three questionnaires on Goal orientation, Intrinsic motivation and Self–efficacy were administered to members of the sample during academic year 2010 / 2011.

Results indicated that 72% of the students had a learning goal, 15.2% had a performance goal orientation, and 23.9% had a performance – avoidance goal orientation. In addition, results indicated that there is a relationship among learning goal, self – efficacy and intrinsic motivation. Also, results indicated that there is relationship among performance goal, self – efficacy, and intrinsic motivation.
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Introduction

In recent years, goal orientation has become a popular construct of interest among social, developmental, and educational psychology researchers. So, the type of academic goals pursued by students is one of the most important variables in motivational research in educational contexts.

Goal orientation emphasizes the purpose for which an individual participates in an activity or engages in a task (Rivers, 2008). According to goal orientation, students hold Personal goal orientation that serves as reasons for engaging in or avoiding achievement-related behaviors. Students who are focused on demonstrating their ability to others and define their competence in relation to others are thought to be holding a performance-approach goal orientation, whereas those who primarily want to avoid looking incomplete are considered to be holding a performance-avoidance goal orientation. Conversely, students with a learning goal orientation are focused on learning and improvement and define their competence in relation to their own past performance (Beghetto, 2007).

Goal orientation is generally regarded as integrated patterns of motivational beliefs that represent different ways of approaching, engaging in, and responding to achievement-related activities (Pintrich, 2000). On the other hand, teachers' knowledge about students' goal orientation play an important role in how they organize and enact their classroom instruction (Borko & Putnam, 1996; Calderhead, 1996). Researchers have theorized that individuals focusing on a learning goal strive to master the task, seek out challenging tasks, and view failure and success feedback as a source of information to use in improving future performance (Diener & Dweck, 1978). Additionally, individuals focusing on a performance goal strive to demonstrate their abilities to perform tasks well related to others, seek positive judgments from other individuals, and perceive effective performance as an indication of high ability. Finally, individuals focus on avoidance-performance goal orientation as individuals' desire to avoid unfavorable judgments from others.

The above introduction shows that goal orientation plays a crucial role in students' motivation and success. According to goal orientations theory, students might have different goals when engaging in achievement tasks. In addition, goal orientation may be related to a variety of factors, such as; intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy.

Statement of the Problem

In the field of social cognitive psychology, students’ goals are strong predictors of their motivation and academic achievement (Ames, 1992; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Students enter learning situations with different goals, which lead them to different response patterns in competence-related activities (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). So, Educators have recognized the need to understand the factors that contribute toward students' success in the classroom, and to find ways to motive students to succeed. Of particular interest is the relationship between student's goal orientations, academic self-efficacy, and motivation to learn in light of lack of attention given to the study of these variables in general, and
mainly in Arab countries. Therefore, the problem of this study is to examine the patterns of Goal Orientation Among students of Faculty of Educational sciences in Al- Hussein Bin Talal University and its relationship to self–efficacy and intrinsic motivation.

**Study Purpose and Questions:**

The motivation for this study was grounded in a desire to expand the understanding of possible Psychological Predictive measures of students' success. More specifically, the aims of the study will be two–fold:

1. to explore whether students can be classified in groups according to their goal orientations (Learning, Performance or Avoidance)
2. to test the relationship among goal orientations, self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation for a sample of (AHU) students

The specific study questions that guided this study were:

1. what different goal orientations do students have?
2. are the relationships among goal orientation, academic self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation

**Significance of Study:**

The present study represents the first explicit examination of the patterns of goal orientation, and the relationships among goal orientation, intrinsic motivation, and self–efficacy in the Arab countries - according the researchers knowledge. Therefore, this study may be closed the lack in this field.

In addition, this study is very important for many reasons:

1. Benefit teachers in helping them to understand the importance of motivation, goal orientation, and self–efficacy as these factors relate to engaging students in academic tasks.
2. It opens the door for researchers to conduct related studies in the field of goal orientation and its relationship to other variable in different universities

**Definition of terms**

*Goal orientation:* the reasons and purposes that lead students to engage in the learning tasks with goal-directed and cognition–based behaviors. It includes learning goal orientation, performance goal orientation, and performance-avoidance goal orientation. Goal orientation will be measured by using Midgely's patterns of adapted learning survey (Midgley, et al., 1996).
Intrinsic motivation: It can be defined as doing an activity for itself and for the pleasure. As such, an individual's internal desire to attain success as measured by Harter's intrinsic orientation scale (Harter, 1981).

Self-efficacy: The student's beliefs about their ability to do a particular task as measured by self-efficacy scale (Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs & Rogers, 1982)

Literature Review

For the past two decades, goal orientation has been one of the primary constructs used in the study of achievement motivation. An individual's goal orientation represent one's purpose for engaging in achievement-related behaviors, as well as one's orientation towards evaluating his or her competence in the achievement activity. For instance, individuals who preference goals that involve learning new skills and mastering unfamiliar situations would be labeled as having a learning goal orientation (Gerhardt & Brown, 2006). Alternatively, individuals who pursue achievement-related behavior for the purpose of demonstrating their skills and who evaluate their competence in relation to others would be labeled as having a performance goal orientation (Pastor, Barron, Miller & Davis, 2007). Similarly, individuals with a performance-avoidance goal orientation concerned about their performance in relation to their peers (Pastor, Barron, Miller & Davis, 2007). The performance approach orientation student, however, is focused on performing better than other students, whereas the performance-avoidance student is focused on not performing worse than other students.

Intrinsic motivation (IM) has been one of the concepts studied in motivational research in teaching. According to Deci and Ryan (1990), intrinsically motivated behaviors are engaged in for their own sake, for the pleasure and satisfaction derived from the process of engaging in activity. More specifically, intrinsically motivated students are motivated to learn, perform, and/or succeed for the internal feeling of satisfaction (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Gottfried, 1985). Intrinsically motivated students are interested in learning and achieving, in turn, tend to be associated with creativity, cognitive flexibility, and self-esteem (Kasser, 2002). Intrinsically motivated students view their personal choice are important when they decide whether to pursue a goal; they experience their goal-seeking activities as meaningful; and they enjoy performing their tasks, regardless of whether or not they succeed in reaching their goals and regardless of feedback from the environment (Ames, 1992). They see their mistakes or failures as valuable experiences and opportunities to learn. Research has shown that students who are intrinsically motivated are more likely to persist when experiencing an academic challenge (Boyd, 2002), exhibit higher academic performance (Goldberg & Cornell, 1998), and adopt learning goals.

Traditionally, research studies have indicated that learning orientation is associated with intrinsic motivation, and performance orientation is usually related to extrinsic motivation (Rawsthorne & Elliot, 1999). Elliot and Church (1997) examined the effects
of goal orientation on college students’ intrinsic motivation and graded performance. Results showed that learning goals facilitated intrinsic motivation and performance goals had the strongest predictability of students’ final grades. In addition, performance goals had negative effects on intrinsic motivation and graded performance.

Heintz & Steele-Johnson (2004) examined relationships between goal orientation dimensions and intrinsic motivation. Results revealed that learning goal orientation is related to intrinsic motivation.

Another motivational construct that is important for understanding students' motivation is self-efficacy, or belief that one is capable of successfully performing a particular task. Students are said to have high self-efficacy for a task when they believe they possess the capabilities necessary to perform the task successfully. However, if they believe that they don’t have the necessary capabilities, then they would be said to have low self-efficacy for the task. Self-efficacy can be regarded as the belief that one can master a situation and produce favorable outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Schunk (1991) proposed that self-efficacy is critical to the academic achievement. He hypothesized that self-efficacy influences students' choice of activities. Thus, students with a high level of self-efficacy will select more challenging learning tasks, therefore expending more persistence and effort to obtain higher achievement outcomes, whereas students with low level of self-efficacy will avoid difficult and challenging tasks that require more effort and persistence; Consequently, they obtain lower achievement outcomes.

Students with higher self-efficacy expend greater effort, exhibit more persistence and demonstrate greater resilience in the face of adverse situations. In addition, the research literature includes several studies which emphasize the effect of self-efficacy on numerous positive outcomes as well as academic achievement. For example, Bell & Kozlowski (2002) conducted an experimental study to examine the relationships among goal orientation, self-efficacy, and task performance. The results of the study revealed that only learning goal orientation was positively and significantly related to self-efficacy and task performance. Schunk and Ertmer (1999) also found similar results based on their experiments with US college students, identifying that learning goals led to higher self-efficacy, self-regulatory competence, and strategy use. Results indicated that learning goal-oriented students have stronger intrinsic motivation and positive attitudes toward learning activities than performance goals.

Thus, the results of studies examining the relationship of self-efficacy, goal orientation and motivation are inconclusive. Also, there exists a lack of attention given to the study of these variables. Specifically, through reviewing the literature, the researcher hasn’t encountered any study addressing this issue in Jordan or in Arab countries. Therefore, this study will attempt to address significant gaps in literature regarding the relationships between goal orientation, motivation, and self-efficacy.
Method

Participants:

The population of this study consisted of (1120) undergraduate students, who were enrolled in the faculty of educational sciences in Al-Hussein Bin Talal University (AHU) in the academic year 2009 / 2010, who represent all levels of study at (AHU). For the purpose of this study, a random sample was chosen from the population, it consisted of (460) students representing (41%) of the population of the study. Their ages ranged between 18 – 22 years.

Instruments:

Participants completed self–report measures of goal orientation, self–efficacy, and intrinsic motivation. Each is described at length below.

Goal Orientation:

Goal orientation questionnaire which was developed by Midgley, et al., (1996) was used to measure students' goal orientations. This questionnaire composed of three subscales: a learning goal orientation, a prove performance goal orientation, and avoidance goal orientation. Participants rated each item on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from totally disagree (1) to totally agree (5). The learning goal orientation scale was a unit weight mean of six items that focused on efforts to improve skills and learning new material. The performance goal orientation scale was a unit weight mean of five items assessing student's desires to outperform others. The performance - avoidance goal orientation scale was a unit weight mean of five items concerned with students' attempts to hide their perceived inability.

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on the achievement goal orientation items to examine the factor structure of the three sets of items (learning, Performance, avoidance). It was found that learning, Performance, and avoidance goal orientation all loaded on different latent factors. All three subscales are characterized by statistical reliability.

A Cronbach alpha of (0.85) was reported for the learning goal orientation scale. In terms of the performance goal orientation scales, a reliability estimate of (0.89) was reported for the performance goal orientation scale, and a (0.74) was reported for avoidance goal orientation scale.

In this study, to ensure that the content of the questionnaire is valid, it was handed to a jury of six professional faculty members. The members of jury were asked to evaluate the appropriateness of the questionnaire to the whole purpose of the study. Consequently, they sent letters in which they ensured the validity of the questionnaire and recommended some modifications which were taken into consideration. The internal consistency of the
instrument was determined two weeks prior to the final applied. Using a sample of (60) students (32 Females and 28 Males) who were studying in AHU. This sample of students was also excluded from the sample of the main study. The calculated coefficient alpha reliability was (0.83) for the learning goal orientation, (0.84) for performance goal orientation, and (0.82) for avoidance goal orientation. This figure suggests that the instrument is suitable to measure students' goal orientations.

Intrinsic Motivation:

Harter's intrinsic orientation scale was used to measure student's intrinsic motivation (1981). The instrument consisted of (30) items that relate to motivation for classroom learning in five dimensions: preference for challenge, curiosity, independent learning, independent judgment about what to do in the classroom, and internal criteria for evaluation of success. Each dimension contains (6) items, each item is scored on an ordinal scale from (1) to (4) point, where a score of (4) indicates the maximum intrinsic motivation, and a score of (1) indicates non–intrinsic (extrinsic) motivation. The reliability of each subscale was assessed by employing a reliability coefficient (Kuder–Richards on formula 20) a cross samples from New York, California, and Colorado, reliability range from (0.78 to 0.84), (0.68 to 0.82), (0.70 to 0.78), (0.72 to 0.81) and (0.75 to 0.83) for challenge, independent mastery, curiosity, judgment, and criteria subscale respectively.

In this study, the reliability coefficient was calculated using test–retest and was found to be (0.82, 0.75, 0.79, 0.80, 0.69) for challenge, independent mastery, curiosity, judgment, and criteria subscales respectively. In this study, to clarify the validity of the instrument, the researcher translated the items into Arabic language and then a specialist in educational psychology was asked to translate the Arabic items into English as a backup translation in order to ensure accepted validity indices and validated translation. The items were then given to another specialist who is proficient in both languages to compare the Arabic translation with the original.

Self–efficacy:

The self–efficacy scale (Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante, Prentice–Dunn, Jacobs & Rogers, 1982) was translated into Arabic to be accessible by students of AHU. The original scale consisted of 12 items. After translating the items, a specialist in psychology and education was asked to translate the Arabic items into English as a backup translation in order to ensure accepted validity indices and validated translation. The items were then given to another specialist who is proficient in both languages to compare the Arabic translation with the original. Thus, an accepted instrument with significant validity was available.

The scores on the scale ranged between 12 and 60 on a continuum starting with strongly disagree having one point value and strongly agree having a five point value. So, the levels of self-efficacy were determined with two levels as follow:(a) low self-efficacy (30and less);and (b) high self- efficacy (31 and above). A correlation coefficient between
the items and the total score was found to be ranging between 0.41 and 0.90. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was also calculated using test–retest and was found to be 0.81 which is generally an acceptable level.

Procedures:

The instruments were administered to the participants in their regular classrooms by the researchers. The researchers explained to the participants the purpose and the importance of their participation in this study. In addition, the researchers assured the participants of the confidentiality of their responses and that their responses would be used only for research purposes.

Then, the question booklets were distributed and instructions were given to the participants on how to answer them. Approximately 40 minutes were given to complete the instruments. The participants’ responses were scored by the researchers and were entered into the computer for statistical analysis. The data were analyzed using the SPSS package.

Results and Discussion:

To facilitate understanding the results of this study, questions of the study are divided into two questions.

**Results related to study question (1): What different goal orientations do students have?**

To answer this question, the students' preferences percentage and frequencies were calculated and reported in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 1 shows, a noticeable percentage (60.8%) of the students had a learning goal orientation, 15.2% had a performance goal orientation, and 23.9% had a performance-avoidance orientation. That is, most of students of the Faculty of Educational Sciences in AHU try to master the learning activities. Also, they have a need to achieve, and they have a focus on understanding, gaining knowledge, and improving
one's competence and ability. In addition, they focus on learning, mastery of the content or task, and set high goals for themselves.

According to students of that faculty, a success is internally referenced and performance of other people on the same task is irrelevant. In addition, the central belief of AHU students is that success will follow effort.

![Frequencies of students' goal orientation](image)

**Fig. 1. Frequencies of students' goal orientation**

**Results Related to Study Question (2): Are there correlation among students' goal orientations, academic self-efficacy, and motivation?**

To answer to this question, the correlation coefficients between goal orientations subscales of learning, performance approach and performance-avoidance and academic self-efficacy are presented in Table 2. The Bonferroni technique was applied to prevent type 1 error due to multiple tests and chance.

**Table 2: Correlations between goal orientations subscales and Academic self–efficacy (n = 460 )**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic self-efficacy</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Performance-avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Academic self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Academic self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (P < 0.01)

Table 2 shows that there are significant correlations at the level of (α=0.01) between the goal orientations subscales and academic self-efficacy. Based on the Bonferroni technique, there are significant correlation at the level of (α=0.01) between leaning goal orientation and students with high academic self-efficacy (r =
This means that students who have learning goal orientations perceive their academic self-efficacy as high.

Also, based on the Bonferroni technique, there are significant correlations at the level \((\alpha=0.01)\) between Performance goal orientation and students with high academic self-efficacy \((r=0.003)\). This means that students, who have performance goal orientation, perceive their academic self-efficacy as high.

Finally, Table 2 shows that there are significant correlations at the level of \((\alpha=0.01)\) between performance–avoidance goal orientation and students with low academic self–efficacy \((r = 0.001)\). This means that students who had performance–avoidance goal orientations perceive their academic self–efficacy as low.

This result means that students with high self–efficacy are more motivated and more active in learning. So, these students didn't seek to gain favorable judgments. Consequently, students with a high level of self–efficacy have more challenging learning tasks, therefore, expending more persistence and effort to obtain higher achievement outcomes. In comparison, students with low level of self–efficacy will avoid difficult and challenging tasks that require more effort and persistence, and thus, obtain lower achievement outcomes. This finding is consistent with previous research by Bell & Kozlowski,2002; Schunk & Ertmer (1999) which found that learning goals led to higher self-efficacy.

Correlation coefficients between goal orientation subscales of learning, performance approach and performance-avoidance and intrinsic motivation are presented in table 3. The Bonferroni technique was applied to prevent type 1 error due to multiple tests and chance.

**Table 3: Correlations between Intrinsic Motivation and Goal Orientation Subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Orientations</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Curiosity</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>-0.249*</td>
<td>-0.295*</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>0.257*</td>
<td>0.260*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.221*</td>
<td>0.325*</td>
<td>-0.278*</td>
<td>0.291*</td>
<td>0.209*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Avoidance</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* = \(P < 0.01\)

Based on the Bonferroni technique, the alpha level was set at \(P < 0.01\), and levels of goal of learning were positively related to challenge, \(r = -0.249, P < 0.01\), curiosity, \(r = -0.295, P < 0.01\), mastery, \(r = 0.237, P < 0.01\), Judgment, \(r = 0.257, P < 0.01\) and criteria, \(r = 0.260, P < 0.01\). Also, the alpha levels was set at \(P < 0.01\) and levels of goal of performance was positively related to challenge, \(r = 0.221, P < 0.01\), curiosity, \(r = 0.325, P < 0.01\), mastery, \(r = -0.278, P < 0.01\), Judgment, \(r = 0.291, P < 0.01\), and criteria, \(r = 0.209, P < 0.01\). On the contrary, the table shows no correlation between performance - avoidance goal orientation and intrinsic motivation subscales. This
result means that students who had learning and performance goal orientation had intrinsic motivation, whereas students who had performance–avoidance goal orientation hadn't intrinsic motivation.

In other words, students who have learning goal and performance perceive difficult task as challenging, whereas students who have performance–avoidance perceive it as threatening. In addition, students who have learning goal and performance goal attribute their performance to effort, whereas students who have performance–avoidance attribute performance to external things–to factors outside of themselves. This finding support the previous studies (Heintz & Steele-Johnson, 2004; Elliot & Church, 1997) that showed students who have learning goal and performance goal demonstrate high levels of intrinsic motivation.

Multiple Regression Analysis:

Table 4 shows the results of the stepwise regression analysis using intrinsic motivation and academic self–efficacy as predicted to patterns of goal orientations: Learning, Performance, and Performance–avoidance.

Table 4: Hierarchical Regression of Goal Orientations, Academic Self–efficacy and Intrinsic Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>Sig. F change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Academic Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>135.621</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>561.023</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Academic Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>507.279</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>511.764</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-avoidance</td>
<td>Academic Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>497.301</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>478.293</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that academic self–efficacy is a significant predictor of learning goal orientation, R² = .277, F = 135.621, P<.005. This result was supported by the close to moderate correlation between the two variables (r=0.528 ). Approximately 28% of the variance of the students' learning goal orientation was accounted by academic self–efficacy. The same result also showed that the students' learning goal orientation was significantly related to the students' intrinsic motivation, r =0.410, r² = 0.168, F = 561.023, F <.005. This means that almost 17% of the variance of the students' learning goal orientation was accounted for by intrinsic motivation.

Also, the results show that academic self–efficacy is a significant predictor of performance goal orientation, R² = 0.147, F = 507.279, P<.005. This result was supported by the close to moderate correlation between the two variables (r =0.384). Approximately 15% of the variance of the students' performance goal orientation was accounted by academic self–efficacy. The same result also showed that students' performance goal orientation was significantly related to the students' intrinsic
motivation, \( r = 0.398, r^2 = .150, F = 511.467, F < 0.005 \). This means that almost 15\% of the variance of the students' performance goal orientation was accounted by intrinsic motivation.

Finally, these results showed that the correlation between performance–avoidance and academic self–efficacy is not significant, \( r = 0.297, r^2 = 0.098, P = 0.537 \), since the academic self–efficacy variable accounts for almost less than 1\% of the variance of the students' performance–avoidance variable. Also, the results showed that the correlation between performance-avoidance and intrinsic motivation is not significant, \( r = 0.301, r^2 = 0.090, P = 0.640 \), as the intrinsic motivation variable account for almost less than 1\% of the variance of the students' performance-avoidance variable.

By the end, the researchers recommend conducting other studies on other variables in different universities. Also, the researchers recommend lecturers in universities to encourage students to adapt learning goal, and teaching goal orientation through courses.
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## APPENDIX
Sample Items for Self-Report Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Sample Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goals (6 items)</td>
<td>It’s important to me that I learn a lot of new concepts this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Goals (5 items)</td>
<td>One of my goals is to show others that class work is easy for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-avoidance Goals (5 items)</td>
<td>It’s important to me that I don’t look stupid in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation (30 items)</td>
<td>I work on problems to learn how to solve them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy (12 items)</td>
<td>I am sure I can do an excellent job on the problems assigned in this class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>