

Investigating Second Language Learner Self-Efficacy and Future Expectancy of Second Language Use for High Stakes Program Evaluation

by Greta Gorsuch, Texas Tech University and Dale T. Griffiee, Texas Tech University
greta.gorsuch@ttu.edu, dale.griffiee@ttu.edu

This presentation is being given in order to answer two questions:

1. How can faculty interest and buy-in be increased?
2. What must happen in order for learner self-efficacy to be established as a meaningful criteria in high-stakes evaluation of foreign language programs?

I. What was done

A. A survey ($n = 150$, $K = 47$)

1. U.S. undergraduate learners at the end of their required two years
2. Learners of Arabic, Arabic, Chinese (Mandarin), French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish
3. Items captured self-efficacy in foreign language use and future expectancy of foreign language use

Self-efficacy “is an ability construct...that refers to individuals’ beliefs about their capabilities to perform well” (Graham & Weiner, 1995, p. 74). Activities and tasks done in these classrooms may provide a platform for experience on which initial judgments of self-efficacy are necessarily centered, and then subsequently developed. *In other words, a measurement of self-efficacy may tell us the extent to which learners have sufficient practice and language use opportunities to achieve what teachers wish them to learn.*

B. An evaluation of program theory

Program Theory (Rogers, 2000) seeks to make explicit how program staff believe a program works to achieve outcomes.

1. Language as academic content
 - i. Learners memorize dialogs, verb declensions, vocabulary (learning *about* a language).
2. Language as language use
 - i. Learners get repeated, extensive experience engaging in language use tasks.
 - ii. Learners should be asked to create “a direct link between the strategies they have used and the learning outcome” (Graham, 2006, p. 306).

Our assumption was that if we could capture what faculty and TAs thought students ought to know and be able to do in the L2, and then measured students' self-efficacy in regard to these goals, we would learn to what extent students had opportunities to use the L2 and experience struggle and success with these goals.

II. Why it was done

A. Texas Tech University SACS-COC Task Force, 2008

1. Formulate sources of data that would provide reasonable, theory-driven evidence that undergraduate students had achieved stated core competencies. Ours: 1. learners will be able to negotiate and interpret meaning in the L2, 2. learners will demonstrate confidence in using the L2, 3. learners will demonstrate familiarity with culture of the L2

III. How the self-efficacy questionnaire was done

- A. Four steps: 1. item generation; 2. item refinement; 3. merging items with the three constructs of interest; and 4. final perusal for clarity of meaning.

Sample Item Refinement Survey

Things Done in the Classroom

Please respond to each of the statements below in terms of "A" or "B" students in 2302 OR 2607 classes taught in your division. Please respond in terms of the extent to which you believe "A" or "B" students in 2303 or 2607 classes, who have not participated in study abroad, have these abilities. It is perfectly normal for you agree or disagree strongly with certain statements. For example, first or second year courses in your division may not have been designed to get students to do much to develop the ability to tell their personal histories, or read folktales. If this is the case, you would simply respond "strongly disagree an "A" or "B" student has this ability" to those sorts of items. You may agree or strongly agree on other items, depending on your own classroom insights and perceptions of your divisional goals.

4
strongly agree
an A or B student
has this ability

3
agree that an A or
B student has this
ability

2
disagree tha an A
or B student has this
ability

1
strongly disagree that an
A or B student has this
ability

Listen and respond appropriately in the target language.

Develop narratives using varied tenses.

Interact with teacher in the L2.

Interact with classmates in the L2.

Use grammar to complete tasks creatively using a model previously given.

Conduct a basic conversation in the L2.

Participate in conversations.

B. "Finished" item samples (K = 47):

I think I can ask and answer basic questions in the second language.

I like improving in the second language as I work with language more.

I will be able to use the second language to greet people who are the same age as me.

this very much fits me = 6, this fits me = 5, this fits me a little = 4, this does not fit me very much = 3, this does not fit me = 2, this does not fit me at all = 1

C. Electronic survey done through instructors

D. Factor analyses established factors and reliability (theta reliability on Factor 1 was .96 and on Factor 2 was .63)

E. Generation of descriptive data and report to lower division language program heads

IV. What happened

A. Return rates on the classroom ability efficacy and future expectancy of second language use questionnaire by division

<u>Language Division</u>	<u>Questionnaires Returned</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Percent Return</u>
Arabic	10	12	83.3%
Chinese	3	6	50.0%
French	28	60	46.6%
German	3	34	8.8%
Italian	5	28	17.8%
Japanese	11	18	61.6%
Portuguese	3	13	23.1%
Russian	10	14	71.4%
Spanish	77	426	18.07%

B. Descriptive Statistics for Classroom Ability Efficacy (samples)

<u>Classroom Ability Efficacy</u>										
<u>(Cognitive)</u>										
	Arab	Chin	Fren	Germ	Ital	Japn	Port	Russ	Span	
	<i>(n = 12)</i>	<i>(n = 3)</i>	<i>(n = 28)</i>	<i>(n = 3)</i>	<i>(n = 5)</i>	<i>(n = 11)</i>	<i>(n = 3)</i>	<i>(n = 10)</i>	<i>(n = 77)</i>	
<i>Interact with teacher</i>										
Total	<i>M = 4.26</i>	4.56	5.00	4.25	5.67	4.60	4.40	3.33	4.10	4.13
	<i>SD = .99</i>									
<i>Ask and answer questions</i>										
Total	<i>M = 4.96</i>	5.33	5.33	4.96	6.00	5.40	5.40	4.00	4.90	4.81
	<i>SD = 1.09</i>									
<i>Talk about myself</i>										
Total	<i>M = 5.12</i>	5.33	5.33	5.04	6.00	5.60	5.40	5.00	4.90	5.04
	<i>SD = .84</i>									
<i>Ask questions classroom</i>										
Total	<i>M = 4.00</i>	4.00	4.67	3.64	5.67	4.40	4.70	4.00	3.60	3.95
	<i>SD = 1.28</i>									

C. Matches and mismatches between what instructors think and what students experience: Above 4.5 is a “match and below 3.5 is a mismatch.

i. Sample matches (19):

I think I can ask and answer basic questions in the second language (4.96—*this fits me*)
I am comfortable talking about myself in the second language using short and simple sentences (4.58—between *this fits me a little* and *this fits me*)

ii. Mismatches (2)

I am confident I can do well in oral interview tests in the second language (3.36—*this does not fit me very much*)
I feel fine doing oral interview tests in the second language (3.38—*this does not fit me very much*).

iii. Inter-division differences (many)

11 students of Japanese gave a 4.70 (*this fits me*) average response to *I believe I can ask questions in the second language if I do not understand how to do a class activity* and 28 students of French gave an average response of 3.64 (*this fits me a little*).

12 students of Arabic gave *I like interacting with my classmates in the second language* an average response of 5.00 (*this fits me*) and students of Spanish gave an average response of 3.62 (*this fits me a little*).

iv. Departmental average on all items just squeaked by 4.00 (“this fits me a little”)

D. DEEP silence

V. Why we are interested in faculty buy-in

VI. Why establishing learner self-efficacy as a meaningful criteria seems important

References

Graham, S. (2006). A study of students’ metacognitive beliefs about second language study and their impact on learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(2), 296-309.

Graham, S. & Weiner, B. (1995). Theories and principles of motivation. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.). *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 63-84). New York: MacMillan Library Reference USA.

Rogers, P. (2000). Program theory: Not whether programs work but how they work. In D. Stufflebeam, G. Madaus, & T. Kellaghan (Eds.). *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on*

educational and human services evaluation (2nd ed.)(pp. 209-232). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.