JOURNAL OF GOVERNANCE AND LAW REFORM
YEARS 2026, VOLUME 01, NOMOR 04
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64670/jpgs.v1i4.148

CATALIST JOURNAL
PUBLISHER

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Self-Efficacy as a Psychological Resource in Community Corrections: A Public Administration Perspective from West Kalimantan, Indonesia

Mujib[1], Wahyu Saefudin [2], Kasdi Tri Aryada[3]; Martoyo[4], Tri Meliana[5], Mohammad Adlan Ali Arifin[6]

[1,3] Politeknik Negeri Pontianak, Indonesia; [2]Flinders University, Australia; [4] Universitas Tanjungpura, Indonesia; [5]Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia; [6]Ide Publishing

ABSTRACT

Self-efficacy is a psychological construct that may provide useful information for understanding how public employees perceive their capabilities in performing professional tasks. In community corrections, personnel undertake responsibilities that require professional judgment, interaction with clients, and the application of knowledge across different work situations. This study describes the self-efficacy profiles of Community Corrections Officers (Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan) in West Kalimantan, Indonesia, and discusses their implications for public-sector human resource development. The study employed a descriptive quantitative approach using survey data collected in 2021 from 42 officers. The analysis examined 19 questionnaire items grouped into three dimensions of self-efficacy: magnitude, generality, and strength. Descriptive statistics and hypothetical-score categorization were used to summarize the respondents' profiles. The overall self-efficacy score had a mean of 58.79 (SD = 7.36), with observed scores ranging from 41 to 76. At the dimension level, magnitude had the highest mean per item (3.19), followed by strength (3.07) and generality (2.99), on a four-point scale. Based on the hypothetical-score criteria, 81.0% of respondents were classified in the high category for magnitude, 64.3% for generality, and 59.5% for strength. No respondents were classified in the low category for any dimension. These findings provide a descriptive profile of perceived capabilities within the study sample. From a public administration perspective, the results suggest that dimension-level self-efficacy information may contribute to workforce development planning when considered alongside competency assessments, organizational conditions, and supervisory feedback. The study does not establish causal relationships between self-efficacy and job performance. Its contribution lies in providing context-specific evidence from community corrections in West Kalimantan and identifying directions for further research on psychological resources in public-sector personnel management.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received: 30 September2026
Revised : 10 October 2026
Accepted: 19 October 2026

KEYWORDS
Self-Efficacy; Community Corrections Officers; Public Administration; Human Resource Development; Indonesia

CORRESPONDENCE
Nama: Mujib
Email: mujibmargono@polnep.ac.id
No Hp: 083844155666

1. Introduction

Public administration depends not only on formal structures, regulations, and technical competencies but also on the capabilities that public employees believe they can mobilise when performing their duties. Public-sector work often requires employees to exercise professional judgment, respond to changing circumstances, and sustain their efforts when tasks become difficult. Understanding employees' perceived capabilities may therefore contribute to a broader understanding of public-sector human resource management. However, psychological characteristics should be considered alongside organisational resources, working conditions, and formal competency requirements, not as substitutes for them. Research on public-sector motivation and organisational behaviour has emphasised the importance of considering the relationship between individual resources and the demands of public service (Bakker, 2015; de Geus et al., 2020).

One psychological construct relevant to this discussion is self-efficacy. Bandura (1997), defined self-efficacy as individuals' beliefs about their ability to organise and execute the actions required to achieve particular performances. These beliefs shape how individuals approach tasks, mobilise effort, and respond to obstacles. Nevertheless, self-efficacy is not equivalent to actual competence or demonstrated

performance. An individual may believe that they can perform a task without necessarily possessing all the skills or resources required to perform it effectively. Conversely, an individual may have relevant knowledge and skills yet feel uncertain about applying them in a particular situation. Self-efficacy should therefore be understood as a perception of capability rather than a direct measure of professional effectiveness.

Bandura's theoretical framework offers three dimensions for examining self-efficacy: magnitude, generality, and strength. Magnitude concerns the level of task difficulty an individual believes they can manage. Generality concerns how widely efficacy beliefs extend across activities or situations. Strength concerns how firmly individuals hold those beliefs, particularly when they encounter difficulties or setbacks (Bandura, 1997, 2006; Bandura et al., 1999). Examining these dimensions separately may provide a more differentiated description of perceived capability than relying exclusively on an aggregate score. A person may, for example, express relatively strong beliefs about handling tasks of varying difficulty but less consistent beliefs about applying those capabilities across different situations.

These dimensions matter in public services that involve direct engagement with individuals and communities. In Indonesia, Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan undertake responsibilities associated with social inquiry, assistance, guidance, and supervision of correctional clients (Awibowo & Wibawa, 2023). Their work is situated at the intersection of public administration, rehabilitation, and community-based service delivery (Nugraha et al., 2021; Saefudin et al., 2021). It requires not only knowledge of formal procedures but also professional judgment in interactions with clients and other stakeholders (Idrus & Setiyadi, 2021). These responsibilities provide a relevant institutional context for examining how officers perceive their capabilities across different aspects of their work.

Research in correctional and community-supervision settings has begun to address the relevance of self-efficacy and related psychological or professional characteristics. For example, Miller et al. (2022), developed a self-efficacy index for correctional officer trainees using item response theory, illustrating the value of task-related measurement in correctional personnel research. Balzarini & Louden (2024), examined probation officers' perceptions of evidence-based practices and the relevance of role orientation, job satisfaction, confidence, and skill proficiency. Their findings underscore the importance of distinguishing officers' perceptions and professional characteristics when considering the implementation of evidence-based practices. These studies provide useful conceptual and contextual points of comparison, although their populations, instruments, and research questions differ from those of the present study.

Relevant research has also emerged in the Indonesian correctional context. Eliyana et al. (2024) reported survey data from 1,284 correctional officers across Indonesia, covering proactive work behaviour, perceived organisational support, person–environment fit, proactive personality, and role-breadth self-efficacy. Their work illustrates the relevance of examining individual psychological resources alongside organisational and behavioural factors in correctional human resource management. In the broader public-sector context, Sudewo & Defayani (2026), examined self-efficacy among Indonesian civil servants across generational and gender groups and discussed implications for more differentiated human resource development. Although these studies examine different populations and constructs, they show that self-efficacy remains relevant to current discussions of correctional personnel management and public-sector workforce development.

Despite these developments, the self-efficacy profiles of Community Corrections Officers in West Kalimantan warrant specific examination. Findings from correctional institutions, probation services in other countries, or civil servants more broadly cannot automatically be generalised to Indonesian community corrections personnel. Differences in occupational responsibilities, institutional settings, instruments, and working conditions may influence how self-efficacy is understood and measured (Bäcklander et al., 2021; Baernholdt et al., 2022; Peng et al., 2021). A context-specific description is

therefore a useful first step in examining the perceived capabilities of officers who perform community-based correctional functions.

This study is grounded in Bandura's self-efficacy theory, which conceptualises self-efficacy as individuals' beliefs in their capabilities to organise and execute actions required in specific situations (Bandura, 1997, 2006). The study applies the three dimensions of self-efficacy—magnitude, generality, and strength—to describe how Community Corrections Officers perceive their capabilities across different levels of task difficulty, situations, and degrees of confidence. The conceptual contribution lies in connecting this multidimensional psychological construct with public-sector human resource development in the specific institutional context of community corrections in West Kalimantan, Indonesia. Unlike studies focusing on correctional personnel in institutional settings or examining self-efficacy alongside broader organisational and behavioural variables, this study provides a descriptive account of the three dimensions among community-based correctional personnel. Its contribution is context-specific rather than the development of a new theory: it demonstrates how dimension-level self-efficacy profiles can inform further assessment and workforce development discussions, while recognising that perceived capability does not independently establish actual competence or job performance.

From a public administration perspective, self-efficacy can be considered a potential psychological resource relevant to workforce development. This perspective does not assume that self-efficacy independently determines job performance or that individual beliefs can compensate for inadequate training, unclear role expectations, insufficient resources, or unsupportive supervision. Instead, a self-efficacy profile may provide supplementary information on how personnel perceive their capabilities and identify questions that merit further assessment. This information may be useful when combined with professional competency assessments, supervisory observations, and evidence about organisational conditions.

The present study addresses this issue through a descriptive analysis of survey data collected in 2021 from Community Corrections Officers in West Kalimantan, Indonesia. The analysis examines 19 retained questionnaire items grouped into the magnitude, generality, and strength dimensions. It reports the overall self-efficacy score, compares dimension-level score patterns, and examines respondents' distribution across categories based on hypothetical-score criteria. The study does not test whether self-efficacy causes better performance or whether particular human resource interventions improve self-efficacy.

Accordingly, the study has three objectives. First, it describes respondents' self-efficacy profiles across the dimensions of magnitude, generality, and strength. Second, it compares the relative score patterns across these dimensions. Third, it discusses the implications of the observed profiles for public-sector workforce development in community corrections. By situating a multidimensional psychological construct within an Indonesian community-corrections setting, the study seeks to contribute context-specific evidence to discussions of psychological resources in public administration and public-sector human resource management.

2. Methodology

This study used a descriptive quantitative approach to describe the self-efficacy of Community Corrections Officers (Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan) in West Kalimantan, Indonesia. The analysis used survey data collected in 2021 from 42 respondents. It described respondents' overall self-efficacy and its three dimensions, magnitude, generality, and strength, without testing causal relationships or examining self-efficacy's effects on professional performance. This approach aligns with descriptive self-efficacy research that uses frequency distributions to characterise respondents' self-efficacy levels and dimensions (Mujib et al., 2024). Research on Community Corrections Officers has also examined work

performance using descriptive quantitative methods (Saefudin et al., 2020), and explored relationships among self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and performance (Saefudin et al., 2021).

We collected data using a 19-item questionnaire with a four-point response scale ranging from 1 to 4. The items were grouped into three dimensions: magnitude (items 1–7), generality (items 8–12), and strength (items 13–19). The questionnaire contained positively and negatively worded items. We reverse-scored negatively worded items before calculating overall and dimension-level scores, ensuring that higher scores consistently represented higher reported self-efficacy.

We analysed the data using descriptive statistics. We summarised overall self-efficacy scores using the mean, standard deviation, and observed score range. Dimension-level results were expressed as mean scores per item to facilitate descriptive comparison across dimensions with different numbers of items. Frequencies and percentages were also calculated to describe respondents' distribution across the low, moderate, and high categories for each dimension. These categories were established using hypothetical means and standard deviations based on the theoretical score ranges, following Azwar's (2012), and Bandura's (2012), categorisation approach.

The interpretation of the findings was guided by Bandura (1997, 2006) conceptualisation of self-efficacy. The analysis was descriptive and did not include inferential testing of differences between dimensions. The findings describe respondents' self-efficacy as reported at the time of data collection in 2021. They are not intended to establish causal relationships, measure objective professional competence, or represent current conditions among all Community Corrections Officers in West Kalimantan.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Overall Self-Efficacy Profile

The descriptive analysis included 42 respondents and 19 questionnaire items. The overall self-efficacy score had a mean of 58.79 and a standard deviation of 7.36. The observed scores ranged from 41 to 76, with a median of 57. The theoretical score range was 19–76.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the overall self-efficacy score

Statistic	Result
Number of respondents	42
Number of items	19
Theoretical minimum	19
Theoretical maximum	76
Mean	58.79
Standard deviation	7.36
Median	57
Observed minimum	41
Observed maximum	76

The results indicate that observed scores fell in the middle-to-upper range of the theoretical scale, although individual scores varied. The maximum observed score reached the theoretical maximum of 76, while the minimum observed score was 41. These descriptive statistics provide an overview of respondents' total scores but do not, by themselves, establish their professional competence or capacity to perform every aspect of their work.

3.2. Descriptive Statistics Across Self-Efficacy Dimensions

We examined the three dimensions separately because they have different item counts and conceptual meanings. Magnitude and strength each had seven items, whereas generality had five.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics by self-efficacy dimension

Statistic	Magnitude	Generality	Strength
Number of items	7	5	7
Mean dimension score	22.36	14.95	21.48
Standard deviation of dimension score	3.22	2.09	2.97
Observed minimum	14	10	16
Observed maximum	28	20	28
Mean per item	3.19	2.99	3.07
Standard deviation per item-scale average	0.46	0.42	0.42

We used the mean per item to compare the dimensions because generality had fewer items than the other two dimensions. Magnitude had the highest mean per item (3.19), followed by strength (3.07) and generality (2.99), on the four-point scale. These differences describe the sample's relative score patterns. They do not establish that the dimensions differ significantly unless a verified inferential analysis supports them. The results also do not indicate why respondents scored differently across dimensions.

3.3. Categorization of Self-Efficacy Dimensions

We categorised items using hypothetical means and standard deviations. For magnitude and strength, the theoretical score range was 7–28, giving a hypothetical mean of 17.5 and a hypothetical standard deviation of 3.5. For generality, the theoretical range was 5–20, giving a hypothetical mean of 12.5 and a hypothetical standard deviation of 2.5.

The resulting categories were low, moderate, and high. For magnitude and strength, scores of 7–13 were classified as low, 14–20 as moderate, and 21–28 as high. For generality, scores of 5–9 were classified as low, 10–14 as moderate, and 15–20 as high.

Table 3. Distribution of respondents by self-efficacy category

Dimension	Low, n (%)	Moderate, n (%)	High, n (%)	Total
Magnitude	0 (0.0%)	8 (19.0%)	34 (81.0%)	42
Generality	0 (0.0%)	15 (35.7%)	27 (64.3%)	42
Strength	0 (0.0%)	17 (40.5%)	25 (59.5%)	42

The high category was the most common category across all three dimensions. Magnitude had the largest proportion of respondents in the high category (81.0%; n = 34), while 19.0% (n = 8) were classified in the moderate category. No respondents were classified in the low category.

For generality, 64.3% (n = 27) of respondents were classified in the high category, while 35.7% (n = 15) were in the moderate category. For strength, 59.5% (n = 25) were classified in the high category and 40.5% (n = 17) in the moderate category. Strength therefore had the largest proportion of respondents in the moderate category.

These classifications represent the positions of observed scores relative to the theoretical score ranges and hypothetical-score criteria. They should not be interpreted as validated thresholds for professional performance, nor do they demonstrate that respondents in the moderate category have deficiencies in their work.

3.4. Summary of the Main Findings

Three main findings emerge from the descriptive analysis. First, the overall self-efficacy score had a mean of 58.79, with observed scores ranging from 41 to 76. Second, the mean per item was highest for magnitude, followed by strength and generality. Third, the high category predominated across all three dimensions, although its proportion was lower for strength than for magnitude and generality.

Together, these findings provide a differentiated description of the respondents' self-efficacy profiles. Their interpretation should remain within the limits of the sample, instrument, and descriptive design.

3.5. Interpreting the Self-Efficacy Profile

The findings provide a descriptive account of self-efficacy among 42 Community Corrections Officers in West Kalimantan. The overall mean of 58.79 falls within the theoretical range of 19–76, and the observed scores extend from 41 to the maximum theoretical score. This pattern indicates variation in respondents' reported self-efficacy rather than a uniform level across the sample.

The overall score should not be interpreted in isolation. Self-efficacy concerns beliefs about capability in relation to particular activities and circumstances, rather than a general guarantee of competence. Bandura (1997), framework emphasises that efficacy beliefs are linked to the tasks and contexts against which capability is judged. Accordingly, the dimension-level results provide additional information that would be obscured if the interpretation relied only on the total score.

This distinction matters in public administration because institutional environments shape personnel's opportunities to apply knowledge and skills. Individual beliefs may shape how employees approach professional responsibilities, but they do not diminish the importance of formal competencies, work procedures, supervision, and available resources. Bakker (2015), discussion of job demands and resources in public service similarly illustrates the importance of considering individual resources in relation to the wider work environment.

3.6. Differences Across Magnitude, Generality, and Strength

Magnitude had the highest mean per item (3.19), compared with 3.07 for strength and 2.99 for generality. The category distribution followed a similar pattern: 81.0% of respondents were classified in the high category for magnitude, compared with 64.3% for generality and 59.5% for strength.

Conceptually, the magnitude result suggests that respondents more frequently selected responses associated with the upper portion of the scale for items assigned to perceived capability across levels of task difficulty. However, the interpretation depends on the wording of the actual questionnaire items. Without examining the individual items, it would be premature to conclude that respondents are demonstrably more capable of managing difficult professional tasks.

Generality had the lowest mean per item (2.99), and 35.7% of respondents were classified in the moderate category. This distribution may warrant further examination of whether respondents perceive their capabilities consistently across the situations represented by the instrument. It does not establish that their capabilities fail to transfer across actual work settings, because that question would require item-level evidence or additional data concerning different task contexts.

Strength had the largest proportion of respondents in the moderate category (40.5%) and the smallest proportion in the high category (59.5%). This pattern may justify further examination of how respondents perceive their ability to sustain confidence when encountering difficulties. Nevertheless, it does not demonstrate low confidence, weak resilience, or inadequate professional performance. The moderate category reflects the theoretical score range used for this analysis, not a direct assessment of work behaviour (Balluerka et al., 2021; Otero et al., 2021; Wilmot & Ones, 2021).

These distinctions are consistent with the rationale for examining self-efficacy dimensions separately. For example, Miller et al. (2022) developed a task-relevant self-efficacy index for correctional officer

trainees, demonstrating the value of measures suited to specific correctional work contexts. Their instrument and population differ from those in the present study, so their findings should be treated as methodological context rather than direct validation of the present scale.

3.7. Comparison with Research on Correctional and Public-Sector Personnel

The present study adds a context-specific description to research examining psychological and professional characteristics among correctional personnel. Balzarini & Louden (2024), investigated how role orientation, job satisfaction, confidence, and skill proficiency related to probation officers' perceptions of evidence-based practices. Their study shows that multiple factors shape professional perceptions and that they should not be reduced to a single psychological measure. The present research differs because it describes self-efficacy dimensions rather than testing predictors of perceptions of evidence-based practices. Consequently, the two studies are complementary in topic but not directly equivalent in their findings.

Eliyana et al. (2024), examined survey data from 1,284 correctional officers across Indonesia, including role-breadth self-efficacy, perceived organisational support, person–environment fit, proactive personality, and proactive work behaviour. This work is especially relevant because it concerns correctional personnel in Indonesia and considers individual and organisational factors together. However, the population consists of correctional officers, and its constructs and research objectives differ from those of the present study. The larger sample and different measurement framework mean that its results cannot be used to validate or generalise the findings from 42 Community Corrections Officers in West Kalimantan.

At the broader public-sector level, Sudewo & Defayani (2026), examined self-efficacy among Indonesian civil servants across generational and gender groups. Their discussion of differentiated human resource development, mentoring, coaching, and varied work experiences provides a relevant contemporary perspective on self-efficacy in public organisations. Nevertheless, the present study does not examine demographic differences or test the effects of particular development approaches. The comparison therefore contributes conceptually: both studies situate self-efficacy within public-sector personnel management, but they address different populations and questions.

More broadly, de Geus et al. (2020), highlighted the importance of accounting for public-sector characteristics when studying employee behaviour in public organisations. This supports situating psychological constructs within their institutional contexts. For community corrections, the relevant context includes officers' specific responsibilities, the nature of their interactions with clients, and the organisational arrangements through which they perform their duties. The present findings provide an initial descriptive profile within that context, rather than a general explanation of employee behaviour across public organisations.

3.8. Implications for Public Administration and Human Resource Development

The findings offer a descriptive basis for considering self-efficacy within public-sector workforce development in community corrections. The relatively high proportion of respondents in the magnitude dimension (81.0%) suggests that most participants were classified in the high category for their perceived ability to address tasks at different levels of difficulty, according to the hypothetical-score criteria used in this study. By comparison, the strength dimension had the smallest proportion of respondents in the high category (59.5%) and the largest proportion in the moderate category (40.5%). Generality fell between these two dimensions, with 64.3% of respondents classified in the high category and 35.7% in the moderate category. These distributions indicate that the respondents' self-efficacy profiles were not entirely uniform across dimensions. However, interpret the categorical results as positions relative to the instrument's theoretical score ranges, not as direct evidence of professional competence, actual job performance, or deficiencies in particular work practices.

From a public administration perspective, self-efficacy profiles may serve as one source of information for workforce development planning. The comparatively larger share in the moderate category may justify further examination of how officers perceive their ability to maintain confidence when facing difficulties, setbacks, or demanding work situations. Nevertheless, this finding does not establish that respondents lack confidence in practice or that confidence-building training is necessarily required. Such conclusions would require closer examination of individual questionnaire items and corroborating evidence from competency assessments, supervisory observations, or officer interviews. Research on probation personnel indicates that confidence, role orientation, job satisfaction, and perceived skill proficiency can shape how officers view evidence-based practices (Balzarini & Louden, 2024). However, the present study did not measure these factors or test their relationships with self-efficacy.

Practically, workforce development should be informed by differentiated needs assessments rather than a single overall self-efficacy score (Drawbridge et al., 2021; Dugan et al., 2021; Madigan & Bonney, 2021). Where further assessment identifies relevant development needs, agencies could consider scenario-based learning, supervised practice, mentoring, structured feedback, and reflective supervision as possible development approaches. Treat these options as proposals for consideration, not as interventions whose effectiveness the present findings have demonstrated. Research on correctional officer self-efficacy has highlighted the value of task-relevant assessment for identifying potential areas for professional development (Desjardins et al., 2026; Koedijk et al., 2019). However, instruments developed for correctional officer trainees cannot automatically be transferred to community corrections personnel without appropriate validation (Miller et al., 2022).

The findings also reinforce the need to consider individual psychological resources alongside organisational conditions. Self-efficacy should not replace adequate training, clear role expectations, supportive supervision, sufficient work resources, and opportunities to apply professional knowledge (Calvert et al., 2020; Martínez-Díaz et al., 2021; Quratulain et al., 2021; Shapiro et al., 2021). Research involving correctional officers across Indonesia has examined role-breadth self-efficacy alongside perceived organisational support, person–environment fit, proactive personality, and proactive work behaviour, illustrating the relevance of considering individual and organisational factors together in correctional human resource management (Eliyana et al., 2024). Because that study concerns correctional institutions and a different set of constructs, it provides contextual support rather than direct confirmation of the present study's findings. Similarly, recent work on self-efficacy among Indonesian civil servants highlights the potential relevance of mentoring, coaching, and varied work experiences to public-sector human resource development (Sudewo & Defayani, 2026). These studies support further consideration of self-efficacy in public-sector personnel management. Still, they do not establish that any particular intervention will produce the same outcomes among the officers examined here.

Accordingly, self-efficacy assessment may be most useful when integrated into a broader workforce development process (Baernholdt et al., 2022;Tower et al., 2021). Agencies could combine dimension-level profiles with task-based competency assessments, training evaluations, supervisory feedback, and, where feasible, repeated measurements over time. This approach would help distinguish perceived capability from demonstrated competence and allow subsequent evaluation of whether development initiatives are associated with meaningful changes. Because the present study is descriptive, uses data collected in 2021, and includes 42 respondents from West Kalimantan, its findings should be used as context-specific evidence rather than a basis for generalising to all Indonesian community corrections personnel. The study therefore contributes an initial psychological profile relevant to public-sector workforce discussions, while leaving the effectiveness of specific human resource interventions and the relationship between self-efficacy and job performance for future investigation.

3.9. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings of this study, particularly regarding sample representativeness, the period of data collection, measurement procedures, and the descriptive nature of the analysis. Although the findings provide valuable insights into the self-efficacy of Community Corrections Officers, these limitations are important for understanding the scope and applicability of the results.

First, the study involved 42 respondents from West Kalimantan, Indonesia. The relatively small sample size and limited geographical coverage restrict the generalisability of the findings to the broader population of Community Corrections Officers in Indonesia. Officers working in different regions may experience variations in institutional support, professional responsibilities, workloads, and access to training opportunities, which could influence their perceptions of self-efficacy. Furthermore, the available documentation does not establish whether the sample adequately represents the wider professional population. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted as reflecting the perceptions of the participating respondents rather than the overall condition of Community Corrections Officers nationwide. Future studies involving larger and more geographically diverse samples could provide a stronger basis for comparative analysis.

Second, the data were collected in 2021, which presents a temporal limitation when interpreting the findings in 2026. The results describe respondents' self-efficacy perceptions during the original data collection period and should not be considered an assessment of current professional conditions. Organisational changes, professional development programmes, technological advancements, and adjustments in work responsibilities may have influenced officers' experiences and perceptions since the survey was conducted. However, the available data do not establish whether these developments occurred or affected self-efficacy. Updated empirical investigations are therefore necessary to determine whether the observed patterns remain relevant in more recent institutional contexts.

Third, the study relied on self-reported questionnaire responses, which primarily capture participants' subjective perceptions rather than directly measuring professional competence or actual workplace performance. Responses may be influenced by individual expectations, professional experiences, and social desirability, particularly when respondents perceive confidence as an expected professional attribute. Consequently, higher self-efficacy scores should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of stronger technical competence or better job performance. The accuracy of the findings also depends on the questionnaire's wording, scoring procedures, and evidence of validity and reliability. Complete documentation of instrument adaptation, including reverse-scoring procedures, should therefore be verified before publication. Future research could strengthen measurement quality by validating instruments specifically for Community Corrections Officers and integrating self-efficacy assessments with competency evaluations or supervisory observations.

Fourth, the study employed a descriptive research design and did not investigate causal relationships or evaluate the effectiveness of human resource development interventions. Differences in mean scores and category proportions should therefore not be interpreted as statistically significant without appropriate inferential analysis. Similarly, the findings cannot establish whether professional training, organisational support, or accumulated work experience directly influence self-efficacy. Future studies could employ comparative, longitudinal, or intervention-based designs to examine these relationships more systematically. Larger samples would also support more detailed item-level analyses and comparisons across institutional settings.

Finally, future research could benefit from combining quantitative self-efficacy measurements with qualitative interviews, workplace observations, and supervisory evaluations. Such approaches would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how Community Corrections Officers develop professional confidence and respond to workplace challenges. Longitudinal studies could examine changes in self-efficacy over time, while intervention-based research could assess whether training, mentoring, and continuing professional development are associated with improvements in perceived

capability. Importantly, future investigations should also determine whether changes in self-efficacy correspond to measurable improvements in professional competence, decision-making, and service delivery. These efforts could strengthen the empirical foundation for developing evidence-based human resource development strategies within Indonesia's community corrections system.

4. Conclusion

This study described self-efficacy among 42 Community Corrections Officers in West Kalimantan, Indonesia, using survey data collected in 2021. The overall self-efficacy score had a mean of 58.79 (SD = 7.36), with observed scores ranging from 41 to 76. At the dimension level, magnitude had the highest mean per item (3.19), followed by strength (3.07) and generality (2.99). Based on the hypothetical-score categorisation, the high category predominated across all three dimensions, with proportions of 81.0% for magnitude, 64.3% for generality, and 59.5% for strength. No respondents were classified in the low category.

The results provide a differentiated descriptive profile of perceived capabilities within the study sample. Magnitude had the largest proportion of respondents in the high category, whereas strength had the largest proportion in the moderate category. These patterns may help identify areas for further assessment, but they do not establish professional competence, actual job performance, or the need for a specific training intervention.

The study contributes context-specific evidence to discussions of self-efficacy in community corrections and its potential relevance to public-sector human resource development. In practice, workforce development planning may consider dimension-level self-efficacy information alongside competency assessments, supervisory feedback, and organisational conditions. Because the research is descriptive, geographically limited, and based on 2021 data, the findings should not be generalised beyond the available evidence. Future research should verify the instrument's measurement properties, examine broader samples, and investigate relationships among perceived capabilities, professional competencies, organisational support, and work outcomes.

Acknowledgment

The authors acknowledge the Community Corrections Officers who participated in the original survey. Any additional institutional acknowledgments, funding information, or statements concerning permission to reuse the data should be included after confirmation from the original research documentation.

Bibliography

Awibowo, A. D. A., & Wibawa, I. (2023). Peran Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan Dalam Pembimbingan Klien Kasus Tindak Pidana Narkotika Di Bapas Kelas Ii Pati. *JUSTITIA Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Humaniora*, *6*(1), 169. https://doi.org/10.31604/justitia.v6i1.169-176

Azwar, S. (2012). *Penyusunan Skala Psikologi* (edisi 2). Pustaka Pelajar.

Bäcklander, G., Fältén, R., Bodin Danielsson, C., Toivanen, S., & Richter, A. (2021). Development and Validation of a Multi-Dimensional Measure of Activity-Based Working Behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.655881

Baernholdt, M., Jones, T. L., Anusiewicz, C. V., Campbell, C. M., Montgomery, A., & Patrician, P. A. (2022). Development and Testing of the Quality Improvement Self-efficacy Inventory. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, *44*(2), 159–168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945921994158

Bakker, A. B. (2015). A Job Demands–Resources Approach to Public Service Motivation. *Public Administration Review*, *75*(5), 723–732. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12388

Balluerka, N., Gorostiaga, A., Rodríguez-López, A., & Aliri, J. (2021). Assessment of Personality in Basque Public Sector Employees and Its Role in Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Selection Processes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.787850

Balzarini, T. K., & Louden, J. E. (2024). What Factors Contribute to Differential Perceptions Toward Evidence-Based Practices? An Examination of Officer Role Orientation, Job Satisfaction, Confidence,

and Skill Proficiency. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *51*(5), 687–706. https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548241230085

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman and Company.

Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a Psychology of Human Agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *1*(2), 164–180. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x

Calvert, F. L., Deane, F. P., & Barrett, J. (2020). Improvements in psychologists' metacommunication self-efficacy, willingness, and skill following online training and a supervision exercise. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *76*(6), 1083–1100. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22889

de Geus, C. J. C., Ingrams, A., Tummers, L., & Pandey, S. K. (2020). Organizational Citizenship Behavior in the Public Sector: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Agenda. *Public Administration Review*, *80*(2), 259–270. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13141

Desjardins, A. C., Deschènes, A., & Maheux, J. (2026). *Self-Efficacy and Psychological Health at Work of Correctional Officers*. *20*(10), 2026.

Drawbridge, D. C., Truong, D., Nguyen, N. T., Lorenti, V. L., & Vincent, G. M. (2021). Risk–need–responsivity: Evaluating need-to-service matching with reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, maintenance. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *39*(1), 106–122. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2502

Dugan, A. G., Namazi, S., Cavallari, J. M., Rinker, R. D., Preston, J. C., Steele, V. L., & Cherniack, M. G. (2021). Participatory survey design of a workforce health needs assessment for correctional supervisors. In *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* (Vol. 64, Number 5, pp. 414–430). https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.23225

Eliyana, A., Sridadi, A. R., Yuwono, H., Yuspahruddin, A., Pratama, A. S., Hasib, F. F., & Kamil, N. L. M. (2024). Proactive work behavior and its antecedents: Survey data on correctional officers throughout Indonesia. *Data in Brief*, *53*, 110211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2024.110211

Idrus, A., & Setiyadi, B. (2021). The Effect of Self-Efficacy and Entrepreneurship on Managers' Professionalism and Performance in Jambi Community Learning Centers. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *34*(1), 31–53. https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.21341

Koedijk, M., Renden, P. G., Oudejans, R. R. D., & Hutter, R. I. (Vana). (2019). Training for the job: evaluation of a self-defence training programme for correctional officers. *Ergonomics*, *62*(12), 1585–1597. https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2019.1677947

Madigan, D., & Bonney, T. (2021). Reemployment Needs and Barriers of Users of Workforce Development Programs: A Mixed-Methods Study. *Workplace Health and Safety*, *69*(11), 494–505. https://doi.org/10.1177/21650799211016244

Martínez-Díaz, A., Mañas-Rodríguez, M. A., Díaz-Fúnez, P. A., & Aguilar-Parra, J. M. (2021). Leading the challenge: Leader support modifies the effect of role ambiguity on engagement and extra-role behaviors in public employees. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(16). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168408

Miller, W. T., Burton, A. L., Jonson, C. L., & Burton, V. S. (2022). The Creation of a Correctional Officer Trainee Self-Efficacy Index: An Application of Item Response Theory. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Research and Practice*, *22*(3), 285–306. https://doi.org/10.1080/24732850.2021.1973235

Mujib, M., Pratomo, T., Lestari, M., Jumadi, J., & Sriwiyanti, S. (2024). Efikasi Diri Mahasiswa Tingkat Akhir. *Economic and Education Journal (Ecoducation)*, *6*(3), 630–640. https://doi.org/10.33503/ecoducation.v6i3.776

Nugraha, B., Defi, I., Yolanda, R., Warliani, M., Biben, V., Jennie, J., Mubarak, H., Mayasari, N., & Gutenbrunner, C. (2021). Describing community-based rehabilitation services in Indonesia by using The International Classification of Service Organization in Rehabilitation 2.0. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, *53*(3), jrm00166. https://doi.org/10.2340/16501977-2804

Otero, I., Salgado, J. F., & Moscoso, S. (2021). Criterion Validity of Cognitive Reflection for Predicting Job Performance and Training Proficiency: A Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.668592

Peng, J., Zhang, J., Zhou, X., Wan, Z., Yuan, W., Gui, J., & Zhu, X. (2021). Validation of the Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale in a Sample of Chinese Employees. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.755134

Quratulain, S., Khan, A. K., Sabharwal, M., & Javed, B. (2021). Effect of Self-Efficacy and Instrumentality Beliefs on Training Implementation Behaviors: Testing the Moderating Effect of Organizational

Climate. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *41*(2), 250–273. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X19876676

Saefudin, W., Bestari, D. K. P., Aisyah, M., & Mujib, M. (2020). Analisis Kinerja Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan di Wilayah Kalimantan Barat. *Dinamika Administrasi*, *17*(1), 46–50.

Saefudin, W., Bestari, D. K. P., Aisyah, M., & Mujib, M. (2021). Pengaruh Efikasi Diri dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan di Wilayah Kalimantan Barat. *Dinamika Governance : Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.33005/jdg.v11i1.2516

Shapiro, C. J., Watson MacDonell, K., & Moran, M. (2021). Provider self-efficacy in delivering evidence-based psychosocial interventions: A scoping review. *Implementation Research and Practice*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2633489520988258

Sudewo, P. A., & Defayani, S. K. (2026). Analisis Efikasi Diri Aparatur Sipil Negara berdasarkan Perspektif Lintas Generasi dan Gender di Era Transformasi Birokrasi. *Jurnal Wacana Kinerja: Kajian Praktis-Akademis Kinerja Dan Administrasi Pelayanan Publik*, *29*(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.31845/jwk.v29i1.1036

Tower, C., Van Nostrand, E., Misra, R., & Barnett, D. J. (2021). Building Collective Efficacy to Support Public Health Workforce Development. *Journal of Public Health Management & Practice*, *27*(1), 55–61. https://doi.org/10.1097/PHH.0000000000000987

Wilmot, M. P., & Ones, D. S. (2021). Occupational Characteristics Moderate Personality–Performance Relations in Major Occupational Groups. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *2021*(1), 10126. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2021.10126abstract