ASSESSMENT OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-EFFICACY AND ACHIEVEMENT AND THEIR DIFFERENCES ACROSS INSTITUTION TYPE IN JAVA PROGRAMMING AMONG COMPUTER UNDERGRADUATES IN SOUTH-WESTERN NIGERIA

Josiah Owolabi
National Open University of Nigeria
Email: joowolabi@noun.edu.ng
Phone: +2348150762756

Abstract
This study assessed the relationship between students' self-efficacy and achievement in Java programming among computer undergraduates in South-Western Nigeria. It was also aimed at testing the significance of institutional type differences in self-efficacy and achievement in Java programming. The Java programming self-efficacy scale ($r = 0.96$) and achievement test ($r = 0.70$) were completed by 254 students across both Federal and State owned public universities in South-Western Nigeria. By using Pearson correlation, the relationships between self-efficacy and achievement in Java programming was investigated and by using t-test, significant difference of self-efficacy and achievement across institution type were tested. The analysis of the data indicated a significant relationship between self-efficacy and achievement in Java programming ($r = 0.249$, $p < 0.05$). It showed a significant difference in the mean self-efficacy scores of students in Federal and State universities ($t = 7.57$, $p < 0.05$), but a non-significant difference in achievement ($t = 45.92$, $p > 0.05$). Based on the findings from the study, it was recommended among others that efforts be made to improve self-efficacy of students (especially those in the Federal government-owned universities) in Java programming as it relates positively and significantly with their achievement.

Keywords: Achievement; Assessment; Institution type; Java Programming; Self-efficacy.

Introduction

Computer programming skill is a major aspect of computer science which is needed not only by the computer professionals but also by the non-computer professionals. For computer professionals in particular, acquisition of programming skills is inevitable, because a computer is quite useless unless it is running a program. According to Jenkins (2001), programming lies at the very heart of computing. Pioro (2004) also opined that programming courses are not just about programming perse, they also provide a forum for teaching precise and logical thought processes. Moreover, they constitute necessary background for computer science students by introducing basic concepts and techniques to be used and to be built upon in more advanced computer science courses. An understanding of how the programs are written is a key part of the development of any computer science student. It is therefore not surprising that computer undergraduates are required to take and pass some programming courses during their traning.

Computer programming is the craft of writing useful, maintainable and extensible instructions which can be interpreted by a computer system to perform a meaningful task. Precisely, programming has been defined as; "the process of taking a problem specification written in plain language, understanding it, devising a solution, and then converting the solution into a correct computer program "usually expressed in some special-purpose programming language" (Jenkins, 2001). To program using the computer, one must learn how to give instructions to it. One must also learn the language understood by the computer. The instructions you give to the computer must be according to some specified rules. The words that make up the instructions as well as the rules that the instructions must obey form the computer language. In giving instructions to the computer, it must be done in any of the computer programming languages. Several computer programming languages had been developed and more are still being developed.

There are several programming languages studied in the Nigerian Universities. Java programming language has been chosen for this study because it is taught presently in most public universities in south – west, Nigeria. It is also more relevant in the industries today and works on the web browser. Research reports shows a consistent decline in number of students choosing computer science programme at the undergraduate level (Heersink & Moskal, 2010; Hoegh, & Moskal, 2009;

Hutchinson, Moskal, Cooper & Dann, 2008). Since there has been a rising demand of computer scientists and programmers for employment in the industries, the need to increase students' participation in computer science programmes becomes inevitable (Hutchinson, Moskal, Cooper & Dann, 2008). The perceived difficulty, boredom and absence of social interaction might be responsible for students' reluctance to choose computer science (Farkas & Murthy, 2005)). Consequently, students tend to have low self-efficacy, which in turn affects their commitment and perseverance in programming and consequently their achievement.

Institutions have been found to make a difference in students' achievements whether in mathematics or computer programming. The level of influence however differs as shown in the following: In South Korea, about 4% of the total variance of mathematics achievement was due to institutional – level factors (Park & Park, 2006) while for South African students it was 55% (Howie, 2003). For Australian students 27% and 47% formed the percentage contributions of institutional – level differences in the Trends in mathematics and science study (TIMSS) conducted in 1995 and 1999 respectively (Fullarton, 2004). In Singapore 45%, Botswana 27%, Chiki 30% and Flenders 14% were the percentage contributions found (Chepete, 2008; Mohammadpour, Moradi & Naijib Abdul Ghafar, 2009; Ramirez, 2006; Van den Broeck, Van Danme, & Opdenakker, 2006). Recently, a study carried out among eight graders in Malaysia indicated that 57.28% of the total variance in mathematics achievement of eight graders in Malaysia was accounted for by institutional level differences (Ghagar, Othman & Mohammedpour, 2011). Also in a study on school effectiveness in mathematics and science at the 4th grade, using data from International Educational Assessment (IEA's) TIMSS study where 14 countries were included in the study, about one – quarter (25%) of the variability in mathematics and science achievement was found to lie between schools.

Institutional type was also found to influence self-efficacy as students in private schools in Sweden performed significantly better on the reading test than students in public schools since their teachers are more efficacious (Batool & Abbas Shah, 2018; Myrberg & Rosen, 2003; Gafoor, 2012; Bututcha, 2013; Capa, 2005). Studies that evaluated the relationship between achievement and self-efficacy of Java programming language and the significant differences in the two concepts across institution type (particular Federal and state institutions in Nigeria) are very rare and this is what this study sought to do.

Purpose of the Study

The study sought to carry out the following:

1. Assess the relationship between achievement and self-efficacy of computer undergraduates in Java Programming.
2. Assess the difference between Java programming achievement of computer undergraduates in Federal and State government owned universities.
3. Assess the difference between Java programming achievement of computer undergraduates in Federal and State government owned universities.

3. Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant relationship between achievement and self-efficacy of computer undergraduates in Java programming.
2 There is no significant difference in the mean score achievement in Java Programming between undergraduates students of Federal and State Universities.
3. There is no significant difference, in the mean self-efficacy score in Java Programing, between undergraduates students of Federal and State Universities.

Methodology

This study adopted purposive sampling technique for the selection of participants' universities and levels of study. The Universities of respondents were selected based on the following criteria; (i) the university is owned by federal or state government, (ii) there is a computer science department where potential computer professionals are being trained, (iii) Java programming language is taught in the computer science department of the university. Five public universities within the South – West, Nigeria satisfied the three criteria above. One of them was used for pilot study to determine validation and reliability of the instruments before the main study. The remaining four (4) public universities were used for the real study. Each participant used was selected based on the following criteria: (i.) he / she is a full time student in the Department of Computer Science in any of the chosen Universities; (ii.) he / she had been taught Java programming Language; (iii.) he / she is

available at the time of data collection and (iv.) he / she was willing to participate in the study. A total of 254 computer undergraduates participated in the study by attempting the Java programming achievement test and filling the self-efficacy scale.

The instruments used for the study were the Java programming achievement test and Java self-efficacy scale. Two faculty members from two separate universities validated the Java programming achievement test, the final copy was produced after effecting the corrections. The reliability coefficient using Kuder-Richardson 20 formula was found to be 0.70. The Java Programming Self-efficacy scale was the adapted version of the C++ programming Self Efficacy Scale designed by Ramalingam & Wiedenbeck (1998). It consisted of 32 items. The participants were given instructions to rate their confidence in understanding and doing the Java programming related tasks using a scale of 1 (Not confident at all) to 7 (Absolutely confident). Administration of the instrument on Engineering undergraduates in Turkey who had been part of the Java programming produced a reliability of 0.99 (Askar & Davenport, 2009). In this study, the instrument was pilot tested on computer undergraduates in south-west, Nigeria and the reliability coefficient was found to be 0.96. It was therefore found to be reliable for the study. The instrument was therefore adopted for the study. Data was analysed using mean, standard deviation, Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient, and t-test.

Results

Hypothesis One: There is no significant relationship between achievement and self-efficacy of computer undergraduates in Java programming.

Table 1: The Relationship between Achievement and Self-efficacy in Java programming (N = 254)

		1	2
1	PPMC	1.000	0.249*
	P-value	.	0.000
2	PPMC	0.249*	1.000
	P- value	0.000	.

Key: 1 – Java Programming Achievement, 2 – Java Programming Self-efficacy
PPMC – Pearson Product Moment Correlation; P-value – Significant value
** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed)*

Table 1 shows the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient for the relationship between Java programming achievement and Java programming self-efficacy. A weak positive correlation that was significant was found ($r = 0.249$ $p < 0.05$). Therefore Java programming achievement has a weak positive relationship with the Java programming self-efficacy. The implication of this finding is that computer undergraduates with higher self-efficacy perform better in Java programming achievement.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference, in the mean scores achievement in Java Programming between computer undergraduates in Federal and State Universities.

To test the hypothesis, independent smple t-test was used.

Table 2: T-test comparison of Achievements in Java Programing, Between Undergraduates in Federal and State Universities.

Institution Type	N	Mean	S.D	t_{cal}	Df	p-value	Remark
Federal	194	20.54	18.72	8.67	25	0.250	N.S
State	60	22.92	11.78		2		

N.S – Not Significant

Table 2 shows the t-test comparison of the scores of achievement in Java Programing, between undergraduates in Federal and State Universities. The t-test comparison showed a difference which is not statistically significant between the mean scores of achievement in Java Programing in Federal and State Universities ($T_{calculated} = 8.67$, $df = 252$, $p > 0.05$). The null hypothesis was accepted. Therefore there is no significant difference, in the mean score of achievement in Java programing, between undergraduates in Federal and State Universities.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference, in the mean scores of self-efficacy in Java programming between computer undergraduates in Federal and State Universities

To test the hypothesis, independent smple t-test was used.

Table 3: T-test comparison of Self-Efficacy in Java Programing Between Undergraduates in Federal and State Universities

Institution Type	N	Mean	S.D	t_{cal}	Df	p-value	Remark
Federal	1945	128.07	44.5	7.57	252	0.001*	S
State	607	173.99	26.3				

S – Significant

Table 3 presents the t-test comparison of the scores of self-efficacy in Java Programming, between undergraduates in Federal and state universities. The t-test comparison showed a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of self-efficacy in Java Programming, among undergraduates in Federal and State Universities (Tcalculated = 7.57, df = 252, $p < 0.05$). We therefore reject the null hypothesis. Therefore there is a significant difference in the mean score of self-efficacy in Java programming between undergraduates in Federal and State Universities.

Discussion

In Table 1, Java programming achievement related positively and significantly with Java programming self-efficacy, it implies that higher the self-efficacy the higher the achievement in Java programming. There are also other researches that showed positive relationship between the self-efficacy, self-regulated learning and academic achievements (Wigfield, Eccles, Schiefele, Roeser & Kean, 2006; Zimmerman, Bandura & Martinez-Pons, 1992; Denissen, Zarrett & Eccles, 2007).

The result in table 2 showed a difference which is not statistically significant in the mean achievement scores of Federal and state owned University undergraduates. Variance in achievement due to institutional – differences varies from one place to another. According to Park and Park (2006), in South Korea, about 4% of the total variance of mathematics achievement was due to institutional – level factors. Howie (2003) also showed that for south african students it was 55%. Similarly for Australian students 27% and 47% formed the percentage contributions of institutional – level differences in the Trends in mathematics and science study (TIMSS) conducted in 1995 and 1999 respectively (Fullarton, 2004). In Singapore 45%, Botswana 27%, Chiki 30% and Flenders 14% were the percentage contributions found (Chepete, 2008; Mohammadpour, Moradi & Naijib Abdul Ghafar, 2009; Ramirez, 2006; Van den Broeck, Van Danme, & Opdenakker, 2006). Recently, a study carried out among eight graders in Malaysia indicated that 57.28% of the total variance in mathematics achievement of eight graders in Malaysia was accounted for by institutional level differences (Ghagar, Othman, & Mohammedpour, 2011).

Also another study on school effectiveness in mathematics and science at the 4th grade, using data from International Educational Assessment (IEA's) TIMSS study where 14 countries were included in the study gave that about one – quarter (25%) of the variability in mathematics and science achievement was found to lie between schools. This study however, state universities had higher mean achievement scores when compared with their federal university counterparts; although the difference is not significant. The non-significant difference in the mean achievement in Java programming across institution type as observed among the respondents of this study suggests that both types of public universities require attention in the bid to step up achievement in Java programming.

The result in table 3 shows a significant difference in the mean self-efficacy scores across institution type; with the state universities having higher mean scores. This finding is in agreement with that of a study carried out to determine the extent to which teacher self-efficacy could enhance secondary school students' achievement (Gisemba, 2011). Teachers form part of the institution and hence coud be used to explain institutional differences. The study confirmed that teachers frequent use of mathematics homework and level of interest and enjoyment of mathematics as well as their ability and competence in teaching mathematics played a key role in promoting students mathematics self efficacy (Gisemba, 2011).To boost students' self efficacy in computer programming, students should not only be the focus, the institutions must also create an enabling environment. In this study, the mean scores in table 3 showed a higher mean self-efficacy score from the undergraduates in state university. It therefore follows that the mean self-efficacy in Java Programming of undergraduates in

the state universities (mean = 173.97, standard deviation = 26.39) is significantly higher than that of their counterparts in the Federal universities (mean = 128.05; standard deviation = 44.57). The higher mean self-efficacy score in the state-owned institution could be explained by the fact that unlike in the federal universities, the state universities are used to providing and doing things for themselves. Consequently ownership of computer which is expected to be more in the state owned universities might have impacted positively on their self-efficacy in Java programming.

Conclusion

The findings of the study showed the following: (i) a significant relationship between self-efficacy and achievement in Java programming, (ii) a non-statistically significant difference in achievement between Federal and State Government owned Universities and (iii) a significant difference in the self-efficacy scores between Federal and State owned Universities.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made:

1. There is the need revisit undergraduates' self-efficacy variable so that achievement could be improved.
2. Focus should be on Federal Government owned schools in south west, Nigeria in the bid to improve self-efficacy of undergraduates.
3. More researches to be carried out on factors that influence self-efficacy in computer programming especially in Federal government-owned universities within South-West, Nigeria.

References

Askar, P. & Davenport, D. (2009). An investigation of factors related to self-efficacy for Java programming among engineering students. *Turkish Online Journal of Education Technology,* 8(1).

Batool, S & Abbas Shah S.M. (2018). Causative Factors behind an Efficacious Teacher: Evaluating Teacher Efficacy. *Journal of Human Psychology* - 1(1):18-26..

Bututcha, K.G. (2013). Gender and school type diffrences in self-efficacy in teaching. *Sky Journal of Educational Research* (4), 23-31, Available: http:www.skyjournals.org/SJERhttps://www.spsstests.com/2015/how-to-test-validity-questionnaire.html.

Capa, Y. (2005). *Factors influencing first-year teachers' sense of efficacy.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Available: http://www.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/199apa%20Yesim.pdf?acc_num=osu1110229553

Chepete, P. (2008). *Modeling of the Factors Affecting Mathematics Achievement of Form 1 Students* In Bostwana Based On The 2003 Trends In International Mathematics And Science Study. Unpublished doctor of philosophy, Indiana University.Child Quarterly, 42, 39-48.

Denissen, J. J. A., Zarrett, N. R., & Eccles, J. S. (2007). I like to do it, I'm able, and I know I am: Longitudinal couplings between domain specific achievement,Eds.) & N. Eisenberg, Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development (6th ed., pp. 933–1002). New York: Wiley.*Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 87–99.

Farkas, D. & Murthy, N. (2005). Attitudes toward computers, the introductory course and recruiting new majors: Preliminary results. In 17 *Workshop of the Psychology of Programming Interest Group*, Sussex University, 268-277.

Fullarton, S. (2004). Closing the gaps between schools, accounting for variation in mathematics achievement in Australian schools using TIMSS 95 and TIMSS 1999. *Paper presented at the The 1st IEA International Research Conference,* IRC – 2004.

Gafoor, A.K. (2012). Influence of school-image on academic self-efficacy beliefs. *Innovations and Researches in Education* 2(1), 51-58.

Ghagar, M.N.A, Othman, R., & Mohammedpour (2011). Multilevel Analysis of Achievement in mathematics of Malaysian and Singaporean students. *Journal of educational psychology and counseling*, 285 – 304.

Gisemba, B.J. (2011). The role of teacher characteristics and practice on upper secondary school students' mathematics self efficacy in Nyanza Pronvice of Kenya: A multilevel analysis. *International Journal of science and mathematics education* 9(4), 817 – 842.

Heersink, D. & Moskal, B.M. (2010). Measuring high school students' attitudes toward computing. In *Proceedings of the 41 ACM technical symposium on Computer science education (SIGCSE '10)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 446-450.

Hoegh, A. & Moskal, B.M. (2009). Examining science and engineering students' attitudes toward computer science. In *Proceedings of the 39th IEEE international conference on Frontiers in education conference (FIE'09)*. IEEE Press, Piscataway, NJ,USA, 1306-1311.

Hutchinson, A., Moskal, B., Cooper, S. & Dann, W. (2008). Impact of the Alice curriculum on community college students' attitudes and learning with respect to computer science. Paper appears in the In *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the American Engineering Education, Pittsburgh, PA.*

Howie, S. (2003). Languages and other background factors affecting secondary pupils' performance in Mathematics in South Africa. *African Journal of Research in SMT Education,*7, 1-20.

Jenkins, T. (2001). The motivation of students of programming. A Thesis Submitted to the University of Kont at Canterbury in the Subject of Computer Science for the degree of Master of Science.

Mohammadpour, I., Moradi, G.F., & Naijib Abdul Ghafar, M. (2009). Modeling affecting factors on mathematics performance for Singapore eight – grades students based on TIMSS 2007. Paper presented at the *proceedings of 2009 International Conference on Social Science and Humanities (ICSSH 2009).* Singapore.

Myrberg E & Rosén, M. (2003). Social selection into independent schools in Sweden. Results from PIRLS2001.Gothenburg:DepartmentofEducation.(unpublished manuscript). Available: http://www.iea.nl/sites /default/files/irc /IRC2004_ Myrberg_Rosen.pdf .

Park. C. & Park. D. (2006). *Factors Affecting Korean Students' Achievement in TIMSS 1999*. In S. Howie & T. plomp (Eds.), Contexts of Learning Mathematics and Science: Routledge. Parsimonions measure. Humanfactors,32, 477 – 491.

Pioro, B.T. (2004). Performance in an Introductory Computer Programming Course as a Predictor of future Success for Engineering and Computer Science majors. *A Paper delivered at the International Conference on Engineering Education at Gaines-Ville,* Florida October 16-21, 2004.

Ramalingam, V. & Wiedenbeck, S. (1998). Development and Validation of Scores on a Computer Programming Self-efficacy Scale and Group Analysis of Novice Programmer Self-efficacy. *Journal of Educational Computing Research,* Vol. 19 (4), 37-386.

Ramirez, M. J. (2006). *Factors Related to Mathematics Achievement* in Chile. In S. Howie & T. plomp (Eds.), Contexts of learning Mathematics and science: Routledge.

Van den Broeck, A., Van Danme, J., & Opdenakker, M. C. (2006). *The effects of student, Class and School Characteristics on TIMSS 1999 Mathematics Achievement* in Flanders. In S. Howie & T. plomp (Eds.), Contexts of learning Mathematics and Science: Routledge.

Wigfield, A. , Eccles, J.S., Schiefele, U., Roeser, R.W. & Kean, P.D. (2006). *Development of achievement motivation*. In W. Damon & R.M. Lerner (Series Eds.) & N. Eisenberg (Volume Ed.), Handbook of ChildPsychology, 6th Edition, Vol. 3, Social, Emotional and Personality Development (pp. 933–1002). New York:Wiley.

Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A. & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal. *American Educational Research Journal,* Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 663-676.