



Education Quarterly Reviews

Yosef, Harlina, Rahmi, & Muslifar, R. (2022). Designing a Scale for Measuring Multicultural Self-Efficacy of High School Students. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 5(3), 207-217.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.05.03.539

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

Designing a Scale for Measuring Multicultural Self-Efficacy of High School Students

Yosef¹, Harlina¹, Rahmi¹, Rury Muslifar²

¹ Universitas Sriwijaya. Email: josephbarus@unsri.ac.id

² Universitas Mulawarman

Abstract

Assessing students' multicultural self-efficacy was a challenging duty for high school counselors, particularly in conjunction with the understanding function of school counseling. The main objective of this development research was to design and validate a scale for measuring the multicultural self-efficacy of high school students. The 851 public high school students from seven regions of Indonesia participated as respondents. After reviewing pertaining literature, the study set 40 preliminary items about cultural insight, communication, cultural value, cultural awareness, and flexibility. A school counselor educator and a high school counselor experienced in the field examined its construct validity and suggested improving item clarity. The revised scale had sequential testing to determine its practicality, validity, and reliability values, namely the practicality test, the pilot test, and the main test. The results showed that 36 of 40 items met the validity and reliability criteria. In addition, most respondents were in significant agreement about the scale practicality. This evidence indicated that this assessment instrument was suitable for measuring the multicultural self-efficacy of high school students.

Keywords: Multicultural Self-Efficacy, High School Student, School Counselor

1. Introduction

In the Indonesian education system, high school students are teenagers who attend public or private schools and have a commonality in developmental tasks. One of their developmental tasks was to achieve a positive attitude toward cultural identity, social group, peers, and socially acceptable behavior (Manning, 2016). This task was essential because, in the learning activities, they should communicate, relate, cooperate, and collaborate interpersonally with culturally diverse peers (Lalonde & Hynie, 2004). By establishing a harmonious relationship with one another, the students benefit from them in the long run for their learning (Altugan, 2015; Kang & Chang, 2016).

There are some reasons for high school students have to develop adequate multicultural self-efficacy. There is a need to promote a learning society where students can "learn to know, to do, to be, and to live together" (Delors, 1996). Students from various cultural backgrounds will relate with one another on varied occasions, particularly during curricular and extracurricular activities. To achieve the common goal of being members of the learning community, they need to establish a multicultural atmosphere. Emphasizing the fourth, students with adequate multicultural self-efficacy will show socially acceptable and responsible behavior when working with diverse

peers.

High school students will be future adults. They need education and skills to become lifelong learners, to secure for productive work, make informed decisions, and positively engage in their communities (UNICEF, 2021). They will meet, relate, and collaborate with other people who may be culturally different. To be successful adults in a plural society, very early, they should learn to be competent culturally. School is the best place to learn harmonious relationships with people of different cultures, namely with peers and teachers. It will promote a larger perspective on students under a multicultural education umbrella, which according to Banks (2013) encompassed content integration, knowledge construction process, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and empowering school culture and social structure dimensions. School counseling as part of high school service has a central role in developing multicultural self-efficacy and meeting the need of diverse students (Hughey, 2011). By having the efficacy adequately, they may get along and work together productively with peers who come from other cultures confidently.

Multiculturalism is one of the crucial issues in today's society, including in school settings. Discussion about it occurred in various contexts, such as multicultural competence concerning self-regulated learning (Hladík et al., 2012), ethnic identity and attachments to the nation-state (Banks, 2014), the responsibility of educators in multicultural education (Yılmaz, 2016), teachers' multicultural competence in teaching students with diverse cultural backgrounds (Lehman, 2017), culture clash in the multicultural classroom (Hansen-thomas & Chennapragada, 2018). In the Indonesian context, similar issues get attention published in several professional works of literature, such as multicultural practice among Muslim students (Wibowo, 2018) and multicultural practice among pre-service teachers (Mulya et al., 2021). These studies indicated that multicultural education still needs more attention from all educators.

Culture is an essential part of each society. It is a social construction (Diaz-Leon, 2013), an incomparable knowledge system (Hong & Khei, 2014), and its elements will be different among societies (Oettingen, 1995). The cultural practices will be more complicated if it is associated with other cultural relations in various settings, such as at schools (Bishop, 1994; Reitz et al., 2009; Zhao, 2007) and families (Sengstock, 2001; Want, 2013). Moreover, studies of cultural relations like Chao et al. (2011) and Chie et al. (2013) suggested that the cultural competencies were fractious to generalize to other societies. In this challenging atmosphere, students who are adequately in self-efficacy---described as one's belief in their capability that could produce given levels of attainment (Bandura, 1997)--- would be ready to relate with various people, including in provoking multicultural interaction. As such, enactive mastery of learning, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective states were essential factors that contributed to ramping up multicultural self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Bandura & Locke, 2003). This complexity gave a meaningful clue that not all high students would have adequate multicultural self-efficacy since family, education institutions, and larger communities influenced the development of self-efficacy (Rateau & Moliner, 2012). Lacking the adequacy may limit their courage and confidence to relate with peers. In turn, it will lessen the success of their learning.

One of the school counseling functions is to help the student to understand self and others (Myrick, 2011). Multicultural self-efficacy is a pivotal part of their understanding to their learning be successful. For the students, achieving it will be beneficial in the long run since they can figure out, comprehend, analyze, and ramp up their multicultural self-efficacy. To school counselors, having such data is not only for understanding their function but also importantly enables them to plan various kinds of intervention purposively (Myrick, 2011). Primarily, it aims to prevent and develop students' multicultural self-efficacy or solve problems for deficits through responsive service. To assess students' efficacy satisfactorily, the school counselors, firstly, should be skillful in several issues of multiculturalism (Sue & Sue, 2013), and secondly, they demand to use of an adequate instrument (Hays, 2013). Unfortunately, a current open-source scale is scarce. For example, it is available only for college students majoring in guidance and counseling (Yosef et al., 2020) which might be less applicable to high school students. Because multicultural education has been a crucial issue and to ensure school counselors have adequate data for providing evidence based-service, it is necessary to design a multicultural self-efficacy scale for high school students (MSES-HS).

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Researchers contacted the high school counselors by a telephone call to recruit their students as respondents. Their telephone numbers were available on several social media group, such as the Whatsapp and Telegram. A total of 813 students, from ten public high schools, in 7 provinces in Indonesia (North Sumatera, Riau Islands, South Sumatera, West Java, Central Java, West Kalimantan, and East Kalimantan) participated in this study. The description of respondents was displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Information of Participants

Categories	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Number of students	813	16.08	.90
Gender			
Male	272		
Female	541		
Grade level			
10 th	283		
11 th	262		
12 th	268		
Assignment			
Practicality test	9		
Pilot Test	45		
Main Test	759		

2.2. Instruments

In this study, a school counseling educator and a high school counselor estimated the construct validity of MSES-HS by filling out the MSES-HS Review Sheet. They rated each preliminary item by stating a measure or not measure. Especially for the not measuring items, the validators provided suggestions on whether to delete or revise them. In addition to validation, in the MSES-HS Review Sheet, they ought to review the manual of MSES-HS for its completeness. To measure the practicality of MSES-HS, the researchers wrote a ten item-questionnaire. It asked the students to rate aspects of the scale, namely content, fairness of the items, easiness to respond, readability, diction, duration of responding, number of items, and technical matter to respond via Google Form in 1-5 Likert-type.

2.3. Procedures

The procedures for producing MSES-HS consisted of two parts, the design and validation phase (Harlacher, 2016). In the design phase, firstly, the researchers did a literature review for choosing the goals, aspects of the scale, writing the items, writing the manual, and preparing the scale review sheet for validators and a practicality questionnaire for students. Secondly, to examine the construct validity and manual of MSES-HS, the study involved a school counseling educator and an experienced school counselor. They judged the validity of the scale by completing the MSES-HS Reviewing Sheet. Both should consider the accuracy of all preliminary items according to the designed constructs by putting a statement of measuring or not measuring each item. For correcting an item, they also might suggest if an item yielded in the not measuring category. After completing the first part, they ought to review the manual of MSES-HS by giving their judgment on its completeness. The researchers followed up the results by revising the items and the manual.

In the validation phase, firstly, the study set an orderly practicality test, pilot test, and main test to investigate the practicality, validity, and reliability values of MSES-HS. The scale, formatted in Google Form, was administered to 9 respondents, three 10th grades, three 11th grades, and three 12th grades. Upon completing the scale, they examined the scale in terms of the easiness of filling out, readability, and time to answer the separated

questionnaire. Referring to Lim and Lee (2008), the following steps were conducting the pilot test and the test to measure the validity and reliability of the MSES-HS in a small and large number of subjects. The pilot test involved a sample of 45 respondents and asked them to complete the MSES-HS by one week. Finally, the researchers administered the main test involving 759 respondents, which they had to finish within two weeks.

2.4. Data Analysis

The interrater agreement procedure was utilized to determine items of MSES-HS. When both validators agreed to an item, it would be a valid item, and vice versa, the item would be reviewed by the researchers based on their comments and suggestions. The item might be deleted or revised. In addition to the construct validity analysis, practicality data of the scale gathered from the student questionnaire was analyzed by calculating the given scores of each aspect. Mean scores ≤ 4.0 indicated the scale had good practicality. Lastly, the researchers also included an analysis of respondents' answers in the practicality test. Designedly engaging a small number of respondents (9 students) in the practicality test, the researchers utilized Rho of Spearman to analyze the validity and reliability of the scale. In continuance of the first step of data analysis, in the second step, the researchers analyzed the validity and reliability of MSES-HS by referring to Cohen & Swerdlik (2017), Gall et al. (2003), and Howitt & Cramer (2017). In determining the scale validity of the pilot and the main test, the study employed Pearson's r formula, whereas for measuring its reliabilities, it utilized Cronbach's alpha. For analyzing all computerized data of the measure, the researchers used SPSS software version 28.0.

3. Results and Discussion

The main emphasis of the current study was on designing and validating the scale to measure the multicultural self-efficacy of high school students (MSES-HS). It had been working accordingly. In the design phase, the study selected cultural insight, communication, cultural value, cultural awareness, and flexibility as subscales based on reviewing the literature, particularly Yosef et al. (2020). Different from this particular reference, the current scale resulted in 40 items, of which eight items for each subscale. The scale had A 0-10 response format, ranging from 0 (cannot do at all) to 10 (highly certain can do), allowing the respondents to express their responses more freely than a Likert-style response. In addition, MSES-HS had a manual for guiding the high school counselor in using it. The manual described the rationale of the scale, goals, measurement aspects, characteristics, validity and reliability, instruction, informed consent, the scale, scoring procedure, and reporting of the assessment results.

After completing MSES-HS and its manual, two assigned validators judged its construct validity. They considered 7 out of 40 items were not favorable and suggested reformulating be more measurable. They were item number 20, 21, 24, 30, 31, 32, 37. Their judgment encompassed the redundancy of items, clearness of item sentences, incomplete sentences, and chosen diction. Revision of the items worked out accordingly to meet the suggestion. In addition, the reviewers examined the manual of the MSES-HS, pertaining aspects of content (8 items), display (4 items), and language (3 items).

Both reviewers agreed with the completeness of the manual, which had all aspects required in the instrument manual. Their decision indicates that the manual had an introduction that informs the rationale, the goal of the instrument, construct, characteristics, indicators, number of items set orderly, a letter of informed consent, direction to fill out scoring methods, and spent time to fill out. It also had an appropriate display in terms of size manual, lovely cover, and readable text size. For the language aspect, the manual considered using the standard Bahasa and was readable for high school students. Instead of the completeness of the manual, they also gave some suggestions to enhance it, for instance, giving examples of how to fill out the scale and identifying some uncommon words. They were followed up by adding some examples and replace with common words.

The results of the practicality test revealed that the MSES-HS fulfilled an easiness of use. The respondents scored it 4.25 out of 5 on average. However, in terms of validity, 13 items had a validity coefficient below the requirement for four subscales, except the communication subscale. The flexibility subscale had the most items below the rho value of Spearman. Only 2 of 8 items had high correlation coefficients in Spearman's rho. Since the practicality test only explored the possibility of validity and reliability values, mainly to identify the weakness of the items,

those items below the rho value was revised. In addition, respondents noted several items to reconsider since they might perceive the meaning of the items as unclear, especially on unfamiliarity dictions. They were items 2, 3, and 8 of cultural insight, item 23 of cultural values, items 27 and 28 of cultural awareness, and items 37 and 39 of flexibility. Rewriting these items was completed before doing the pilot test. The final number of the items of MSES-HS was still 40.

Continuing the practicality test step, the pilot and the main test of the MSES-HS took place orderly. The first test involved 45 high school students selected from the three cities. On this trial, they filled out the online scale and returned after completing it by a week. Data from the pilot test were analyzed to determine the validity and reliability values. Only items that met the requirement finally became part of the scale. Meanwhile, in the second test, 759 selected students from 6 public high schools participated and returned the scale for one month. Tables 2, 3, and 4 displayed the statistical data of the pilot test and the main test.

Concerning the pilot test of MSES-HS, the results found a slight difference between the pilot test and the main test validity coefficient. However, the study reduced four items due to the validity coefficient according to Pearson's r below the requirement. The validity coefficient range of the subscales after the test was .70 - .89 indicating that MSES-HS was feasible for measuring students' multicultural self-efficacy. Meanwhile, the inter-subscale correlation matrix displayed in Table 4, suggested correlation coefficient among subscales of the MSES-HS was .492 - .755. These values surpassed the critical value of .30 ($p < .05$) indicating that MSES-HS fulfilled the reliability requirement of the instrument.

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation, Item Validity of Scale, and Item Validity of Subscale MSES-HS in the Scale and Subscales in Main Test (N=759)

Items of each subscale	Mean	SD	Validity of the Scale (Pearson's r)	Validity of Subscale (Pearson's r)
A. Cultural Insight				
1. Introduce your cultural customs to peers.	7.383	2.620	.586**	.720**
2. Be familiar with the uniqueness of other cultures.	7.834	2.223	.595**	.736**
3. Learn about other cultures through a relationship with peers.	7.942	2.167	.634**	.735**
4. Identify factors relating to cultural differences.	7.323	2.277	.641**	.769**
5. Discuss cultural tradition differences with other students openly.	7.371	2.554	.645**	.755**
6. Understand that culture can change over time.	7.710	2.273	.611**	.709**
7. Recognize the effects of contrasting one's own culture with other cultures.	7.322	2.773	.522**	.618**
8. Perceive cultural differences as a reality of life.	7.558	2.396	.584**	.665**
B. Communication				
9. Recognize speech that can belittle other cultures.	6.180	3.234	.413**	.659**
10. Converse with interspersed words in the local language.	6.918	2.692	.506**	.718**
11. Avoid gestures that lead to misunderstanding.	7.709	2.444	.581**	.687**

12. Use knowledge of other cultures to help deliver messages.	7.729	2.133	.682**	.708**
13. Avoid using words that can lead to misunderstanding.	8.445	2.012	.594**	.602**
14. Use dialect of peer local language.	6.329	2.613	.483**	.649**
C. Cultural values				
15. Remember well the cultural uniqueness of all group members.	7.795	2.007	.699**	.779**
16. Identify the similarities between own and group members' cultural values.	7.578	2.170	.714**	.805**
17. Be aware of customs in one's own culture that may offend other group members.	7.526	2.486	.662**	.731**
18. Capture the importance of cultural values often conveyed by group members.	8.012	1.911	.771**	.847**
19. Know the different traditions of each group member.	7.889	1.996	.723**	.814**
20. Avoids judging group member behavior based on one's cultural measures.	7.889	2.278	.602**	.700**
21. Accept the politeness of group members in speaking according to their culture gracefully.	8.610	1.763	.653**	.710**
D. Cultural awareness				
22. Respect their less-than-favorable customs.	8.312	2.081	.568**	.676**
23. Show a positive attitude towards their cultural advantages.	8.679	1.691	.672**	.716**
24. Always have a good attitude towards their culture.	8.588	1.842	.576**	.662**
25. Convey their cultural shortcomings openly.	6.806	2.785	.510**	.650**
26. Expresses the attractiveness of the culture eagerly.	8.095	1.944	.731**	.763**
27. State frankly the influence of one's culture in treating people of other cultures.	7.046	2.487	.569**	.699**
28. Accept criticism of one's tradition calmly.	8.082	2.051	.564**	.695**
29. Encourage others to preserve their own culture.	8.244	1.967	.673**	.693**
E. Flexibility				
30. Take the initiative to get to know other students first.	7.946	2.281	.627**	.799**
31. Build togetherness with other students.	8.379	1.942	.648**	.852**
32. Mingle with other students without feeling awkward.	7.714	2.389	.547**	.775**
33. Accept other cultural perspectives in dealing with conflicts with peers.	8.130	1.930	.699**	.768**

34. Take part in any cultural preservation activities.	7.750	2.119	.674**	.775**
35. Take lessons from the positive side of other cultures in overcoming adversity.	8.445	1.844	.688**	.770**
36. Work together regardless of cultural differences.	8.754	2.000	.484**	.585**

Pearson Correlation** $p < .001$

Table 3: Cronbach's α of MSES-HS by Subscales and Scale

Subscale	Practicality Test (N=9; N of Item=40)	Pilot Test (N=45; N of Item=40)	Main Test (N=559; N of Item=36)
Cultural Insight	.924	.816	.859
Communication	.884	.267	.745
Cultural value	.961	.850	.881
Cultural awareness	.926	.871	.837
Flexibility	.894	.848	.878
Full Scale	.976	.862	.954

Table 4. Subscale Inter-correlation of Main Test

	Cultural Insight	Communication	Cultural value	Cultural awareness	Flexibility	Total
Cultural Insight	-	.649**	.706**	.646**	.606**	.864**
Communication		-	.650**	.616**	.492**	.792**
Cultural value			-	.755**	.694**	.894**
Cultural awareness				-	.699**	.874**
Flexibility					-	.819**
Total						-

Pearson Correlation** $p < .001$

Reflecting its development in the design stage, MSES-HS has five subscales, each consisting of 8 items that meet practical requirements, so there is no obstacle to trying it with a large number of respondents. The level of its practicality is closed to Bandura's (2006) guide for construction self-efficacy, as he recommended utilizing a 0-100 scale in constructing self-efficacy assessment. Meanwhile, other researchers preferred to use a Likert-type scale response format, such as 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) (Dullas, 2018; Panc et al., 2021), or used a 0-10 scale response to give respondents more choices (Bijl & Shortridge-Bagget, 2001).

Test of each subscale validity found that MSES-HS reached .70 - .89 of Pearson's r . Meanwhile, its reliability value was .98 in Cronbach's α . These results prove the MSES-HS has good validity and excellent reliability and thus can be used to assess student multicultural self-efficacy in high school. The validity value of MSES-HS based on Pearson's r critical value is at a moderate level ($r_{xy} = .70$). Referring to Jackson (2009), one of the functions of correlation is for an individual prediction of a phenomenon, and the correlation coefficient below .30 had a less predictive value. With a validity coefficient of .70, in the range of .60-.80 for its subscales, all items of the scale are coherent. In other words, the MSES-HS has an acceptable validity value. Referring to Christensen et al. (2014), this value is meaningful because to reach it, the samples involved in the study are large enough ($n > 100$). The research finding concludes that this scale is valuable for school counselors to plan basic service, responsive service, or individual planning programs in guidance and counseling services.

In addition to the validity test, a requirement that should meet a measurement instrument is reliability (Taherdoost, 2016). Testing for the reliability of MSES-HS is critical to proving the degree to which separate items on the measuring scale are related to each other consistently. The results of the main test, involving 759 students, showed that the MSES-HS' reliability value reaches .98 ($\geq .90$, Cronbach's α). For comparison, there are several methods

to test reliability, such as test and retest reliability, split-half reliability, reliability by Cronbach's α , and reliability by Kuder-Richardson (Livingston, 2018). This study chooses Cronbach's alpha internal consistency approach because it involves a modesty procedure, but the level of accuracy remains high. The use of Cronbach's α is theoretically permitted to determine the internal complexity value of scale-shaped instruments such as MSES-HS. The number of items 36 has the advantage in achieving the desired magnitude of reliability. Moreover, some authors argue that a convincing level of reliability falls in alpha values of .90 to .95. In this alpha scale, the items of an instrument are in a very high correlation. In order to test reliability more precisely, inter-subscale correlation needs to calculate. As displayed in Table 4, the coefficient correlation among subscales yields between .375 - .864. In this value, the MSES-HS confidently performs a measuring requirement, although Lyons-Thomas (2014) reminds us that utilizing strong correlation may not be suitable for the intention of the scale since if there are separate subscales, to begin with, the purpose would be to measure separated constructs.

In several instrument development studies, an instrument should meet validity and reliability requirements. Specifically, according to Taherdoost (2016), testing the questionnaire's validity and reliability before being used for collecting data in research is unavoidable. The testing may encompass several validity types, such as face, content, construct, or criterion validity. Some types of validities are mandatory, and others are advisory. In addition to the validity test, the reliability test was considered mandatory. Since they provide the relationship among items and the whole items, construct validity and reliability internal consistency tests are mandatory. Furthermore, for its practicality, the scale should fulfill additional requirements, such as accessibility, readability, and duration of response. All of the completed tests prove that MSES-HS meets such criteria.

Referring to the self-efficacy of Bandura (1977) and related studies, such as Davis-Kean et al. (2008), Ouweneel et al. (2013), and Isa et al. (2019), analogically, multicultural self-efficacy may be dissimilar to individual's actual ability, but rather his belief of what he can do in given multicultural circumstances. MSES-HS is a type of self-report questionnaire intended to assess beliefs. Theoretically, this type of instrument can be used to collect any information. It helps the researcher in obtaining quick or easy, cheap, and efficient means of collecting a large amount of information from a large sample of respondents (Demetriou et al., 2015; Etikan & Bala, 2017). In the current era, using a questionnaire in online surveys has some advantages. In their review, Durga (2019) found some of its strengths. As proved by this study, MSES-HS enables to obtain information from large students anywhere in a relatively short period of time as long as an internet connection is available. In other words, an online questionnaire has no time limit and gives more chances to respondents to complete it quickly and truthfully.

An instrument for measuring multicultural self-efficacy is ideally applied across cultures in similar settings by referencing its required criteria. Statistically, MSES-HS meets the practicality, validity, and reliability criteria. Nevertheless, the designing and validating process of the scale still has some limitations. Despite many respondents participating in the study, namely 851 students, most respondents are students who come from the western part of Indonesia. In the meantime, high school students in the middle and eastern parts of Indonesia are less participated, even though there was a good intention from the principals and school counselors to participate in the study. These results certainly have given a slightly comprehensive picture of the scale represented by students of such a limited region.

For these limitations, several suggestions need consideration. First, the incoming research may reach more schools and diverse students, so the conclusion of the scale's validity and reliability will be more confident. They have to include representative students from all regions of Indonesia, currently consisting of 33 provinces. Because the current study only involves students of public high schools, to be more representative, future research may ask private high school students since their numbers are comparable to that of public high schools. By involving more diverse students, the generalization of MSES-HS as an instrument will be solid. Second, considering the number of items in the current scale, further research may reduce them so that this scale will become more practical without decreasing its validity and reliability.

4. Conclusion

Some conclusions are apparent from the findings of the current study. MSES-HS has the proper design to measure the multicultural self-efficacy of high school students. Its five subscales, namely cultural insight, communication, cultural values, cultural awareness, and flexibility, represent necessary indicators for measuring efficacy. Next, based on the rigorous analysis, MSES-HS is considered to have good construct validity judged by reviewers. The 36 items of the scale meet the construct validity. It also has practicality value in which it potentially can be used by school counselors to measure students' multicultural self-efficacy accordingly without difficulty. Since MSES-HS meets the practicality, validity, and reliability criteria, as a practical implication, it can be used by school counselors to measure multicultural self-efficacy for designed purposes.

References

- Altugan, A. S. (2015). The effect of cultural identity on learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 190(November 2014), 455–458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.05.025>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward unifying of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1977PR.pdf>
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy Mechanism in human agency. In *American Psychologist* (Vol. 37, Issue 2, pp. 122–147).
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307–337). Information Age Publishing.
- Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.87>
- Banks, J. A. (2014). Multicultural education and global citizen. In Benet-Martínez & Ying-Yi Hong (Eds.), *Multicultural Education and Global Citizen* (p. 561). Oxford Library of Psychology.
- Bijl, J. Van der, & Shortridge-Bagget, L. (2001). Self-efficacy theory and measurement. *Research and Theory for Nursing Practice*, 15(3), 189–207. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/11490001_The_theory_and_measurement_of_the_self-efficacy_construct
- Bishop, A. (1994). Cultural Conflicts in Mathematics Education: Developing a Research Agenda. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 14(2), 15–18.
- Chao, M. M., Okazaki, S., & Hong, Y. (2011). *The quest for multicultural competence: Challenges and lessons learned from clinical and organizational*. 5, 263–274.
- Chiu, C. Y., Matsumoto, D., & Ward, C. (2013). *Cross-cultural competence: Theory, research, and application*. February 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113493716>
- Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B., & Turner, L. A. (2014). *Research methods, design, and analysis* (12th ed.). Pearson. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/research-methods-design-and-analysis-d192711779.html>
- Convertino, C., Levinson, B. A., & Gonzalez, N. (2013). Culture, teaching, and learning. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives* (8th ed., pp. 25–42). Wiley.
- Davis-Kean, P. E., Huesmann, L. R., Jager, J., Collins, W. A., Bates, J. E., & Lansford, J. E. (2008). Changes in the relation of self-efficacy beliefs and behaviors across development. *Child Development*, 79(5), 1257–1269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01187.x>
- Delors, J. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000109590>
- Demetriou, C., Uzun, B., & Essau, C. A. (2015). *Self-report questionnaires*. 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118625392.wbecp507>
- Diaz-Leon, E. (2013). *What Is social construction ?* 1137–1152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejop.12033>
- Dullas, A. R. (2018). The development of academic self-efficacy scale for Filipino junior high school students. *Frontiers in Education*, 3(April), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00019>
- Durga, M. S., Nayak, P., & Narayan, K. A. (2019). *Strengths and weaknesses of online surveys*. August 2021. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2405053138>
- Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2017). *Developing questionnaire base on selection and designing*. 5(6), 219–221. <https://doi.org/10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00150>
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational Research_ An Introduction* (7th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
- Hansen-thomas, H., & Chennapragada, S. (2018). *Culture clash in the multicultural classroom: A case study from a newcomer school*. 11(4), 82–90. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n4p82>
- Harlacher, J. (2016). *An educator's guide to questionnaire development*. January. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED562653.pdf>
- Hays, D. G. (2013). *Assessment in counseling: A guide to the use of psychological assessment procedures* (5th

- ed.). American Counseling Association. www.counseling.org
- Hladík, J., Hrbá, K., & So, Ě. (2012). *Individual Importance of Multicultural Competence in relation to Components of Students' Self-regulated Learning*. 69(Icepsy), 341–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.419>
- Hong, Y.-Y., & Khei, M. (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Multicultural Identity* (V. Benet-Martinez & Y.-Y. Hong (eds.); 1st ed., p. 561). Oxford University Press.
- Howitt, D., & Cramer, D. (2017). *Research methods in psychology* (5th ed.). Pearson.
- Hughey, J. R. (2011). Meeting the needs of diverse students: enhancing school counselors' experiences. *Educational Considerations*, 38(2), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.113>
- Isa, T., Ueda, Y., Nakamura, R., Misu, S., & Ono, R. (2019). Relationship between the intention–behavior gap and self-efficacy for physical activity during childhood. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 23(1), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367493518777297>
- Kang, H., & Chang, B. (2016). *Examining culture's impact on the learning behaviors of international students from confucius culture studying in western online learning context*. 6(3), 779–797. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022104268386>
- Lalonde, R. N., & Hynie, M. (2004). *The role of culture in interpersonal relationships: Do second generation south Asian Canadians want a traditional partner?* 35(5), 503–524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022104268386>
- Lee, D.-G., & Lim, H.-W. (2008). Scale Construction. In P. P. Heppner, D. M. Kivlighan, & B. E. Wampold (Eds.), *Research Design in Counseling* (3th ed., pp. 494–510). Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Lehman, C. L. (2017). *Multicultural Competence: A Literature Review Supporting Focused Training for Preservice Teachers Teaching Diverse Students*. 8(10), 109–116.
- Livingston, S. A. (2018). Test Reliability - Basic Concepts. In *Research Memorandum ETS RM-18-01* (Issue January). <https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RM-18-01.pdf>
- Lyons-Thomas, J. (2014). Mode, central tendency of distribution. In *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* (pp. 3352–3353). Springer. <https://www.pdfdrive.com/encyclopedia-of-quality-of-life-and-well-being-research-d166601954.html>
- Manning, M. L. E. E. (2016). Havighurst's developmental tasks, young adolescents, and diversity. *The Clearing House*, 76(2), 75–78. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30189796>
- Mulya, T. W., Aditomo, A., & Suryani, A. (2021). On being a religiously tolerant Muslim : discursive contestations among pre-service teachers in contemporary Indonesia. *British Journal of Religious Education*. [http://repository.ubaya.ac.id/39333/1/proof%2099%25 - On being a religiously tolerant Muslim.pdf](http://repository.ubaya.ac.id/39333/1/proof%2099%25%20-%20On%20being%20a%20religiously%20tolerant%20Muslim.pdf)
- Myrick, R. D. (2011). *Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach* (5th ed.). Educational Media Corporation.
- Oettingen, G. (1995). Cross-cultural Perspective on Self-Efficacy. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies* (p. 351). Cambridge University Press.
- Ouweneel, E., Schaufeli, W. B., & Le Blanc, P. M. (2013). Believe, and you will achieve: Changes over time in self-efficacy, engagement, and performance. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 5(2), 225–247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12008>
- Panc, T., Mihalea, A., & Panc, I. (2021). Self-efficacy survey: A new assessment tool. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 33, 880–884. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.01.248>
- Rateau, P., & Moliner, P. (2012). *Social Representation Theory*. January. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249222.n50>
- Reitz, J. G., Raymond, B., Dion, D. K. K., & Dion, K. L. (2009). *The Oxford handbook of multicultural identity*. Springer.
- Sengstock, M. C. (2001). Multicultural Families — What Makes Them Work ? *Sociological Practice*, 3(1), 1–17. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43735781>
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2013). *About the Authors Section One : The Multiple Dimensions of Multicultural Counseling and Therapy Part I : The Affective and Conceptual Dimensions of Multicultural Counseling / Therapy Chapter 1 : The Multicultural Journey to Cultural* (6th ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument; How to validity and reliability of the research instrument; How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 5(3), 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205040>
- UNICEF. (2021). *Adolescent education and skills Adolescents*. UNICEF. <https://www.unicef.org/education/skills-development>
- Want, K. M. (2013). Intermarried Couples and “Multiculturalism” in Japan. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 15(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2216>
- Wibowo, A. M. (2018). Multiculturalism of Muslim Students in Yogyakarta. *Edukasi: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Agama Dan Keagamaan*, 16(1), 2018. <http://jurnaledukasikemenag.org>
- Yilmaz, F. (2016). Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education : A Case Study of Teacher Candidates' Perceptions Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education : A Case study of Teacher Candidates'

- Perceptions. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1172394>
- Yosef, Rozzaqyah, F., & Sucipto, S. D. (2020). *Multicultural Self-Efficacy Scale for Students Majoring in Guidance and Counseling* (p. 6). P.T. Bening.
- Zhao, Y. (2007). Cultural Conflicts in an Intercultural Classroom Discourse and Interpretations from a Cultural Perspective. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, XVI(1), 129–136.