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Abstract
The purpose of this study is to analyze the rule of self regulated learning method strategy and self efficacy to conceptual application as learning outcomes for second semester on Christian Religious Education students. Research subjects were 96 people divided into two groups namely the experiment and control groups. Data were obtained through Neil’s self-efficacy questionnaire and tests to measure the learning outcomes of conceptual application. Data analysis were done using two-way ANOVA. The results show that there are differences in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application between learning strategies (self regulated learning and teacher regulated learning) with different levels of self efficacy (high and low levels of self efficacy) (sig 0.001 <0.05). There is an interaction between learning strategies with self efficacy based to the learning outcomes of conceptual application (sig 0.003 <0.05). It can be concluded that self regulated learning method strategy and high self efficacy have better influence on the learning outcomes of students’ conceptual application.
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INTRODUCTION
The importance of the conceptual application as a form of basic mastery of students towards the lessons that have been delivered by educators, is also felt necessary for students of the second semester Christian Religious Education study program at the Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Ambon especially for learning theory courses. Considering that the second semester students are categorized as new students in the world of higher education, thus requiring the process of adjusting to the academic climate in tertiary institutions, one of which is a learning strategy. Learning strategies in higher education are different from learning strategies obtained in secondary schools, where teachers are more dominant than students, students are only listeners, that teachers have more role in regulating student learning, about when, where, what sources will be used until how the student is learning or teacher centered learning (TCL). According to VenkatRaoVishnumolakala et al., (2017) the dynamics of learning on TCL that occur tend to make students as recipients of information (passive recipients) without considering them to actively participate, thus making students lack independence in learning, lack of motivation to try, lack of ability to transfer knowledge possessed, lack of self-confidence in their own abilities, lack of ability to regulate themselves in learning, and also make them not ideal in developing thinking skills. Learning strategies at college students require them to be more active compared to lecturers. Students must be given the opportunity to arrange their own learning about when, where, what resources will be used to how to learn in higher education as a method of strategy. Learning strategies that are in line with the nature of learning in higher education are learning strategies that provide opportunities for students to organize themselves for learning or self-regulated learning that here and after will be referred to SRL. SRL is an activity in which individuals who learn actively, arrange, determine learning goals, plan and monitor, regulate and control cognition, motivational behavior and environment to achieve the goals set (Pintrich, 2000; Wolters et al., 2003). Some research results show that SRL strategies are very effective to be used as learning strategies to improve learning outcomes in understanding facts, concepts, principles and procedures. Meanwhile, conventional learning in higher education still use TCL in the course.

SRL strategies help students determine the first step to learning, provide their needs, set their learning goals, explore learning resources, manage time and environment, and apply them effectively to achieve satisfying learning outcomes (Zhu et al., 2016). Pauli (2007) investigated the effect of the SRL strategy in solving mathematical problems independently and Nurfiela (2012) reported SRL learning strategies affect learning outcomes. The same thing was also stated by Fasikhahand Fatimah (2013), that SRL method strategies can improve academic achievement (Sadi&Uyar, 2013).

In addition to learning strategies, one of the conditions for learning success is determined by the characteristics of students. According to Dicket al.(2001) states that, “Information about the group's general characteristics can be very helpful in planning instructions tailored to group needs”. Student characteristics are all backgrounds that are brought when present in class before learning begins. Reigeluth (2009) explains that optimal learning outcomes are strongly influenced by the application of learning procedures that consider the student's value system, methods, conditions (characteristics), materials and learning objectives. Therefore, lecturers in carrying out learning in class, need to pay attention to the method of subject characteristics and learning.
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objectives, and the condition of students. Self efficacy according to Bandura (1993) is a belief held by students about the ability in an effort to complete a task, about his perseverance, and also about his achievements. The results showed that students with high self efficacy had high academic achievement whereas students with low self efficacy had low performance (Wilson-Conrad & Kowalske, 2018). Self efficacy significantly improves learning outcomes.

There are three formulation of the problem based on the description above: 1) Is there a significant difference in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application between students who are taught with SRL method as learning strategy and students who are taught with TRL method as learning strategy? 2) Is there a difference in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application between students who have high self efficacy and low self efficacy? 3) Is there an interaction between learning strategies (SRL and TRL) with self efficacy levels on the learning outcomes of conceptual application?

The purpose of this study are: 1) to find out the significant difference in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application between students who are taught with SRL method as learning strategy and students who are taught with TRL method as learning strategy, 2) to find out the difference in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application between students who have high self efficacy and low self efficacy, and 3) to find out the interaction between learning strategies (SRL and TRL) with self efficacy levels on the learning outcomes of conceptual application.

THEORITICAL REVIEW

Conceptual Application

The conceptual application in Bloom's taxonomy is in the C3 cognitive domain, which uses or implements a particular procedure to work on probing problems or solving problems. Application or implementation of concepts is intended as the ability to use concepts in practice or new situations. Krathwohl and Anderson(2009), suggested that the application of concepts is the use of abstractions (ideas, principles, and theories) to solve new problems or problems in real life. The ability of this application requires students to use the principles or knowledge in solving problems.

Self Regulated Learning Method Strategy

Schunkand Zimmerman was the first to write about SRL method strategy (Panadero et al., 2017). There are several theoretical and perspective about SRL such as social cognitive theory, will theory and phenemology (Schunk&Zimmerman, 1998). SRL shows the ability of students to actively and deliberately set goals for their learning and to monitor, regulate, control and evaluate their cognition, behavior, motivation and environment to achieve their learning goals (Pintrich, 2000; Schunk&Zimmerman, 1998). Pintrich (2000) describes SRL as,”Active and constructive processes in which students set goals for their learning and then try to monitor, regulate, and control their cognition, motivation and behavior, and are guided and limited by appropriate contextual goals and features its environment.”

In the process of learning activation the conceptual application of SRL method strategy, there are several steps to guide proactive students learning using the Pintrich 2000 model, namely: 1) forethought, planning, and activation, 2) monitoring, 3) controlling, and 4) reaction and reflection. Based on the SRL steps proposed by Pintrich, the steps for a learning strategy based on SRL are made, as in the Table 1.

Table 1. Steps of SRL Method Strategy on Learning Theories Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Activities</td>
<td>SRL Strategy</td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminaries</td>
<td>Forethought, planning and activation</td>
<td>1. Listening and take notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>Presenting the learning goals.</td>
<td>2. Analyzing their study assignments based on the stated learning objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Determining their learning goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core activities</td>
<td>Monitoring and Controlling</td>
<td>4. Determining how the learning strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Monitoring students’ activities.</td>
<td>5. Searching actively for information with several sources, modules, internet, library, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Controlling students’ activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing activities</td>
<td>Reaction and Reflection</td>
<td>1. Monitoring progress in completing tasks, and monitoring the effectiveness of the strategies chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating the performance according to standards.</td>
<td>2. Monitoring the motivation to complete the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(In this step, lecturers can help students in problems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(In this steps, students can ask the lecturers or friends)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Efficacy

The term of self efficacy was first coined by Albert Bandura in 1977. Self efficacy is self-confidence or encounter in one's ability to carry out effectively determined tasks (Bandura, 1986, 1977). Self efficacy theory is considered one of the approaches of applying social learning theory or social cognitive theory. According to Betz & Hackett (1995) self efficacy has an important role in the belief in the ability of students in achieving success in achieving the tasks or behaviors that are expected. Self efficacy is a student's self-confidence and self-confidence in his own ability to do certain tasks effectively (Yeşilyurt et al., 2016).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses quasi-experimental research to test hypotheses to the causal relationships between variables (Degeng& Sudana, 1989: 13). The research design used was a 2 x 2 factorial design (Degeng& Sudana, 1989: 15; Setyosari, 2010: 180). The research design can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Factorial Design 2x2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Learning Strategies</th>
<th>Moderator Variable</th>
<th>Teacher Regulated Learning (TRL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Regulated Learning (SRL)</td>
<td>(A1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Annotation:
1. A1B1 Group: The learning outcomes of the conceptual application with learning strategies based on SRL method strategy and high self efficacy.
3. A2B1 Group: The learning outcomes of the conceptual application with learning strategies based on TRL method strategy and high self efficacy.

The subject of the study was the second semester students of the Christian Religious Education study program at the Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Ambon in the academic year 2017/2018, which consisted of 4 parallel classes (classes A, B, C, and D). Each class numbered 23 people so that the total number of 96 people, then divided into two groups namely the experimental group and the control group. The experimental class is class A and class B, while class C and class D are the control group. During the learning process, all students follow from the beginning of the learning activities to the end, both for the experimental class and the control class, thus the research subjects numbered 96 people. For more details about the research subjects can be seen in Table 3.

### Table 3. Research Subjects on Experiment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Experiment Class</th>
<th>Control Class</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instrument used in this study consisted of tests and questionnaires. The test form is multiple choice. Test instrument is used to measure the learning outcomes of the conceptual application. The number of questions used is 25 items with a score of 1 for the correct answer and a score of 0 for the wrong answer (dichotomy test). While the questionnaire is used to collect data related to self efficacy which refers to Neil (2008). The questionnaire consisted of 35 items, using a Likert scale with a range of 1 to 4. To classify research subjects based on high or low self efficacy, it was carried out by finding the median (median) using SPSS. The median value obtained was 104. Based on the midpoint, then research subjects who scored below 104 were grouped in research subjects with low self efficacy and research subjects who scored above 140 were grouped in research subjects with high self efficacy.

The data analyzed were divided into two, the first as a requirement for ANOVA analysis and the second as the main analysis to test the research hypothesis. For the prerequisite analysis in the form of data normality tests and homogeneity tests, data must be normal and homogeneous. Data normality test uses Kolmogorov-Smirnov and homogeneity variance test uses Levene's test. Test data normality and homogeneity to meet parametric assumptions as ANOVA test requirements. Data analysis to test the research hypothesis using two-way ANOVA statistical techniques with the SPSS program. And all parametric assumption tests were carried out at a significance value of 5%.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### Description on Pretest Results of Conceptual Application

Before holding the stages of research and giving treatment of learning strategies, pretest is conducted to students who will be involved in research to find out the initial abilities possessed by them related to the Learning Theory courses. Pretest results are presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest (Experiment Class)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td>4.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (Control Class)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65.48</td>
<td>4.247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that the average value of the conceptual application pretest results for the experimental class was 66.17, with a standard deviation of 4.276, meanwhile the average value obtained by the classroom was 65.48, with a standard deviation of 4.247. The pretest average value of the experiment class is higher than the control class.

#### Description on Self Efficacy

Self efficacy as a moderator variable is divided into two namely high self efficacy and low self efficacy. Table 5 presents the results of the measurement groups of research subjects based on learning strategies and self efficacy levels. The pattern on subjects amount is presented.

#### Table 5. Description on Research Subject of Learning Method Strategy and Self Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Self Efficacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRL method strategy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL method strategy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that self efficacy for the experiment class (using SRL method) and the control class (using TRL method). Students who have high self efficacy are 23 people and students who have low self efficacy are 23 people. Meanwhile control classes show the same results. Students who have high self efficacy are 23 people and who have low self efficacy are 23 people.

#### Description on Post-test Results of Conceptual Application

The learning outcomes of the conceptual application post-test results in this study were obtained after the group of research subjects received treatment with learning strategies based on SRL method strategy and TRL method strategy. The post-test results of the learning outcomes of the conceptual application are shown in Table 6 based on self efficacy levels.

#### Table 6. Post-test Results on Conceptual Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Strategy</th>
<th>Self Efficacy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRL method strategy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>76.52</td>
<td>4.261</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.26</td>
<td>7.620</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL method strategy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>74.43</td>
<td>5.492</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>62.61</td>
<td>4.283</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 shows the learning outcomes of the conceptual application on experiment classes (using SRL method strategy). The groups of students who have high self-efficacy are 23 people and the score obtained is an average value of 76.52, with a standard deviation of 4.261. The groups of students who have low self-efficacy are 23 people and the score obtained is an average value of 64.00, with a standard deviation of 5.492. Furthermore, Table 6 also shows the learning outcomes of the conceptual application obtained by the control class (using TRL method strategy). Students who have with high self-efficacy are 23 and the score obtained is an average value of 74.43, with a standard deviation of 5.942. Students who have low self-efficacy are 23 and the score obtained is an average value of 62.61, with a standard deviation of 4.283. Both groups of students have differences. The post-test results showed that there were significant differences in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application between experiment class (using SRL method strategy) and the control class (using TRL method strategy). Based on the post-test results, the average value of the learning outcomes of the concept application for the experimental class was 70.26 with a standard deviation of 7.620 and a control class of 68.52 with a standard deviation of 7.711. This shows that the average value of the experiment class is higher than the average value of the control class.

From the results of the post-test score the learning outcomes of the conceptual application, groups of students who have high self-efficacy get an average value of 75.48 with a standard deviation of 5.102, while the score of learning outcomes for the conceptual application for groups of students who have low self-efficacy get an average value of 63.90 with a standard deviation of 4.157. It can be said that the group of students who have high self-efficacy also have better learning outcomes of the conceptual application than the group of students who have low self-efficacy after treatment applied.

Prerequisite Analysis Test
To test the hypothesis proposed in this study, the variables studied were tested using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The independent variables in this study are learning strategies which are SRL method strategy and TRL method strategy. The moderator variable in this study is students’ self-efficacy levels (high and low categories). The dependent variable is this study is the learning outcomes of the conceptual application. All of the variables are tested using ANOVA (Analysis of Variance). Before analyzing the results data of the research using ANOVA, the prerequisite tests of ANOVA must be fulfilled. Those are normality test and homogeneity test.

Normality Test
Normality test is used to determine whether the data is normally distributed or not as one of the prerequisites for conducting two-way ANOVA analysis tests. The results of the post-test data normality test for the conceptual application is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Normality Test of Post-test Results on Conceptual Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Learning Strategies</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov*</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Learning</td>
<td>SRL</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of the Conceptual Application</td>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above the normality test results using Kolmogorov-Smirnov show that the significance value of the learning outcomes of the concept application for learning strategies based on self-regulated learning and teacher regulated learning is greater than 0.05 (0.54> 0.05, 0.14> 0, 05). This means that the learning outcomes of the application concept data are normally distributed.

Homogeneity Test
Homogeneity test to determine the homogeneity of variance score data on learning outcomes of application concepts using Levene’s test, the following homogeneity test results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Homogeneity Test of Post-test Results on Conceptual Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above the homogeneity test results show that the significance value for learning outcomes of application concepts for learning strategies based on self-regulated learning and teacher regulated learning is greater than 0.05 (0.8297> 0.05). This means that the data has a homogeneous variance matrix. After two of prerequisite test are fulfilled, the ANOVA test can be carried out.

Research Hypotheses Test
The research hypotheses in this study consist of three hypotheses which are:
1) Ho-1: there is no difference in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application in learning theory courses between students who are taught with SRL and students who are taught with TRL.
Ha-1: there is difference in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application in learning theory courses between students who are taught with SRL and students who are taught with TRL.

2) Ho-2: there is no difference in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application in learning theory courses between students who have high self-efficacy and students who have low self-efficacy.
Ha-2: there is difference in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application in learning theory courses between students who have high self-efficacy and students who have low self-efficacy.

3) Ho-3: there is no interaction between learning strategies and self-efficacy to the learning outcomes of the conceptual application.
Ha-3: there is interaction between learning strategies and self-efficacy to the learning outcomes of the conceptual application.
To test the hypothesis above, the ANOVA analysis results are presented in the form of an inter-subject effect test (Test of Between-subject Effects) in Table 9.
The results of the first hypothesis test based on the two way ANOVA test in Table 9 show that the calculated F value is 37.222 for the learning strategy and the significance value is 0.00. Significance value is smaller than 0.05 (0.00 <0.05). Thus the null hypothesis is rejected, this means that there are significant differences in the learning outcomes of application concepts between groups taught with SRL which is experiment class and groups taught with TRL which is control class.

The results of the second hypothesis test based on the two way ANOVA test in Table 9 show that the calculated F value is 155.431 and the significance value is 0.00. Significance value is smaller than 0.05 (0.00 <0.05). Thus the null hypothesis is rejected, this means that there are significant differences in the learning outcomes of conceptual application between groups that have high self efficacy and groups that have low self efficacy. This shows that students who have high self efficacy have better conceptual application than groups of students who have low self efficacy.

The third hypothesis is that there is an interaction between learning strategies and self efficacy towards the learning outcomes of the conceptual application. The ANOVA 2 path test results in Table 9 show that the calculated F value of 2.938 and a significance value of 0.05. Significance value is smaller than 0.05 (0.04 <0.05). Thus the null hypothesis is rejected, this means there is an interaction between learning strategies and self efficacy towards the learning outcomes of the conceptual application of the Learning Theory courses.

The difference between them is significant.

**DISCUSSION**

Based on the results of the hypothesis test, the first hypothesis in this study is: there is difference in the learning outcomes of the conceptual application in learning theory courses between students who are taught with SRL and students who are taught with TRL is accepted. This means that groups of students who use SRL get higher application learning outcomes compared to groups of students who use TRL.

The results of this study is supported by the results of Zhu, Au & Yates (2016) that helping students in self direction can determine the steps for learning and can improve learning outcomes if these steps applied effectively.

This is also supported by research by Fasikahah & Fatimah, (2013) that SRL method strategy improves learning achievement. This study found that in applying SRL, students use the ability of metacognition process of thinking so that they can make stages to help them learn(Flavel, 1976). These stages include forethought, planning and activation or the planning stage. The second stage is monitoring and controlling. The third stage is reaction and reflection. Pintrich (2000) states that behavior is a regulatory strategy that can help students plan their learning and evaluate so that it can improve learning achievement.

The results of the second hypothesis test showed that there were significant differences in the learning outcomes of application concepts between groups with high self efficacy and low self efficacy. The results of this study are supported by Bandura (1986) that students with high self efficacy will get good results whereas students with low self efficacy will get less learning results. Students with high self efficacy tend to have a high level of self confidence of their abilities and the belief encourages them to learn. The abilities are used to find sources of information to complete the given task. Meanwhile students with low self efficacy have low confidence in the abilities possessed yet their abilities to perform supporting arguments in solving problems and ideas are relatively small. Students with low self efficacy are not sure that they are able to get better learning outcomes. The results of this study support the results of research by Angola & Willson-Conrad and Kowalski (2018), high self efficacy has high academic achievement whereas students with low self efficacy have low performance. This is in line with what is found by individuals with low self efficacy will have negative thoughts and consider the task as a threat, thus setting low goals for themselves (Md & Ali, 2009), other research shows that self efficacy can improve learning outcomes (Yusuf, 2011; Motlagh et al., 2011; Ismail et al., 2005; Tamara & Kouteros, 2002).

The third hypothesis test results show that there is an interaction between learning strategies and students’ self efficacy. The results of this study are supported by Sharon Zumbrunn, (2011) that states SRL through self efficacy can result in higher academic performance and achievement. Also Sadi's & Uyar (2013) found that SRL and self efficacy can improve academic achievement.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results and discussion of the research in the previous section, it can be concluded that: 1) SRL method as learning strategy has a positive influence on the learning outcomes of the conceptual application during the process of theory courses learning. Thus it can be concluded that there are significant differences on the learning outcomes of the application concepts between students who were taught using TRL and SRL. It can be said that SRL method as learning strategy has a better and more positive influence on the learning outcomes of the conceptual application of Christian Religious Education learning theory than TRL method as learning strategy. 2) High self efficacy gives a positive influence on the learning outcomes of conceptual application of the learning theory. 3) There is an interaction between learning strategies and self efficacy to the learning outcomes of the conceptual application. Based on the brief conclusion, it can also be added that the SRL method as learning strategy and high self efficacy are very effective to conceptual application. For this reason, SRL method strategy is very appropriate to be applied in the learning process as an effort to improve the learning outcomes of the conceptual application by paying more attention to students’ self efficacy skills.
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