

---

# Mapping of Self-Effication and Performance of Equality Tutors Implementing Learning Duties in SKB Kota Pekanbaru

**Wilson, Daeng Ayub**

1 Teaching and Education Faculty, Outside School Education Study Program,  
University of Riau

Email: wilsonumarunri@gmail.com

**Abstract :** This study aims to determine how self efficacy and performance of Equality Package tutors in Pekanbaru City SKB, is there a relationship between self-efficacy and performance in the implementation of learning tasks. The study was conducted in Pekanbaru city with respondents all tutors who were members of SKB Pekanbaru City who were honored 20 people. As a survey research, data using questionnaire (questionnaire). Data processed with percentages and results are: (1) self-efficacy with three dimensions, an average of 89.99% believe in their ability to adjust the tasks assigned to them. (2). The performance of tutors in carrying out learning tasks with four sub, averaging 82.35% who have carried out their duties (3) The link between self-efficacy and tutor performance, the results of which are data analysis with chi square using SPSS, that is, chi count of 0.333, df 1 and a significant accumulation of 0.564 with 0.05%. Chi Square table value at df 1 (0.05%) is 3.841. Thus the chi square value is smaller than the chi square table value, then the proposed hypothesis is rejected. There is a relationship between self-efficacy and tutor performance in carrying out learning tasks.

Keywords: Students, Self Efficacy, Performance Tutors, Equality Packages

## 1. Introduction

At present the orientation of quality education has increased, as well as the need for non-formal education which shows the increasing number of non-formal education institutions starting from tutoring institutions, community learning activities (SKB), community learning centers (PKBM) and education and training institutions, all of which require qualified teaching and education personnel.

According to Law No. 20 of 2003 concerning the national education system that non-formal education is a path of education outside formal education that is carried out in a structured and tiered manner and serves to develop the potential of students with an emphasis on academic knowledge and functional skills as well as the development of professional attitudes and personalities. In order to support the implementation of education throughout life (throughout life), non-formal education with its function as implements, supplements and complement to national education, non-formal education appears to provide an alternative to provide opportunities for all citizens who are not served by formal education, including by program equality known as package A is equivalent to elementary school, package B is equivalent to junior high school, packet C is equivalent to high school. The learning outcomes of this equality program are valued equivalent to formal education after going through the equality test process

---

The quality of successful implementation of learning activities in this equality education program is largely determined by the performance of educators (Tutors). The word performance comes from the word job performance which is defined as work performance achieved by someone in carrying out their main tasks, functions and responsibilities given to them. To support the achievement of work performance, it is needed the ability to carry out their duties correctly and appropriately. According to Prawirosentono (in physical terms Asf and Syaiful, 2013) stated performance or performance is the work that can be achieved by a person or group of people in an organization, in accordance with their respective authorities and responsibilities, in order to achieve the objectives of the organization legally, not violate the law and in accordance with norms and ethics.

Based on Government Regulation No. 19 of 2005 concerning BSNP mentioned that educators in formal education are teachers, while educators for non-formal education are called tutors. In PP No. 19 of 2005 in Article 28 paragraph 3, it is stated that educators have pedagogic competence, social competence, personal and professional competence. In BSNP (2008) specifically tutor competence consists of two groups, namely 1). Generic competence and 2). specific competence. Whereas generic competencies include pedagogical and androgogical, personality and social competencies, then specific competencies include professional competence. Generic competencies must be mastered and owned by all types of tutors, while specific competencies are mastery of competencies that are only valid for each type / field of tutors.

A tutor in carrying out the learning process needs to have special abilities. The task of tutors is not just to convey learning material, but tutors can change the behavior of their learning citizens. In the learning process the tutor is required to carry out the process of guiding the learning community so that it develops in accordance with its developmental tasks, trains skills, motivates the learning community to stay motivated to face challenges, and has the ability to design / plan fun learning programs. Based on this, it is clear that a tutor in carrying out his duties must have self-efficacy, namely the belief in the ability to carry out the tasks for which he is responsible.

According to Robins, 2001 self-efficacy is a factor that influences performance. This means that having good / high self-efficacy will improve performance / performance. Self efficacy is an individual's belief in his ability to perform tasks or actions needed to achieve certain results (Bandura, 1994). Then Devi (in Educhaild's Journal, 2005) self efficacy has an effect of 18.25% on performance. From this description the question arises whether the tutors have high self-efficacy in carrying out their duties have high performance?

Based on observations and interviews of researchers at the Pekanbaru City SKB head who held an equality package A, B and C program obtained information in the form of equality package A, B and C tutors with a formal education background, there were new tutors, on average became tutors less than five years (5) and they have not received much tutor training, they carry out learning tasks with a formal education approach. Then there were a number of people indicated their productivity (performance) was still low, the phenomenon was found that some people had not made plans, when teaching was not based on the learning program plan, they had not guided the learning community.

The above phenomenon raises the question of how is the description of their self-efficacy? how is their performance in carrying out learning? Is there a connection between self-efficacy and tutor performance in carrying out learning? Therefore, the researcher wants to express through a

---

study with the title "Self-Efficacy Mapping and Performance of Equity Tutors Package A, B and C in carrying out learning tasks in the Pekanbaru City SKB).

Based on the background of the above problems, the formulation of the problem:

1. What is the description of equivalence tutor self efficacy packages A, B and C in Pekanbaru City SKB
2. What is the performance of equality tutors package A, B and C in carrying out their duties in Pekanbaru City SKB
3. Is there a connection between self-efficacy and the performance of tutors in implementing learning in the SKB

The purpose of this research is:

1. To find out the description of the self-efficacy of equality package A,B and C in the Pekanbaru City SKB
2. To find out the level of performance of equality package A,B and C tutors at Pekanbaru City SKB
3. To find out whether or not there is a connection between the self-identification and the performance of the tutor in carrying out the learning in the SKB

## 2. Methodology

This research is a type of survey research. The type of research used is aimed at getting an objective picture of Self-Efficacy and Performance of Equality Package Tutors in Pekanbaru City SKB. Specifically how the level of Self-Efficacy and Performance of Tutors in carrying out their duties includes planning, implementing the learning process, conducting guidance and conducting assessments, and how to score self-efficacy and tutor performance. The population of this study were all equality package tutors in the Pekanbaru City SKB, amounting to 20 people (Pekanbaru City SKB data source). In relation to the population of this study is small, then the sample of this study is all populations into samples, meaning that the sample is total sampling. There are two data in this study, namely: 1). Data about self-efficacy, 2) Data about the performance of tutors in carrying out their duties, namely in the form of planning, carrying out the learning process, conducting guidance and conducting assessment. Data on self-efficacy with indicators: the level of level of work difficulty is 3 items, the dimension of strength is 3 items, while the generality dimension is 3 items. So the total number of self-efficacy items is 8 items. Then the data about the performance of the tutor in carrying out his task with the indicator: learning plan consists of 8 items, relating to the learning process consisting of 7 items, relating to guiding 3 items, then relating to the assessment consists of 5 items. So the total number of items is 23 items. This instrument before being used as a data retrieval tool, was tested for several tutors who were teaching outside the SKB. The choice of answers in the questionnaire consisted of 2 (two) choices, namely given weight 2, not weight 1. there were 2 items on the self-efficacy variable which was the answer 3, namely: able / sure given a score of 3, doubt / uncertain with score 2 and not able / not sure of the score 1.

Data collection techniques used are questionnaires. Questionnaire to capture information related to self-efficacy and tutor performance. Data analysis techniques, specifically to determine the level / picture of self-efficacy and tutor performance using descriptive statistical techniques (AnasSujiono, 2005)

$$P = \frac{f}{N} 100\%$$

Information:

P = Percentage rate

F = frequency

N = Number of cases (number of frequencies / number of individuals)

With criteria as follows:

81% - 100% = Very high

61% - 80% = High

41% - 60% = Medium

21% - 40% = Low

00% - 20% = Very low

Meanwhile, to determine the relationship between self-efficacy and performance variables using Chi-Square Correlation statistics using the SPSS program

### 3. Result and Discussion

#### 3.1. Result

##### 3.1.1. Description Data.

The data that will be presented as a result of this study is in the form of raw data. Data that has been collected is in the form of data: Level of tutor education, employment status, and length of service as a teacher, then processed using descriptive statistical techniques. The following can be seen in the description relating to the description of the respondent's data in the table

Table 1: Level of education

Level education	F	%	Description
S1 Education	17	85	
S1 Non Education	1	5	
S2	2	10	
<b>Amount of</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	

Source: Data processed by 2018 statistics

Table 1 shows that from 20 tutors who have an S1 degree in education there are 85% (17 people), there are 5% (1 person) their educational background is non-education S1, and there are 10% (2 people) with S2 education

Table 2: Employment status

Employment status	F	%	Description
PNS Tutors	0	0	
Permanent Tutor	12	60	
Non Permanent Tutor	8	40	
<b>Amount of</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	

Source: Data processed by 2018 statistics

Table 2 shows that out of 20 tutors, 60% (12 people) have a fixed tutor, 40% (8 people) are non-permanent tutors, and none are civil servants. Then table 3 follows the term of duty on the SKB

Table 3: Period of service

Period of servive	F	%	Description
Less than 5 years	13	65	
5 to 10 years	7	35	
11 - more	0	0	
Amount	20	100	

Source: Data processed by 2018 statistics

Table 3 shows that out of 20 tutors who have served no more than 11 years (0%), there are 35% (7 people) on duty 5 - 10 years, while the highest number is 65% (13 people) serving less than 5 years.

Table 4: Performance of Tutors in carrying out learning tasks

N o	Indicator	Sub indiator	Rerpon-den	Skor Ideal	SkorFak- tual	Averag e	%
<b>1</b>	Making Learning Tools	Syllabus	20	40	32	1,6	80
		Semester program	20	40	24	1,2	60
		Weekly Program	20	40	28	1,4	70
		Daily Program	20	40	28	1,4	70
		Teaching materials	20	40	36	1,8	90
		Props	20	40	30	1,5	75
		Instructional Media	20	40	34	1,7	85
		Assessment Instrument	20	40	32	1,6	80
<b>Average</b>			<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>27,16</b>	<b>1,53</b>	<b>76,25</b>
<b>2</b>	Carry out the Learning Process	On schedule	20	40	36	1,8	90
		Material based on the syllabus	20	40	32	1,6	80
		Material based on RPP	20	40	28	1,4	70
		Material based on RPP	20	40	30	1,5	75
		Material according to age group	20	40	34	1,7	85
		Use Media	20	40	40	2	10
		Use method Give Exercise	20	40	30	1,5	0
<b>Average</b>			<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>32.86</b>	<b>1.64</b>	<b>82,14</b>
<b>3</b>	Providing tutoring	Related to Material	20	40	36	1,8	90
		Related to Learning	20	40	34	1,7	85
		Difficulties	20	40	26	1,3	65
		Related to time utilization	20	40	26	1,3	65
<b>Average</b>			<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>4</b>	Assessing Learning	Formulate assessment	20	40	38	1,9	95
		objectives	20	40	38	1,9	95

Outcomes	Compile grading scores	20	40	34	1,7	85
	Conduct formative assessment	20	40	34	1,7	85
	Conduct summative assessment	20	40	38	1,9	95
	Conduct a problem analysis					
<b>Average</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>91</b>

The data in table 4 above reveals that out of 20 equality tutors, 60% of people make learning tools especially making semester programs, then 70% of people make weekly programs and 75% of them make teaching aids. While that includes 90% of people who make teaching materials

The performance of equality tutors in carrying out learning tasks, giving material based on RPP there are 70% of people, who provide training there are 75% of people. While the one who uses the most learning methods is 100%, and in terms of learning according to the schedule there are 90% of people.

The performance of tutors in conducting tutoring to their learning residents related to the utilization of time after and before learning is 65% of people, doing guidance related to the subject matter there are 90% of people, then doing guidance related to learning difficulties there are 85% of people. Furthermore, the performance of tutors in assessing learning outcomes was revealed starting to formulate the objectives of the assessment, compiling a grid, conducting formative, summative research and analyzing questions on average above 91% of tutors.

Table 4: Recapitulation of Average Tutor Performance in carrying out learning tasks

N O	Tutor Performance	Respon- den	Skor Ideal	SkorFak- tual	Rata - Rata	Persenta se (%)
1	Learning Media	20	40	27.25	1,53	76,25
2	Learning Implementation	20	40	32.86	1,64	82,14
3	Coaching	20	40	32	1,6	80
4	Make an assessment	20	40	36.4	1,82	91

Source: Statistical processed data 2018

The data in the table above shows that the performance of tutors starts making learning tools, carrying out the learning process, conducting tutoring to learning citizens and conducting an average learning outcome assessment process of 82.35% of people.

Table 5. Self-efficacy of tutors in carrying out tasks

N o	Indikator	Sub indikator	Rerp on- den	Skor Ideal	SkorFak- tual	Rata - Rata	%
1	Dimension of level of difficulty of task	Feel able to work	20	40	36	1,8	90
		Choose behavior	20	40	35,33	1,77	88,3
		Perceived behavior	20	40	37,67	1,88	3
							94,1 7

	<b>Average</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>36.33</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>90.83</b>
<b>2 Dimension Level (strength) of encouragement</b>	The level of confidence is capable	20	40	37,67	1,88	94,1
	Level of encouragement to remain	20	40	37	1,85	7
	Confidence can complete	20	40	34,33	1,72	93,3
						3
	<b>Average</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>36.33</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>90.83</b>
<b>3 Generalization dimension</b>	Which area of expertise can Room (place)	20	60	56,3	2,82	93,5
		20	60	49,67	2,48	5
						82,7
	<b>Average</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>52.99</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>88.17</b>

Source: Data processed by 2018 statistics

The data in the table above shows that of the 20 tutors, their self-efficacy in the level of level of work difficulty, it turns out the data in this table shows 90.83% of tutors feel able to do the given tasks ranging from easy to very difficult

There are 88.33% of the 20 tutors still working, not delaying good work, very difficult, medium and easy work. Then there are 94.17% of the 20 tutors who feel they have a job starting from the easiest to the most difficult

Here are 94.17 out of 20 tutors who have a level of confidence capable of doing work ranging from the very easy to very difficult work. There are 93.33% of the 20 tutors who have encouragement / enthusiasm will still do the work even though they face very difficult jobs. There are 85.83% of the 20 tutors who have the confidence to be able to complete the work provided, even though it is very difficult

There are 93.55% of the 20 tutors feel they are able to do work other than the area of expertise and include doing the same time. There are 82.78% of 20 tutors who feel confident they can work in two and three places

In the level of encouragement level with aspects of confidence level, the level of encouragement and confidence can complete the work seen on average above 90.83 people have the strength / drive with a level of confidence, with encouragement and with confidence can complete on time. Then there are 88.17% of tutors having.

Table 5: Recapitulation of Average Tutor Self-Efficacy

NO	EfikasiDiri Tutor	Respon- den	Skor Ideal	SkorFak- tual	Rata- Rata	Perse ntase
1	Level Dimension (level)	20	40	36,33	1,82	90,83
2	Strength Dimension	20	40	36,33	1,82	90,83
3	Generalization dimension	20	60	52,99	2,65	88,17
		20	60	41,88	2,09	89,94

From table 5, the tutor's self-efficacy related to the task level of the task / job level is 90.83%, then the strength dimension that becomes the amplifier is 90.83%, this is at a high level, while

the generality dimension is related that is 88.17% is also at a high level. The average self-efficacy of tutors in carrying out their Pokemon work is at a high level of 88.4%.

From the results of the calculation of the above analysis in the form of a percentage, related to the average self-efficacy of tutors is equal to 89.94%, and the average performance of tutors in implementing is equal to 82.35%. This figure shows that the average self-efficacy and performance of tutors are at a high level.

To see the maximum and maximum score distribution can be seen in the following table

Table 6. Descriptive Data of Self-efficacy and Tutor Performance

Descriptive Statistics					
Variabel	N(Indikator )	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Self-efficacy	3	41.8833	9.61866	36.33	52.99
Performance	4	32.1275	3.76816	27.25	36.40

Source: Statistical processed data with SPS

Table 6 results of descriptive statistical analysis of tutor self efficacy variables obtained a minimum score of 36.33, a maximum score of 52.99, the mean (average) of 41.8833 and the standard deviation of 9.61866. Then the descriptive statistical data of the tutor's performance obtained a minimum score of 27.25, a maximum score of 36.40, the amount of 32.1275 and the standard deviation score of 3.76816.

The following description is to find out if there is a connection between self-efficacy and the performance of tutors in carrying out learning tasks, can be seen below

**Chi-Square Test  
Frequencies**

**VAR00001**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
36.33	2	1.5	.5
52.99	1	1.5	-.5
Total	3		

**VAR00002**

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
27.25	1	1.0	.0
32.00	1	1.0	.0
32.86	1	1.0	.0
36.40	1	1.0	.0
Total	4		

**Test Statistics**

	VAR00001	VAR00002
Chi-Square	.333 <sup>a</sup>	.000 <sup>b</sup>



df	1	3
Asymp. Sig.	.564	1.000

a. 2 cells (100.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 1.5.

b. 4 cells (100.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 1.0.

The results of data analysis with chi square test with SPSS obtained the chi value of square count of 0.333, df 1 and a significant assumption of 0.564 with 0.05%. Chi Square table value at df 1 (0.05%) is 3,841. Thus the chi square value is smaller than the chi square table, then the proposed hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a relationship between self-efficacy and tutor performance in carrying out learning tasks.

### 3. Result and Discussion

Referring to the theoretical concepts that form the basis of this study, specifically related to self-efficacy, which is a reflection of someone having confidence in their ability to perform tasks or actions needed to achieve certain results in various levels of difficulty and situation. Bandura, in Guhfron and RiniRisnawati (2012) states that self-efficacy includes three dimensions namely first; the level of difficulty of the task feels able to do it, second; a dimension of strength (strength) confidence about its ability to complete its task, third; generalization (generality) is related to the broad field of behavior in which individuals feel confident in their abilities. The results of this study indicate that the results of the calculation of data analysis in the form of percentage, the average self-efficacy of tutors is 89.94%, this means that equality tutors in Pekanbaru City SKB 89.94% have confidence in their ability to carry out the tasks given to them. Referring to the tutor's personal data from 20 people there are 2 people who have a master's education level and 17 people do have an education degree in education that is in accordance with the teaching field and 1 person has an undergraduate education. With their personal data attached to them, it is reflected that they are confident they can do learning tasks. Bandura and Wood in M.NurGhufron&RiniRisnawati, 2012 explained that self-efficacy refers to the belief in an individual's ability to drive motivation, cognitive abilities, and actions needed to meet the demands of the situation.

Then the results of data analysis on the performance of tutors in learning tasks began to make learning tools, carry out the learning process, conduct learning guidance to learning citizens and conduct an average assessment of learning outcomes there were 82.35%. referring to the theory expressed by Hamid Darmadi (2010) that the teacher's performance can be seen from his sense of responsibility in carrying out anamah, the profession he embraces and the sense of moral responsibility on his shoulders. E.Mulyasa (2005) states that performance or performance can be interpreted as work performance, work performance, work achievement, work performance or performance. Furthermore, E.Muyasa (idem) stated that there were several factors affecting work productivity, one of which was education. He said that generally people who have higher education will have broader insights, especially appreciation of the importance of productivity. The education in question can be formal or non-formal. The high awareness of the importance of productivity will encourage the relevant education staff to act productively (high-performance)

Related to the relationship of self-efficacy and tutor performance, based on descriptive analysis of self-efficacy 89.94% while the performance of tutors 82,355 means both above 80%. If observed by S. Robbins's opinion, 2001 "people who have high self-efficacy will try harder to overcome the challenges that exist". Furthermore Robins, 2001 revealed "self-efficacy (self-efficacy) is a factor that affects performance. This means that having good / high self-efficacy will improve performance / performance. KemudiaAlwisol, 2015 stated "the range of expectations is high (believing that he can do the job according to the situation) and hope that the results are realistic (estimating the results according to their own abilities), that person will work hard and endure the task until it's finished". Furthermore Devi (in Educhaild's Journal, 2005) self efficacy has an effect of 18.25% on performance.

The results of data analysis with chi square test with SPSS obtained the chi value of square count of 0.333, while the chi square table value at df 1 (0.05%) was 3.841. Thus the chi square value is smaller than the chi square table, then the proposed hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a relationship between self-efficacy and tutor performance in carrying out learning tasks.

#### 4. Conclusion

Based on the results of this study it can be concluded that the average tutor has self-efficacy, believes with the ability possessed to be able to do the tasks given. The tasks they do as a performance in the form of making learning tools, carrying out the learning process, conducting tutoring to students (learning citizens) and carrying out assessment of learning outcomes. There is a link between self-efficacy and performance.

#### References

- Bandura, A. 1994. *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliff, New York: Prentice Hall.
- E. Mulyasa. 2005. *Becoming a Professional School Principal*. Bandung: PT RemajaRosdakarya
- HadariNawawi. 2001. *Human Resource Management*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press
- Hamid Darmadi. 2010. *Basic teaching ability*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Halim, L., Meerah, TSM., 2017, Practicality Assessment of Student Worksheets for SMP Physics Learning on the Traditional Culture-Based Equipment, *Journal of Educational Sciences* 1 (1), 69-78
- Ivancevich, John, M, et al. 2008. *Organizational Behavior and Management*, volumes 1 and 2. Jakarta:Erlangga.
- M.NurGhufron&RiniRisnawati S.2012. *Psychological Theories*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzzi Media.
- Moh. UzerUsman. 2000. *Become a Professional Teacher*. Bandung: PT RemajaRosdakarya
- Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu., 2005. *HR Performance Evaluation*. Bandung: RefikaAditama
- Robbins, S.P. 2001. *Organizational theory: structure, Design, and Applications*. Prentice Hall
- SudarwanDanim, 2011. *Teacher Professional Development*. Jakarta: Kencana
- RI Law NO. 20 of 2003 *Concerning the National Education System*. Jakarta: Directorate General Primary and Secondary Education.
- RI Law No. 14 of 2005 *Concerning Teachers and Lecturers*. Jakarta: PB PGRI
- William Crain, 2007. *Concept Development and Application Theory*. Yogyakarta: Student Library