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Abstract

The conundrum many foreign and second language educators face is how to create a climate in which students are not hesitant to speak the target language (MacIntyre, 2007). Dörnyei (2005) has noted that many learners that possess the ability to speak fluently in the target language are unwilling to do so. He called for researchers to devote their attention to bridging the gap between ability and a willingness to communicate (WTC)—a concept that has received considerable attention in the communication (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987) and L2 (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2003) literatures. One of the hypothesized antecedents of willingness-to-communicate is self-perceived communication competence—a construct similar, but conceptually distinct, from self-efficacy. While few studies have offered direction to teachers on how to promote self-reported communication competence, self-efficacy has received the focus of much research in educational settings and has been shown to contribute approximately 14% of the variance of students’ academic performance (Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991). Furthermore, four known sources of self-efficacy have been described (Bandura, 1997), paving the way for researchers to suggest practical application.

There were three overarching purposes of the present study: (a) to examine the relationship between self-efficacy for the target language and select outcomes such as willingness-to-communicate and course grade, (b) to examine key contextual factors that
may promote self-efficacy and willingness-to-communicate such as perceptions of teacher and classroom characteristics, and (c) to examine actual teacher practices that may lead to the promotion of self-efficacy beliefs. In total, 577 university students and 33 teachers participated in this study. Participants were drawn from three programs: ESL, Spanish, and Chinese. Student participants completed surveys at the beginning and end of the term, while teachers completed them at the beginning. Surveys included measures to tap into self-efficacy for the target language, willingness-to-communicate, communication apprehension, expectancy and values for the course, as well as perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy and classroom climate. Three teachers were then selected to collect observational and interview data.

Results from the quantitative analysis indicated that students’ self-efficacy for speaking the target language increased during the term, and that this increase predicted both their willingness to communicate as well as their course grade. Additionally, WTC was predicted by the utility value that students assign study of the target language, as well as their perceptions of an aspect of their classroom climate, such as their teacher’s sense of efficacy. Also, the more competitive a class was perceived to be, the less likely students were to communicate. Communication apprehension also negatively predicted students’ willingness to communicate. In addition to change in self-efficacy, grades were predicted by students’ expectancy. And whereas climates perceived as competitive negatively predicted students’ willingness to communicate, they positively predicted their course grade.
Qualitative findings revealed that the sources of self-efficacy in these classrooms often occurred together—bound by back-to-back events, or as one event that served as multiple sources. Teachers also used physical, temporal, and interpersonal space in ways that likely promoted self-efficacy of the target language. Findings also reveal that many of the teacher practices were an extension of their beliefs about student motivation in language-learning contexts. And finally, the findings indicated that mastery, vicarious experiences, and affective/physiological states were all bountiful sources of self-efficacy while social persuasion—though occurring frequently—was not likely a significant source as the simple verbal and physical affirmations that were present lacked rich performance feedback.
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Prologue

My interest in the self-efficacy beliefs and language learning actually began years before the advent of this study. In the spring of 1991, I took a social psychology course as a requirement toward a Bachelor’s of Arts in Psychology. During this course, I was exposed to the construct of self-efficacy for the first time. I know now that the professor was talking about a general sense of efficacy, which is not as strong a construct than when it is not defined in terms of task-specificity. But at the time, I was drawn in. He described how self-efficacy impacted the choices people make. An individual with a high sense of efficacy, according to my professor, is one who feels they can have an impact. They are more likely to take calculated risks. They are more likely to be involved in spheres that impact their lives or communities. They believe that it is they who control their lives. I felt as if he described individuals that I knew. I felt as if he was describing the “me” I wanted to be. He labeled for me something I had seen, but had not recognized, and I was drawn in.

Fast-forward to 2005. I was living in Japan at the time and working on my Master’s degree in Educational Psychology. At the same time, I was teaching English at the elementary school level for a local board of education in the neighboring village. There were five elementary schools, plus a “safe house” for elementary and junior high students who were having difficulty adjusting to the more traditional school
environments. The number of schools, and the number of classes within the schools, meant that I ended up teaching English to each student approximately once a month during the school year for a grand total of six 45-50 minute lessons. Absences, unplanned school events, and special schedules may cut this number down further for some students. Knowing that it takes approximately 5 years for non-native speakers to learn the language of the country in which they reside, let alone learning it as a foreign language, I realized that I was setting myself and my students up for frustration and failure. Indeed, as I prepared for this assignment, I was informed that these schools had not been pleased with my predecessor and conversations with him suggested the feeling was mutual. His previous assignment had been at a high school where he saw students daily. His complaint: That teaching English under these conditions was an impossibility. And yet, there he was in that assignment. And then, there I was. It became clear to me that teaching students so that they learn English could not have been the reason I was there. To find meaning in my work, I had to look beyond the classroom—where English-learning was certainly not occurring—to the larger context.

When I first arrived in Japan in 1998, English instruction at the elementary level was only beginning to take place. I arrived in Japan through the Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme (JET) and was placed at a local board of education to work in an elementary school setting. At that time, English was compulsory at the junior high level and taken by the vast majority of high school students, but almost non-existent at the primary level. During this period, each prefecture had designated one pilot school where English would be taught on an experimental basis for a three year period (1996-1999),
and it was at one of these schools that I had been placed. There were several factors behind the rationale for this program. First, Japan lagged behind its East Asian and Southeast Asian neighbors in standardized measures of English proficiency—in spite of the fact Japan devoted as much classroom time to English instruction. It was felt that instituting English instruction at the elementary level would be one way to improve these scores.

The second rationale was aimed to address motivation and confidence. In spite of having studied English for six years or more during their schools years, many Japanese nationals have difficulty *speaking* English when interacting with native speakers. It was felt that more exposure to native English-speakers was needed. At the same time, there were concerns with the drop-off in motivation for English study between the first and second years of junior high. It was felt that students needed to see the utility of learning a foreign language—that it is more than simply a means of scoring well on high school and college admittance exams, but can be a way of exploring different worlds. To this end, the JET Programme was expanded to include the recruitment and placement of native English-speakers into elementary settings. And indeed, when the pilot program ended in March of 1999, institution of English curricula became widespread at the elementary level—and with it, high demand for native English-speakers to teach English.

And so there I was in 2005 in a situation in which my students would be exposed to an absolute maximum of *five hours* of English over the course of the year—less than one full day at school. If my mission was to teach them English over this period, I would surely fall far short. However, if my aim was simply to create an environment that paired
“learning” English with enjoyment and instilled a sense of confidence in their abilities to learn English, then perhaps this was something I could do, if to a limited extent. Perhaps this was a reasonable objective. I soon came to see my role not as one who would produce students well equipped with language skills going into junior high—an impossible task—but one in where I would nurture an attitude and support the confidence needed to prepare them for English in their junior high classrooms.

As noted earlier, during this same period, I began working on my Master’s degree in educational psychology and took the opportunity to explore the idea of self-efficacy a bit further—specifically, how it operated in educational contexts, its association with outcomes, and the ways in which teachers influence the efficacy beliefs of their students. It was here that I was able to find a sense of mission for my current assignment. I would take steps to promote the students beliefs in their ability to speak/learn/master English. I attempted to make my classrooms spaces where speaking a foreign language was fun, and the tasks achievable, yet challenging. The feedback I received from the administration, teachers, and students suggested I was at least partially successful.

I finished out the school year and prepared to return to the U.S. where I had been accepted into a Ph.D. program at The Ohio State University. Returning to the U.S. resulted in a shift in my research interests. Though I continued to have an interest in language learning and self-efficacy beliefs, I began to focus on how English language learning differs in this context. In Japan, English was taught as a foreign language in the hopes of increasing a nation’s prosperity in the international market. The typical student benefitting from “mastering” English went on to a good high school and, in turn, a good
university and well-paying job. In other words, the student who benefitted the most from learning English was the student whose family could afford to send them to cram school to prepare for entrance examinations—that is, the student from middle- to upper-SES income levels. In the U.S., the consequences of learning English have a more immediate impact. The students who are learning English as an additional language are often immigrants, many of whom have come to seek a better life. And many of whom have arrived—and are arriving—from Central America. As someone who had lived abroad as a minority, I could appreciate the role that language played in meeting basic needs, forming meaningful relationships, and being able to play an active role in society regarding those decisions that affect my life. It was from this context that the current study sprang forth.
CHAPTER 1

AN INTRODUCTION: SETTING THE CONTEXT
AND IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM

Purpose

The conundrum many foreign and second language educators face is how to create a climate in which students are not hesitant to speak the target language (MacIntyre, 2007). For, like other skills, increasing one’s ability to effectively communicate in English is greatly enhanced by attempts to do so. Speaking is an action—not simply recall of facts as may be the case with a history exam. People can read and receive all the instruction they want about how to ice skate, but they must lace up and step out onto the ice to take this ability to a higher level. And indeed, those who recognize that making mistakes (e.g. falling on your bum) is a vital part of this learning process master the skill more quickly than those unwilling to take a spill. Like the acquisition of many skills, learning English is similar to learning to skate in that it involves risk-taking, but unique in that society in general, and teachers specifically, expect students to instantly apply what they have learned (Foster, 1997). In the language-learning environment, some students readily engage in the target language (L2) whilst others are greatly hesitant to do so (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998). If
making the effort to *perform* the skill is requisite to *acquiring* the skill, then a student’s unwillingness to speak will have ramifications for the process of learning the target language.

One construct that has received attention in the field of second language (L2) motivation for addressing this issue is *willingness to communicate* (WTC) (MacIntyre, 2007)—one’s intention to initiate communication when free to do so (MacIntyre, 1994; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). And though WTC is believed to be relatively stable (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987, 1990), research suggests that learners’ perceptions of their skills are a powerful antecedent (MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996). One such competency belief is self-efﬁcacy—an individual’s belief in her/his capabilities to execute the necessary steps to achieve a given outcome (Bandura, 1997). Self-efﬁcacy in academic domains is associated with a host of positive outcomes including: (a) effort expenditure, (b) persistence, and (c) instrumental help-seeking (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). But, the application of self-efﬁcacy theory to language-learning classrooms would be of limited value if teachers were powerless to promote students’ sense of personal efﬁcacy.

And indeed, few studies have examined what teacher characteristics or behaviors encourage self-efﬁcacy among students—especially in language-learning contexts. Lightbrown and Spada (2006) noted that “little research has directly investigated how pedagogy interacts with motivation in second language classrooms” (p. 65). And yet, as Hall and Verplaeste (2002) noted, “language learning is not a strictly individual,
cognitive act, equivalent across learners and situations. Rather, it is presumed to be a fundamentally social enterprise, jointly constructed and intrinsically linked to learners’ repeated and regular participation in their classroom activities” (p. 11). Teachers play an important role in second language acquisition. Teachers: (a) make salient specific content and strategies to master it, (b) mediate the quality and quantity of learning activities, and (c) assess students performance—that is, they setting the standard for which performance will be evaluated, and then evaluate the performance (Hall & Verplaeste, 2000).

The aim of this study is threefold: (a) to examine the classroom and personal characteristics that predict students’ willingness to communicate in the target language, (b) to examine the extent that a change in students’ self-efficacy for speaking the target language predicts students outcomes such as course grade, and (c) to determine the actual teacher practices that may result in increasing students’ self-efficacy for speaking the target language.

**Problem Statement and Context**

The primary target languages of focus in this study are English, Spanish and Chinese taught in higher education contexts. Ability in these languages would appear to have adaptive value in the United States. Diplomatic and economic ties to China are increasing in importance as the country becomes a prominent presence in the global geopolitical climate. The utility value of Spanish is increasing within U.S. borders as the number of native Spanish-speakers rises. For example, while minority groups represented approximately 30% of the total U.S. population in 2000, this figure is expected to reach
nearly 50% by 2040 with the most significant increases expected from Hispanic/Latino and Asian Americans (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2004a).

Ability to speak Spanish may be particularly useful for those in the teaching profession as native Spanish-speaking English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) students are increasing in regular classrooms, and posing special challenges for teachers not trained to address their unique needs (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2007). In the state of Ohio, public schools have witnessed at 124% increase in students with limited English proficiency between 1997 and 2007 (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). Many more such students are expected to emigrate from regions where English is not the native language (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2004b), naturally resulting in an increase of ESL students. Addressing these needs by be particularly important as those arriving to the U.S. not already fluent in English may find the adjustment particularly difficult, as research suggests that target language fluency is inversely related to the stress associated with adjusting to the majority culture (Elmeroth, 2003; Yeh & Inose, 2003).

And yet, students of foreign-language education in the U.S. generally fail to truly become proficient in the target language. Reagan and Osborn (2002) list three oft-cited public justifications or arguments for language study—cognitive, cultural, and pragmatic reasons. The cognitive argument posits that foreign-language study promotes cognitive benefits such as critical thinking and creativity. However, Reagan and Osborn note that this argument is generally used as rhetoric in policy-making rather than as a force that results in modifications to the curriculum. Cultural arguments tend to be based on
anecdotal evidence. However, Reagan and Osborn note that this often leads to “bicultural chauvinism” (p. 4) rather than any form of broader cultural tolerance and/or understanding. Pragmatic arguments tend to center around greater employability. Yet, Reagan and Osborn note that this rarely translates into increased job prospects. Instead, they suggest that foreign-language education in the U.S. is most often used for gate-keeping purposes. At the secondary level, foreign-language classes play a role in determining who gets into what university. In institutions of higher education, foreign-language credits may determine who does or does not get granted a diploma. In other words, the purpose of foreign-language education may be less about foreign-language education than about granting select students access to progress through the educational “process.” To the extent that foreign-language education serves this purpose, it may actually be setting multitudes of students up for failure. Indeed, Reagan and Osborn note that of those students who “take” a foreign language in high school, only a few actually go on to develop a minimum level of competence—it is not all that unusual to hear a U.S. citizen lament about her/his inability to speak a language s/he studied for two to three years in high school or whilst at university.

Other aspects of foreign-language education in the U.S. may set students up for failure. First, Reagan and Osborn (2002) note that—with the exception of language clubs—few language programs actually offer meaningful opportunities to utilize the target language outside of the classroom. And out-of-the-classroom opportunities may be particular important for second-language acquisition given that actual in-class
opportunities are likely insufficient. Reagan and Osborn note that research suggests 240 hours of language study a year are needed to make meaningful progress in Spanish—though 480 hours or more may be needed for languages that share fewer similarities to English such as Chinese. Yet, most high school courses offer a maximum of 150 hours over the course of a year. In institutions of higher education, a five-hour Spanish class taken over three quarters or two semesters also comes to about 150 hours of in-class study. As a result, only the most enthusiastic students with the available time and resources are able to even approach the threshold needed for meaningful progress (Reagan & Osborn, 2002)—the remaining may be subject to failure—and loss.

Reagan and Osborn (2002) posit that to study an additional language is to study the essence of what it means to be human. As they put it:

…one of the more fascinating outcomes of the study of human language over the past few centuries has been the discovery that there is no such thing as a primitive language, that each and every human language (of which there are currently well in excess of 5,000) is a full, complete, and rule-governed entity capable of serving its users and their needs. Furthermore, the recognition that in spite of their many differences, all human languages also share a number of significant common features—that is, what linguists call linguistic universals. It is in these linguistic universals that we may come closest to identifying what it is, exactly, that makes us human.
The study of languages other than one’s own cannot only serve to help us understand that we as human beings have in common, but can also assist us in understanding the diversity that underlies not only our languages, but also our ways of constructing and organizing knowledge, and the many different realities in which we all live and interact. Such understanding has profound implications not only epistemologically, but also with respect to developing a critical awareness of language and social relationships. In studying languages other than our own, we are seeking to understand and, indeed, in at least a weak sense, to become) the Other—we are, in short, attempting to enter into realities that have, to some degree, been constructed by others and in which many of the fundamental assumptions about the nature of knowledge and society may be different from our own. We are, in fact, creating new selves in an important sense. Such creation and recreation forces each of us to reflect more deeply on many of the cores questions related to being an educated person, as well as requiring that we become not merely tolerant of differences, but truly understanding of differences (linguistic and otherwise) and their implications. The sort of humility that is learned from studying a language other than one’s own is a valuable possession in its own right… (pp. 12-13)

In other words, foreign-language study is a means to help the learner better understand who s/he is both individually and collectively.
Overview of motivation in second/foreign language acquisition. As eluded to previously, in addition to these institutional barriers to foreign-language education, one of the issues that language teachers face is that of student motivation. And this may be of no small consequence—motivation may be the second strongest predictor of language learning success after aptitude (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Zoltán Dörnyei (2001, 2005) noted that motivation provides the impetus to engage in language study and to sustain learners through the long and challenging process of second-language acquisition (SLA). He goes so far as to say “all the other factors involved in SLA presuppose motivation to some extent” (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 65). He noted that even individuals with extraordinary abilities will not acquire the target language without a certain level of motivation. And indeed, while language aptitude may be an attribute that the language teacher can do little about, certain aspects of motivation may be amendable to change. In other words, there may be a limited number of ways to address language aptitude. Thus, a greater understanding of the variables associated with student motivation may be of greater value to the language teacher (Gardner & Smythe, 1974).

Interestingly, the study of motivation in language-learning contexts has a relatively brief history. Dörnyei (2005) describes three distinct periods in foreign/second language (L2) motivation research: (1) the social psychological period occurring roughly between 1959 and 1990 and marked by the work of Richard Gardner and colleagues (e.g., Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Gardner & Smythe, 1974, 1975), (2) the cognitive-situated period during the 1990’s drawing from cognitive psychological
theories, and (3) the process-oriented period from approximately 2000 to the present marked by an interest in motivational change.

**The social psychological period.** The core of the social psychological period can be summed up as an interest in the motivational implications of learners’ attitudes toward the target *culture*—that is, the culture associated with the target language. This view recognized that “unlike several other school subjects, a foreign language is not a socioculturally neutral field but is affected by a range of sociocultural factors such as language attitudes, cultural stereotypes, and even geopolitical considerations” (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 67).

This period was arguably launched by a study conducted by Wallace Lambert in 1955. The purpose of the study was to measure “linguistic dominance” (Lambert, 1955, p. 197) as it related to culture, and various personality characteristics. Forty-two participants in three groups of French speakers (undergrad French learners, graduate-level French learners, and native French speakers) responded to commands in both their first- and second-languages. Their response time was measured. While the results are not all that surprising in light of contemporary perspectives (i.e., generally, participants had shorter response times for commands given in their native language), the responses of two of the graduate participants were inconsistent with the others in that their reaction times were shorter in the *target* language than in their *native* language. Though not part of the formal procedure, Lambert interviewed these participants and those familiar with the background of these individuals. The interviews revealed that both participants had
strong bonds with, and extensive knowledge of, the French culture. Lambert suggested that personality variables may play a role in acquisition of a second language. Specifically, he speculated that some individuals may engage in language study in an attempt to become “socially accepted” (p. 199) in the target culture.

These findings led to a classic study by Richard Gardner and Lambert (1959) in which the concept of an integrative orientation towards acquisition of the target language was proposed. Prior to this study, linguistic aptitude was considered the only factor associated with achievement in the target language (Gardner & Lambert, 1959). The purpose of the study was to determine the importance of linguistic aptitude and motivational variables in terms of French achievement (as measured by instructor ratings). They drew upon first-language acquisition theories (e.g., Mowrer, 1950) that propose that children learning their native language are motivated to do so out of a desire to be more similar to members of their own family. Gardner and Lambert hypothesized that successful second-language learners would similarly be motivated to integrate—in this case, into the target-language community. They found two factors related to achievement in French—factors they referred to as a linguistic aptitude factor and a motivation factor. Furthermore, they found a significant positive correlation between what they called an integration orientation index and French achievement. They concluded that those participants who were more integratively oriented are more successful at acquiring French.
This study led to Gardner’s *socio-educational model* of second language acquisition (Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Smythe, 1974, 1975). Though the model has been extensively modified over the years (cf., Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992, 1993; Gardner, Tremblay, & Masgoret, 1997; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995), the premise of the model lies in the assumption that target language acquisition is more than simply acquiring a set of skills, but also of a socio-cultural process of taking on some of the norms, behaviors, and attitudes of the culture and/or people group associated with the target language (Gardner & Smythe, 1974). The core of the model proposes four broad categories of variables that contribute to target language acquisition. *Group specific attitudes* refer to the learner’s attitudes toward the culture/people group associated with the language of study. *Course related characteristics* refer to the attitudes towards the language itself, towards the class and/or course, towards the actual language teacher, as well as the learner’s parental orientation, attitudes, and influence regarding the target language. *Motivational indices* refer to the learner’s goals, effort, and desire to learn the language as well as their general orientation toward the language. Finally, *generalized attitudes* refers to those attitudes that are not directly associated with language study, but have an impact nonetheless such as attitudes about language study in general, study habits, etc. The model assumes these components interact with one another (Gardner, 1988).

In addition to providing a framework for the various contributors to SLA, the model is distinguished by its proposal of *orientations* toward the target language and associated culture. Specifically, the model proposes integrative and instrumental
orientations toward the target language. Learners are considered to have an *instrumental orientation* if their reasons for engaging in language study are utilitarian in nature (e.g., to increase one’s employability). An *integrative orientation* is defined as “a desire to learn the language of another language community in order to communicate with, interact with, or to become (in some small way) a part of the other language community” (Gardner & Smythe, 1975, p. 219). Gardner and Smythe (1974) claim that students who have an integrative orientation expend more effort, have a stronger desire, have more favorable attitudes toward study of the language, more favorable attitudes toward the people group associated with the target language, report encouragement from parents to study the target language, and have an interest in language study in general. The authors also claim—while acknowledging that studies have indicated mixed results—that these learners tend to experience less anxiety in the language classroom than their peers and that they tend to be “non-ethnocentric, non-authoritarian, non-Machiavellian, but to evidence some dissatisfaction with their role in society” (Gardner & Smythe, 1974, p. 33). They also propose that integratively-oriented students are more likely to take subsequent courses in the target language. Gardner and Smythe (1974) interpret these findings through a behaviorist paradigm—those that have an integrative orientation are more likely to find the tasks associated with language study to be rewarding—and thus, more likely to continue.

While the premise of the socio-educational model has largely remained the same since its conception, there have been attempts to modify it. Two such attempts (Gardner,
Tremblay, & Masgoret, 1997; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995) occurred during the “Cognitive-Situated Period” described earlier by Dörnyei (2005). In general, these modifications entailed the borrowing of constructs from educational psychology. One such construct was that of self-efficacy. Though Tremblay and Gardner (1995) claim the construct is based on Bandura’s (1989, 1991) conceptualization they posit that the construct is similar to the concept of self-confidence used widely in second-language studies. However, the construct of self-confidence assumes an affective component lacking in Bandura’s (1997) conceptualization. Similarly, the measure of self-efficacy used in their study blurs the distinction between learners’ judgments of their ability to execute given tasks and the outcome they may expect if successful. Though related, self-efficacy beliefs are conceptually distinct from outcome expectancies (Bandura, 1997).

Other constructs borrowed from other fields were measured with the same instruments used in their previous research—namely, the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (Gardner & Smythe, 1981). The result leaves questions as to the level of fidelity to the original constructs.

Whereas the socio-educational model was a very influential force in studies of motivation in SLA contexts, it was not without its critics. Criticisms of the model tend to fall into three categories: (a) a lack of empirical evidence supporting the model (Au, 1988), (b) a lack of conceptual clarity (Clément & Kruidenier, 1983; Dörnyei, 2005), and (c) poor explanatory power (Clément, 1980; Clément & Kruidenier, 1983, 1985; Norton Pierce, 1995). Regarding conceptual clarity, Dörnyei (2005) notes that the terminology in
the model can be confusing. For example, Gardner uses the term *integrative* at three levels of abstraction—to describe an orientation, to describe a motive, and as an adjective (e.g., *integrativeness*) while also failing to make a distinction between *motivation* and *integrative motivation* (Dörnyei, 2005). Clément and Kruidenier (1983) point out that it is not always clear what exactly constitutes an integrative as opposed to an instrumental orientation, noting that an item referring to “study abroad” appears in measures of integrativeness in some studies, but instrumentality in others. Dörnyei (2005) has also pointed out issues with the measure most often used in the model (the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery). He notes the ‘motivation’ subcomponent of the battery is defined by three subscales that overlap at the item level. Of additional concern to Dörnyei is the way motivation was operationalized—as a behavioral outcomes rather than effort. Clément and Kruidenier (1983) have suggested that one of the reasons for contradictory findings is this lack of conceptual clarity.

However, Clément and Kruidenier (1983) suggest another reason for contradictory findings is a failure of the model to take into account the language learning *context*—specifically by noting the significance of the culture or community associated with the target language. Clément and colleagues (Clément, 1980; Clément & Kruidenier, 1983, 1985) have proposed the concept of *ethnolinguistic vitality* be added to the socio-educational model. Ethnolinguistic vitality is “defined by three structural variables: the status of a language in a community, the absolute and relative number of its locators (demographic characteristics) and the institution support (e.g. governmental services,
schools, mass media)” (Clément, 1980, p. 148). The implication is that if the target language has low ethnolinguistic vitality, language learners are less likely to have an integrative orientation towards it. Another contextual variable of import is fear of assimilation. Fear of assimilation “represents the negative affective basis of the primary motivational process and corresponds to the fear that loss of the first culture and language might result from learning the second language” (Clément, 1980, p. 149).

**The cognitive-situated period.** The cognitive-situated period was characterized by the influence of two broad trends: (a) the import of concepts from motivational/cognitive psychology—thus, an interest in how learners think about their abilities, potentials, limitations, and past performance, and (b) a change in emphasis from a macro perspective of L2 motivation—that is, an examination of entire communities—to a more “situated analysis of motivation as it operates in actual learning situations (such as language classrooms)” (Dörnyei, 2005, p. 74). One of the hallmark studies of this era was a study by Donitsa-Schmidt, Inbar, and Shohamy (2004) who found that the quality of the teaching program was the best predictor for students to continue study of the target language—even when the students were Israeli and the language was Arabic. In other words, the situated context of the learning environment overcame the presumably negative attitudes toward the culture associated with the target language.

Dörnyei (2005) notes that one area of interest during this period was self-determination theory (e.g., Noels, 2001, 2003; Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 2000; Ushioda, 2001). Findings were mixed regarding an integrative orientation, though
generally indicated an association between integrativeness and those aspects of motivation believed to be more self-determined such as identified and intrinsic motivation. An instrumental orientation, however, was generally strongly associated with external regulation.

**The process-oriented approach period.** The process-oriented approach is characterized by attempts to examine changes of motivation across time. The Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) model breaks the motivational processes into three temporal segments. The *Preactional Stage* or *Choice Motivation* is the place where motivation is first generated. Functions of this stage include: the setting of goals, the forming of intention, and the launching of action. Influences include the relevance, specificity, and proximity of goals; task values, outcome expectancies; attitude towards the target language and community; perceived coping potential; learner beliefs and strategies; and environmental supports or impediments. The *Actional Stage* or *Executive Motivation* and refers to the maintaining motivation (i.e., sustaining activities) during the task; volition. Functions include generating and carrying out specific subtasks, ongoing appraisal of one’s performance, and self-regulation. Influences include: the quality of the learning experience (e.g., pleasantness, need significance, coping potential, self and social image), sense of autonomy, teacher/parental/peer influences, classroom goal structures, knowledge and use of self-regulatory strategies (e.g., goal setting). The *Postactional Stage* or *Motivational Retrospection* refers to the learner’s evaluation of her/his performance. Functions include: forming causal attributions, and elaborating standards
and strategies. Influences include: attributional factors (e.g., attributional styles and biases); self-concept (and self-confidence and self-worth); and feedback, praise, and grades. The author notes a few limitations of the model.

**Position of the present study.** In sum, much of the work in motivation for the target language has examined the value placed on study of the target language, attitudes toward the culture or people-group associated with the target language, the situated contexts of learning, or the process of motivation behind learning the target language. While numerous studies have examined self-confidence and self-perceived communication competence, as well as learners’ epistemological beliefs associated with language-learning (cf. Horwitz, 1985, 1987, 1988, 1999; Mori, 1999), far less attention has been directed towards learners’ beliefs in their capabilities to organize and execute actions necessary for speaking the target language. Dörnyei (2005) provides two guidelines for future research pertinent to the present study. The first pertains to the gap between students’ communication competence and their willingness to communicate (Dörnyei, 2005). As will be demonstrated in Chapter 2, there is a body of work that has examined students’ *self-perceived communication competence*—a construct similar to self-efficacy. However, there are important conceptual and measurement distinctions between the two constructs that will be discussed. The present study examines self-efficacy for speaking the target language and its ability to predict both students’ willingness to communicate and their course grades.
The second pertains to the role of the teacher. As noted earlier, teachers may not have much influence on students’ aptitude for language learning, but they are positioned to affect change in student motivation. Teachers are a critical part of the social context in which language learning occurs—a part of the context that needs to be considered to understand the variables that affect students’ success in learning the target language (Lightbrown & Spada, 2006). Though there is a large body of work that has examined teaching methods in SLA, far less has examined the impact that teachers have on student motivation (Dörnyei, 2005). The present study will examine students’ perceptions of the climates that teachers structure, as well as the actual teacher practices that presume to increase students’ self-efficacy beliefs for speaking the target language.

**Theoretical Framework: Social Cognitive Theory**

While the socio-educational and process-oriented models have provided a solid foundation from which to study issues of motivation in target language acquisition, and have generated volumes of research, they have several limitations. In addition to the aforementioned criticisms of the socio-educational model, one of limitations of the model is implied uni-directional relationships. In responding to Au’s (1988) critique of the model, Gardner (1988) claimed that the model assumes that the factors influence one another. However, subsequent revisions to the model (i.e., Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992, 1993) fail to denote this (see Figure 1.1). In Gardner and MacIntyre’s (1993) model, language-learning contexts do not impact cognitive or affective variables, nor do cognitive or affective variables influence one another. The model also makes clear
distinctions between formal and informal learning contexts and their relation to motivation that may not exist in practice. For example, an immigrant learner studying the language of the majority culture who encounters a difficulty communicating at the grocer—an informal context—may come to class to seek answers. Similarly, s/he may anticipate difficulties at the grocer, so is then more motivated in the classroom—the formal context.

Figure 1.1. *The socio-educational model* (adapted from Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). The ‘socio-cultural milieu’ includes antecedent factors, individual difference variables, language acquisition contexts, and outcomes.

Aspects of the process-oriented model (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998) also possess a degree of insufficiency. Though the model attempts to explain how motivation changes over time, it also implies clearly defined action and sharply demarcated boundaries.
between stages. In actuality, it is unlikely that motivation, as a process, can be so neatly divided. A second issue is that the model does not account for competing interests. That is, the task in question is presumed to occur in isolation. In practice, students are likely to weigh the cost of language study against an upcoming biology exam or the desire to spend time with friends.

Social cognitive theory (SCT; Bandura, 1986, 1999) differs from the above models in that SCT posits that contexts, personal factors, and one’s own actions are all subject the influences of one another—they interact in a *triadic reciprocal* manner (see Figure 1.2). As Bandura (1986) puts it:

> In the social cognitive view people are neither driven by inner forces nor automatically shaped and controlled by external stimuli. Rather, human functioning is explained in terms of a model of triadic reciprocity in which behavior, cognitive and other personal factors, and environmental events all operate as interacting determinants of each other. The nature of persons is defined within the perspective in terms of a number of basic capabilities. (p. 18)

Bandura notes that human agency can be conceptualized in three ways: *autonomous agency* in which humans are autonomous agents of their own actions/behavior, *mechanical agency* in which people act autonomously, but without true agency—that is, environmental forces act as the sole determinant of behavior—or *interactive agency* in which the personal factors of individuals influence their own behavior within a reciprocal
causal relationship with their actions and the environment. Of the three models highlighted, only SCT falls into this latter category.

Figure 1.2. Triadic reciprocal causality (adapted from Bandura, 1986).

Bandura (1986) noted that humans possess a variety of capabilities that allow them to play a role in determining courses of action. Symbolizing capability allows individuals to transform experience into internal models, which can then guide future behavior. Symbols also allow individuals to communicate to one another across time and space. Forethought capability allows individuals to anticipate certain events, the behaviors needed to overcome them, as well as possible consequences. Forethought capability enables individuals to set goals. Vicarious capability allows individuals to learn from observing the consequences of other’s actions. The result is that humans can learn without having to always engage in a practice of trial and error. Self-regulatory capability enables individuals to set internal standards by which they self-evaluate, motivate, and guide their own behavior. Finally, self-reflective capability is a meta-cognitive skill. That is, it allows individuals to analyze and evaluate their own thinking processes. The implication of these capabilities is that individuals are both products and
shapers of their environment (Bandura, 1999). The nature of causation implied by the socio-educational model (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992, 1993) is uni-directional, starting with environmental contexts that impact various learner attributes which then predict motivation and, ultimately, behavior. The reverse situation—behavior shaping beliefs which then impact motivation that ultimately shapes environments—is absent from the model.

Self-efficacy beliefs are one of the cornerstones of SCT (Bandura, 1997, 1999). As Bandura (1999) said regarding the role of self-efficacy beliefs in SCT:

This belief system is the foundation of human agency. Unless people belief that they can produce desired effects by their actions they have little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties. Whatever other factors serve as motivators, they are rooted in the core beliefs that one has the power to produce changes by one’s actions. (p. 28)

This study will examine the self-efficacy beliefs in the context of learning to speak English, Spanish, and Chinese as a target language at an American university—specifically, how these beliefs contribute to learners’ willingness to speak in the target language as well as grades received for the course. Additionally, this study will examine the role of learners’ perceptions of their teachers as well as the classroom environment. Lastly, this study will examine those things that teachers actual do that may promote students beliefs in their capabilities for speaking the target language.

Key Terms
**English language learner (ELL).** English language learners in this study refer to students who are learning English as non-native speakers of the language. See ESL for comparison.

**English as a second language (ESL).** ESL refers to the study of English by native speakers of other languages. Many scholars and educators raise objections to the use of this term due to its ethnocentric bias where the inherent assumption is that non-native speakers are learning English as a second language, ignoring the fact that a significant portion of these learners are learning it as a third or fourth language (or more). The use of “ESL” is useful in distinguishing the context in which the learning of English takes place. ESL refers to learning English in regions of the world where English is the predominant mode of communication (e.g. Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, U.S., etc.), whereas English as a foreign language (EFL) refers to learning English in a context where it is not the predominant language used for everyday communication (e.g. Brazil, China, France, Japan, Spain, etc.). The context has implications for motivation (Hall & Verplaeste, 2000). Despite the controversy surrounding the term ESL, it continues to be regularly used (e.g. Columbus City Schools, 2008), though more often to describe a type of program rather than a type of learner. References to ESL in this study will refer to program type unless otherwise noted. ELL will refer to the type of learner. However, it should be noted that while ELL is generally considered the “correct” term by many educators and scholars, this term is still problematic as it fails to distinguish those
who are learning English as a native language as opposed to those learning it as an additional language.

**Native language (L1).** L1 refers to students’ native language or languages.

**Self-efficacy.** A central tenet of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), self-efficacy refers to “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Self-efficacy is generally conceptualized as a domain-specific construct (Bandura, 1997). That is, one’s beliefs in her ability to obtain an “A” in calculus may be different than her beliefs in her ability to write a 20-page paper on the circumstances that led to the Civil War. Likert-type scales have been used extensively as a measure of self-efficacy, though some have advocated for the use of rating scales (e.g. Bandura, 2006; Pajares, Hartley, & Valiante, 2001). Others claim that Likert-type scales offer comparable levels of reliability (Maurer & Andrews, 2000; Smith, Waekly, de Druif, & Swartz, 2003). The measures in this study will utilize rating scales.

**Self-efficacy for the target language (SETL).** SETL in this study is considered a domain of self-efficacy, and refers to individuals’ beliefs in their ability organize and execute the courses of action required to speak the target language.

**Self-perceived communication competence (SPCC).** As the name suggests, self-perceived communication competence refers to the belief one has regarding her or his “ability to make known by talking or writing” (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988, p. 109). This construct was introduced in the communication literature as a proposed
antecedent of WTC. Studies in this domain were initially restricted to SPCC in participants’ native language, though studies of WTC in the target language also widely utilize SPCC as a variable (MacIntyre, 1994). The focus of the present study is limited to SPCC as it pertains to speaking the target language. SPCC is generally measured using the Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988). The SPCC Scale consists of 12 items that ask respondents to rate their perceived ability to communicate effectively with three types of receivers (strangers, acquaintances, and friends) across four contexts (public, meeting, group, and dyad) from 0 (completely incompetent) to 100 (completely competent). McCroskey and McCroskey (1988) report an internal reliability for the SPCC Scale at .92.

**Target language (L2).** L2 refers to the language of formal instruction, or the non-native language of the student/speaker. Many researchers and scholars also use the terms second or foreign language, and their use appears throughout the manuscript in an attempt to maintain fidelity with a particular author’s perspective or framework. And, it should be noted that these terms do serve descriptive purposes. Hall and Verplaetse (2000) point out two primary differences between second and foreign language development. First, second-language learners have increased exposure to the target language and presumably more opportunities to communicate in the language. The foreign language learner is often restricted to classroom interaction while those studying a second language are exposed to the target language in a variety of real-world, applied settings. Second, they note that the motives for engaging in language study of these two
types of learners are likely to differ in important ways. That is, though the foreign-language learner may have a very real desire to attain fluency in the target language, their interests likely lack the immediacy of the second-language learner. That is, the second-language learner may be motivated to learn the language for the survival value it has the moment the learner steps out of the classroom. However, each term can also be problematic. As noted previously (see ESL, this section), global use of the term “second” to describe the language of instruction assumes the learner was monolingual at the onset of instruction. The use of “foreign language(s)” is avoided as it implies a position of inferiority to the language(s) of the majority culture.

**Teaching self-efficacy (TSE).** Many definitions of teacher self-efficacy can be found in the literature. Armor and colleagues (1976) first defined teacher efficacy as “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to produce an effect on the learning of students” (p. 23). Subsequent definitions abound with little variability, though measurement of the construct has received considerable attention and debate (cf., Dellinger, Bobbett, Olivier, & Ellett, 2008; Labone, 2004; Tschannen-Moral & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, et al., 1998; and Wheatley, 2005 for detailed discussions). Dellinger and colleagues (2008) have attempted to distinguish teacher efficacy from teacher self-efficacy claiming that the construct of teacher efficacy has strayed from the construct of self-efficacy as proposed by Bandura (1997). They define teacher self-efficacy as, “teachers’ individual beliefs about their own abilities to successfully perform specific teaching and learning related tasks within the context of their own [emphasis
added] classrooms” (p. 751). The emphasis is on one’s own immediate teaching context. However, this definition seems unnecessarily restrictive. Bandura’s definition of self-efficacy (see above) does not bind one’s beliefs about abilities only to her or his immediate context. Such a definition suggests that those who do not yet have responsibilities in a classroom, such as preservice teachers, would not have efficacy beliefs. As Bandura points out, individuals make judgments about their abilities prior to taking action—even when the task is novel. This definition also ignores the known sources of efficacy. Preservice teachers have had years of vicarious experiences in regards to teaching, having spent a large amount of time in classrooms observing teachers. It reasons that they would have at least a naïve notion of what teaching entails, against which they would have surely considered their own capabilities to complete such tasks.

This study will utilize the definition put forth by Tschannen-Moran and colleagues (1998) due to its close kinship to the definition of self-efficacy put forth by Bandura. They define teacher efficacy as “the teacher’s belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context” (Tschannen-Moran, et al., p. 233). All references to teacher efficacy or teacher self-efficacy will reflect this definition unless otherwise noted.

Willingness to communicate (WTC). Most researchers define willingness to communicate as one’s intention to initiate communication when free to do so (MacIntyre, 1994; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987), and this will be the sense in which it used in this
study unless otherwise specified. WTC is generally measured using the Willingness to Communicate Scale (McCroskey, 1992; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). The WTC Scale consists of 20 items, 8 of which are fillers. The 12 remaining items probe respondents’ willingness to communicate with three types of receivers (strangers, acquaintances, and friends) across four contexts (public, meeting, group, and dyad). Respondents are prompted to presume that they are free to choose to engage in communication in the particular context and to rate the percent of the time they would choose to communicate (0 = never; 100 = always). Internal reliability estimates of the WTC Scale range from .86 to .95 (McCroskey, 1992).

**Research Questions**

As previously mentioned, the aim of this study is to examine the relation between learners’ self-efficacy for speaking the target language (SETL) and their willingness to communicate as well as its contribution to explaining the degree to which students’ grades vary. This study will also examine other variables hypothesized to be associated with willingness to communicate, such as teachers’ actual sense of efficacy as well as learners perceptions of their classroom context. Additionally, the purpose was to observe classrooms and interview teachers to better understand those practices that teachers engage in that could promote students’ personal sense of efficacy for speaking the target language. Specifically, this study aims to address the following research questions:

- Does students’ SETL predict their willingness to communicate?
• Do SETL and perceptions of climate predict course grades after controlling for other variables?

• Are students’ perceptions of their teacher’s sense of efficacy (PTSE) associated with increased SETL and willingness to communicate?

• Does teachers’ sense of efficacy explain the ways in which SETL varies at the student-level?

• Do students’ perceptions of their classroom climate predict WTC after controlling for other variables?

• Is teachers’ sense of efficacy associated with increased SETL and WTC?

• What do teachers perceived as highly efficacious by their students do to promote SETL, and WTC?

Limitations

There are several limitations inherent in the proposed study. The first limitation is the result of the tension between level of specificity and generalizability in the measures used. As noted previously, self-efficacy is a domain-specific construct. As Pajares (1996a, 1996b) and others (e.g. Tschannen-Moran, et al., 1998) have pointed out, a self-efficacy measure that is too global in breadth may miss important dimensions of learner beliefs. For example, the reliability and validity of a measure that asks students about beliefs of their academic ability in general may suffer if the student references her math ability rather than her ability to construct sentence diagrams. And yet, if measures are too specific then any ability to generalize may be lost, as Tschannen-Moran and colleagues
humorously illustrate, “I am confident I can teach simple subtraction in a rural setting to middle-income second grade boys who do not have specific learning disabilities, as long as my class is smaller than 16 students and good manipulatives are available” (p. 219).

Another significant limitation of this study is the focus on only the speaking aspect of learning the target language. In actuality, learning to speak an additional language may be related to learning to comprehend or write that same language. Bandura (1997) notes that self-efficacy beliefs can generalize to tasks perceived as similar. Thus, it is reasonable to speculate that successful mastery of organizing the skills required to write a lengthy passage of text could boost one’s confidence in her ability to make her thoughts known to others through speaking. Again, the scope of this study is narrowed to language learners’ WTC. Other aspects of language learning, and their interplay, are left to explore in subsequent research projects.

And finally, this study is limited by the number of populations in the sample. Language-learning is a highly contextualized type of learning, and the motivational variables salient in one context may be non-factors in others (Clément, 1980). Thus, results should be interpreted with caution before generalizing to other settings.

Summary

The study of motivation in language learning contexts has a relatively brief history that began with the proposition that learners are motivated to learn a given language out of a desire to integrate with members of the culture or people group associated with the target language (Lambert, 1955). Since that time, research has
expanded to include contextual variables (Clément, 1980) and the process of motivation (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998). However, this research has been somewhat limited by models that have failed to recognize the triadic reciprocal relationship between learners’ beliefs, their behavior, and the learning context. Situated in social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), this study aims to examine the beliefs that learners have about their capability in being able to organize and execute the necessary actions to speaking the target language and the relationship these beliefs have in their willingness to speak that language and the grades they receive. This study will also examine learners’ perceptions of their classroom climate as well as the actual structures in these environments.
CHAPTER 2

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As noted in Chapter 1, motivation in language-learning contexts has a relatively brief, but rich history. Still, one of the areas of research in which work remains is an understanding of the gap between students’ abilities and their willingness to communicate in the target language. Though several antecedents to willingness-to-communicate (WTC) have been described, models of WTC have, thus far, been limited by their inability to describe the teacher practices that encourage it. In that chapter, I suggested that self-efficacy for speaking the target language (SESTL) may play an important role in WTC. In this chapter, I will review the literature on WTC including its antecedents. One of those antecedents is self-reported communication competence—a concept related to, but conceptually distinct from self-efficacy. Next, self-efficacy in language-learning contexts will be explored, and then an examination of self-efficacy for teaching tasks—likely an important variable in the promotion of self-efficacy for the target language. Finally, the purpose of the study will be outlined.

Willingness to Communicate

Though it has been defined differently in the literature (cf. Cao & Philp, 2006), most researchers define Willingness to Communicate (WTC) as one’s intention to initiate
communication when free to do so (MacIntyre, 1994; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). Though an individual’s willingness to communicate may vary from context to context, WTC was originally conceptualized as a trait-like construct (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). Indeed, it has been proposed that “WTC is a trait with a strong genetic base” (J. C. McCroskey, personal communication, June 27, 2008). That is, those who have high scores on measures of WTC tend to be more likely to initiate communication across a variety of settings. And indeed, individuals’ WTC in one context is correlated with their WTC in other contexts (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987) though WTC has also been shown to change in response to experience (Roach, 1998).

WTC is thought to have a significant impact on interpersonal relationships. In summarizing previous studies that illustrate the characteristics of WTC, McCroskey and Richmond (1987) note that high WTC in school is associated with positive outcomes—though students with a high WTC may also be occasionally reprimanded. Such outcomes include: positive expectations from teachers, higher scores on teacher-made tests, grades, and standardized tests (in spite of the fact that WTC is not associated with intellectual ability), have more friends, report being more satisfied with school, less prone to dropout, and more likely to graduate. Low WTC has been associated with negative perceptions from peers, though it is not clear if this is true across different cultural contexts. And WTC affects perceptions of teachers as well, as their supervisors are more likely to rate teachers with a low WTC as being less effective at teaching than their peers with a higher WTC (Allen & Shaw, 1990). In organizational environments, high WTC is
associated with hiring preferences and promotions, greater job satisfaction, and longevity in the workplace (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). Individuals with low WTC again are seen less favorable by peers though again, it is not clear if this is true across cultures (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987).

WTC has been associated with other benefits as well. For example, Chan and McCroskey (1987) found that those who scored high on the Willingness to Communicate Scale participated significantly more frequently in philosophy, mathematics, and geography classes than those with low scores. Individuals with high WTC scores are also more likely to volunteer to participate in communication research (Zakahi & McCroskey, 1989), to have enhanced listening comprehension (Clark, 1989), and to report communicating more frequently than those low in WTC (Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004).

**Antecedents of WTC.** McCroskey and Richmond (1987) originally proposed six antecedents to explain individual differences in WTC, though they were quick to note that these factors may develop in tandem with WTC so causality should not be assumed. These variables are: (a) introversion, (b) anomie and alienation, (c) self-esteem, (d) cultural divergence, (e) communication skill level, and (f) communication apprehension. However, subsequent studies have indicated that introversion, anomie and alienation, and self-esteem only appear to impact WTC indirectly (MacIntyre, 1994). Therefore, the discussion of antecedents will be limited to the last three antecedents described by McCroskey and Richmond as well as others proposed in the literature.
Cultural divergence refers to the degree that the communication norms of a minority culture differ from those of the majority culture (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). As such, this is a variable that only becomes a factor when one from the minority culture is in a position to communicate with a member of the majority culture—as would often be the case with second-language learners. McCroskey and Richmond (1987) note that communication norms vary from culture to culture. The assumption is that an individual from a minority culture with a high degree of cultural divergence from the dominant culture will not be as knowledgeable about the communication norms of the dominant culture, and thus, less willing to communicate.

Though few studies have investigated cultural divergence directly, a number of studies have examined WTC in different contexts revealing cultural differences. For example, Burroughs, Marie, and McCroskey (2003) reported that Micronesians had lower WTC and self-perceived communication competence (SPCC), but higher communication apprehension (CA) scores than Americans. In another study, Australians had lower mean WTC and SPCC, but similar CA scores to those of Americans (Barraclough, Christophe, & McCroskey, 1988), while Swedes appear to have less WTC than Americans, but had higher reported SPCC, though CA were similar across groups (McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, & Richmond, 1990). Finns, on the other hand, have shown lower WTC than Americans, but similar CA and SPCC (Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1991), though statistical significance was not reported. Participants in Taiwan reported having lower WTC and SPCC, and more CA than Americans (Hsu, 2007), while those in
Hong Kong reported lower mean WTC scores than Americans, Micronesians, Australians, Swedes, or Finns (Asker, 1998). However, it is important to stress that though these studies may suggest differences in WTC across cultures, they do not address the question of whether minorities with communication norms that differ greatly from the majority culture actually have lower WTC when speaking to members of the majority culture.

A construct with some similarity to the idea of cultural divergence in WTC is intercultural willingness to communicate (IWTC). Y. Lin and Rancer (2003) note that an individual who has a high WTC in a small group of strangers may actually have a low WTC if the strangers in that group are members of another culture. They borrow from Kassing’s (1997) definition of IWTC as one’s intention to initiate intercultural communication encounters. In a study examining IWTC differences between Koreans and Americans, Y. Lin, Rancer, and Lim (2003) found that Koreans had significantly lower IWTC scores than Americans. They also had significantly lower ethnocentric scores than Americans—defined as “people’s tendency to view their own group being the center of everything and to judge other groups based on ingroup standards” (Y. Lin, Rancer, & Lim, p. 118). This latter finding was not expected as the researchers had hypothesized an inverse relationship between ethnocentrism and IWTC. However, it may be that simple demographics may have played a role in the outcome of this study. Korea has a relatively homogeneous culture compared to the United States. The results of this study could be interpreted to suggest a positive relationship between cross-cultural
encounters and IWTC. In terms of our discussion, individuals from minority groups are likely to have many opportunities to communicate across cultures—living in the majority culture, it is something many would be accustomed to. Those with few opportunities to communicate across groups are more likely to be members of the majority culture in regions where members of the minority culture are relatively few, or else members of highly insular minority groups. It is likely that individuals from more diverse regions are more likely to have higher IWTC than individuals from regions where contact with members of other cultural groups is a relatively rare phenomenon. Still, IWTC does not address McCroskey and Richmond’s (1987) suggestion that minorities from backgrounds with communication norm mismatches with the dominant culture are going to have lower WTC when communicating with members of the majority culture than members of the majority culture communicating with one another, or than members of minority groups where the gulf between communication norms with the majority culture is not as great.

But again, while studies of IWTC may illuminate attitudes individuals hold about communicating across cultures, they do not directly investigate the experience of communicating as a minority in a majority culture.

McCroskey and Richmond (1987) note that the relationship between WTC and communication skill level is complex. Instruction that results in increased skills can result in an increase in one’s WTC (MacIntyre & Baker, 2002; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2003), yet a low WTC will likely result in the avoidance of the practice necessary to build skill. McCroskey and Richmond postulate however that “the
perception [italics added] of one’s own skill level may be more important than actual skill level” (p. 141). It is one’s perceptions of her abilities that are likely to be a factor in how willing she is to communicate. If one lacks the communicative competence to successfully initiate and navigate a communicative interaction, yet perceives that she does not lack this competence, then her WTC will likely remain high. Indeed, most studies that have examined the variables associated with WTC have assessed one’s self-perceived communication competence (SPCC), and it is this factor that has been shown to be strongly associated with WTC (MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010). This construct will be revisited in the next section.

Communication apprehension (CA) refers to “level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987, p. 141-142)—that is, anxiety about oral communication (Daly, 1991) Communication apprehension or anxiety has been shown to be strongly associated with WTC (MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996). Though believed to have a genetic component, McCroskey and Richmond (1987) proposed that CA is largely the result of experience. And indeed, experience has shown to impact CA (Roach, 1998). CA is thought to produce internal experienced feelings of discomfort which result in communication avoidance, communication withdrawal, and communication disruption. Additionally, though a certain level of anxiety may be beneficial (Lightbrown & Spada, 2006), increased CA has generally been found to be inversely associated with listening comprehension (Clark, 1989), and teaching assistant satisfaction with students (Roach &
Olaniran, 2001), and proposed to inhibit language acquisition (Krashen, 1982). In the foreign or second language-learning literature, the terms *language anxiety* is more commonly used, and refers to a more specific kind of communication apprehension specific to language-learning situations which includes a fear of skill evaluation (Horwitz & Young, 1991). Communication anxiety is generally *inversely* associated with outcomes other than WTC, such as risk-taking (Samimy & Tabuse, 1991) and course grades—an especially strong negative predictor after more fundamental language strategies are developed (Saito & Samimy, 1996).

**L2 WTC.** MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1998) suggest that individuals’ WTC in their native language (L1) is likely different than their WTC in a second or foreign language (L2). Indeed, they suggest that L1 WTC and L2 WTC may have no relationship. A student who is very willing to communicate in his social studies class may be much less so in his introductory French class. MacIntyre and colleagues noted that a much wider range of competence can be expected with L2 in adults than in their L1. And indeed, there is support that individuals are more willing to communicate, have greater perceived competence, and are less anxious in their native language as opposed to L2 (Burroughs, Marie, & McCroskey, 2003; MacIntyre & Baker, 2002). Additionally, MacIntyre and colleagues point out that use of L2 may be laden with social and political issues that are typically non-factors with L1.

Burroughs and Marie (1990) conducted a study to compare the WTC of Micronesian and American students. They found that Micronesians were more
apprehensive and perceived themselves as less competent than Americans. However, Micronesian participants in this study were prompted to reference English when completing the surveys—their L2. The researchers suspected the observed group differences may have been due to the language participants were referencing rather than any cultural differences per se. They conducted a follow-up study to further investigate the group differences they found (Burroughs, Marie, & McCroskey, 2003). In this study three groups were compared—Micronesians in their native language (eight languages represented), Micronesians in their L2 (i.e. English), and native English-speaking Americans. While CA remained relatively constant across Micronesian L1 and L2 groups, those in the L2 group were had lower WTC and perceived themselves as less competent communicators than those in the L1 group. This suggests that, indeed, L1 WTC and L2 WTC are distinct.

Other factors associated with L2 WTC. In addition to the variability that comes with a different skill set in L2, other variables have been proposed to factor into an individual’s WTC in L2. Indeed, Wen and Clément (2003) have proposed that WTC be “viewed as an interplay of communicative, linguistic and social-psychological factors rather than as a simple display of linguistic competence or communicative competence” (p. 34). In this spirit, Gardner’s socio-educational model (Gardner, 1988; Gardner & Smythe, 1975) was tested for its compatibility with the WTC construct. The socio-educational model proposes that two fundamental attitudes factor into learners’ motivation to learn the target language. First, learners will be more motivated to learn the
L2 if they have positive attitudes towards the learning situation. That is, a positive evaluation of the teacher and course or environment of study. Second, learners are motivated out of desire to integrate with members of the target language community. The flip of integrativeness is the fear of assimilation (Clément, 1986). “Integrativeness and fear of assimilation may be seen as opposing forces within the individual. To the extent that one is more salient than the other, L2 communication may be either facilitated or disrupted” (Clément, 1986, p. 552). MacIntyre and Charos (1996) used path analysis to examine whether these factors had an impact on individuals’ WTC in their L2. Though they did not find that a desire for integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation impacted WTC directly, language anxiety—an important correlate of WTC (MacIntyre, 1994)—was associated with integrativeness which was then related to motivation, and, ultimately, how much one actually communicates.

Another variable proposed as a factor in WTC in the L2 is that of international posture (Clément, Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003; Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004). International posture refers to one’s attitude about what the language symbolizes (Yashima, 2002), and Yashima (2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004) proposes that it affects how one approaches study of the language and, ultimately, communication behavior. For example, those with a positive international posture might have an interest in foreign or international affairs, be willing to go overseas to stay or work, be eager to interact with intercultural partners, have an openness to different cultures, and have a non-ethnocentric attitude toward different cultures.
The difference between international posture and IWTC is that international posture is one’s attitude towards the language and what the language represents, while IWTC is one’s willingness to communicate with individuals of different cultural backgrounds. Theoretically, one could have a very favorable attitude towards study of the L2 and be very willing to communicate with classmates, but be very apprehensive when given the opportunity to use L2 with native speakers. Yashima (2002) suggests this may be an important variable in situations where learners rarely come in contact with native speakers. Models using path analysis indicate a significant link between international posture and WTC (Yashima, 2002).

Ethnolinguistic vitality (ELV) has also been suggested to play a role in an individual’s WTC (Clément, Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003). ELV refers to the strength of a particular group in terms of its relative population, its socioeconomic status, and institutional representations. An individual who lives in an area where there are few others of her ethnic group, or in an area where members of the ethnic group are typically of a lower socio-economic status level than the mean, or lack political power are thought to have low ethnolinguistic vitality. This construct relates to cross-cultural communication, language attitudes, language usage and bilingualism, and identity. Clément and colleagues propose that when two groups come in contact, the one with the highest ELV is the one whose language the groups use to communicate.

In a study comparing Anglophone (high ELV) and Francophone (low ELV) Canadian college students, Clément and colleagues (2003) found that the lower ELV
group indicated higher frequency and quality of L2 contact, L2 confidence, and WTC.

The authors speculate that

it is reasonable to argue that the context provides them with greater opportunities for L2 group contact and more pressure to use the L2. The lower vitality group further can expect more occasions to use the L2, thus promoting L2 proficiency. The result is that Francophones experience higher L2 confidence. (p. 203)

However, caution should be exercised in generalizing these findings to other groups. It is likely that Francophones enjoy higher status in Canadian society than speakers from other groups in other contexts such as native Spanish-speaking Mexican immigrants in the United States. The point is that low ELV may not always result in increased confidence in all contexts, especially if the majority group holds a predominantly negative attitude toward the minority group. In such a situation, confidence may be undermined when representatives from the minority group experience instances of being told their attempts to speak English are lacking. Clearly, when considering the effects of ELV on WTC or SLA, attitudes of the dominant group toward non-native speakers should be taken into account as well. Still, in the Clément and colleague’s (2003) model, the path from ELV to WTC was significant and the point that culture impacts WTC is well taken, but caution should be exercised when interpreting exactly how it impacts WTC as there are likely a host of factors.

In addition to the variables that make L2 WTC distinct from L1 WTC, the context in which L2 learning takes place differs from L1. MacIntyre and his colleagues (Baker &
MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre & Baker, 2002; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2003) conducted a series of studies in language immersion educational contexts. In their first study (MacIntyre & Baker, 2002), the L1 and L2 WTC of native English-speaking, French immersion junior high students (grades seven through nine) was examined. They found that students had significantly higher WTC and lower language anxiety (LA) in L1 than L2, and significantly higher L2 WTC and SPCC in grades eight and nine than in grade seven though LA remained constant. They did not find an increase in WTC or SPCC between grades eight and nine. The researchers speculated that this may be due to an increase in self-consciousness that comes with the cognitive changes with adolescence.

In a second study (Baker & MacIntyre, 2003) native English-speaking, French language learners were studied in two contexts—immersion and non-immersion programs. Students in the immersion program received instruction in L2, and were expected to use French both in- and outside the classroom when at school. Those in the non-immersion program received no more than an hour of L2 a day. Baker and MacIntyre found that those in the immersion program had higher WTC and SPCC, but lower LA even though scores for both groups were nearly identical on these variables in L1. Interestingly, with the immersion students, LA was a better predictor of WTC, while SPCC was the better predictor with students in the non-immersion program. The researchers speculated that in the non-immersion setting SPCC becomes a more salient factor in WTC since the opportunities for communicating are fewer. Immersion students
however, have many more opportunities to communicate, and once competence is achieved then the expectations to communicate increase making LA the more salient factor.

In a third study (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2003), the WTC, SPCC, and LA of three groups were analyzed—French study by native English speakers in full immersion, summer immersion, and French as a second language (FSL). Students in the full immersion context had significantly higher WTC and SPCC than those in the FSL context. Mean scores for the summer immersion fell between the other two groups, but did not significantly differ. The differences between groups also extended to how frequently they reported communicating in L2 with the full immersion group reporting they communicated significantly more frequently than the summer immersion group who reported communicating significantly more frequently than the FSL group. LA for the three groups did not significantly differ. Collectively, these three studies help to further distinguish L1 and L2 WTC, though clearly more study is needed to examine the relationships between WTC, SPCC, and LA, and the contextual characteristics of language-learning environments.

But language learning occurs in a broader array of contexts beyond the immersion/single classroom spectrum. Freiermuth and Jarrell (2006) conducted a mixed-methods study to compare WTC in a web-based context vs. face-to-face settings. Participants were enrolled in English classes at a Japanese women’s university. All participants communicated either online or face-to-face, and alternated modes weekly.
Freiermuth and Jarrell discovered that participants reported increased anxiety in the face-to-face interaction, and increased WTC in the online context. Participants found more pressure for their efforts to be free of errors in the face-to-face context than online. The authors speculate that there are fewer social cues present to guide communication expectations in the online setting. Participants also reported perceiving less of a power imbalance in the online setting. The authors propose that these factors contributed to a greater WTC in online vs. face-to-face settings.

And in addition to differing contexts, WTC can fluctuate within settings, and Kang (2005) conducted a qualitative study to examine this. Specifically, she interviewed four Korean ESL students at an American university about their experiences communicating with native English-speaking tutors. The author identified several themes relating to security, excitement, and responsibility, and it can be seen how CA and SPCC played a role in participants’ perceptions of their encounters. Participants in the study reported feeling less secure, or more anxious, when the tutors were not aware of their English proficiency level or when other Koreans were present (as opposed to other international students). Participants also reported feeling less secure if there were multiple tutors present who already appeared to have established rapport with one another. Also, anxiety appeared to increase as the number of individuals participating in the conversation increased. Other factors that appeared to increase anxiety were body language perceived as showing signs of boredom from the tutor (e.g. looking at the clock or watch), being in the presence of other language learners who were deemed more
proficient, a lack of background about the topic, and at the beginning of the conversation. Anxiety decreased when participants perceived that they were being listened to carefully.

In terms of excitement, or motivation, participants reported feeling excited when discussing a topic in which they had experience or background knowledge, though this excitement dissipated when the topic had been discussed a couple times. Other factors that increased a participant’s excitement about a conversation encounter included feeling that the tutor could help them improve their L2 ability and perceptions of a tutor’s attractiveness. Being asked for additional information on a topic also increased participants reported motivation. Being asked to make further contributions to the conversation likely promotes participants’ SPCC when the attribution is made to L2 ability.

Kang (2005) defines responsibility in this context as “a feeling of obligation or duty to deliver and understand a message, or to make it clear” (p. 285). Participants reported their sense of responsibility increased when they perceived the topic being useful or important. They also reported feeling more responsibility for making contributions when the perceived themselves to be more knowledgeable about the topic than the tutors or when the topic pertained to a sensitive issue in relation to Korea or Korean culture. Sense of responsibility decreased as the number of conversation participants increased.

Kang (2005) recommends that ESL instructors choose conversation topics in which learners have adequate background knowledge or experience. Additionally, she
suggests effort should be made so that learners feel they have a safe and secure environment in which to speak. Kang proposes this can be accomplished when instructors de-emphasize errors, and by utilizing body language that is perceived by students as interest in their contributions (e.g. smiling).

**WTC: Trait or State?** As previously noted, WTC, as originally conceptualized by McCroskey and Richmond (1987, 1990), is a trait-like characteristic that can be impacted by situational variables—both internal and external. What is important in this conceptualization of WTC is an individual’s tendency or probability towards initiating communication across situations. For example, an individual may generally enjoy initiating communication at social gatherings, but may fail to do so when circumstances are aligned in such a way as when he is feeling “down,” or an acquaintance he has had a falling out with has arrived to the gathering. Though generally a “talkative” individual, he may not be so willing to communicate in this particular context.

However, others (e.g. Dörnyei, & Kormos, 2000; MacIntyre, Babin, & Clément, 1999) have proposed that WTC is better conceptualized in terms of distinguishing between trait WTC and state WTC. In his attempt to make a conceptual clarification with the construct of language anxiety (LA), MacIntyre (2007) makes a distinction between trait, situation-specific, and state levels of LA. For example, an individual may be “neurotic” or regularly anxious (trait level), or simply when the individual is speaking in the L2, but not her native language (situation-specific level). Alternatively, an individual may simply be experiencing anxiety at a moment that is not bound to a general trait or
regularly occurring situation (state level). MacIntyre contends that WTC, as a variable in SLA, should be similarly conceptualized.

In a study to examine the distinction between trait and state WTC, MacIntyre, Babin, and Clément (1999) measured the trait-level characteristics of 226 university students—WTC, SPCC, and CA among other variables. Additionally, they were asked if they would participate in a laboratory portion of the study. Eighty-six volunteered to participate in the laboratory portion, of which 70 actually participated. The analysis revealed that those choosing to volunteer for this portion had significantly higher WTC than those who declined. During the laboratory portion, participants were asked to perform two speaking, and two written tasks—one easy, and one difficult for each. Prior to each task, participants’ were asked to rate their state-level WTC, SPCC, and CA on a scale of 1 to 10. For example, for state-level SPCC, participants were asked to rate how competent they felt about performing the task within a three-minute time period. The analysis revealed differences in state WTC between those who choose to engage in the difficult speaking tasks and those who declined.

However, though the researchers made a conceptual distinction between trait and state WTC, it is not clear there were actually two phenomena at work here. Trait WTC, SPCC, and CA for the participants who did and did not engage in the laboratory tasks were not analyzed for differences, so it cannot be determined if these trait variables were also predictive of participation, even if they were associated with volunteering. Furthermore, had an analysis revealed differences in state and trait WTC, it would not be
clear that the attribution could be made to different processes at work, or to situational factors. MacIntyre, Babin, and Clément (1999) propose that states “potentially will be affected by several variables including mood, physiological factors (e.g., arousal levels), environmental conditions (eg. [sic], the presence of recording equipment), and a host of other factors” (p. 219). But, the same could be said about traits in so far as they result in communicative behavior. WTC is one’s intention to initiate communication when free to do so. It is this factor, coupled with physiological states, environmental conditions, and other factors that predicts an individual’s actual communicative behavior. The trait/state distinction does not appear to be necessary.

But even if the trait/state distinction were warranted, it reasons that trait WTC would be of more interest to language educators, for a larger goal of language teaching is that students would communicate across situations. However, the key to promoting WTC across contexts may lie in structuring specific situations so as to build students’ beliefs in their capabilities. One such way would be to utilize the sources that promote self-efficacy.

**Promoting WTC: Implication for teachers.** While a number of studies have examined the characteristics of WTC, few have actually examined what teachers do in the classroom to actually promote WTC. Still, in study after study, it is clear that individuals’ WTC is strongly associated with how apprehensive they are and how competent they perceive themselves to be (Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre, 2007; Richmond, McCroskey, & McCroskey, 1989), and a few researchers have been bold
enough to make some recommendations. Baker and MacIntyre (2003) had found that students in a French immersion program had higher WTC and SPCC, and lower CA than the non-immersion students in their study. They speculate that the increased contact with the target language provides students opportunities improve their ability to evaluate their competence which then lowers anxiety and increases perceived competence resulting in higher WTC. But, it would be imprudent to assume that mere exposure to the target language results in increased SPCC since not all immersion programs are alike—that is, they are not all structured so that comprehensible input is maximized (Padilla, 2006).

Yashima (2002) notes that a student’s international posture has been indirectly associated with WTC and recommends that English as a Foreign Language educators should prepare lessons that “enhance students’ interest in different cultures and international affairs and activities” (p. 63). Freiermuth and Jarrell (2006) recommend using online chat as a means of increasing students’ WTC noting that learners in their study reported perceiving fewer social constraints in this medium, and thus freer to communicate. And finally, Kang (2005) recommends that instructors choose conversation topics in which learners have experience or background knowledge as a way to promote WTC. She also recommends that learning environments be structured so that students are not overly anxious about making production errors. She suggests this could be accomplished when instructors indicate they are listening by smiling and actively responding. Lastly, Kang recommends that group size for conversation be relatively
small in order to increase security and responsibility. However, she defined responsibility as:

a feeling of obligation or duty to deliver and understand a message, or to make it clear. Responsibility is accompanied by a feeling of pressure [italics added] to deliver and understand a certain message, which arises out of personal, interpersonal, or intergroup motives. The pressure is often associated with the outcome of not delivering or understanding the message, which may result in a loss of personal benefit and intergroup respect, or ruin an interpersonal relationship. (p. 285)

While a smaller group may increase a student’s sense of responsibility, feelings of pressure may be assumed to accompany some level of anxiety, thus an instructor may want to consider the contextual aspects of the situation, such as group dynamics and conversation topic, before setting the size of conversation groups.

However, while the above recommendations seem a reasonable place to begin, they do not address what teachers actually do to promote students’ perceptions of competence or to decrease their language anxiety. At present, there is much that is not known about how SPCC actually impacts outcomes. It is at this point that we turn toward self-efficacy theory for some answers.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is a central component of Albert Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1986). Social cognitive theory proposes a reciprocal relationship between the
environment, one’s behavior, and personal factors that consist of cognitive, affective, and behavioral events. In this theory, the individuals play a role in shaping their environment. The mind is proactive, creative, and reflective and not simply an entity that guides the individual in reacting and responding to stimuli that happen to cross her path. The beliefs that individuals have about their ability to accomplish specific tasks can be a strong determiner in the choices people make about whether to actually engage in the task or not (Bandura, 1999).

Self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations (Bandura, 1997). It is these beliefs that can be powerful predictors of performance. Indeed, these beliefs can be a better predictor of performance than actual ability (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 1995). This makes sense to those in education who are familiar with “high or low achievers.” Low achievers may include those who have high ability but low efficacy and therefore have lower achievement, whereas high achievers may include those with low ability but high efficacy who therefore have higher achievement. For example, an individual is not likely to attempt a task they do not believe they can succeed at. An individual may even know how to achieve a certain task, but will still not be likely to engage in the task if she doubts her ability to follow it through. An individual may recognize that daily study will result in an “A” in her anatomy class, but not believe she has the discipline this kind of study would require. Hence, she is not likely to attempt this kind of study and is, consequently, not likely to receive that “A.”
Self-efficacy also plays a role in students’ behavioral practices towards academic subjects. Students who have a higher sense of perceived efficacy are more likely to: (a) physically expend more effort, (b) persist longer at tasks, and (c) engage in instrumental help-seeking (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). Indeed, a meta-analysis of studies conducted on self-efficacy and academic performance between 1977 and 1988 indicate that self-efficacy accounts for approximately 14% of the variance of students’ academic performance (Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991). Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, and Pastorelli (1996) have demonstrated that students higher in self-efficacy are also more likely to engage in prosocial behavior though similar to peers in all other aspects. This, in turn, affects academic achievement. Students with a high sense of self-efficacy are also more likely to choose more academically oriented peer groups than peers with low self-efficacy, again resulting in higher academic achievement (Bandura et al., 1996).

**Sources of self-efficacy.** According to Bandura (1995, 1997), an individual’s belief in their efficacy to accomplish a given task can be affected in four ways: (a) enactive mastery experiences, (b) vicarious experiences, (c) social persuasion, and (d) physiological and emotional states. However, as Bandura notes, tasks are typically performed in complex contexts. Thus, he posits that these sources rarely operate in isolation. An individual attempting a novel task may make judgments about her/his ability while visualizing the model s/he saw previously perform the activity. At the same time, the individual may be receiving performance feedback from others. And, it is likely
that the individual is also inferring information from her/his affective or physiological state at the time.

**Enactive mastery experiences.** Enactive mastery experiences refer to direct experience with the task in question, and are considered the strongest source of self-efficacy in general (Bandura, 1997) and educational settings specifically (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Generally, success in a task is expected to increase one's perceived self-efficacy while a failure will lower it. However, a variety of factors play a role in determining how effective a particular mastery experience will be including: (a) self-knowledge, self-monitoring, and reconstruction of the experience; (b) task difficulty and contextual factors; (c) the amount of effort expended; and (d) the temporal pattern of success/failure (Bandura, 1997). Self-schemata influence the environmental cues individuals attend to prior, during, and after the task. As Bandura notes, multiple performances over time may result in various levels of performance which leave room for biases in interpretation. If one brings a high sense of efficacy to the task, one is also bringing schemata that result in being more inclined to remember successful attempts and attribute personal factors to the success while failing to recall failure, assistance, or the ease of the task. Success and/or failure at novel tasks—before an individual has had sufficient information to calibrate their sense of efficacy—are exceptionally vulnerable to one’s self-schemata. In other words, “efficacy beliefs are thus both products and constructors of experiences” (Bandura, 1997, p. 82).
The perceived difficulty of the task is also important in determining the relative value of a mastery experience. A task perceived as easy, fails to provide the performer with much information about her/his ability as the attribution for success likely rests with the nature of the task and not one’s ability. On the other hand, challenging tasks may result in learning more about the task as well as one’s abilities (Bandura, 1997). But tasks are performed within contexts. Thus, normative evaluations and attributions are also crucial. If one has little experience with the task, s/he may rely on the performance of others in gauging the difficulty of the task. Additionally, the attributions one makes regarding difficulties lying outside the task (e.g., temperature, noise), the assistance one receives, or the availability of resources (e.g., adequate tools or equipment) will also factor into how difficult one perceives the task (Bandura, 1997).

Individuals also infer from the amount of effort they exert how capable they are at a given task. Generally, a lot of effort serves as an indication of low self-efficacy while relative ease may signal a high sense of efficacy. But here too, a variety of factors contribute to these inferences. While adults may believe that much effort is an indication s/he may not be up for the task, children may not make this distinction (Bandura, 1997). And again, the sources of self-efficacy rarely operate in isolation. Struggling with a task that one perceives others as having little difficulty with is likely to result in a lowering of self-efficacy. Likewise, accomplishing a task with ease that others appear to struggle with is likely to raise one’s self-efficacy. However, without others to make comparisons to, a task that requires little effort provides little information about one’s abilities. Indeed, a
strong sense of personal efficacy can weather the occasional failure, and failures may even increase the level of persistence that one puts forth if the challenge can eventually be overcome by increased effort (Bandura). In fact, easy successes could create a low tolerance for tasks that require more effort and can result in one becoming easily discouraged (Bandura, 1997). However, if a failure occurs before a strong sense of efficacy has developed, then this experience will likely undermine it.

Attainment trajectories—the amount of time it takes to perform a task and the pattern of success or failure—is another factor taken into account as individuals make efficacy judgments (Bandura, 1997). An occasional failure may not have that much impact on one’s sense of efficacy provided that one notes the gradual improvements s/he is making over a period of time. At the same time, failures coupled with a period of no marked improvement are likely to have a detrimental influence on self-efficacy.

Another aspect of mastery experiences is their ability to generalize to other tasks. A high sense of efficacy that was influenced by mastery tasks can generalize to other tasks—especially ones that are similar (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 1995). Thus, an individual who excelled in Spanish class may now feel more confident about her capability to take on French.

**Vicarious experiences.** Vicarious experience refers to a source of self-efficacy that is modeled—either by observing others or envisioning one’s self performing the task. Individuals make judgments of capability by making comparisons to the performance of others (Bandura, 1997). Thus, outperforming others will generally act to raise self-
efficacy while failing at a task others succeed at will likely lower self-efficacy. However, not all models or contexts will have the same impact on each learner. And of course, each learner possesses unique characteristics that partially determine the impact that a vicarious experience will have on her/his sense of perceived efficacy. Some of these factors include: (a) the cognitive and motivational processes of the learner, (b) the mode of the actual modeling, and (c) the perceived characteristics of the model.

Generally, observing success by those perceived as similar will serve to increase self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). However, the impact of the event is governed by four cognitive and motivational processes: Attentional, retention, production, and motivational (Bandura, 1997). Learner histories and skills—such as values, preferences, preconceptions, and cognitive abilities—factor into what aspects of the modeled situation will be attended to. Likewise, aspects of the event—its salient characteristics, utility value, and intrinsic value—play a role. Once attention to pertinent information about the event has occurred, information is transformed and retained in memory. Again, learner characteristics—biases, learning histories, etc.—play a role in what information is represented and recalled in memory. And of course, information that is retained influences what behaviors are actually produced at a later time. Motivational processes are influenced by the perceived consequences of the modeled behavior. If the model is rewarded for her/his actions, then the observer may be more likely to act in kind (Bandura, 1997).
Bandura (1997) describes four modes of vicarious influence: Actual modeling, symbolic modeling, self-modeling, and cognitive self-modeling. Actual modeling refers to the modeling by others in one’s immediate social environments. For a student, this means those in her/his classroom, extra-curricular activities, out-of-school programs, and/or other social networks. Symbolic modeling refers to the modeling that occurs through media. Whatever the mode of modeling, Bandura posits that models are most effective when they allow the observer to be privy to the cognitive strategies they are using to achieve the task—that is, when they verbalize their thought processes. He also claims that modeling is most effective when coupled with cognitive rehearsal on the part of the observer (Bandura, 1997). Self-modeling refers to watching one’s performance via video/audio playback. Viewings of successful attainments are thought to increase one’s self-efficacy. Even viewing faulty performances can increase self-efficacy provided the viewer is able to work out what would constitute a superior strategy. The last mode of modeling Bandura describes is cognitive self-modeling—or imaginal experience (Maddux, 2005). This refers to visualizing one’s self performing a series of progressing more complex tasks.

No matter the mode of modeling, its impact will be determined by how the experience is processed (Bandura, 1997). Factors that may contribute to how the event is processed include: Performance similarity, attribute similarity, multiplicity and diversity of modeling, coping versus masterly modeling, and perceived competence of the model (Bandura, 1997). The first two of these factors are related to the perceived similarity of
the model to the observer. Thus, a model perceived to be of similar ability level is more likely to be a stronger influence on the observer’s self-efficacy than one perceived as being far beyond or below one’s own ability. Bandura posits that those at or slightly above one’s own perceived ability level will have the strongest impact. Likewise, those perceived as similar in other ways will have more of an influence. That is, models of roughly the same age, educational attainment, socioeconomic (SES) level, and of the same sex and ethnicity will be a more powerful influence than models who differ from the observer in those personal characteristics.

Additionally, many models (i.e., multiplicity of modeling) will have a stronger impact than a single individual who may be easily discounted as an atypical case (Bandura, 1997). Bandura posits that observing a wide range of models (i.e., diversity of modeling) succeed at a particular task provides one with a strong foundation with which to judge one’s own capabilities. However, again, it is those individuals within the group perceived as similar who will carry the most weight. Thus, in a classroom context, observing the performance of all one’s peers will provide one with a good sense of where her/his ability stacks up, it is those peers perceived as similar that will have the biggest impact. But, how the model actually engages with the task is also important. For example, those models who successfully struggle through the challenges embedded within a particular task (i.e., coping models) provide an observer with more information about the task—thus, a better platform from which to judge one’s ability—than those who perform effortlessly (i.e., masterly models; Bandura; Schunk & Hanson, 1985).
the same time, the perceived competence of the model is also important (Bandura, 1997). Observers have a tendency to direct more attention to competent models—especially when the observer is a novice (Bandura, 1997).

**Social persuasion.** The third source of self-efficacy comes from verbal or *social persuasion*. Though thought to be a common source, Bandura (1997) claims it operates indirectly. That is, social persuasion is effective in enhancing efficacy beliefs only to the extent that the one receiving such encouragement mobilizes the necessary effort to accomplish the task—successfully. Thus, it is generally considered a weaker source as there is no authenticated experience to back it up (Bandura, 1997). If one is encouraged to attempt a task that he then succeeds at, his perceived efficacy for the task will increase. On the other hand, an individual persuaded to attempt a task s/he had no real expectation of accomplishing is likely to experience a lowering of self-efficacy. One may become convinced by a peer that she is capable of traveling alone in a country where English is the predominant language, but getting lost and ripped off on a daily basis will probably nullify the pep talk that occurred prior to the trip. However, if she makes it to all the sites and successfully navigates transportation and shopping encounters, this would likely increase her self-efficacy for the task.

Not all attempts at persuasion will have the same effect. Bandura (1997) identifies several factors that determine the effectiveness of social persuasion. First is how the performance feedback is framed. According to Bandura, evaluative feedback is likely to increase self-efficacy when the performer is in the early stages of skill development and
told they have ability for the task. Additionally, feedback that is framed to focus on progress towards a goal rather than short-comings is more likely to increase self-efficacy. The second factor pertains to the credibility of the one providing the persuasion. Feedback from persuaders who are perceived as credible and knowledgeable is more likely to have an effect than feedback that is perceived as coming from someone not familiar with the performer or the task. And third is the degree of disparity between the individual’s assessment of her/his ability and the one providing feedback. Bandura posits that performance appraisals from persuaders that are only moderately beyond the performer’s beliefs about her/his ability are more effective than those that are far beyond those held by the performer.

And, of course, the quality of the feedback is also important. Bandura (1997) notes that much of the feedback received regarding one’s performance may not be overtly communicated. A persuader may respond by providing the individual with tasks that are less challenging or excessively praise a performance that is far from spectacular. Additionally, Bandura notes that an individual may be given unsolicited assistance or less recognition for a performance matched by her/his peers. Likewise, unrealistic pep talks will easily be disconfirmed by experience while those who are told they lack capabilities are likely to seek easier tasks and give up more easily. An individual who is informed that he is not “gifted” at language study may be more likely to take a level of English below his actual level, and to quit once a difficulty is encountered. Feedback that is
specific (Schunk & Rice, 1987) and directed towards the progress students are making
toward mastering strategies appears to be particularly effective (Schunk & Swartz, 1993).

An increase in self-efficacy due to social persuasion has been shown to increase
academic achievement (Jackson, 2002; Schunk & Swartz, 1993). Schunk and Swartz
(1993) conducted a pair of experiments to examine goal setting and the type of feedback
that students received regarding their writing. The fifth-grade students in their study were
given a process goal of learning a strategy, a product goal of writing paragraphs, or a
general goal of working productively. Half of the students who had a process goal also
received progress feedback on how effective the writing strategy was working for them.
These latter students experienced the most significant increases in self-efficacy and
achievement. Another study by Jackson (2002) also demonstrated the value of social
persuasion. Jackson divided his class into two sections—those who were given feedback
designed to increase their efficacy beliefs for a psychology course and those who
received neutral feedback. Those who received the efficacy-inducing feedback went on to
achieve higher test scores than those students who received the neutral feedback.

*Physiological and affective states.* The fourth source of self-efficacy comes from
physiological and affective states. As Bandura (1997) notes, individuals use somatic
information via physiological and affective states in determining whether s/he is up to the
task. Generally, fatigue, pain, and negative affect are interpreted as signs that one is less
than capable of accomplishing the task at hand. However, several factors play a role in
how much of an impact these states will have on self-efficacy.
The first factor includes the salience of the somatic information plays a role in the impact a physiological/affective state on one’s sense of personal efficacy for a given task. Bandura (1997) posits that individuals differ in the attention they pay to somatic information. Those absorbed in the present task may be less attuned to their affective/physiological states, and thus less likely to be debilitated by them. But one’s appraisal of the information is also important. If one interprets his increased heart-rate and sweat to having run up a flight of stairs to enter a warm room, then his sense of efficacy is not likely to be affected as much than if he interprets these cues to giving a speech he is not prepared for. As noted earlier, one’s past experiences and construal biases play a role in how the affective/physiological state is interpreted. To the extent that a physiological event does not convey distinct meaning, it is left open to interpretation. Thus, those who tend to believe arousal is a sign of inadequacy will be more likely to experience a decrease in self-efficacy as opposed to those who believe that such experiences are an expected part of the situation. The level of intensity of arousal is also a factor. But here too, it is the interpretation of the arousal that appears to be important (Bandura, 1997). One who has developed a level of expertise at a particular task is likely to find a moderate level of arousal beneficial while a novice may find it debilitating. Thus, for these high achievers, arousal may work to increase self-efficacy.

Additional sources of self-efficacy. While much empirical research supports the existence of the above sources (Bandura, 1997), some have suggested additional sources of self-efficacy not previously described by Bandura (e.g., Klassen, Tze, Betts, &
Gordon, 2011; Palmer, 2006; Usher & Pajares, 2008)—often in studies of self-efficacy for teaching. Others have suggested that some of the modes of a particular source may actually be separate sources altogether. For example, Usher and Pajares (2008) have suggested that cognitive self-modeling may differ in important ways from actual and simulated modeling. Similarly, they suggest that the concept of self-persuasion (i.e., self-talk) should be further explored as it may represent a unique source of self-efficacy. Others have suggested that empathy (Yough, 2011) and perceived respect (Cheung, 2008) may represent additional sources of self-efficacy. In a study of self-efficacy in a teaching context, Cheung found that the perceived respect from parents and students acted to increase the self-efficacy of the in-service teachers in China. However, it may be that the perceived respect the participants in that study reported had behavioral origins that functioned as social persuasion.

Palmer (2006) proposed that content and pedagogical knowledge may act as sources of efficacy. Preservice teachers enrolled in science methods courses in Australia completed the Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument Form B (Enochs & Riggs, 1990) as well as more informal surveys. While Palmer found the more “traditional” sources of self-efficacy (e.g., social persuasion and affective/physiological states), he also found that participants reported less traditional, and perhaps unique sources. In addition to simulated and cognitive self-modeling, participants also reported that content and subject-specific pedagogical knowledge contributed to their personal sense of efficacy. Bandura has suggested that knowledge of the task is inherently bound in the execution of
the task. However, tasks vary in their complexity, and teaching is a fundamentally multidimensional task (Woolfolk, 2010) comprised of pedagogical (i.e., the means) and content (i.e., the ends) knowledge. In terms of teaching, it would reason that subject-specific pedagogical knowledge (or general pedagogical knowledge for that matter) is closely bound with the execution of the task of teaching. It has clear behavioral manifestations. However, content knowledge is not so readily transferable to the demonstration of actual skills. The argument here is that it could be that one’s personal sense of efficacy is enhanced simply through the acquisition of content knowledge—knowledge that has no direct outcome regarding the enactment of given tasks.

Integration of the sources. While various sources have been described, isolating them in practice may be no small matter. As Bandura (1997) notes, it is likely that the sources of self-efficacy rarely operate independently. For example, an enacted mastery experience may be coupled with social persuasion that is also accompanied by feedback from one’s physiological or affective state. Usher and Pajares (2008) note that studies that measure individual contributions of sources typically yield significant correlations between them suggested that they often operate in tandem. However, it is likely that individuals provide differing weights to the individual sources. Bandura indicated that the integration rules that individuals use likely vary from person to person. He suggested that the sources could work in an additive fashion—the more sources present, the more of an influence they may have. Or, it could be that the sources present act multiplicatively. Others may give relative weight to the sources—that is, some sources may have more
weight than others. Lastly, Bandura suggests that they could act *configuratively*. That is, relative weights are allotted according to the specific sources present. For example, an individual may give a lot of weight to social persuasion when that source is coupled only with an affective state. Add a vicarious event however, then the weight given that source may disproportionally shrink.

**Processes affected by self-efficacy.** Self-efficacy influences human functioning through four processes: (a) cognitive, (b) motivational, (c) affective, and (d) selection (Bandura, 1997). These four processes often influence one another rather than operating independently (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy influences cognitive processes in several ways. Individuals set goals for themselves based on their perceived beliefs about their abilities (Bandura, 1997). One is not likely to set the goal of becoming an interpreter for the United Nations if he does not believe he can consistently form grammatically correct sentences. Bandura notes that most behavior is thought out before being acted out. Those with a high sense of efficacy for a particular task are likely to envision successful scenarios. These scenarios act as guides for performance unlike an individual with low self-efficacy who may visualize failure (Bandura, 1997). Visions of failure will not likely be of much use in accomplishing the task. Finally, a strong sense of self-efficacy helps people meet the various challenges that a task may impose, maintaining resilience through unexpected obstacles (Bandura, 1997).

Students who have a higher sense of efficacy will be more likely to use learning strategies that are at a deeper processing level than students with a lower sense of
efficacy (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003; Zimmerman, 1995). They are also more likely to be consciously aware of their own cognitive processes and can therefore better regulate their own learning (Bandura, 1997; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). Strategy use and metacognition have been linked to self-efficacy, and effective use of cognitive strategies has been shown to positively correlate with academic achievement (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003; Zimmerman, 1995).

Self-efficacy influences *motivational processes* in several ways. First, is that self-efficacy influences the causal attributions that one makes. Those with high self-efficacy will attribute the cause of a failure to special circumstances or lack of effort rather than to low ability (Bandura, 1997). A student who has a high sense of perceived efficacy for written English may attribute the cause of a low test score to having stayed up late the night before, a “bad test,” or lack of study time and lack of preparation rather than attribute the failure to his own inability at English. Additionally, efficacy beliefs: (a) shape the goals that people set for themselves, (b) determine how much effort they put into these goals, (c) determine how long they persevere through difficulties they encounter, and (d) determine how resilient they are to failures (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 1995). A learner with a high sense of self-efficacy for ESL may set a goal of advancing to the next level within the next three months. This individual will also likely increase the amount of time that he spends studying (effort), continue to study on days that he is not feeling well or when met with time challenges (perseverance), and continue to put forth this level of study even in the face of a setback such as a
conversation in which he was not able to successfully communicate his thoughts (resilience).

Motivation may increase when a student: (a) has interest in the subject, (b) places importance on the subject, and (c) has positive affect towards the subject (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). Students who have high self-efficacy are also less vulnerable to depression, which would result in lower academic achievement (Bandura, et al., 1996). A student who has intrinsic interest in study of a particular target language will probably place more importance on this subject over one that she is not as interested in. Likewise, she will probably have positive feelings for this topic. All these elements being the case, she is probably also going to have a high sense of perceived efficacy for mastery of this subject. This, in turn, will be linked to higher academic achievement as compared to students who do not have this level of efficacy. Zimmerman (1995) also notes that a student who has a high sense of perceived efficacy will: (a) have a higher rate of performance, (b) be more likely to persist at the task, and (c) expend more energy doing it. And as mentioned earlier, the successes and failures of peers that are perceived to have similar characteristics can affect self-efficacy and motivation (Zimmerman, 1995). Lastly, students who have a high sense of perceived efficacy are more likely to be motivated to take on challenging tasks than students low in perceived efficacy. In fact, those with low self-efficacy are more likely to avoid tasks they perceive as challenging (Zimmerman, 1995). In this way, self-efficacy influences motivation which, in turn, results in higher academic achievement.
Self-efficacy also influences *affective processes* in several ways. First, self-efficacy affects the way potential threats are interpreted. Those with a high sense of self-efficacy remained undisturbed by threats while those with a low sense of self-efficacy can be debilitated by them (Bandura, 1997). A newly arrived immigrant to an English-speaking country may view all the new stimuli and changes as a challenge if she has a high sense of self-efficacy, or a threat if she has a low sense of perceived efficacy. The second way that self-efficacy can influence affective processes is in how one controls disturbing, ruminative thoughts (Bandura, 1997). Those with a high sense of efficacy to control disturbing thoughts are not likely to become disturbed, while those with low self-efficacy will likely become depressed and anxious.

Lastly, self-efficacy influences *selection processes*—the processes that people use to make choices. Bandura (1997) notes that those with a high sense of perceived efficacy are likely to consider more options than those with a low sense of self-efficacy. This can have a significant impact on one's life. The choices that individuals make can shape the different skills, interests, and social networks that then, in turn, influence the course that their life then takes (Bandura, 1997).

**Self-Efficacy, SPCC, and Self-Confidence**

Another characteristic of efficacy beliefs is that they are domain specific (Bandura, 1997). One’s belief in her ability to understand the economic factors that led to the Civil War may differ greatly from her belief in her ability to master physics. And even more specifically, one’s belief in her ability to write a paper on the economic
factors that led to the Civil War may be different than her belief about giving a *speech* on the same topic. And indeed, measures of self-efficacy are more accurate when they measure specific, rather than general beliefs (Bandura, 1997; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003; Pajares, 1996b). It is not difficult to imagine why this would be. For example, a native English-speaking student who is asked about her belief in her ability to master a second language may envision a similar language to English such as German, or a language that she may have had a lot of exposure to, such as Spanish, rather than a language that is not similar to English or one that she has not had much exposure to, such as Chinese. If the researcher had intended to measure perceived efficacy to master Chinese, a question regarding general language learning is not as likely to predict achievement as is a question specifically about a belief to master Chinese. Though, as self-efficacy can generalize to similar tasks (Bandura; Zimmerman, 1995), this general question about language learning is likely to be a better predictor of achievement than an even more general question about overall academic performance.

Thus, in the domain of SLA, self-efficacy may be conceptualized as a *language learner’s beliefs in her or his capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to speak the target language*. Self-efficacy for speaking a target language (SESTL) is conceptually distinct from WTC as the latter refers to one’s *intention* to initiate communication when free to do so (MacIntyre, 1994; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987), whereas self-efficacy refers to *beliefs*. A recovering alcoholic may *intend* on obtaining that 30-day sobriety chip, but may not believe he can do so as even the liquor
aisle at the grocery proves too big a temptation. Similarly, a student may intend to speak with conversational fluency, but may not believe he has the fortitude required for this level of sustained study and practice.

A more closely-related construct is that of *self-perceived communication competence* (SPCC). Though definitions of this construct in the literature are sparse at best, in the domain of learning L2, SPCC can be thought of as one’s perceptions of her or his competence at communication in the target language. However, Zimmerman (1995) notes that self-efficacy is often confused with similar constructs, and posits that perceived self-competence is distinct from self-efficacy—though closely related. Zimmerman describes perceived self-competence as more of a general composite view of the self as the result of comparisons with others. Another important distinction is that SPCC refers to *perception* of ability—self-efficacy refers to *beliefs* about capabilities to *organize and execute* the necessary steps to achieve a specific attainment. Perceived competence is likely one of several considerations an individual makes in forming judgments about capabilities.

A third construct that has receiving considerable attention in the field of motivation in language-learning contexts is that of *self-confidence*. Though it has been proposed as a concept similar to self-efficacy (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995), it has generally been treated as an affective variable (e.g., Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992; Krashen, 1982). Indeed, it is conceptualized to have two components—perceived confidence and a lack of anxiety (Clément, 1980; MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels,
In the social context model (Clément, 1980; Clément, R., Kruidenier, 1985), self-confidence is thought to increase with exposure to members of the target language/culture—as long as the interactions are pleasant experiences for the learner.

This is in contrast with self-efficacy. Though the positive experience could be construed as an affective source of self-efficacy, they are only that—a source. With self-efficacy, the most salient feature of interaction with the target-language community would be the perceived results of attempts at communication with members of this community. Indeed, measures of self-confidence are rather general in that they ask respondents to rate their confidence in their capacity to interact appropriately with members of the target language on a personal level (Clément, R., Kruidenier, 1985). “Appropriate interactions” can refer to culturally congruent non-verbal behavior (e.g., personal space), and do not necessitate an actual speaking component. In short, self-efficacy encompasses self-confidence which encompasses self-perceived communication competence.

Self-Efficacy in Second-/Foreign-Language Contexts

Interest in students’ self-efficacy second- and/or foreign-language contexts has grown in the last 10 years. Research in these contexts has largely examined the relationship between self-efficacy and other variables that had previously been examined in motivation research in SLA contexts. Unfortunately, much of the research has been plagued by failing to consider contextual and other variables (e.g., correlational analyses that fail to control for other contributors to variance) or equating self-efficacy with
similar, but distinct constructs (e.g., outcome expectancies, self-confidence, or self-reported communication competence).

One of the most consistent findings thus far, is that self-efficacy for the target language in general appears to be positively associated with achievement as defined by course grades in the target language (Dwyer & Fus, 2002; Hsieh, 2008; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2007; Tilfarlioğlu & Cınkara, 2009; Wang, Spencer, & Xing, 2009).

Interestingly, Mills, Pajares, and Herron (2007) found that self-efficacy for self-regulation in language-learning contexts was a better predictor of course grades than self-efficacy for obtaining a particular grade. Perhaps not so surprisingly, self-efficacy in particular domains of language learning were significantly related to proficiency in those domains—reading (Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006) and listening proficiency (Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006; Rahimi & Abedini, 2009), for example.

What also appears to be clear is that a high sense of personal efficacy is associated with strategy-use. For example, Magogwe and Oliver (2007) found a relationship between self-efficacy for English-as-a-second-language and strategy use in Batswana. Shang (2010) found self-efficacy to be related to reading strategies amongst English-as-a-foreign-language students in Taiwan. Li and Wang (2010) found it to be associated with a variety of strategies including reading, metacognitive, and social/affective strategy-use. However, Matthews (2008) failed to find a relationship between self-efficacy and tutor-seeking behavior—apparently, only those with poor grades sought-out this service.
Other findings include that self-efficacy may be related to the attributions one makes. Hsieh and Kang (2010) found that EFL students with a high sense of personal efficacy were more likely to make internal attributions and hold control beliefs for their successful outcomes. Those with low self-efficacy were more likely to make external attributions for successes. Additionally, a small number of studies indicate that communication anxiety is inversely related to self-efficacy (e.g., Lucchetti, Phipps, & Behnke, 2003; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006).

Still, only a few studies provide any indication of how self-efficacy is actually supported or develops in language-learning contexts. For example, Caldwell (2007) suggested that language study coupled with service-learning opportunities with members of the target community could provide mastery experiences that could promote self-efficacy. In a qualitative study of English learners studying French, Graham (2006) found that those with low self-efficacy tended to make peer-comparisons—and used exaggerated language when talking about the comparison. Furthermore, they tended to have an entity-view of language ability (cf., Dweck, 2000). Graham found that success at lower levels of study did not necessarily bring lasting effects to students’ self-efficacy. As she put it, “success in earlier language learning does not seem to have been sufficient to help them cope with new and perhaps unexpected difficulties or to maintain a view of themselves as a ‘good language learner’” (p. 305). She recommends that students establish their own learning goals—ones that would presumably offer an optimal level of challenge. And finally, Chan and Lam (2010) found that the type of feedback that
students receive could be important. They found that the EFL students in their study experienced less of a decrease in self-efficacy if they received formative, rather than summative, feedback. They also found that self-referenced feedback more beneficial to self-efficacy beliefs than norm-referenced feedback.

In sum, the research on self-efficacy in language-learning contexts to date suggests that it is positively associated with achievement, proficiency, strategy-use, internal attributions of ability, and negatively associated with communication anxiety. Enactive mastery experience in real-world settings with an optimal level of challenge and feedback that is formative in nature and self-referenced may act as sources to promote self-efficacy beliefs. What appears to be absent from the literature at this time is an examination of self-efficacy for speaking the target language, its relation to grades and students’ willingness to communicate, and the contextual variables that promote it.

**Teaching Self-Efficacy**

Teaching self-efficacy is one of the few teacher characteristics associated with student achievement (Armor, et al., 1976; Ross, Cousins, & Gadalla, 1996), and is associated with students’ self-efficacy for learning (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1988). Teacher efficacy was first introduced in a study to assess the effectiveness of a reading program at schools with predominantly minority populations in the Los Angeles Unified School District for the Rand Corporation (Armor, et al., 1976). Amor and colleagues failed to find relationships between student achievement and teacher background characteristics such as race and ethnicity, college attended, undergraduate major,
graduate training, amount of instruction in reading, or teaching experience. But they did find that participant responses to two items from a questionnaire used in the study were associated with student achievement: (a) *When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can’t do much (because) most of a student’s motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment*, and (b) *If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students* (Armor, et al., p. 23). Armor and colleagues called this teacher efficacy and defined it as “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to produce an effect on the learning of students” (p. 23).

Ashton (1984) defined teacher efficacy similarly, as “the extent to which teachers believe that they have the capacity to affect student performance” (p. 28). Ashton described eight dimensions of teacher efficacy: (a) sense of personal accomplishment, (b) positive expectations for student behavior and achievement, (c) personal responsibility for student learning, (d) strategies for achieving objectives, (e) positive affect, (f) sense of control, (g) sense of common teacher-student goals, and (h) democratic decision-making. According to Ashton, teachers with a high sense of efficacy view their work with students as important and meaningful and believe their teaching directly impacts student learning, and are confident they can influence student learning. Highly efficacious teachers expect students to make progress. And indeed, teachers with a high degree of teacher efficacy tend to make more positive predictions of student success, and do not appear to be distracted by a student’s level of attentiveness when making predictions (Tournaki & Podell, 2005). That is, a teacher with a high sense of efficacy is not likely to
make negative predictions about students who do not appear to be paying attention. Yet, according to Ashton, highly efficacious teachers believe the responsibility for student learning lies with them. If students do not succeed, the highly efficacious teacher reflects upon her/his performance and how the approach could be modified to help students succeed. They believe they are effective in planning for student learning. They perceive they are effective at setting goals for themselves and their students, and can effectively identify the strategies needed to meet these goals. According to Ashton, teachers with a high sense of efficacy have positive feelings toward their students, and positive feelings about teaching and themselves as teachers. They involve students in the decision-making process regarding the goals that affect them and perceive teaching as a joint venture with students in reaching these goals. Additionally, teacher efficacy is inversely related to burnout (Fives, Hamman, Olivarez, 2007; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007).

On the other hand, teachers with a low sense of efficacy, according to Ashton (1984), find teaching frustrating and easily become discouraged. They tend to have negative feelings about their students. These teachers expect students to misbehave and to react negatively to their teaching efforts. They do not expect students to succeed. The responsibility for success, as perceived by low efficacious teachers, lies with students. Student failure is attributed to students’ ability, background, motivation, and attitude rather than quality of instruction. And indeed, teachers with low TE tended to attribute student failure to external factors (e.g. language barriers, home background, and district constraints on teaching) (Fisler & Firestone, 2006). According to Ashton, these teachers
do not have specific goals for their students and a vague notion of what they want their students to achieve. They perceive student goals as being distinct from, and in opposition to, their goals. They impose decisions about learning goals upon students rather than sharing the responsibility for setting these goals with them. Ashton noted that many school environments are not structured in ways that support a strong sense of efficacy. As a teacher, one is often isolated making it difficult to assess one’s effectiveness. Additionally, there may be a lack of support from colleagues and administrators as well as a limited role in making decisions that affect the larger context of one’s teaching.

Ashton (1984) notes that teacher efficacy is context dependent. That is, teachers may feel efficacious with a certain group of students (e.g. native English-speakers) than others (e.g. English language learners) or in one setting (e.g. first-grade students) over another (e.g. high school math). Research has supported this proposition. In a study of 52 teachers in east-central Ontario, Ross, Cousins, and Gadalla (1996) examined within- and between-teacher predictors of teacher efficacy. The within-teacher variables included feelings of being well prepared, feelings of having past success, and perceptions of student engagement. Between-teacher variables included subject discipline, teaching experience, graduate degree attainment, gender, perceptions of school as a learning organization, preference for student directed teaching strategies, and preference for innovative assessment practices. They utilized a hierarchical linear model to estimate both the within- and between-teacher effects on participants’ sense of efficacy. The analysis indicated that within-teacher variables represent different dimensions of teacher
efficacy. That is, teachers may feel efficacious about one aspect of their teaching (e.g. engaging students), but not another (e.g. being prepared). Ashton recommends that teacher education program provide preservice teachers with a wide range of experiences in a variety of situations.

Again, in the vein of Armor and colleagues (1976) and Ashton (1984), Dembo and Gibson (1985) define teacher efficacy as “the extent to which teachers believe they can affect student learning” (p. 173). They conceptualized teacher efficacy as consisting of two components: personal teacher efficacy and teaching efficacy. Personal teaching efficacy (PTE) refers to the teacher’s beliefs in his or her abilities to affect student learning. Teaching efficacy refers to a teacher’s belief that issues pertaining to teaching effectiveness lie outside one’s sphere of influence—i.e. factors external to the teacher. It refers to the role of the teaching profession in general. Some have referred to teaching efficacy as general teaching efficacy (GTE) (e.g. Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998) (and GTE will be used from this point on to avoid confusion with the construct of teacher efficacy). However, in an earlier study, Gibson and Dembo (1984) stated that the GTE “component” of teacher efficacy is actually more akin to an outcome expectancy. They argued that it is the combination of GTE and personal teaching efficacy that result in the determination of behavior.

However, some have questioned the validity of GTE as self-efficacy (Deemer & Minkey, 1999; Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990) or an outcome expectancy (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk
Hoy, & Hoy, 1998; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Guskey and Passaro noted that items from the PTE component of Gibson and Dembo’s measure were worded in positive terms and used “I” as a reference (e.g. “I can”) whilst items pertaining to GTE were negatively worded and used “teachers” as the referent (e.g. “teachers cannot”). When they modified items to reflect either a personal internal/external or a teaching internal/external orientation, they found two distinct factors that only showed a moderate relationship. Their results suggest that GTE does not refer to perceived beliefs about one’s ability to achieve given outcomes or the expectancy of a specific behavior to achieve the outcome, but refers to the source of control for a given outcome (cf., Rotter, 1966)—the beliefs regarding the relationship between the outcomes and their source. That is, GTE refers to the belief about the power of teaching in general (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). This distinction is an important one to make. As Bandura (1997) noted, “teachers’ instructional efforts are governed more by what they believe they can accomplish than by their view of other teachers’ abilities to prevail over environmental obstacles by effective teaching” (p. 243). Other studies have shown an inconsistent relationship between teacher behaviors and GTE (Podell & Soodak, 1993; Saklofske, Michayluk, & Randhawa, 1988; Soodak & Podell, 1997) while PTE consistently predicts behavior (Soodak & Podell, 1997). Therefore, this study will focus on PTE, which I will simply refer to as teacher self-efficacy hence forward.

**Contemporary views of teaching self-efficacy.** But even after making the GTE/PTE distinction, some have advocated for the construct of teacher efficacy to be
expanded to include other aspects of teaching not directly related to instruction (Imants & Debrabander, 1996; Labone, 2004). Labone suggests that efficacy to engage the community where the child lives—and the school resides—should be included in measures of teacher self-efficacy. She notes that efficacy for engaging community is a legitimate dimension of teaching, and may be becoming increasingly important as the gap between the backgrounds of students and teachers widens. However, some have moved beyond a call for mere expansion of the construct, but have questioned its emphasis in research and its application in the classroom in general (cf. Wheatley, 2005).

Wheatley (2005) questions the benefits of having a high degree of confidence in one’s ability to teach effectively. He issues four concerns that he proposes researchers and teacher educators should be mindful of before jumping on the teacher efficacy bandwagon. First, he notes that environments in which teacher confidence is explicitly valued may result in teachers gravitating towards traditional practices that are more control-oriented and may result in a teacher appearing more effective on the surface, rather than to adopt more power sharing with students which may not look like conventional notions of “teaching.” Second, teachers who strongly believe they have the ability to effectively teach may not feel compelled to change existing, yet less than effective, practices. This may be especially problematic when teachers receive limited feedback on the effectiveness of their skills, or define teaching in ways that do not maximize learning. For example, teachers who view a room full of quiet students as an indication of effective classroom management and the hallmark of good teaching may
perceive themselves as effective even though students may be less than cognitively engaged with the content. Third, Wheatley points out that doubt may actually play an important role in teacher development. He notes that doubt is critical for reflection, thinking, and teacher learning. And fourth, a high degree of confidence may promote maladaptive motivational patterns when coupled with an entity view of ability (cf. Dweck, 2000) or a performance goal orientation (cf. E. Anderman & Wolters, 2006)—they may give up easily when obstacles are encountered.

However, the concerns that Wheatley raises may stem from issues of efficacy belief formation, rather than with the construct of self-efficacy per se. According to Bandura (1997), one of the characteristics of those exhibiting a high sense of efficacy is the tendency to persist when tasks become challenging. It may be that those who give up easily actually have efficacy beliefs that are still being crystallized rather than a strong, fully-formed set of beliefs about their ability to effectively teach. Thus, the issue may be more one of efficacy development rather than a pitfall of high efficacy beliefs in general.

**Developmental trajectory of teaching self-efficacy.** As noted earlier, self-efficacy beliefs are informed through four sources: Direct and vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and affective and physiological states (Bandura, 1997). This suggests that efficacy beliefs are subject to change. And indeed, studies have indicated that teacher efficacy can change as the result of experience. For example, Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) found that preservice teacher efficacy increased after their student teaching experience—though this may not hold true in all domains (Plourde, 2002). Hoy and Woolfolk
speculated this may be due to experience in learning to control students—an orientation that may have been valued at their host schools, and thus a salient aspect of the student teaching experience. But the context appears to play a role in the formation of efficacy beliefs as well. Knoblauch and Woolfolk Hoy (2008) also found that student teaching was associated with increases in teacher efficacy. However, perceiving the cooperating teacher as having a high sense of teacher efficacy appeared to be particularly important, as this significantly predicted teacher efficacy. Additionally, the school setting appeared to play a role—being placed in an urban school significantly negatively predicted perceived collective efficacy. Along the same lines, other studies have suggested that the students one has during student teaching may also have an impact on one’s efficacy beliefs (Yeung & Watkins, 2000).

However, the gains in teacher efficacy during teacher preparation appear to be short lived—at least for the first couple of years in the classroom. Woolfolk Hoy and Spero (2005) found similar results in that teacher efficacy increased as preservice teachers progress through their preparation program. However, they followed these same students through their first year of teaching to find a significant drop in teacher efficacy—though others have found that in urban settings this drop in self-efficacy may be mediated by having a student teaching experience during teacher preparation (Oh, Ankers, Llamas, & Tomyoy, 2005). In another study on the role of experience, Soodak and Podell (1997) found that teacher efficacy decreases dramatically the first two years of teaching from preservice teaching levels. They found this decline is especially rapid for
primary teachers in comparison to secondary teachers. Their results suggest that over
time, teacher efficacy increases as teachers gain experience. This finding has been
replicated in other studies (e.g. Hansen, 2006), and appears to be true in other cultural
contexts as well (e.g. Cheung, 2006). Soodak and Podell suggest this decline in efficacy
the first year of teaching indicates that teacher education programs are not adequately
preparing preservice teachers for the challenges faced in the classroom, and recommend
increased support for beginning teachers—a recommendation supported by findings that
novice teachers desire mentoring from more experienced teachers (Onafowora, 2004).
However, it is important to note that their study was a cross-sectional design. As teachers
who leave the profession may have low teacher efficacy than those currently teaching
(Glickman & Tamashiro, 1982), a reasonable alternative explanation for the steady
increase in teacher efficacy after the first couple of years is simply that those with
exceedingly low teacher self-efficacy leave the profession. Thus, it reasons that the
veteran teachers would show higher levels of teacher efficacy as a group when those no
longer in the profession are left out of the analysis.

A study involving preservice teachers from both the U.S. and Taiwan (H. Lin,
Gorrell, & Taylor, 2002) supports the claim that teacher efficacy decreases once teachers
step into the classroom as the primary person in charge of student learning. In a study
intended to illustrate the cultural differences and influences in the development of teacher
efficacy, Lin and colleagues found that the Taiwanese preservice teachers in their study
began their programs with lower teacher efficacy than their American counterparts. By
the end of the program the Taiwanese preservice teachers showed a *decrease* in teacher efficacy, while the *Americans* showed an *increase*. The researchers point to the responses of individual items on the teacher efficacy measurement, and suggest that differences may be due to differing expectations of teaching in the two cultural contexts. And while this interpretation of the results appears valid, a close inspection of the two education programs suggests that differences could also conceivably be due to the nature of these two programs. One difference between the two programs is that of student teaching. Taiwanese preservice teachers were required to complete an entire year of student teaching while their American counterparts had to complete a mere quarter. Thus, it could be that the realities of the classroom had an impact on the teacher efficacy of these preservice teachers.

Once in the classroom, teachers may benefit from critically examining their classroom, developing and implementing educational interventions, and evaluating the effectiveness of those interventions as these practices may increase teacher efficacy (Henson, 2001). Eight teachers and three instructional assistants took part in a participatory action research project to in the alternative education schools in which they worked (Henson, 2001). The intent of the study was, in part, to examine the effects of participatory action research on teacher efficacy. The teachers took part in brainstorming activities to identify instructional challenges and classroom management issues, devised data-based methods to quantify these issues, developed interventions, and then evaluated their effectiveness. The results indicated statistically significant increases in teacher
efficacy. Qualitative data added further insights. Post-test interviews suggested that newer teachers reported feeling more efficacious than more experienced teachers. It seems they had more to gain from the experience.

**Teaching self-efficacy in language-learning contexts.** As previously mentioned, self-efficacy beliefs are domain specific (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1996a). However, only recently have researchers begun to examine teacher efficacy in language learning contexts. This may be especially timely as foreign-language teachers with a low sense of personal efficacy for teaching may be more likely to leave the profession (Swanson, 2010). Much of the research in this domain mirrors that of TSE research in general. For example, Chiang (2008) found that field experience served to boost TSE as preservice teachers worked their way through teacher preparation.

However, other studies have illuminated some of the complex ways that field experience may have on TSE for teaching the target language. For example, in a mixed-methods study with preservice teachers in an EFL context in Turkey revealed that the efficacy beliefs of preservice teachers changed as they progressed through their teacher education program (Atay, 2007). Atay used a version of the *Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale* (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), modifying items for an EFL context. As participants progressed through their practicum year their teacher efficacy for instructional strategies significantly decreased, while their efficacy for classroom management and student engagement significantly increased. The qualitative analysis revealed that those preservice teachers with higher teacher efficacy reported working
hard to overcome deficiencies and finding satisfaction in their improvement. If they perceived their cooperating teacher as ineffective, they expressed determination not to utilize the same practices, and believed themselves to be more effective at engaging students. Those with lower teacher efficacy had trouble finding use for the instructional practices they had learned during their coursework. Additionally, these teachers reported not learning from their cooperating teachers.

Other findings have also indicated that TSE for teaching a target language may entail distinct characteristics from other domains of teaching. For example, in what was one of the earliest studies on TSE in foreign-language study context, Chacón (2005) conducted a study in an English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) context in middle schools in Venezuela. The intent of the study was to determine the relationships between teachers’ sense of efficacy and their perceived English proficiency and strategy use. The efficacy measure developed in this study, the English Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (ETSES), based on the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) by adding or substituting “English” or “learning English” for “school work.” The results of this study indicate that teachers’ sense of efficacy for instructional strategies was higher than efficacy for classroom management and student engagement. Also of interest was that self-efficacy was correlated with self-reported English proficiency—a finding that has since appeared in subsequent research (e.g., Yilmaz, 2011).

Eslami and Fatahi (2008) also found that TSE was positively correlated with self-reported proficiency in the target language—in their case, English. They also found that
TSE was associated with use of communication-based strategies. And in a study of foreign-language students in an English-teaching training program in Turkey, Çubukçu (2008) found a significant relationship between communication anxiety and TSE. Specifically, those with a lower sense of personal efficacy were more likely to experience communication anxiety.

In sum, TSE for teaching a target language likely operates in distinct ways. Specifically, a teacher’s perceived language proficiency appears to play a significant role in how efficacious s/he perceives her/himself to be.

**Summary**

In conclusion, the literature indicates that students’ willingness to communicate in the target language greatly determines whether they proceed to do so. Two strong antecedents of WTC include communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence. Self-perceived communication competence is a construct similar, but conceptually distinct from self-efficacy in that it pertains to perceptions of ability whereas self-efficacy refers to beliefs about capabilities to organize and execute actions to attain given outcomes. Indeed, it is likely that learners consider perceptions of their abilities, along with features of the task and external restraints, in formulating their self-efficacy beliefs. Though no studies to date have examined the relationship between self-efficacy and WTC, it is like that self-efficacy beliefs are a strong predictor of WTC. Additionally, researchers have offered little direction to teachers on steps to take to change students’ perceptions of their abilities. Self-efficacy theory, on the other hand, has
generated much interest in the sources that affect personal beliefs of efficacy. As a result, the leap from theory to practice is not so great.

Interest in self-efficacy in language-learning contexts has increased over the last ten years. Findings include a relationship between self-efficacy and course grades (Dwyer & Fus, 2002; Hsieh, 2008; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2007; Tilfarlioğlu & Cinkara, 2009; Wang, Spencer, & Xing, 2009), proficiency (Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006; Rahimi & Abedini, 2009), strategy-use (Li & Wang, 2010; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Shang, 2010) as well as inverse relationships to communication anxiety (Lucchetti, Phipps, & Behnke, 2003; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006). However, fewer studies have examined the contextual variables that may promote a sense of personal efficacy (see Caldwell, 2007; Chan & Lam, 2010; Graham, 2006 for exceptions). Still, researchers have yet to attend to self-efficacy for speaking the target language specifically, its relationship with WTC, nor to important contextual variables. One such significant contextual variable may be teachers’ sense of efficacy. Self-efficacy for teaching has been shown to be related to student outcomes (e.g., Amor, et. al., 1976). However, in language-learning contexts, not much is known exactly how teachers’ sense of efficacy may relate to students’ self-efficacy for speaking the target language other than as possible models of proficiency (Chacón, 2005; Yilmaz, 2011) and strategy use (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008). The present study attempts to address these gaps.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

The present study contains three broad goals: (a) to examine the role that self-efficacy plays in outcomes such as learners’ willingness to communicate in the language and their course grades, (b) to examine the contextual factors that may promote self-efficacy, and (c) to better understand the teacher practices that may lead to a learners’ sense of personal efficacy for speaking the target language. Specifically, the study aimed to address the following questions:

- Does students’ self-efficacy for the target language (SETL) predict their willingness to communicate?
- Do SETL and perceptions of climate predict course grades after controlling for other variables?
- Are students’ perceptions of their teacher’s sense of efficacy (PTSE) associated with increased SETL and willingness to communicate?
- Does teachers’ sense of efficacy explain the ways in which SETL varies at the student-level?
- Does students’ perceptions of their classroom climate predict WTC after controlling for other variables?
- Is teachers’ sense of efficacy associated with increased SETL and WTC?
• What do teachers perceived as highly efficacious by their students do to promote SETL, and WTC?

**Participants**

**Student participants.** All student participants were enrolled in a large Midwestern university. The first wave of participants was English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) students (and their teachers). However, foreign-language learners (Spanish and Chinese) were recruited in subsequent waves due to concerns with low overall low numbers \((n = 47)\) and response rate. While this decision was made to address issues of sample size, it was also felt that these populations could results in insights during the analysis as it is likely that the motives for language study of these groups differ in important ways. As an incentive, all participants were entered into a drawing to win one of six $20 gift certificates to a national bookstore chain. Each level of participation (e.g., completing a post-survey) resulted in an additional drawing entry. A random number generator was used (http://www.random.org/) to select winners of the incentive for participation. Selected participants were contacted via email and informed of various options (i.e., mail or pick-up) to receive their gift certificates.

**English-as-a-second-language learners.** Participants in the ESL program included 47 students representing 15 nationalities (8 from the United Arab Emirates; 7 from Libya; 5 each from China and Korea; 3 each from Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Taiwan; 2 from Columbia; 1 each from Chile, Italy, Japan, Peru, Qatar, Turkey, and Venezuela; and 4 not reporting country of origin). The mean age of ESL participants was
25.05 (n = 42, s.d. = 7.07) with a range between 17 and 44. The mean number of months in the U.S. at the time of completing the first set of surveys was 5.04 (n = 43, s.d. = 6.49), and there were 15 females and 28 males with 4 not reporting gender.

The program is an intensive language program. Enrollees have several classes a day in reading/writing, listening/speaking, and grammar followed by electives. Class size is typically 12-15 per class. Program enrollees are assessed prior to the term and placed in one of five levels of study (Level Five being the most advanced). Participants enrolled in this program are generally pre-matriculated, undergraduate students interested in improving their standardized English-proficiency scores (e.g., TOEFL, MELAB, SAT verbal) to meet the minimum English proficiency requirements for admission to an American university. Some are also graduate students or company employees. The purported intent of the program is to provide students with linguistic tools and cultural knowledge so that they may be better equipped to succeed in American university settings.

In addition to the drawing incentive, ESL participants were also offered departmental tokens redeemable for use in an end-of-the-term raffle held by the department. The tokens are generally distributed by department faculty and staff to students deemed to be making an effort to use English outside of the classroom (e.g., attendance and participation at department-sponsored social events/ outings). The tokens distributed to participants in this study had an approximate value of five U.S. dollars.
As previously noted, the ESL program experienced unanticipated low enrollment rates during the period of this study. Possible reasons include: (a) a general global economic depressed climate, (b) concerns over an H1N1 epidemic, and (c) university-wide changes to the course-registration system. It should also be noted that administrators from the primary ESL program of recruitment did not consent to class time being used for participants to complete surveys. Several steps had been taken to increase response rate—including the shortening of the surveys, additional reminders to complete them, and a “pizza party” that included free food and assistance—to no avail.

**Spanish-as-a-foreign-language learners.** There were 469 Spanish-as-a-foreign-language (SFL) participants in the study. Participants were recruited from five credit-hour, 100-level Spanish courses. SFL participants were generally traditionally aged (mean age = 21.00, s.d. = 5.07), native English speakers (n = 458 with 3 reporting multiple native languages, and one each of Fulfulde, Spanish, Tamil, Vietnamese, and Yoruba with 3 not reporting). There were 237 females and 230 males with 2 not reporting gender. Participants enrolled in introductory Spanish courses are generally undergraduate students attempting to fulfill requirements of the general education curriculum at the university.

**Chinese-as-a-foreign-language learners.** There were 51 Chinese-as-a-foreign-language (CFL) participants recruited from five credit-hour, 100-level Chinese courses with a mean of 20.88 (n = 50, s.d. = 8.76). CFL participants were primarily native English-speakers (n = 43 with 2 native Chinese speakers, 3 Korean, and 3 reporting
multiple native languages). There were 29 females and 21 males with 1 not reporting. Participants enrolled in introductory Chinese courses are generally undergraduate students attempting to fulfill requirements for the general education curriculum. The Chinese courses students were recruited from had multiple instructors for each section. For example, an instructor emphasizing grammar may teach on Monday followed by a different instructor emphasizing culture on Tuesday.

**Teacher participants.** There were 33 teacher participants across three programs—5 ESL teachers, 25 Spanish, and 3 Chinese. All teacher participants were employed by the university as lecturers or teaching assistants/associates (TA). There were 20 females and 13 males. Lecturers had a mean age of 44.22 years (n = 9, s.d. = 15.24) and 9.82 years teaching in their respective departments (n = 11, s.d. = 12.08). TAs had a mean age of 28.4 (n = 15, s.d. = 4.88) and 1.24 years of teaching experience in their departments (n = 15, s.d. = 3.03). Of those reporting a native language (n = 25), 20 were native English speakers, 3 Spanish, 1 Chinese, and 1 two or more native languages.

**Measures**

Both teacher and student participants completed surveys as part of the study. Student participants completed surveys at two times points—one near the beginning of the term and the second set near the end of the term. Student surveys at the first time-point consisted of six parts including a demographic portion that asks respondents to report their native language, home country, primary area of study, age, gender, etc.

Student surveys at the second time-point consisted of seven parts including an
abbreviated demographic portion. Teacher surveys were administered only at the beginning of the term. They consisted of seven parts including a demographic portion.

Toward the end of the ESL portion of the study, a reliability analysis ($n = 33$) was performed on all measures in the student surveys to determine if items could be dropped as an attempt to increase response rate. See Appendices A and B for the pre- and post-student surveys and Appendix C for the teacher survey.

**Perceptions of classroom climate.** The *Perceptions of Classroom Climate* scale (PCC) was constructed for use in this study as it was felt that current measures of the sources of self-efficacy contained issues of construct validity—that is, they conflated the presence of sources of self-efficacy with learners’ actual efficacy beliefs. The PCC was included in the student post-survey packets. The intended purpose of the PCC was to determine the extent to which classrooms/teachers promoted self-efficacy for speaking the target language. Given this end, and to address issues of content validity, items were based on the four sources of self-efficacy described by Bandura (1997) in terms of how they would be manifest in classroom environments. For example, to tap into the presence of “mastery experiences” in the classroom, items such as *I have sufficient time to practice speaking the target language with a partner* and *I have opportunities to speak (the target language) before the entire class*. Items intended to indicate “vicarious experiences” include *I have opportunities to listen to native speakers speak English* and *I have opportunities to listen to good English learners speak English*. “Social persuasion” was represented by such items as *The teacher has high expectations for my success* and
Everyday in this class, the teachers says things that make me feel a personal sense of accomplishment. Examples of items intended to gauge the presence of structures to monitor and manipulate “affective/physiological state” in ways thought to promote self-efficacy include *In this class, we are encouraged to say positive things to one another when someone takes a chance in speaking English* and *The activities we do make me feel anxious about speaking*. While many events in the classroom may clearly fall into a particular category of self-efficacy source, others may function as multiple sources. For example, praise may act as social persuasion while simultaneously reducing anxiety for the recipient. This is reflected/accounted for in item generation with prompts such as *In this class, it feels like a team in which we all encourage one another.*

After items were generated, they were e-mailed (in tandem with items from the *Self-Efficacy for the Target Language* scale—described below) to seven “expert raters” for review. Six of the raters all had a Doctor of Philosophy with specializations in Educational Psychology (*n = 3*) or Second/Foreign-Language Education (*n = 3*). The Educational Psychologists had all done research involving self-efficacy. The seventh reviewer had a Master’s in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) and possessed more than ten years of experience teaching English as a foreign or second language in both the U.S. and East Asia. Raters were prompted to review, critique, and provide feedback on the items in terms of their adherence to the construct of self-efficacy and/or their congruence with the principles of second/foreign-language acquisition. Feedback was provided by three of the reviewers (two Educational Psychologists and one
foreign/second language educator). Minor modifications were made to the surveys based on their recommendations. Specifically, the raters singled out three words in separate items felt to be troublesome (e.g., idiomatic) for English language learners, and were thus substituted.

Next, cognitive interviews were conducted to address issues of reliability—that is, to better assure that respondents’ interpretation of the items was consistent with the construct the item was constructed from (Karabenick, et al., 2007) as well as to address general issues of comprehension. As the PCC and Self-Efficacy for the Target Language were originally intended for use with ELL students, non-native speakers of English were recruited primarily from graduate classes in foreign/second-language education from a large, Midwestern university for interviews. Interviewees included two native Chinese speakers, one Bulgarian speaker, one Korean speaker, and a native speaker of Igbo. The average length of stay in the U.S. was four years with a range between two and seven years.

As a preliminary step to address issues of reliability and validity, interviewees were asked if they could explain the instructions to the researcher in her/his own words. Next, interviewees were prompted to reflect on a language-learning class they had had and presented with surveys. Interviewees were asked to complete selected items that were felt could be problematic (e.g., when there was question as to how strict an item adhered to the intended construct, or if an item contained an idiom that only advanced learners may be familiar with, etc.). Following their response, interviewees were asked if the
question was confusing or lacking in clarity in any way, as well as what they believed the question was attempting to ascertain. Finally, interviewees were asked which response they gave to the item and offered an opportunity to explain their response.

The surveys were modified in several ways in response to the cognitive interviews. Additionally, surveys were modified immediately following every interview so that subsequent interviewees were responding to the most updated version (i.e., not to the version containing problem items). Modifications included: (a) providing examples within items to instill a more reliable prompt, (b) adding greater detail in place of select terms that could be confusing due to multiple meanings of the original terms, and (c) modifying the format to assure that the rating scale appeared on every page so that respondents would not have to retain the content of the scale in working memory. Interviews were discontinued when they ceased to add data that would indicate additional modifications would be needed.

Next, the surveys were pilot-administered in an attempt to obtain reliability estimates. Participants in the pilot administration were seventeen English language learners enrolled in an English language program at a large, Midwestern university. There were eight native Arabic speakers, three Chinese, and one each of Spanish, Turkish, and Vietnamese (three declined to report their native language). There were 13 males and 4 females with a mean age of 27 \( (n = 13, \text{s.d.} = 7.16) \). The mean amount of time in the U.S. was 6.65 months \( (n = 13, \text{s.d.} = 6.47) \) with a range from 1.5 to 24 months. The analysis
indicated that the PCC had an acceptable level of reliability to permit use in the study \((n = 16, \text{Cronbach's } \alpha = .80)\).

The final version included 23 items. Respondents were prompted to rate their agreement with each item on a six-point, Likert-type scale with anchors at 1 (Don’t agree), 3/4 (Moderately agree), and 6 (Strongly agree). Items with a negative valence were reverse-coded in the analysis.

**Self-efficacy for the target language.** The *Self-Efficacy for the Target Language* scale (SETL) was constructed for use in this study, and included as part of both student surveys. The SETL is a measure of self-efficacy for the target language. The SETL was based from the *Self-Efficacy for English as a Second or Foreign Language* (SEES/FL; Yough, 2005) and the *Teachers’ Self-Reported Proficiency* measure (TSRP; Chacón, 2005), but modified in several ways for use in the present study. That is: (a) items were modified to include learning the target language in general rather than English specifically, and (b) TSRP items that were used (e.g., items that tapped into the sociocultural aspects of language learning such as *know how to act in social English-speaking situations*) were modified to be in alliance with the self-efficacy construct. Additionally, self-regulatory items associated with language learning were included (e.g., *Find or create situations to practice English conversation*). As the SETL had yet to be used in empirical research, it was determined that additional steps were could be taken to assure validity and reliability. Thus, the SESTL was refined in tandem with the PCC for use in this study. That is, the SETL was: (a) sent to “expert raters” for review, (b)
modified in response to cognitive interviews, and (c) pilot-administered (see the above section for details regarding the expert rater review and cognitive interviews).

As with the PCC, minor modifications were made based on feedback from the expert raters. These modifications included the replacement of select idioms that were flagged as being potentially problematic. Modifications resulting from the cognitive interviews include: (a) providing examples within items to instill a more reliable prompt, (b) adding greater detail in place of select terms that could be confusing due to multiple meanings of the original terms, and (c) modifying the format to assure that the rating scale appeared on every page so that respondents would not have to retain the content of the scale in working memory. The pilot version included 38 items (plus 3 practice items). The pilot administration indicated strong reliability (n = 14, Cronbach’s α = .91).

In keeping with Bandura’s (2006) recommendation regarding response scales, respondents are prompted to rate their confidence—from 1 to 100—in their ability to perform specific tasks associated with speaking their respective target languages. Anchors were given at 1 (Not at all certain I can do this), 50 (Moderately certain I can do this), and 100 (Highly certain I can do this). Slight modifications to select items were made for each group of students. For example, ELL participants were prompted to consider the tasks in terms of English, whilst items for Spanish and Chinese learners referred to “the target language.”

Due to the recruitment issues noted previously, it was determined to retain only items pertaining to speaking, self-regulation, and language-learning in general for the
foreign-language portion of the study as items pertaining to listening, reading, and writing were of peripheral interest to the goals of the study. A reliability analysis after the ESL phase of the study indicated that additional items could be dropped resulting in an 8-item measure with acceptable reliability (Cronbach’s α = .85). A ninth item pertained to language-learning in general.

**Willingness to communicate.** The Willingness to Communicate scale (WTCS) attempts to measure one’s willingness to communicate, defined as one’s intention to initiate communication when free to do so (MacIntyre, 1994; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). The WTCS consists of 20 items, 8 of which are fillers. The 12 remaining items probe respondents’ willingness to communicate with three types of receivers (strangers, acquaintances, and friends) across four contexts (public, meeting, group, and dyad). Respondents are prompted to presume that they are free to choose to engage in communication in the particular context and to rate the percent of the time they would choose to communicate (0 = never; 100 = always). Internal reliability estimates of the WTCS range from .86 to .95 (McCroskey, 1992).

The WTCS was modified in this study in two ways. First, the filler items were dropped from the surveys. Second, as this study specifically pertained to events occurring in the classroom, it was felt that this context should be included in the measure. Thus, three items were added to include different types of receivers in this context. However, 11 items were identified to be dropped from the student survey after the reliability
analysis indicated that acceptable reliability could be maintained (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .84$) resulting in four items. The teacher-version of the measure retained 12 items.

**Psychological sense of school membership.** The *Psychological Sense of School Membership* scale (PSSM; Goodenow, 1993b) is an 18-item measure of sense of school belonging. Item generated for the initial measure included those to tap into various aspects of belonging such as perceived personal acceptance by teachers and peers, feelings of inclusion, and perceived respect and encouragement to participate in school functions (Goodenow, 1993b). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for ranged from .77 to .88 during the initial studies with the measure (Goodenow, 1993b) indicating acceptable levels of reliability. Sample items include: *People here notice when I’m good at something and I can really be myself at this school.* Respondents are prompted to rate their agreement on a five-point Likert scale with anchors at 1 (*not at all true*) and 5 (*completely true*). The PSSM was used in the student surveys only with the ESL participants. Select items were modified so that they would be appropriate for participants in this study (e.g., “other adults” changed to “teachers” or “people at this school”). Additional items were added to prompt students to consider their sense of belonging to the U.S. (*I am treated with as much respect as other people in this country*). Fourteen items were maintained after the pilot administration. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the 14 remaining items was .79. Items used in the teacher survey (15 total) were modified to prompt respondents to consider the items in relation to their department (e.g., *The people in my department respect me*).
**Self-perceived communication competence.** The *Self-Perceived Communication Competence* scale (SPCC; McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988) consists of 12 items that ask respondents to rate their perceived ability to communicate effectively with three types of receivers (strangers, acquaintances, and friends) across four contexts (public, meeting, group, and dyad) from 0 (completely incompetent) to 100 (completely competent). Respondents are prompted to “indicate how competent you believe you are to communicate in each of the situations described below” (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988, p. 111). McCroskey and McCroskey (1988) report an internal reliability for the SPCC Scale at .92. The response scale in this studied was modified to maintain consistency with other surveys in the study—that is, respondents were prompted to rate themselves from 1 to 100. Additionally, items were modified to prompt respondents to consider their target language when responding rather than communicating in general. Several items were eliminated after the ESL administration resulting in five items in the student surveys—the teacher-version of the scale retained all 12 items. Initial reliability was acceptable (Cronbach’s α = .90).

**Communication apprehension.** The *Personal Report of Communication Apprehension* (CA; McCroskey, 1986) is a 24-item measure that prompts respondents to rate their agreement on a Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) with statements delineating communication in various contexts (e.g., groups, meetings, public speaking, and interpersonal). Items were modified so that respondents would consider their target language and also that they would reference ‘class’ for select items...
(as opposed to ‘a meeting’). Five items were retained after the ESL administration with an acceptable level of reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .84$). The teacher-version retained the original 24 items. Items with a positive valance were reverse-coded to assure that high scores indicated high communication apprehension.

**Expectancy x task value.** Items for the expectancy-value measure (EXV) were drawn from the *Value of Education Scale* (Battle & Wigfield, 2003), the *Self- and Task-Perception Questionnaire* (Eccles, Adler, & Meece, 1984; Eccles [Parsons] et al., 1983; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995), and a measure of subjective task value (Wigfield, et al., 1997). It was included only in the student pre-survey packet. Internal consistency reliabilities for these measures are generally acceptable to strong ranging from .61 (Wigfield, et al., 1997) to .92 (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995). These measures all used Likert-type rating scales ranging from a 7-point (e.g., Wigfield, et al., 1997) to a 5-point (Battle & Wigfield, 2003). ‘Cost’ items were modified specifically from the *Value of Education Scale* which emphasizes the ‘cost’ dimension of value—24 of its 51 items address three components of cost: personal effort against worth, loss of time allocated toward other valued goals, and the psychological cost of failure.

The expectancy-value measure in this study utilized a 6-point Likert-type scale in an attempt to avoid directing respondents to responding to the center of the scale. Anchors ranged from *Strongly Disagree* (1) to *Strongly Agree* (6). Items prompted respondents to consider the value of select tasks in terms of learning their specific language-learning context. Cost and negatively-worded items were reverse-coded for the
analysis. The pilot version of the scale consisted of 28 Liket-type scale items plus an open-ended question that asked participants to state the most important reason for seeking to improve their language ability—as opposed to simply asking why they are studying the language to avoid a potentially common response (e.g., “to improve”). Two utility-value items were added after the pilot administration based on responses to the open-ended item—*One of the reasons I want to improve my English ability is to increase my chances of becoming successful in an English-speaking environment* and *One of the reasons I want to improve my English ability is to communicate with people who are different from me.* In total, the post-pilot version of the survey contained 30 items. Though reliability estimates were relative low for all dimensions of EXV (i.e., Cronbach’s α < .65), 12 items were dropped after the ESL administration without a striking reduction in reliability resulting in 18 items—3 interest/intrinsic-value, four importance/attainment-value, four utility-value, four cost, and three expectancy—plus the open-ended question. The items and their corresponding subscales are listed in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1. *Expectancy X Value Items.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have generally been interested in studying the target language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to studying the target language in this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I find studying the target language to be boring.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attainment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that improving my ability to speak this target language is a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary part of what will make me feel good about myself in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t need to be good at the target language to fulfill my potential.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value the prestige that comes with a high level of ability in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the reasons I want to improve my ability to speak the target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language is to increase my chances of becoming successful in an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment where it is regularly spoken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to improve my target language ability so that I can make more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my ability in the target language is important to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because it will provide better job opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my understanding of the world around me will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broadened by improving my ability to speak the target language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the reasons I want to improve my ability to speak the target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language is to increase my chances of becoming successful in an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment where it is regularly spoken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering what I want to do with my life, improving my foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language ability is just not worth the effort.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worry that spending all my time in foreign language study will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take time away from other activities I want to pursue.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m concerned that I’m not a good enough student to really improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my target language ability to get to the level I want.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It frightens me that this class will be more difficult than classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve had in the past.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectancy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to do better than most of my classmates in this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to do very well in this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very good at learning this target language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents prompted to consider their agreement with the extent to which the items apply to them on a six-point Likert-type with anchors at: 1—*Strongly disagree*, 2 / 3—*Disagree*, 4 / 5—*Agree*, 6—*Strongly agree*. Items marked with “*” indicate they were reverse-coded prior to the analysis.

*Coding of the open-ended question.* Student responses to the open-ended question (*What is the most important reason why you are seeking to improve your ability...*
to speak the target language?) were coded using a typology based on Eccles [Parsons] and colleagues (1983) conception of task value. That is, responses were coded according to attainment value, intrinsic value, utility value, and cost. An initial pass through the data revealed a number of rationales for pursuing language study that warranted breaking utility value down further. As many participant responses pertained to completing requirements, travel, and communication, it was determined that Gardner’s socio-educational model of second-language motivation may provide a good fit for the responses (Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Gardner & Smythe, 1974). Thus, utility-value was broken down into integrative-utility and instrumental-utility. Coding of the responses consisted of three phases: (1) initial coding of the data by three researchers working independently, (2) tagging of discrepancies by the primary researcher, and (3) discussion between the researchers to reconcile discrepancies in coding.

In total, 394 participants completed the open-ended question. The primary researcher flagged responses in which there was disagreement between the researchers in coding. This included responses that were dissimilar save for omissions (e.g., two of the three researchers have the same two codes, but the third only used one) and additions (e.g., two of the three researchers had a single code, but the third used two). There was complete agreement between the researchers for how 226 of those responses should be coded (57.4%). In meeting to reconcile discrepancies, it became apparent that several responses were not an ideal fit for the coding scheme (e.g., Spanish is a growing language, and I think I should know it or It is increasingly becoming important to learn
another language in today’s world). It was determined that these responses coincided with McColland’s (2000) conceptualization of an integrative motive that includes a desire to identify with a global community rather than a specific target community. Thus, a third utility-value code was created: *global community utility*. The codes were then assigned numbers and entered into the statistical software.

**Perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy.** Student perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy was assessed with the *Perceived Cooperating Teachers’ Efficacy Scale* (PCTES; Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; Li & Zhang, 2000). The PCTES is based on the short form of the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Items are unchanged, but directions prompt respondents to consider how they believed their teacher would respond to the measure. The rating scale of the PCTES was modified per Bandura’s (2006) recommendation for response formats for measures of self-efficacy. That is, respondents were prompted to use a scale between 1 (*Not at all certain I can do this*) to 100 (*Highly certain I can do this*). One item was removed as it pertained to K-12 contexts resulting in an 11-item measure. Initial reliability coefficients indicated acceptable reliability (Cronbach’s α = .91). The PTSES was a part of the student post-survey packet.

**Teaching self-efficacy.** Teaching self-efficacy (TSE) was captured with a measure derived from the short form of the *Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale* (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) and the *Teacher Efficacy for Teaching the English Language Learner* (TETELL; Yough, 2008). Items from the TSES prompt
respondents to consider their ability to accomplish tasks associated with teaching (e.g., motivate students who show low interest in school work, implement alternative strategies in one’s classroom, etc.). Studies generally report a three-factor solution—student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management—with internal consistency reliabilities ranging from .86 to .90 (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007), and has generally been shown to be reliable and valid across teaching and cultural contexts (Klassen, Bong, Usher, Chong, Huan, Wong, & Georgiou, 2009). The initial administration of the TETELL also had a three-factor solution—motivation, instruction/classroom management, community—and a high reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s α of .974; Yough, 2008).

One item from the TSES was not used as it specifically pertained to k-12 contexts (i.e., it pertained to engaging parents). Items from the TETELL that were derived from the TSES were dropped to avoid redundancy. Other TETELL items were removed or modified to align with college teaching (as opposed to the k-12 context in which the measure was initially intended)—specifically, items pertaining to issues that traditionally public school teachers would be dealing with as well as items pertaining to immigrants with no formal educational experience were removed. The resulting measure contained 21 items with two versions—one pertaining to ESL instruction, and one whose items were modified for foreign language teaching contexts. The rating scale prompted respondents to choose between 1 (Not at all certain I can do this) to 100 (Highly certain I
can do this) when considering specific teaching tasks to align with Bandura’s (2006) recommendation for response formats.

**Demographic information.** Sex was coded ‘0’ for male and ‘1’ for female. Native language was coded ‘0’ for English and ‘1’ for every other language. Course grade was coded: 1=F, 2=D-, 3=D, 4=D+, 5=C-, 6=C, 7=C+, 8=B-, 9=B, 10=B+, 11=A-, 12=A. Level of study: 1 = 101, 2 = 102, 3 = 103, 4 = 104. Program was coded ‘0’ for Spanish, and ‘1’ for Chinese.

**Procedures**

See Table 3.1 for an overview of the timeline for the procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
<th>Classroom Observations</th>
<th>Teacher Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students complete surveys at the beginning and end of the term; Teachers complete survey at the beginning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two, 45-minute observations per class conducted with two observers</td>
<td>Single, 30-minute (+/- 10 min.) conducted with primary researcher following observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td>Students: 47 (ESL); 469 (Spanish); 51 (Chinese) Teachers: 5 (ESL); 25 (Spanish); 3 (Chinese)</td>
<td>3 classrooms (2 Spanish; 1 ESL)</td>
<td>3 (2 Spanish; 1 ESL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials</strong></td>
<td>Pre- &amp; post-student surveys; teacher survey</td>
<td>Observation form</td>
<td>Interview guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>Summer 2009– winter 2010 (ESL); Spring 2010 (Spanish &amp; Chinese)</td>
<td>Followed surveys (following term)</td>
<td>Followed observations (same term)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Quantitative analysis (exploratory factor; reliability; correlational; regression)</th>
<th>Qualitative (typological) analysis</th>
<th>Qualitative (typological) analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Program partnership. Directors of the programs participating in this study were approached at least three months or more before the onset of the study. Directors were given a brief protocol of the procedures and the intent of the study was explained. Recruitment procedures were negotiated (thus, recruitment protocols were slightly different for each program). Additionally, de-briefing procedures were discussed. Program directors were given options that included a summary document or presentation before the program faculty and staff. Per the Internal Review Board procedures of the host institution, all programs provided a letter of consent for participation in the study.

Survey administration. Both student and teacher surveys were administered within the first two weeks of the term at the first time point. Teacher surveys included: Teaching Self-Efficacy, the Willingness to Communicate Scale, Psychological Sense of School Membership Scale, the Communication Apprehension Scale, and a demographic portion that asked participants the age, sex, years teaching, years speaking the target language, etc. Student surveys included: Self-Efficacy for Speaking the Target Language, WTC, PSSM, Self-Perceived Communication Competence, CA, Expectancy-Value, and a
demographic portion. Surveys were presented in packets that also included consent forms, instructions, and sealable return envelopes.

The researcher entered classrooms in the ESL program for recruitment purposes. The researcher passed out survey packets and reviewed consent forms highlighting that participation was anonymous and voluntary. Participants were also made aware of what participation entailed in terms of time commitment, and the incentive structure was explained. Potential participants were instructed to place completed surveys in envelopes, seal them, and then return them to their instructors who would then return them to a neutral party in the administration office who would notify the researcher when they were ready for pick-up. The procedure was similar for CFL participants though class time was allotted for survey completion. Thus, sealed envelopes were collected directly by the researcher.

For recruitment in the Spanish program, teacher surveys and student survey packets were placed in teacher mailboxes housed in their department. Instructions were included that directed teacher participants to (a) pass out student surveys, (b) explain to students the general purpose of the study, the approximate time to complete the survey, the incentive structure, the voluntary and confidential aspects of participation, and instructions for completing the survey, (c) a prompt to complete the teacher survey if they choose to participate, (d) instructions for returning the envelopes (campus mail), and (e) the researcher’s contact information in the event any questions remained.
Student surveys in all programs were re-administered during the last two weeks of the term. Measures in the second administration survey packets included: the SESTL, WTC, PSSM, SPCC, CA, the Perceptions of Classroom Climate scale, Perceptions of Teacher’s Sense of Efficacy, and a demographic portion. Recruitment procedures for the individual programs mirrored those of the first administration.

**Classroom observations.** Observations took place in select classrooms following the term in which survey data were collected. The collection of observation data entailed training observers, identification of classrooms, and actual observations. Observers were asked to observe those aspects of the classroom that could impact student self-efficacy beliefs for speaking the target language—specifically, observers were prompted to cue in on the various sources of self-efficacy that may be present.

**Observer preparation.** A total of four observers were recruited over two phases (two per phase)—the ESL and foreign-language phases of the study. The two sets were the result in a shift in participant focus noted previously. Thus, the first set of observers was trained and conducted observations in ESL contexts while the second were trained and conducted observations in SFL contexts. Commitments prevented the first set of observers from continuing with the study through the foreign-language phase. Thus, training/preparation was separate for the two phases. All four were graduate students enrolled in a Ph.D. program at a large, Midwestern university. Their area of study was Educational Psychology. Observers were given literature on teachers’ sense of efficacy and the sources of efficacy, and met with the researcher to discuss the construct of
teaching self-efficacy, the goals for observations, the general expectations, and outline of the time commitment. Additionally, observers worked in tandem with the researcher in developing a form for which to record observations to assure that it was “user-friendly” (Appendix D).

Next, classrooms were selected for practice observations. In the ESL program, the director acted as liaison, forwarding an email request to teaching staff to open up their classrooms to the researcher and two observers to hone observations skills for the observation portion of the study. The director then forwarded the contact information from one instructor willing to participate. Contact was established, and dates and times for observations were negotiated. The instructor was asked if practices could continue until relatively few inconsistencies existed between observers. It was speculated that two to five sessions would be required. In the end, two practice observations were conducted lasting approximately 45 minutes each with both observers and the researcher participating.

In the foreign-language phase, the director of the Spanish program forwarded a request for practice observations to all instructors in the program. Following this request, the researcher contacted seven individual instructors for recruitment, and confirmed dates and times with the first two to respond whose schedules permitted all members of the research team to attend. Again, dates and times were negotiated and instructors were informed that two to five observations may be required. In total, one practice observation was conducted as feedback from independent raters (described below) indicated few
discrepancies. Again, the practice observation lasted approximately 45 minutes with both observers and the researcher participating.

Prior to all practice observations, observers were prompted to hone in on events that could act as a source to impact—positively or negatively—students’ self-efficacy for speaking the target language. Observers were encouraged to provide rich detail of specific incidents at the expense of “counting” particular events. And lastly, observers were encouraged to spend approximately 15 minutes following the observation period to record their general impressions of the period and to fill in any gaps in their notes.

In both phases, the research team met immediately following practice observations to discuss specific instances that may have resulted in differences in interpretation. If there were any events that resulted in discrepancies, the team discussed the saliency of various cues present that may have resulted in the differences in order to illustrate the complexity of variables behind single events. The rationale was that this would deepen observers’ appreciation for the complexity of the multi-faceted nature of classroom events. Other issues in recording observations were discussed at this time. For example, observers were encouraged to provide evidence for claims they were making. That is, if it was recorded that “students feel comfortable telling the teacher they made mistakes,” observers were encouraged to state why they have come to this conclusion—to describe events. That is, to provide the rationale for making this claim.

Later, observation notes were typed and identifying information removed. In the ESL phase, the team met to review the notes, and discuss and note stylistic differences
for the continued purpose of assuring uniformity in recording. During this meeting, observers revealed it was striking the similarity of the events they chose to record. It was also noted that the context was sometimes incomplete in a single set of observations, but was often captured due to the presence of multiple observers. One issue in particular that was discussed was the use of direct quotes (one observer was quoting extensively while another captured the gist of the context). The benefits and costs of capturing direct quotes was discussed (both agreed that classrooms are dynamic places and that context is missed when trying to get a quote, though getting direct quotes provides good evidence). A consensus was reached that observers should error on the side of getting direct quotes and then filling in the context during the post-observation field notes. This process was similar for the foreign-language phase.

**Independent raters.** Following practice sessions, typed, de-identified observation notes were sent to blind reviewers to address concerns with inter-rater reliability. In the ESL phase, three individuals were asked to serve as reviewers; six other individuals were asked in the foreign-language phase. Potential reviewers were briefed on the nature of the task and approximate time commitment. Two agreed for each phase. All had backgrounds in Educational Psychology, and were either currently enrolled in Ph.D. program at a large, Midwestern university or were recent graduates (i.e., fewer than two years removed from graduate study). Reviewers were asked to count the numbers of discrepancies between notes. Discrepancies were defined as differing interpretations of the same events rather than mere omissions. Discrepancies were of greater concern during the training
period than omissions as multiple observers would be making observations in order to minimize omissions. This is also consistent with the intent of the observations—to obtain a thick description rather than a simple count of events.

None of the reviewers noted any significant discrepancies in either phase. For example, one reviewer stated s/he “didn’t find any real discrepancies, but there also wasn’t any real interpretation of the classroom—more like strict observations” (personal communication, June 21, 2009). The only discrepancy noted with the first phase of practice observations was in one observer’s use of the word “hush” in describing a teacher-student interaction. One of the other observers noted the incident, but did not use this adjective, which both reviewers felt gave the event a negative connotation. Thus, due to the report of few inconsistencies between observers, it was determined that further practice sessions were not necessary.

**Classroom identification and recruitment.** Classrooms in both phases of the study were identified based on aggregate mean PCC scores from student surveys. Only teachers whose scores fell in the upper quartile were considered. Prospective teachers were told that responses to student surveys indicated their classrooms may offer unique characteristics of interest to the study, that further investigation was warranted, and that participation would entail two 45-minute periods with two observers. Additionally, potential participants were informed that they would be asked to be interviewed following observations, and that interviews would last approximately 30 minutes. In the ESL program, due to the relatively small number of teachers, the teacher with the top
PCC score was recruited for observation. This teacher was contacted via email, and consented to participate. In the SFL program, an email was sent to instructors whose scores fell in the upper quartile and whose schedules were compatible with the observers (n = 5). Times for observations were negotiated with the first two to respond and consent. Observers were blind as to why and how classrooms were identified.

**Observations.** Observations occurred following the term in which student surveys were completed. Two observations of 45 minutes each with two observers were conducted with each instructor. A third observation was conducted with the ESL instructor with a single observer as the other observer had to cancel at the last minute. Observers forwarded their notes directly to the researcher who then typed them in preparation for analysis.

**Interviews.** Following the observations, observees were contacted via email and asked to participate in an interview. Participants were informed that interviews would last approximately 30 minutes. All consented, and times and locations were negotiated. Semi-structured interviews were conducted by the researcher. Interviews ranged from approximately 20 to 45 minutes. The interview guide can be found in Appendix E.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Overview

The research questions guiding the present study were:

H₁: SETL is a significant predictor of WTC
H₂: SETL is a significant predictor of course grades
H₃: Perceptions of classroom climate are a predictor of WTC
H₄: Perceptions of classroom climate are a predictor of course grades
H₅: PTSES is a significant predictor of WTC
H₆: TSES is a significant predictor of WTC
H₇: TSES is a significant predictor of course grades

Additionally, this study will examine the practices of those teachers perceived as being associated with self-efficacy supporting climates. Thus, a series of correlational and regression analysis were conducted to examine the nature of these relations. Additionally, qualitative data were collected and analyzed to gain a better understanding of the things that teachers perceived as effective actually do to promote a sense of personal efficacy for speaking the target language.

Quantitative Analysis
Scale factors and reliabilities. The first phase of the quantitative analysis entailed a series of exploratory factor analyses to determine the factor structure of several of the scales. The rationale was that many of the scales used in both student and teacher surveys had: (a) been constructed for this study (e.g., Perceptions of Classroom Climate), or (b) been used in only a small handful of studies (e.g., Perceptions of Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy). Exploratory factor analyses were not conducted on measures that consisted of five items or fewer or on measures contained in the teacher data-set as there were too few subjects (i.e., teacher participants) to justify these analyses (Stevens, 2002).

The first analysis conducted with the Perceptions of Classroom Climate scale (PCC) was a reliability analysis. The analysis indicated that the measure, as a whole, had high internal-consistency reliability (Cronbach’s α = .90). Next, Bartlett’s test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of sampling adequacy (KMO) were performed in order to determine if there is enough variability in the correlation matrix to warrant a factor analysis. Bartlett’s test utilizes a \( \chi^2 \) statistic to test the null hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix—the presence of which would indicate no relationships among the variables/items (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). Bartlett’s test for the PCC was significant (\( \chi^2 = 3175.90, df = 253, p < .001 \)) indicating that the correlation matrix contained enough variability to proceed with an exploratory factor analysis. The KMO is a test that compares the correlation coefficients between items to the partial correlation coefficients (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). Strong correlations
between items and small partial correlations would result in a large KMO—and signify adequate relationships between items to warrant further analysis. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy for the PCC was quite high (.92) providing further evidence that an exploratory factor analysis was justified.

Next, a principal components analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was performed to determine the underlying factor/component structure. Stevens (2002) recommends PCA as it (a) yields similar results to a factor analysis, (b) is psychometrically sound, and (c) relatively mathematically simpler than factor analysis. Pett, Lackey, and Sullivan (2003) add that it is a commonly used factor-extraction technique in the social sciences. Varimax rotation is a technique that maximizes the differences on particular factors between the high and low loadings (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). The intent is to achieve a simple structure of factors—that is, to decrease the possibility of interpreting the presence of a “general” factor that may result from an unrotated solution (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003).

The PCA extracted four factors in the PCC scale accounting for 58.39% of the variance in students’ responses. Twelve items loaded strongly (i.e., > .4) to the first factor—though one of the items loaded more strongly to the second factor. The theme emanating from these items was a climate characterized by teacher-generated overt, expressed caring, encouragement, and expectations for success. Thus, this subscale was labeled overt teacher encouragement (OTE). Sample items include: In this class, the teacher praises me when I put forth effort in speaking complex sentences, In this class, I
sense that the teacher cares about my personal life outside of class, and Every day in this class, the teacher says things that make me feel a personal sense of accomplishment. A reliability analysis indicated that this subscale had good reliability (Cronbach’s α = .91).

Five items loaded strongly to the second factor. Items loading to this factor centered on the theme of a classroom climate characterized by autonomy support. This subscale was labeled autonomy-supportive climate (ASC). Sample items include: In the class, the teacher helps us set our own learning goals and Every day in this class, I have opportunities to speak on topics of my choice. A reliability analysis indicated the autonomy supportive subscale had acceptable reliability (Cronbach’s α = .79). However, one of the items in this subscale (Every day in this class, I have time to practice speaking the target language with a partner) was a good conceptual fit with some of the other items loading to the third factor—communication-emphasized climate (CEC). A reliability analysis of that subscale indicated that reliability could be substantially improved with inclusion of this item without a substantial drop in reliability of ASC. A reliability analysis with the four remaining items indicated similar reliability (Cronbach’s α = .77). Thus, the item was moved to the third factor.

Four items loaded strongly to the third factor, though one of these items loaded more strongly to the fourth factor. As noted above, the theme these items centered on was communication-emphasized climate (CEC). Sample items include: Every day in this class, I have opportunities to speak the target language before the entire class and Every day in this class, I have opportunities to listen to good learners speak the target
language. However, as noted, a reliability analysis indicated poor internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s α = .58). However, reliability was improved by dropping one item (Every day in this class, I have opportunities to listen to native speakers speak the target language) and adding the one that had loaded to the second factor, but shared conceptual similarities with the other items loading to this factor. A second reliability analysis with those changes revealed improved reliability (Cronbach’s α = .69).

Four items loaded strongly to the fourth factor. The theme emanating from these items pertained to classrooms marked by competition. Thus, this subscale was labeled competitive climate (CC). Sample items include: In this class, only the best students are given positive feedback from the teacher and In this class, we are encouraged to compete with one another to be our best. A reliability analysis revealed somewhat poor internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s α = .53). See Table 4.1 for items, means, standard deviations, and factor loadings.
### Table 4.1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Rotated Factor Scores for the Perceptions of Classroom Climate Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Overt Teacher Encouragement</th>
<th>Supportive Communication</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
<th>Autonomous-Emphasized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In this class...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the teacher helps us set our own learning goals.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the teacher involves us in decisions that impact the learning in the class.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the teacher has high expectations for my success.</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the teacher praises me when I put forth effort in speaking complex sentences.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we are encouraged to say positive things to one another when someone takes a chance in speaking the target language.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only the best students are given positive feedback from the teacher.</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that taking a chance is encouraged, even if it means that there are some mistakes.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students encourage one another.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sense the teacher cares about my progress in class.</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sense the teacher cares about my personal life outside of class.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we are encouraged to compete with one another in order to be our best.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the activities we do make me feel anxious about speaking.*</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Every day in this class...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enough time to practice speaking the target language with a partner.</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to practice speaking before the entire class.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to speak about topics of my choice.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to listen to good learners speak the target language.</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities to listen to native speakers speak the target language.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the teacher says things that make me feel a personal sense of accomplishment.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the teacher gives me strategies that help improve my speaking ability.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the teacher encourages me when I take risks in speaking the target language.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only correct spoken sentences in the target language are praised.*</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when I am using the target language, I feel encouraged to take chances by using grammar that I have recently learned.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am encouraged to ask questions when I don’t understand.</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Respondents prompted to consider their agreement with the above items in terms of oral communication on a six-point Likert-type with anchors at: 1—Don’t agree, 3/4—Moderately agree, 6—Strongly agree. Factor scores below .40 are not listed. * indicates items that were reverse-coded.
Next, the psychometric properties of the *Self-Efficacy for the Target Language* (SETL) were assessed. An internal-consistency reliability analysis indicated good reliability for both the first and second administrations of the survey (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .89$ and $.90$ respectively). Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 2084.09$, $df = 36$, $p < .001$) and the KMO test of sampling adequacy (.88) both indicated sufficient variability in the correlation matrix to proceed with factor extraction techniques. A PCA with varimax rotation indicated the presence of two factors accounting for 65.81% of the variance in student responses to the first administration of the scale. Seven items loaded strongly (i.e., $>.4$) to the first factor though three of these items actually had stronger loadings to the second factor. The remaining four items all pertained to support skills related to speaking the target language including knowledge of socio-cultural considerations and self-regulatory skills. Thus, this subscale was labeled *indirect skills* (SETL-IS). Sample items include: *Find or create situations to practice conversation in the target language* and *Learn the “cultural rules” needed to successfully communicate in the target language*. Internal consistency reliability analyses for both administrations indicated good reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .82$ and .83 respectively).

Five items loaded strongly on the second factor. All items pertained to the actual speaking of the target language. Therefore, this subscale was labeled *strictly speaking* (SETL-SS). Sample items include: *Speak the target language in front of my classmates* and *Express my opinions in the target language when speaking about general topics.*
Internal consistency reliability analyses indicated good reliability for both administrations of the survey (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .85$ for both administrations). See Table 4.2 for items, means, standard deviations and factor loadings for the first administration.

**Table 4.2.**
*Means, Standard Deviations, and Rotated Factor Scores for the Self-Efficacy for the Target Language Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Indirect Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak the target language in front of my classmates.</td>
<td>63.61</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a conversation at the same speed as a native speaker of the target language.</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express my opinions in the target language when speaking about general topics.</td>
<td>54.56</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give a half hour speech on a topic I do not know well in the target language.</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the target language in casual conversation with people I know.</td>
<td>58.37</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find or create situations to practice conversation in the target language.</td>
<td>62.11</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn the “cultural rules” needed to successfully communicate in the target language.</td>
<td>64.87</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know how to act in social situations in which the target language is spoken.</td>
<td>60.37</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn <em>any</em> language I set my mind to.</td>
<td>68.10</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All data in this table was gathered during the first administration of the student survey. Respondents prompted to rate how certain they can do each of the tasks and a scale from 1 to 100 with anchors at: 1—Not at all certain I can do this, 50—Moderately certain I can do this, 100—Highly certain I can do this. Factor scores below .40 are not listed.

The psychometric properties of the *Perceptions of Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale* (Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; Li & Zhang, 2000) were next assessed. An internal consistency reliability analysis revealed a highly reliable measure (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .96$). Both, Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 4112.98, df = 55, p < .001$) and the KMO measure of sampling adequacy (.95) gave strong indication that a PCA could proceed. However, only one factor (accounting for 71.19% of the variance in responses) with an
eigenvalue above one was extracted. The scree plot also only indicated the presence of a single factor. Thus, no further factor extraction strategies were employed.

Of the remaining measures in the student survey, only the *expectancy-value* measure (EXV) contained more than five items. The EXV measure contained five *a priori* subscales (i.e., intrinsic value, attainment value, utility value, cost, and expectancy) based on clear theoretical grounds (i.e., expectancy value theory) all of which contained four items or less. Thus, factor analytic techniques were not utilized. As previously noted, there were too few teachers in the sample to perform a PCA with the teacher data.

Internal consistency reliabilities were conducted with the remaining scales and subscales from both the student and teacher data. Reliability coefficients for all scales are presented in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3.**

*Reliability Coefficients for Student and Teacher Scales and Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>S 1st</th>
<th>S 2nd</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SETL (full)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETL-IS</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETL-SS</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXV-Int</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXV-Att</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXV-Uty</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXV-Cost</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXV-Exp</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC (full)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC-OTE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC-ASC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC-CEC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC-CC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Reliability coefficients are Cronbach’s α. One item dropped (*Sometimes I feel as if I don’t belong in my department*) to improve reliability of the Belonging measure.
**Preliminary analysis.**

*Student-level correlations.* A correlation analysis was performed on both student and teacher data. Means, standard deviations, and Pearson product correlations for the student-level data are presented in Table 4.4. A Pearson correlation standardizes the relationship between the variables—specifically, the shared variance (i.e., covariance; Lomax, 2007). This is especially useful when the variables were measured on different scales as is the case with the variables in this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SETL-IS 1</td>
<td>63.90</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 SETL-SS 1</td>
<td>44.04</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SETL-SS 2</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SETL-SS 2</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SPCC 1</td>
<td>52.73</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SPCC 2</td>
<td>59.54</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CA 1</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CA 2</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 WTC 1</td>
<td>45.72</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 WTC 2</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 EXV int</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 EXV att</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 EXV uty</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 EXV cost</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 EXV exp</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PCC-OTE</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 PCC-ASC</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 PCC-CEC</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 PCC-CC</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 PTSES</td>
<td>82.73</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Grade</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
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Table 4.4 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 WTC 2</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 EXV int</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 EXV att</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 EXV uty</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 EXV cost</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 EXV exp</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PCC-OTE</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 PCC-ASC</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 PCC-CEC</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 PCC-CC</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 PTSES</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All variables are interval-level and continuous. Coefficients in **bold** indicate \( p < .001 \). *\( p < .01 \), †\( p < .05 \).

As can be seen, mean scores from the second administration—for all measures that were administered twice—increased from the first administration with the exception of communication apprehension (CA) which decreased. Of the EXV measures, participants reported highest agreement with low cost as a value associated with language study and lowest agreement with utility value. Of the four PCC measures, participants reported their classrooms were most characterized by teachers who provide overt encouragement (i.e., the OTE subscale) and least by autonomy support (i.e., ASC).

Most of the relations between student-level variables correlated significantly (i.e., \( p < .001 \)). All the measures administered at two time points were significantly correlated with their counterparts (e.g., the first administration of the PCC-OTE significantly correlated with the second administration of the PCC-OTE). And all subscales that originated from the same “parent” scale significantly correlated (e.g., the first administration of the SETL-IS significantly correlated with the first administration of the SETL-SS). The first and second administrations of the SETL-IS significantly correlated with all of the same measures except grades, which were only significantly correlated...
with the second administration \((r = .18, p < .001)\). Both administrations of the *strictly speaking* subscale (SETL-SS) were significantly correlated with all the same variables—including grades. Likewise, both administrations of the *willingness to communicate* (WTC) and *self-perceived communication competence* (SPCC) were correlated with the same variables.

All of the aforementioned significant correlations were positive—except with both administrations of *communication apprehension* (CA), which were significantly *negatively* correlated. Indeed, the second administration of CA was negatively correlated with all other variables in the matrix—except for the first administration of CA in which the relationship was positive \((r = .63, p < .001)\). The first administration of CA was also significantly negatively correlated with all other variables except for the CA2 and perceptions of competitive classroom climates (i.e., PCC-CC).

The *value* and *expectancy* variables were generally significantly positively correlated with many of the other variables. The exceptions were both CA administrations in which all were significantly negatively correlated as well as select PCC variables in which there were no significant relationships. Specifically, *intrinsic value* (EXV-int) had no significant relationship with perceived autonomy-supporting environments (PCC-ASC). *Utility value* (EXV-uty) had no significant relationship to environments perceived as autonomy supportive or competitive. Additionally, utility value was not significantly related to perceptions of the teacher’s sense of efficacy. *Cost* (EXV-cost) was not significantly correlated with three of the PCC subscales: OTE, ASC,
or CEC. Expectancy was not significantly correlated with environments perceived as autonomy-supportive.

Course grades were significantly positively correlated with all the aforementioned variables with two exceptions previously noted or implied: Grades were significantly negatively associated with communication apprehension, and had no significant relationship to the self-efficacy of the indirect aspects of speaking the target language that students brought with them to the course. In other words, these preliminary findings indicate that the self-efficacy for the strictly speaking aspects of the language as well as one’s self-perceived communication competence and a willingness to speak in the target language reported at the beginning of the term were all significantly related to end-of-the-term course grades—but not self-efficacy for the indirect aspects of language learning. Only SETL-IS reported at the end of the term significantly positively correlated with grades ($r = .18$, $p < .001$).

*Teacher-level correlations.* Means, standard deviations, and Pearson product correlations for the teacher-level data are presented in Table 4.5. As can be seen, only one of the correlations was significant: A negative correlation between willingness to communicate and communication apprehension ($r = -.67$, $p < .001$).
Table 4.5.
Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations for Teacher-Level Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TSE</td>
<td>78.14</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 WTC</td>
<td>77.88</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CA</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Belonging</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All variables are interval-level and continuous. Coefficients in bold indicate \( p < .001 \).

**Regression analyses.** The intent of the quantitative data analysis was to examine the relationship between two criterion variables (i.e., WTC and course grades) and predictors at both the individual (i.e., student) and teacher/classroom level—specifically, teachers’ sense of efficacy. Given the nested nature of the data (students in classrooms), hierarchical linear modeling techniques (HLM) were considered an ideal vehicle for this type of analysis as it provides a framework for the analysis of multi-level data (Luke, 2004; O’Connell & McCouch, 2008; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). However, it was determined that HLM techniques would be problematic for this study for the following reasons: (a) a lack of parallelism, (b) too few cases at the teacher/classroom level, and (c) an inability to include participants in the Chinese classes.

A potential lack of parallelism to the study was evidenced during the preliminary analysis. Given the intent to analyze *two* dependent variables, as a preliminary step, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was constructed to determine if teachers were responsible for sufficient variance between the two dependent variables of interest (i.e., WTC and grades). The preliminary results indicated a main effect for teachers (Wilks’ \( \Lambda = .054, f = 2829.43, p < .001 \)) though the test of between-subjects effects indicated that “teacher” was only significantly related to course grades \( f = 4.46, df = 21, \)
A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), or empty, model was constructed using the student version of HLM 6.08 software with second-administration WTC scores as the outcome variable to examine the between group variability. However, the results were consistent with the MANOVA analysis and indicated insignificant between-teacher variance ($\tau_{00} = 22.99$, $\chi^2 = 12.34$, $p = .14$) with a small intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC; .035) indicating that only about 3.5% of the variance in WTC was between teachers (the ICC is the ratio between-group variation to total variation). Additionally, Maas & Hox (2005) suggest that the design effect is a more crucial indicator than the ICC in determining if a multilevel analysis is viable. In their review of the literature, they conclude that a design effect of less than two to be too small. The formula for calculating the design effect is: $1 + (\text{average cluster size} - 1) \times ICC$. In this case, with a mean class size of 24.27, the design effect is 1.81 for the WTC-as-outcome model—below the cut-off of 2 suggested by Muthén and Satorra (1995; as cited in Maas & Hox, 2005). In short, the preliminary results suggested that an analysis of the data with WTC as the outcome could proceed without the inclusion of level-two predictors without misspecification, though comparison of the results with those of the multilevel analysis with course grades as outcomes could pose challenges of interpretation of the larger whole.

Additionally, the lack of cases ($n = 9$) at the teacher-level would make the analysis restrictive in terms of the number of variables included at the teacher/classroom level, and make generalizability and interpretation of the grades-as-outcomes HLM model problematic. Maas and Hox (2005) note that consideration of the number of
groups is of greater importance than the number of individuals within the group. They point to simulation studies that an alpha-level of 9% is needed for 24 to 30 groups, and should still remain at 8% even when the number of groups approaches 50. And lastly, a nested design would result in only the Spanish-studying participants being included in the analysis as the Chinese program did not permit a match between student and classroom (see Chapter 3).

Still, one of the primary purposes of the study was to examine the relationship between teachers’ sense of efficacy and students’ sense of efficacy for speaking the target language. It was speculated that students’ perceptions of their teacher’s sense of efficacy may not differ from their teacher’s reported self-efficacy for teaching, and could be thus included at the student-level. However, a recent study by Sariçoban (2010) found that teachers’ sense of efficacy did differ significantly from their students’ perceptions of their efficacy. A $t$-test was conducted to test the following hypothesis:

$H_1$: PTSES aggregate scores – TSES scores ≠ 0

Diagnostics indicated that nonnormality of distribution was not an issue (skewness = -.19, kurtosis = -.84). The $t$-test did not support the research hypothesis ($t = 1.02, df = 22, p = .32$), indicating that teachers’ sense of efficacy did not significantly differ from students’ perceptions of their efficacy for teaching. Therefore, a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed—one series with WTC as the outcome, and the other as course grade as the criterion variable.
Predicting willingness-to-communicate. The next steps entailed a series of preliminary hierarchical multiple regression (HMR) analyses. The purpose of the preliminary HMR analyses was to achieve a parsimonious model of the relationships between WTC and various predictors. A second purpose was to identify and address issues of multicollinearity. Demographic variables (age, sex, level of study, program of study, and native language) were entered into the first step of the first preliminary model as controls. Next, psychological variables that students were theorized to have brought to the course were entered at Step 2—the EXV variables as well as WTC scores attained during the first survey administration. At this point, sex, age, native language, intrinsic value, attainment value, and cost were dropped from further analysis as they failed to predict WTC. Expectancy approached significance and was thus kept.

Next, the psychological variables that were hypothesized to be impacted during the study were entered into the third step of the model. “Change” variables were created for self-perceived communication competence (SPCC), and the two self-efficacy for the target language (SETL) variables (strictly speaking and indirect skills) by subtracting first administration scores from second administration scores. The change variables were created as a way to account for beginning levels of SPCC and SETL while avoiding multicollinearity issues. An analysis of distribution of both variables indicated a slightly leptokurtic distribution with negligible skewness (SPCC: mean = 7.30, s.d. = 19.60, skewness = .11, kurtosis = .62; SETL: mean = 7.71, s.d. = 14.25, skewness = -.02, kurtosis = 1.74). SPCC and SETL both significant increased over the term (SPCC: mean
difference = 7.30, \( t = 6.82, p < .001 \); SETL: mean difference = 7.71, \( t = 9.94, p < .001 \). Also, the PTSES and PCC scores were added. However, the next preliminary run suggested that several of the variables were subject to multicollinearity—including the two SETL variables. To address the issue, the change to the full scale of the SETL was used in place of the subscales. Additionally, SPCC was dropped from subsequent analyses due to its conceptual similarity to self-efficacy. Also, two of the PCC variables—OTE and ASC—showed signs of multicollinearity (e.g., Tolerance ≤ .4) and were thus dropped from further analyses.

The final model included level and program of study at Step 1 to control for language-study experience and ability-level; utility value, and WTC recorded at the beginning of the term at Step 2; perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy, communication apprehension, classroom climate measures (CEC and CC), and change in SETL, at Step 3; and WTC recorded at the end of the term as the criterion variable. Means, standard deviations, and correlations are presented in Table 4.6. Collectively, the variables accounted for approximately 56% of the variance in students’ reports of willingness to communicate in the target language at the end of the term. The variables included at each step of the model explained a significant amount of the variance and each step (\( \Delta R^2 = .04, .36, & .15; p = .001, < .001, & < .001 \) respectively; Table 4.7). The model is represented by the following equation:

\[
WTC_2 = -1.33 + 4.36(\text{course level}) + -5.20(\text{program}) + 3.40(\text{utility score}) + .51(\text{WTC 1}) + .22(\text{PTSES}) + .95(\text{CEC}) + -3.66(\text{CC}) + -2.17(\text{CA}) + .50(\text{SETL change})
\]
Table 4.6.
Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations for the WTC Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WTC 2</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>- .08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WTC 1</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>24.91</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.12†</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PTSES</td>
<td>83.16</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SETL</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.10†</td>
<td>-.17†</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12†</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Level” coded: 101 = 1, 102 = 2, 103 = 3, 104 = 4; “Program” coded 0 = Spanish, 1 = Chinese. All other variables are interval-level and continuous. Coefficients in bold indicate p < .001. *p < .01, †p < .05.

Table 4.7.
Change in R² for the WTC Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>R² change</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>d1</th>
<th>d2</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>101.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: WTC was the outcome variable. Language study experience (course level) entered at Step 1, psychological variables present at the beginning of the term Step 2, and psychological variables subject to course contextual factors at Step 3.

At Step 1, level of study was significant predictor of WTC and continued to remain so when other variables were entered (β = .15, p < .001 at Step 3). That is, the higher a student’s course level, the higher her/his willingness to communicate after accounting for other variables in the model. Utility value was a significant predictor at Step 2 and continued to remain so at Step 3 (β = .16, p < .001). As expected, WTC at the beginning of the term predicted WTC at the end of the term (β = .52, p < .001).

Communication apprehension was a negative predictor of WTC (β = -.09, p < .05).

Students’ perceptions of their teacher’s sense of efficacy was also a significant predictor
of WTC (\( \beta = .15, p < .001 \)). Of the PCC variables, environments perceived as characterized by teachers who provide overt forms of encouragement or that emphasized communication were not significant. Unexpectedly, environments perceived as emphasizing communication were not significant predictors of WTC. However, those perceived as emphasizing competition were significant negative predictors (\( \beta = -.15, p < .001 \)). Finally, change in self-efficacy for speaking the target language during the term predicted WTC at the end of the term (\( \beta = .29, p < .001 \)). See Table 4.8 for a summary of the HMR results.

Table 4.8.

Coefficients at Step 3: WTC Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>-4.45</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>-8.17</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC 1</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>-5.20</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC 1</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSES</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC-CEC</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC-CC</td>
<td>-3.66</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA 2</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETL change</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Level” coded: 101 = 1, 102 = 2, 103 = 3, 104 = 4; “Program” coded 0 = Spanish, 1 = Chinese. All other variables are interval-level and continuous.
In summary, a number of variables made significant contributions toward explaining the variation in students’ willingness to communicate—those in more advanced classes are more likely to be willing to communicate than those at introductory levels. Also, those students who place a higher utility value on language study are more willing to communicate than those who may not value study of the target language, or who do not at least value it in the same way. At the same time, students who had a greater degree of communication apprehension were less likely to be willing to communicate in the target language. But students’ perceptions were important too. Those who perceived the classroom climate as one that promoted competition were less likely to be willing to communicate. Conversely, those who perceived that their teachers had a high sense of personal efficacy for teaching were more willing to communicate. Using Keith’s (2006) criteria for effect sizes, the standardized coefficient of .15 suggests this had a relation to students’ willingness to communicate. Finally, the standardized coefficient of .29 suggests that degree to which students’ self-efficacy for speaking the target language changed during the term strongly predicted their willingness to communicate.

Predicting grades. A secondary purpose of the quantitative portion of the study was to determine if SETL and perceptions of classroom climate predict course grades after controlling for other variables. As with the WTC-as-outcome model, the preliminary HMR models were constructed to identify issues of multicollinearity. And, as with the previous analysis, demographic variables were entered into the first step, “psychological” variables that participants would bring to the outset of the study were added to the second
step, while those believed to be subject to influences in the classroom were entered into the third step. However, two of the PCC variables—OTE and ASC—showed signs of multicollinearity (e.g., Tolerance < .5) and were thus dropped from further analyses.

The final model included the following variables: level of study, age, and sex at Step 1; expectancy at Step 2; and communication-emphasized climates, perceived competitive climates, perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy, communication apprehension as recorded at the second administration, and change in SETL at Step 3. The model accounted for about 39% of the variance in course grades, and the grouped variables explained a significant amount of the variance at each step ($\Delta R^2 = .16, .19, & .04; p < .001$ at each step; Table 4.9) Means, standard deviations, and correlations are presented in Table 4.10. The model is represented by the following equation:

$$\text{Course grade} = 6.10 + -.19(\text{course level}) + -.10(\text{age}) + 1.25(\text{gender}) + 1.01(\text{expectancy}) + .01(\text{CEC}) + .40(\text{CC}) + -.01(\text{PTSES}) + -.07(\text{CA}) + .02(\text{SETL change})$$

Table 4.9. 
**Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations for the Course Grade Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.11†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSES</td>
<td>83.05</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA 2</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETL</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09†</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11†</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>.10†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Grade coded: $1 = F, 2 = D-, 3 = D, 4 = D+, 5 = C-, 6 = C, 7 = C+, 8 = B-, 8 = B, 9 = B+, 10 = A-, 11 = A; \text{"Level" coded}: 101 = 1, 102 = 2, 103 = 3, 104 = 4; \text{All other variables are interval-level and continuous. Coefficients in \textbf{bold} indicate } p < .001. *p < .01, †p < .05.”
Table 4.10.
Change in $R^2$ for the Course Grade Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$R^2$ change</th>
<th>$F$ change</th>
<th>$df_1$</th>
<th>$df_2$</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>96.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Demographic variables entered at Step 1, psychological variables present at the beginning of the term Step 2, and psychological variables subject to course contextual factors at Step 3.

At Step 1, age and sex were the only variables that were significant predictors of grades—and they continued to be after Group 2 and 3 variables were entered into the model. However, whereas sex ($\beta = .25, p < .001$) was a positive predictor of course grade, age was a negative predictor ($\beta = -.11, p < .05$). That is, being female was associated with higher course grades while the younger the student, the more likely s/he was to have a higher grade. Participants expectancy to do well in the course was a significant predictor of course grade ($\beta = .46, p < .001$).

Of the variables entered at Step 3, environments perceived as competitive were significantly related to course grades ($\beta = .15, p < .01$), though those perceived as emphasizing communication were not. Interestingly, whereas perceived competitive climates positively predicted grades, communication apprehension was significantly negatively associated with them ($\beta = -.10, p < .05$). And whereas perceptions of the teacher’s sense of efficacy was a significant predictor of students’ willingness to communicate, it was not significantly related to grades. And finally, change in self-efficacy for speaking the target language during the course positively predicted course grades ($\beta = .09, p = .05$). See Table 4.11 for a summary of the HMR results.
Table 4.11.
Coefficients at Step 3: Course Grade Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-4.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>9.314</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC-CEC</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC-CC</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSES</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETL change</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Level” coded: 101 = 1, 102 = 2, 103 = 3, 104 = 4; “Program” coded 0 = Spanish, 1 = Chinese; Sex: male = 0, female = 1. All other variables are interval-level and continuous.

In summary, a number of variables predicted students’ course grades. The two largest contributors to explaining the variance in students’ grade were sex—that is, females were more likely to earn a higher grade than males—and the degree to which students expected to do well. Older students were less likely to obtain high scores than younger students, and those who reported higher degrees of communication apprehension were less likely to receive high grades. Interestingly, those who perceived the classroom climate as promoting competition were more likely to receive high grades. And finally, a
change in self-efficacy for speaking the target language during the course of the term positively predicted grades. Using Keith’s (2006) criteria, the standardized coefficient of .09 for SETL suggests a small to moderate effect size in contributing to explaining the variance in course grades.

**Summary of the quantitative findings.** The purpose of the quantitative analysis was to examine the relations between perceived teachers’ sense of efficacy, perceived classroom climates, and self-efficacy for speaking the target language and students’ willingness to communicate in that target language. Additionally, the intent was to then examine the relation between the aforementioned variables and course grades. Results indicate that a change in self-efficacy during the term significantly predicated both students’ willingness-to-communicate as well as their course grade. Additionally, contextual variables such as student perceptions of their teachers’ sense of efficacy, perceptions of their classroom climates were important predictors of WTC, though only perceived climates were significant factors in predicting grades. The utility value that students had for the course was an important predictor of WTC, but not grades. And finally, communication apprehension was a significant negative predictor of both WTC and grades. What these results do not address, is the actual practices of teachers that may promote self-efficacy for speaking the target language.

**Qualitative Analysis**

A qualitative analysis was conducted to answer the question “What do teachers perceived as highly efficacious by their students do to promote self-efficacy for the target
language?” Given the pre-existing theoretical framework being used and the narrowly-defined research question of this portion of the study, it was determined that a typological analysis was an appropriate approach to utilize for the coding and analyzing of the data. A typological analysis entails dividing the dataset into a priori categories (i.e., typologies) derived from theory or the research objectives (Hatch, 2002; Patton, 2002; Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Hatch (2002) proposes a nine-step process to typological data analysis that was adopted and adapted for this study: (1) identify the typologies, (2) mark entries related to the typologies—one typology at a time, (3) summarize entries by typology, (4) examine the typologies for patterns, relationships, and themes, (5) code the data in terms of identified patterns, relationships, and/or themes, (6) determine if patterns are supported by the data and seek non-examples, (7) look for relationships between identified patterns, (8) create one-sentence generalizations about the identified patterns, and (9) select entries that support the generalizations.

In the present study, qualitative data sources included classroom observations and post-observation interviews. Social Cognitive Theory—and specifically, the concept of self-efficacy—was used as the theoretical frame to ground the analysis. Typologies were based on the four sources of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997): Mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social/verbal persuasion, and affective/physiological states. Several researchers have proposed sources of self-efficacy not described by Bandura (Klassen, et al., 2011; Liaw, 2009; Palmer, 2006). Therefore, a fifth typology— alternative sources—was created to capture any additional sources of self-efficacy that
may have been present in the data. However, a closer examination of events initially identified as alternative sources revealed that they were related to the task of speaking the target language. As a result, these flagged events were deemed to be a better fit for social persuasion and/or enactive mastery experiences. Thus, the typologies used in the analysis corresponded to the four sources described by Bandura. In sum, data were examined in terms of evidence for self-efficacy supporting behaviors, practices, or instructional strategies and approaches.

Entries/events that provided evidence of the above behaviors or opportunities to engage in mastery experiences or profit from vicarious experiences were flagged for further processing. Specifically, entries that indicated use of the target language for the purpose of drawing attention to pronunciation or to otherwise explicitly model speaking were flagged as evidence of a vicarious experience, as opposed to the use of the target language simply for instruction or delivery of content. Likewise, entries that indicated the presence of verbal/social persuasion or comments or behaviors that may have influenced the emotional climate of the learning situation, or comments that indicated considerations of the sources of self-efficacy or the beliefs that students had about speaking were flagged.

Next, summaries of each typology were created for each informant. This was done by creating summary statements for each individual event, and then creating a generally summary statement for each informant. The constant comparative method advocated by Strauss and colleagues (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967)
was employed during this portion of the analysis. This approach to qualitative data analysis entails the comparison of incidents within and between typologies. The product of this approach is the generation of theoretical properties of the typologies—both the characteristics of such categories as well as how they operate to explain behavior (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Finally, one-sentence generalizations were crystallized from the summary statements for each typology. Again, the constant comparative method was used to examine for support and inconsistencies within the data as well as to find relationships and themes that existed across typologies. Entries were identified that were deemed to be particularly illustrative of the findings.

Participants. As noted in Chapter 3, three of the instructor participants agreed to participate in the qualitative portion of the study—one from the ESL phase and two from the foreign-language phase. Also, as previously mentioned, all three were identified based on their aggregated PCC scores—all three fell in the upper quartile. Due to the relatively small size of the programs partnering in this study, descriptions of participants are kept brief to protect anonymity. Pseudonyms are used.

Tina. “Tina” is an instructor in the ESL program teaching a variety of classes (intermediate, integrated skills, etc.). Though there were few teachers from the ESL program participating in the study, Tina’s aggregate perceptions of teachers’ efficacy, overt teacher encouragement, autonomy-supportive climate, and communication-emphasized climate subscale scores were all tops among her peers—though her competitive climate score ranked near the bottom. She has more than 20 years of
experience teaching ESL students at the university/college level. She has a graduate
degree and has taken graduate-level coursework in a variety of areas related to TESOL
(teaching English to speakers of other languages). She does not have experience teaching
or studying languages outside of the U.S. She considers herself fluent only in English—
though she did study a Romance language as an undergrad. Thus, she is a native-speaker
of the target language of her students. She is Euro-American.

*Emi.* “Emi” is a teaching assistant and graduate student in the Spanish-language
program. In addition to her aggregate PCC scores falling in the upper quartile, her *overt
teacher encouragement, autonomy-supportive climate, and communication-emphasized climate* subscale scores did as well—though her *competitive climate* score did not. Her
PTSES score fell within a point from the upper quartile. She has taught in the department
in this capacity or as a lecturer for more than three years at the time of her interview. She
taught 100-level Spanish during the study (i.e., Spanish 103 at the time of qualitative data
collection). Though there is a set curriculum, she is responsible for many aspects of the
course including lesson-planning and instruction. The program sets the sequence of the
content to be covered, examination dates, and the tests themselves are pre-constructed.
She is a native English-speaker. She studied Spanish outside of the U.S. for more than
four months. She is Asian/Pacific-Islander American.

*Daniel.* “Daniel” is also a teaching assistant (TA) in the Spanish-language
program, teaching 100-level Spanish during the study (i.e., Spanish 101). His PTSES and
all four of his PCC subscale scores fell in the upper quartile. He was in his second year as
a TA at the time of classroom observations and interview. A native English-speaker, his interest in languages began with getting to know exchange students in high school, grew into linguistics study as an undergrad, and graduate study in the Spanish program. He is Euro-American.

**Findings.** The analysis revealed three primary findings and four secondary findings. *Primary findings* refer to those findings that included two or more of the typologies (i.e., sources of self-efficacy). *Secondary findings* refer to those specific to a particular typology. The findings are listed in Table 4.12.

Three primary findings were uncovered in the analysis. First, events in the classroom often acted in concert or occurred in tandem. For example, events identified as social persuasion were, with few exceptions, accompanied with events also identified as enacted mastery, vicarious, or affective/physiological states sources of self-efficacy. Second, all three instructors used *space*—physical, temporal (i.e., time), and interpersonal—to create a climate conducive to the promotion of efficacy beliefs. Third, the beliefs these teachers espoused regarding second/additional language acquisition and motivation in language-learning contexts were related to the instructional approach they adopted in the classroom—approaches that likely determined the sources of self-efficacy that their students would have used in forming or calibrating their self-efficacy beliefs for speaking the target language.

The four secondary findings referred to those that were specific to a particular source of self-efficacy. The first of the secondary findings referred to enactive mastery
experiences: All three of the teachers allotted ample class time to practice the target language. Second, actual models—most often the teacher—served as the primary vicarious experiences in all three classrooms. Third, simple verbal and physical affirmation were the most common form of social persuasion and used by all three teachers. Fourth, the Spanish teachers permitted the use—but, infrequently used—English in the classroom as a way to reduce anxiety.

Table 4.12.
Summary of the Primary and Secondary Qualitative Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Findings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inseparable sources</td>
<td>Sources of self-efficacy often operated in concert, or in a single event that contained multiple sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of space</td>
<td>Teachers used physical, temporal, and interpersonal space in ways that promoted self-efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices rooted in beliefs about motivation</td>
<td>Teachers shared similar beliefs about L2 acquisition and motivation, though practices stemming from these beliefs varied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Findings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundant mastery experiences present</td>
<td>All teachers provided ample time for speaking the target language though the format varied between teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundant vicarious experiences present</td>
<td>Teachers served as the primary actual models to varying degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social persuasion generally limited</td>
<td>Performance feedback generally limited to simple verbal and physical affirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 used to reduce anxiety</td>
<td>Teachers did not prohibit use of L1, and occasionally used it for praise, explanation of grammar, or to explain assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary finding one: Inseparable sources.** The sources of self-efficacy present in the study often occurred in tandem—as two related events or as a single event that
acted as multiple sources. As might be expected, enactive mastery experiences were frequently coupled with some form of social persuasion. In the Spanish classes, student attempts at speaking the target language before the entire class almost always received some form of simple verbal or physical affirmation. Verbal affirmation was usually given by the teacher in the target language (e.g., “muy bien,” or very good in English), but also occurred—almost exclusively in the 101-level class (i.e., Daniel’s)—in English (e.g., “good job”). But, simple physical affirmation also occurred as a “thumbs up” from Daniel or a “high five” from Emi. Physical affirmation occurred most commonly as smiles—especially in Emi’s classes. In addition to communicating to learners that their efforts were on target in terms of meeting the learning objectives, these forms of simple affirmation also likely served to create positive affect and decreased anxiety in the learning climate.

Interestingly, though present, simple affirmation was not as frequently recorded in the ESL classroom (i.e., Tina’s). Instead, performance feedback here was generally instructional in nature. For example, learners’ attempts at speaking the target language were often accompanied with corrections on how to improve pronunciation—often in the form of actual modeling on the part of Tina. Thus, the performance feedback events in Tina’s classroom often acted as vicarious experiences. And indeed, it is likely that even the simple verbal affirmations of Daniel and Emi also indirectly served as a vicarious experience to the extent that they modeled pragmatic language use and pronunciation. However, Tina went beyond mere modeling in the feedback she provided. For example,
one observer recorded Tina working one-on-one with a student in preparation for a poster presentation:

Tina: What’s the topic?

Student: Sound pressure.

T: Be careful on the ‘n’ there—in the pronunciation of the sound. The ‘n’ is in the front of your mouth, not in the back.

S: Sound.

T: Yeah, and the vowel sound as well as ‘ou.’ ‘Ou,’ the back of your tongue is up on this sound.

S: Ou.

T: That’s right. Try the word ‘song.’ See the difference between ‘sound’ and ‘song,’ is a big difference. So, what’s your topic?

S: Sound pressure and human hearing.

T: Yeah, good. Let me get a piece of paper and I’ll show you. [Tina draws a diagram of a mouth and shows where the tongue should be in each vowel sound]

In short, Tina provided rich feedback about pronunciation in the target language. Thus, the performance feedback served as both actual modeling and as social persuasion.

In addition to providing performance feedback, all three teachers used the target language to answer student questions about the content—even when the questions were posed in students’ native language (only observed in Spanish classrooms). Thus, when
the questions pertained to content, students were receiving information about the task as well as a vicarious experience in the form of actual models (the teachers).

The use of small groups to practice the dialog was an event that also likely served as a multiple source of self-efficacy. In addition to providing opportunities to perform the task, learners were also likely getting simultaneous performance feedback from peers—both explicitly and implicitly (e.g., being asked to repeat one’s self when misunderstood). At the same time, learners would have been privy to their peers’ attempts at speaking providing opportunities for vicarious experiences—all within the confines of a smaller audience generally void of authority figures. Thus, it is likely that anxiety levels during the small group activities were lower than when using the target language before the class at large.

Teacher sensitivity to the match between student ability-level and content material also may result in students’ utilization of multiple sources in forming or re-calibrating self-efficacy beliefs. For example, both observers noted that Daniel skipped content and modified the directions for an assignment that he appeared to believe to be too difficult for students at that particular moment in time. One observer quoted him as saying, “we’re going over that one later in the week so don’t worry.” A little while later, when students appeared to be having difficulty with the corresponding activity, the same observer recorded, “I’m going to change the directions—(you) can use a verb more than once. I’d rather focus on sentences making sense than what the book says.” In this way, Daniel structured the activity to better assure that enacted mastery experiences were beneficial—
that students would have success. His assurances that they need not worry about missing content and emphasis on the larger goal of communicative use of the language likely also resulted in an atmosphere of increased positive affect and decreased anxiety.

While many of the events described above referred to vicarious experiences that immediate followed mastery experiences, the reverse was true as well—mastery experiences that followed actual or symbolic modeling. Indeed, this was the structural norm in the observations occurring during Daniel’s classes when new vocabulary or phrases were being introduced. He would say the new word or phrase first, and then prompt the class to repeat. After students—as a group—appeared to be performing adequately, Daniel would then call on select students to model the new vocabulary or phrase. Students would then generally receive simple verbal affirmation. Thus, the sequence of introducing new content often involved a vicarious experience in the form of actual modeling (teacher) followed by an enacted mastery experience (the entire class) followed by more vicarious experiences (select students) and social persuasion in the form of affirmation of the peer-modeled language.

Though there were few recorded observations or evidence in the interview transcripts of teacher-generated social persuasion in the form of highlighting the strategy use of the model in the Spanish classes, this occurred several times in the data from the ESL class. For example, Tina reported that she takes her class on a “field trip” to observe classroom interactions and language use at the business school at the university. During these trips she explicitly points out the various strategies the instructor/speaker is using in
the classroom. Additionally, observers recorded that Tina primed students for a listening activity (i.e., symbolic modeling) by asking them to think about how the recoded lecture may be structured. To the extent students were imagining how they themselves may organize a lecture, this prompt may have served to promote cognitive self-modeling. After the recording, Tina highlighted the transitional language of the symbolic model. That is, she made explicit the strategies the recorded speaker was using to deliver a well-organized lecture.

Social persuasion was also used to assist learners in framing vicarious experiences in ways that maximized self-efficacy—or at least in ways that prevented the experience from lowering students’ sense of personal efficacy. For example, Tina reported that she sometimes has students who become discouraged when comparing their skills to those of their more fluent peers. However, she reported that she points out that different aspects of English-language education are emphasized in different regions of the world. Some cultures may emphasize oral communication while others may emphasize grammatically correct writing. In addressing the situation with despondent students, Tina reported:

We talk about different ways that English is taught around the world… we just have to tell them, ‘Believe me, this guy might be talking a mile a minute, but his papers don’t measure up to yours.’ I mean, I wouldn’t be that extreme, but they just have to see it, you know?

Thus, she provides a richer context for students making judgments about their skills when making social comparisons.
However, there are times when a single event could work as a source that promotes self-efficacy in one sense, but decreases it in another. For example, as previously noted, Daniel responded to nearly every attempt to use the target language with simple verbal and physical affirmation. While this serves to communicate to learners that their performance is on track and may contribute to an atmosphere marked by positive affect and low anxiety, at least one observer noted that these affirmations would appear even when student responses were not obviously correct. It was also noted that when students declined to answer a question that Daniel would respond by telling the student that “it’s okay.” Thus, while anxiety levels may be temporarily held at bay, affirmation for incorrect language could result in students who believe that success comes easily or that their skills will enable them to navigate communication with native speakers outside of the classroom. However, it is likely that the personal efficacy of these students may undergo recalibration—likely resulting in a lowering of self-efficacy—once these students are faced with more challenging situations.

Mixed signals were likely present in Tina’s classes as well. As noted earlier, Tina would often model correct pronunciation. This often occurred in summing up a student’s response. Although this event likely served as a vicarious experience for the class as a whole, it is possible that it served as implicit performance feedback for the student in question—feedback the student could interpret to mean that her/his performance was less than adequate. After all, why would the teacher have felt a need to repeat the contribution if it was acceptable? In these ways, events in the classroom could result in self-efficacy
beliefs moving in different directions. Of course, this would depend on the meaning that students made of these events.

But not all of the implicit messages present in the classroom sent contradictory messages. For example, Emi would frequently follow up a student’s response with probing questions in the target language or other attempts to extend the dialog. In addition to providing observers with an actual model of the target language, this likely served as an implicit message to the contributing student that her/his language was at a relatively high level. In other words, Emi implicitly communicated to students that she views them as capable of more than simply parroting back the key vocabulary or phrases.

In summary, the findings indicate there were multiple occasions when the identified sources of self-efficacy acted in concert—in the sense that the sources were linked, but also in the sense that a single event served as multiple sources of efficacy. Mastery experiences were almost always followed with various forms of performance feedback—especially in the Spanish classes. And social persuasion—in the form of performance feedback—almost always simultaneously functioned as a vicarious experience as it was given in the target language. And while these vicarious experiences often followed an enacted mastery experience, they would often precede a mastery experience as when Daniel would model target vocabulary and phrases before prompting learners to repeat. Additionally, while social persuasion served as a vicarious experience, it was also used to accompany a vicarious experience as when Tina would highlight the strategies employed by a particular model. Social persuasion also frequently served to
impact the atmosphere of the classroom. Also, some events that clearly served one purpose (e.g., actual modeling by the teacher) also carried implicit messages that may have had undermining effects to students’ self-efficacy. Lastly, small-group work often contained all four sources of self-efficacy—opportunities to speak and observe peers doing so while also receiving explicit and implicit performance feedback in a setting that was likely less anxiety-inducing than when performing for the class as a whole.

**Primary finding two: Use of space.** The second primary finding of this study was that teachers used space—physical, temporal, and interpersonal—in ways that likely impacted the personal efficacy beliefs of the students in their classrooms. In general, these teachers acted in ways in which physical space was modified, temporal space (time) maximized, and interpersonal space minimized. The primary result of the use of space in these ways contributed to a positive classroom climate—high in positive affect and low in levels of anxiety—that, in turn, likely resulted in environments that were conducive to increases in personal efficacy beliefs.

The most obvious use of physical space on the part of the teachers in this study was their movement in the classroom. All three teachers were observed moving around the classroom—most often during work in small groups. This resulted in teachers who were better able to monitor student progress and more accessible to learners who had questions about key vocabulary or grammar points—teacher interaction about the content they may not have gotten had the teacher remained in the conventional spot at the front of
the room. Thus, teacher accessibility during these periods likely resulted in providing students a more solid foundation with which to practice the target language.

A second way physical space was manipulated was in the way Emi had arranged student desks prior to their entry. She had arranged desks in a semi-circle—presumably to facilitate peer-to-peer interaction. In other words, the desk arrangement likely resulted to increase quality opportunities to engage in the target language—to maximize enacted mastery and vicarious experiences. Emi also used her body to generate enthusiasm for classroom activities. For example, one observer reported that she “bounced” when dividing the class into teams for a game. In addition to grabbing students’ attention and increasing situational interest in the activity, this display of movement likely served to create positive affect and decreasing anxiety—setting the stage for the mastery experiences to follow.

*Temporal space*, or time, was manipulated by the teachers in study in the following ways: (a) students were given time and space to speak the target language, and on their terms, (b) time was used to maximize the impact of content, and (c) time was used to create space for teacher contact with individual students or small groups. This use of temporal space likely reduced anxiety and allowed students to attempt the target language when they decided they were ready—thus, increasing the probability that they would have successful mastery experiences.

Observers noted that all three teachers gave students time to answer or ask questions. As Tina explicitly stated:
I think I have trained myself to not jump on an answer, or not try to fill in empty space. You know? So, I allow a little more time for them to process before I expect them to say something.

In a somewhat extreme example, one observer recorded that Emi waited 30 seconds for a student to respond before opening the question to the rest of the class. Additionally, all three teachers permitted students to ask and respond to questions without the convention of hand-raising. Thus, students were generally free to speak at a time that was largely self-determined. But that does not necessarily mean that less assertive students were left behind, as all three teachers were also recorded cold-calling on students on occasion. Indeed, observers reported that the students that Emi tended to cold-call were the ones who had yet to participate at that particular point in the class, or ones that had previously been unsuccessful in attempts to formulate a coherent response. Tina reported that she takes the extra step of assuring that it is not only the more proactive students who dominate conversation during these exchanges. As she states:

I mean, there will always be the student who is not sensitive to the other person wanting to say something, and I will sometimes have to intervene—maybe have to take the student aside and, you know, ask them to pull it back a little bit because they are not giving everybody a chance to speak.

This way, she better assured that all have an opportunity to contribute in her classes—that is, enactive mastery experiences were maximized.
The second way that temporal space was utilized was in the modification of the structure of class to assure that content was aligned with student abilities and engagement. As noted previously, Daniel passed over content deemed to be beyond the ability level of the students at that particular moment. He also modified the directions of the activity to better assure that the activity was communicative. In other words, he deferred difficult content to a time more appropriate for the ability-level of his students. Emi also appeared to leave room for unanticipated directions the class may take. For example, observers recorded that she allowed time for off-topic conversation in the target language. In this way, she set aside class time to allow for optimal mastery experiences—those in which students were using the language in new and unique ways for communicative ends. And yet, observers noted that Daniel and Emi’s classes were highly organized. Students in these classrooms were keenly aware of the typical structures employed and the accompanying expectations. Thus, transitions between activities were relatively smooth with little time lost to inactivity. In sum, structures in these classrooms were flexible enough to modify activities in ways that met student ability levels at that moment, yet rigid enough so that students had clear expectations so that transition times were minimized.

A third way temporal space was used was time spent with small groups or individual students. As noted previously, all three moved around the room during small-group work. But, it was not mere movement—all three teachers spent *time* interacting with individual or small groups of students during this period. One observer reported that
Emi appeared to make an attempt to check in—or, spend time with—every group during this portion of class. Time spent before class or during breaks was also used by the teachers to spend time with students. Students used this time to ask questions they may not have been able to during instruction. For example, one observer reported that Emi had been asked about the next course in the sequence. As the observer recorded: “(The) teacher has conversions with the class in English telling students not to worry about Spanish next quarter. Students ask more questions and she tells them… that the (verb) tenses are ‘Way facil’ (i.e., easy).” Thus, Emi used the time before class to address expressed student anxiety.

But, it is likely that this use of temporal space also served to lessen the gap in *interpersonal space*, thus improving teacher-student relationships and contributing to a positive learning environment. In the above example, Emi attempted to put the students at ease about the next course in the sequence. Yet, the interaction also served to break down the traditional barriers between teacher and student in that Emi used her position as an instructor in the department to share her knowledge about how the next course fits into language study at the university. Additionally, the above interaction also likely served to implicitly communicate to students that she was keenly aware of their ability level as assertions about their readiness would have no merit had she been oblivious as to where her students’ abilities were at in that moment. And the students raising these concerns about future study would not likely be assuaged by Emi’s input had there not already been some trust established in the relationship. On the other occasion that Emi’s class
was observed, both observers noted that during the time before class, she joined in a conversation between two students—to share that she apparently grew up in the same area as one of the students and knew some of the same people. In this way, Emi took advantage of the off-instruction time to take steps to decrease the interpersonal space between her and her students with a warmer classroom climate as the likely result.

Physical space was also used in ways to reduce interpersonal space. As noted earlier, all three teachers moved around the room. While this made them more available to monitor progress and more accessible to answer student questions, it also likely served to break down teacher-student barriers once the teacher removed her/himself from the traditional place of authority at the front of the room. In this way, the teachers were not only physically closer to students, they were interpersonally closer as well. Indeed, observers noted Daniel taking the reduction of physical space a step farther when he would crouch down to speak to those students sitting during small-group activities. One observer reported that one of the conversations between Daniel and a small group of students appeared to be off-topic. While time spent off-topic with the student may have been at the expense of practice of key vocabulary or grammar, it is likely that this time served to build rapport between Daniel and these students. Thus, it is likely that this action increased positive perceptions of teacher-student relationships for these students.

However, manipulation of physical space and use of the time before class or during small group work were not the only ways teachers appeared to take steps to reduce interpersonal space. Interestingly, all three teachers encouraged students to use their
given names, though Tina did not impose this convention on them. She reported that some of her students came from cultures where they may not be comfortable using her given name. Thus, her flexibility indicates an awareness of the role of culture in interpersonal space. But in addition to encouraging students to use their given names, all three teachers appeared to know their students’ names. Indeed, prior to class, Emi passed back work *before many of the students arrived* indicating that she not only knew their names, but also where they tended to sit—another indication of reduced interpersonal space in these classes.

Another factor that may have served to decrease interpersonal space was use of humor—all three teachers used humor in the target language and encouraged laughter in the classroom. Tina reported that use of humor may be a factor that makes her class different from her peers. As she says: “My classroom is probably a little more relaxed than a lot of the students are accustomed to. Um, and I tend to use humor—sometimes not on purpose.” Observers reported that both Daniel and Emi would make jokes in the target language—both to students individually and the class as a whole. These two would also include humorous slides as part of their presentations that would result in student laughter. Additionally, in these classes, the students themselves would generate laughter. This would often happen in the formulation of humorous responses in the target language. In addition to creating an environment characterized by positive affect, the use of humor also likely served to decrease the interpersonal space between teacher and student.
There were other ways teachers acted to decrease the interpersonal space between themselves and students. For example, Daniel and Emi were reported to frequently smile in class. Indeed, one observer recorded in her/his notes from Emi’s class: “Is she ever not smiling?” Emi smiles when passing back/collecting homework, introducing new material, correcting mistakes, and while responding to students’ request to refrain from providing an answer. Tina reported that she will occasionally bring food to class in order to create a positive atmosphere. Another way teachers may decrease personal space is in being attentive to students’ non-academic needs. For example, during small-group work, Emi approached a student who had been coughing and leaned close and used the target language to communicate that he was free to get a drink of water if needed. The student left to return a little while later.

But in addition to taking steps to decrease the interpersonal space between themselves and students, these teachers also acted in ways to decrease the interpersonal space between student and student. Speaking the target language is more than simply plugging the appropriate vocabulary into the correct grammar structure. It also entails knowing one’s audience. Students in the ESL classroom come from a variety of countries and cultural backgrounds. Tina reports that miscommunication based on cultural differences occasionally occurs in her class. She believes the way to address such conflict is to address the issue immediately by providing explicit feedback to the involved parties. As she says, “Usually you can sometimes just address it directly and say, ‘you know, this is what’s going on.’ And you have to… talk about tolerance and what tolerance is… My
other big phrase involving tolerance is, ‘tolerate ambiguity.’” Thus, this type of feedback highlights strategies for communicating cross-culturally while simultaneously likely operates to promote a more positive learning atmosphere. Observers also reported that in both Daniel and Emi’s classes students appeared comfortable with one another. Students in both of these classes regularly chatted with one another during breaks and the period before class began. During an activity in Emi’s class, students were noted to be encouraging each other—behavior that Emi promoted by pointing out student success. It is likely that the frequent use of small-group activities promoted close interpersonal relations between students. In these ways, teachers acted in ways to decrease the interpersonal space between students.

In summary, the findings indicate that the way teachers used physical, temporal, and interpersonal space contributed to a climate characterized by positive affect and low anxiety that likely provided students a firm foundation with which to make positive appraisals of the capability to speak the target language. In terms of physical space, all teachers moved around the classroom—leaving their conventional position of authority at the front of the room—especially during small group work. This served to position them to better monitor student work as well as to make themselves more accessible for students who may have had questions about content. Additionally, Emi rearranged student seating to promote interaction. Teachers used temporal space by assuring that students had plenty of time to respond to questions, and they shared a degree of control by permitting students to make contributions or to ask questions at a time deemed best by the students.
That is, they did not require that students adhered to the convention of hand-raising. These teachers also modified instructional time to maximize the match between student ability level and content. They also used time during breaks, before class, or during small group activities to build rapport with students or answer questions students may not have asked in the larger class context. In addition to the use of physical space and time, interpersonal space was lessened between teachers and students in that teachers encouraged the use of their given names and appeared to know the names of all their students. The teachers in this study also used and encouraged humor in the target language. And lastly, these teachers actually promoted relationships among the students.

**Primary finding three: Practices rooted in beliefs about motivation.** The third primary finding of the qualitative portion of this study was that many of the practices these teachers adopted in the classroom were related to the beliefs they espoused regarding second/additional language acquisition and motivation. These beliefs were rooted in their own experiences as language learners (Daniel and Emi) or observations as teachers (Tina). Though all three espoused similar beliefs—specifically, all three believe that confidence is an important factor in continued language study—the corresponding practices emanating from these beliefs varied by teacher.

Emi and Tina stated that they believe that confidence stems from extended practice speaking the target language. Similarly, Daniel added that he believes that one must be willing to make mistakes. In Emi’s class, this translates into opportunities to speak the target language—especially in small-group settings in which students speak to
one another as opposed to large-group discussions when only approximately two
individuals have speaking opportunities at any given time. Emi summed up her approach
quite simply: “The less I talk, the better,” indicating that class time is optimized by
maximizing speaking opportunities. The result was that nearly every student used the
target language at some point during the course of the observations. This is also in accord
with one of her stated goals for her students—that they would improve and gain
confidence in speaking the target language.

Like Emi, Tina also expressed belief that confidence and improvement—one of
her espoused goals for her students—comes through practice. Though Tina qualifies this
to mean practice speaking with native speakers of the target language. Thus, Tina
provides plenty of opportunity in class to practice and chooses activities that permit
practice of multiple dimensions of speaking. Though Tina provides opportunity for
student-to-student interaction, as the sole native speaker, many of the speaking
opportunities during the classroom observations took the form of student-to-teacher
interaction. Examples include the posing of a variety of questions to the class at large as
well as one-on-one interaction in assisting students with presentation projects. However,
Tina also believes that language is bound by culture. During the interview, she noted that
she is able to identify which of her students have native English-speaking roommates as
their language contains idioms, slang, and general cultural awareness. Thus, she
encourages her students to “know your context.” This is coupled with encouragement to
immerse oneself in the culture—from taking advantage of social events the department sponsors to watching *The Simpsons*.

Daniel stated that he believes that confidence is very important—students should be confident enough to be willing to try and fail, or make mistakes, but not so confident that they fail to take instruction. He expressed belief that the way to build confidence is by providing a firm foundation which he fosters through repetition. Drawing on his own experience as a language-learner, he said:

Um, sometimes if it’s a really long word I might break it down into syllables… Then I will have the class as a whole—everyone—say it. Then after they’ve all said it, and I kind of look around and see that mouths are moving, then I’ll maybe call on some. I’ll say it, and then I’ll call on them to repeat after me that they’ll say it. If they don’t say it quite right I might say it again. And then they’ll repeat it. I definitely would never want to—if they aren’t saying it right—just keep sayin’ ‘No!’ and then, ‘otra vez,’ you know, ‘another time.’ I wouldn’t want them to feel like they’re standing out in that sense. But trying, I guess, group repetition and individual repetition.. So that way, they get the confidence. ‘Hey, I’ve said this, and I got good, positive feedback from my instructor.’ That’s what I’m getting at I guess. I want them to feel that sense of ‘hey, he thinks I did a good job. Because it helped me learn.’ You know? If I was always told how wrong everything was, it kinda makes me not want to do it.
Thus, Daniel believes there is a time to correct mistakes—but doing so in front of the entire class may not be one of those times as it could result in a lowering of confidence. He adds:

Like if somebody maybe says something and they think that they’re completely off target… I never would call it out in front of the class. Because once you do that one time… I mean, me personally, if I were in a class like that, I would zip up and never say another word. Because I’ve had that happen. You know, where I say something, and then the instructor’s like, ‘No, no’ and then it’s embarrassing and then you clam up. So, I never want them to clam up. So, no matter what they say back when I ask them a question, if it’s completely off topic, ‘Oh, esta bien, pero…’ like, ‘It’s okay, but…’ and then let’s do something else. So, I never want to shoot back a bunch of negative like, ‘no, no es correcto.’ I mean personally, I don’t like that approach… I would never say, ‘No, nope. That’s not right. Let’s do it differently.’ What’s the point? I’d rather give them a lot of encouragement.

Emi also is hesitant to correct shy students, or students just beginning language study, as it is more important to encourage attempts to speak rather than risk discouraging a student in order to correct minor pronunciation errors. As she says, “I try to point out more of the good things that they’re doing rather than the bad things.” Tina also believes there are times to refrain from correcting mistakes, though in her view, it is less about diminishing confidence and more about emphasis—not wanting to stop a student who is struggling to formulate a sentence.
In summary, all three teachers explicitly stated they believe confidence is a factor in determining continued language study, though this manifests itself differently with each teacher. With Tina, this means illuminating the cultural speaking context, and encouraging students to increase familiarity with the target culture (via television and interaction with native speakers). Emi believes confidence comes with practice. Thus, she attempts to maximize for students to use the target language amongst themselves. Daniel believes in providing fundamental skills for students in a supportive environment. This means repetition of new vocabulary or phrases.

**Secondary finding one: Abundant mastery experiences present.** All three teachers provided students with enactive mastery experiences. That is, a significant portion of each class was devoted to the practice of speaking in the target language. In Tina’s classes, opportunities for student-to-student interaction in the target language were present, though the observations indicated that many of the practice opportunities were student-to-teacher interaction in the form of posing a variety of questions the class at large as well as one-on-one interaction in assisting students with presentation projects. As previously noted, much of the practice in Daniel’s class was repetitive in nature though he also used a lot of group work that he closely monitored. He made himself available for questions by walking around the room listening to the groups and providing assistance when needed. Daniel reported he wants to assure that all students are given a chance to speak, thus he frequently cold-calls on students—presumably to assure that this happens. He also cold-calls on students during situations in which none raise their hands. Like
Daniel, group work using the target language was a common occurrence in Emi’s classes.
Students regularly asked questions and called out answers without raising their hand.
However, Emi too, called on select students who did not otherwise participate. The result is that nearly every student used the target language at some point during the course of our observations.

Secondary finding two: Abundant vicarious experiences present. Actual models served as the primary experience in all three classes—usually, the teacher. Indeed, symbolic models were uncommon, and evidence of possible cognitive self-modeling only occurred in Tina’s class. Although Tina provides ample opportunity for students to practice the target language in class before their peers—thus, simultaneously creating vicarious experiences—she will often model the target language herself (being a native English-speaker, she presumably provides a more authentic actual model), frequently summarizing the contributions of students. She will also stop students who may make errors to model the correct pronunciation. Daniel acts as the primary model in his class. He says all the new vocabulary words and prompts students to repeat after him. Emi too acts as the primary model in her class. However, unlike Daniel, she models by responding in the target language to student questions posed in the native language—thus, does more to provide the communicative value of the language.

Secondary finding three: Social persuasion generally limited. All three teachers used simple verbal and physical affirmation in response to students’ attempts at speaking the target language. Tina gave the widest variety of performance feedback, which ranged
from simple verbal (“yeah”) and physical (head nod) affirmation to detailed descriptions on how to obtain correct pronunciation (informing students where the particular sound occurs in the mouth and drawing diagrams). Daniel provides much in the way of simple verbal (and sometimes physical) affirmations. Indeed, one observer noted that these were occasionally provided for student responses that were not obviously correct. When a student declines to answer, this was followed-up (more than once) with “that’s okay.”

Positive feedback occurs in both the native and target languages. Observers failed to report much (i.e., any) in the way of more complex forms of performance feedback. That is, students were never told why the response was incorrect—action that would may have given learners more information about the task. Emi too, provided much affirmation. With Emi, verbal affirmations (e.g., muy bien, excellente) were almost always accompanied with physical affirmations (e.g., a smile or “high five”).

*Secondary finding four: L1 used to decrease anxiety.* None of the three teachers in the study prohibited the use of students’ native language in the classroom. Students in both of the Spanish classes used English to ask questions about content or course assignments. Students would also insert English words to complete phrases or sentences in the target language. Generally, Emi and Daniel responded to these questions by using the target language. However, Daniel occasionally used English in providing simple verbal affirmation, to explain a grammar point if further clarification appeared to be needed, or to modify directions for an activity. Emi was heard using English during class on two occasions: to respond to student questions regarding the parameters of an
assignment, and to explain a grammar point. The flexibility and lack of adherence to a rigid guideline in allowing students to complete sentences using vocabulary from their native language or to ask questions about grammar or the parameters of assignments in their native language likely lowered a sense of anxiety better allowing students to focus on language use rather than class rules.

**Summary of the qualitative findings.** The data from the qualitative portion of the analysis revealed three primary findings and four secondary findings. The first primary finding related to the interrelatedness of many of the sources of self-efficacy operating in these classrooms. For example, as when social persuasion was directly linked to a mastery performance. At other times, a single event acted as multiple sources as when performance feedback given in the target language could function as a vicarious experience or as social persuasion. The second primary finding related to teachers’ use of space—physical, temporal, and interpersonal—to promote a personal sense of efficacy among students. The third primary finding pertained to the espoused beliefs these teachers had about second-additional language acquisition and motivation. Though all three teachers shared similar beliefs, they play out differently in their classroom practices.

The four secondary findings related to the four sources of self-efficacy described by Bandura (1997). Regarding enactive mastery experiences, the data revealed that all three instructors allotted ample, in-class time devoted to speaking the target language. Vicarious experiences were primarily provided by the teachers themselves. The most common form of social persuasion took the form of simple verbal and physical
affirmation. And finally, use of the native language in the classroom likely served to reduce anxiety. And to the extent that this occurred, would have lessened the likelihood that students would have maladaptive attributions regarding their performance.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

There were three overarching purposes of the present study: (a) to examine the role that self-efficacy played in specific outcomes such as learners’ willingness to communicate in the language and their course grades, (b) to examine the contextual factors that may promote self-efficacy such as teachers’ sense of efficacy and learners perceptions of their classroom climates, and (c) to better understand the teacher practices that may lead to a learners’ sense of personal efficacy for speaking the target language. Specifically, this study aimed to address the following research questions:

- Does students’ self-efficacy for the target language (SETL) predict their willingness to communicate?
- Do SETL and perceptions of climate predict course grades after controlling for other variables?
- Are students’ perceptions of their teacher’s sense of efficacy (PTSE) associated with increased SETL and willingness to communicate?
- Does teachers’ sense of efficacy explain the ways in which SETL varies at the student level?
• Do students’ perceptions of their classroom climate predict WTC after controlling for other variables?

• Is teachers’ sense of efficacy associated with increased SETL and WTC?

• What do teachers perceived as highly efficacious by their students do to promote SETL and WTC?

Self-Efficacy for the Target Language

Willingness to communicate. A change in self-efficacy for speaking the target language was a significant predictor of participants’ willingness to communicate after accounting for variables such as students’ level of language study, the actual target language they were learning (i.e., Spanish or Chinese), various indices of value they placed on the language, the perceptions of their teachers’ beliefs and classroom climate, the degree of anxiety they reported, and perhaps most significantly, self-efficacy predicted students’ willingness to communicate at the end of the term, even accounting for the willingness to communicate they reported at the beginning of the term. And indeed, after WTC recorded at the first time point, a change in self-efficacy for the target language was the largest contributor in explaining the variance in participants’ willingness to communicate, and the effect size ($\beta = .29$) indicated that it was a strong contributor (Keith, 2006).

Dörnyei (2005) observed that some students who possess high ability in the target language demonstrate a lack of willingness to communicate in that language. He suggested that one of the needed areas of study on motivation and acquisition of the
target language was a better understanding of the gap between ability and willingness-to-communicate. However, as these results indicate, it may not be as important to understand the relationship between actual ability and students’ willingness to communicate as it is to understand the nature of the relationship between students’ perceived capabilities and their willingness to communicate. As Bandura (1997) and others (e.g., MacIntyre & Baker, 2002) have noted, it is perceptions of one’s ability that matter. A student may have a large vocabulary and an extensive knowledge of grammar, as well as good pragmatic knowledge, but if s/he does not believe that s/he has the ability to successfully navigate a conversation in the target language, then s/he is unlikely to be motivated to engage in such an endeavor. Thus, students’ perceptions of their ability may help explain the gap between actual ability and their willingness to communicate.

However, an interest in the role that students’ perceptions of their ability is not new to studies of motivation and second-language acquisition (SLA). As noted in Chapter 2, a construct similar to self-efficacy—self-perceived communication competence (SPCC)—has long been shown to be associated with students’ willingness to communicate (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre, 2007). Indeed, scores from both administrations of the SPCC strongly correlated with both subscales from the self-efficacy measure ($r \geq .43$). Additionally, in the preliminary regression models, SPCC revealed indications of multicollinearity suggesting that it shared some of the variance with self-efficacy in terms of their relationship with WTC. However, even though the constructs possess similarities, there are important conceptual distinctions as were
outlined in Chapter 2. Whereas SPCC simply pertains to one’s perception of her/his current ability level, self-efficacy refers to one’s belief in her/his ability to organize and execute the necessary steps to attain a given end. Thus, conceptually, self-efficacy subsumes mere perceived competence. That is, perceived competence is likely one of several considerations individuals make—the nature of the task would be another—when forming judgments about their capabilities to organize and execute the behaviors needed to achieve a given task.

Another important distinction between the two constructs is that of application. Whereas SPCC has been shown to relate to WTC, almost no attention has been directed towards what teachers can actually do to promote it—in spite of the fact that teachers are widely believed to play a vital role in motivating students (Dörnyei, 2003, 2005; Hall & Verplaeste, 2002; Lightbrown & Spada, 2006). Self-efficacy, on the other hand, has four known sources that have been shown to increase self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), and have generated much interest (e.g., Usher & Pajares, 2008). Thus, making the leap from the theoretical to practice is not so difficult for self-efficacy. The findings from the qualitative portion of the study provide some indication of what some of these teacher practices may be (see Inseparable Sources and Teacher Use of Space below).

**Grades.** Change in self-efficacy for the target language was also a predictor of course grades after accounting for demographic variables such as age and gender, the level and language of study, various value indices, perceptions of contextual factors, and reported level of anxiety. This adds to a growing body of evidence that self-efficacy

Though the effect size ($\beta = .09$) was considered small—but meaningful—using Keith’s (2006) guidelines, it should be pointed out that grades administered in the Spanish courses—a much larger portion of the sample—were largely standardized and biased towards objective measures of reading and writing tasks (it is unknown how grades in the Chinese course were generated). Thus, it may be unexpected that a measure designed to tap into tasks associated with the *speaking* aspects of the target language would predict grades based largely on the other aspects of the language. However, self-efficacy and social cognitive theory provide some guidance as to how this would be.

First, self-efficacy beliefs may generalize to other tasks—especially those that possess similarities (Zimmerman, 1995). Thus, a student who believes s/he has the capabilities to master speaking tasks, may come to believe that other aspects of the language would be similarly under her/his control. Alternatively, it could be that the behaviors or strategies used to master speaking would work as well towards attaining ends in other domains. It is not likely that access to vocabulary, grammar, or the pragmatics of the language would significantly alter much between speaking, listening, reading, or writing tasks.

Another possibility is that those who have a high sense of personal efficacy for speaking the target language are more willing to communicate, and then actually do so. It is reasonable to speculate that these students are more likely to ask questions about the
content, volunteer for speaking opportunities, actually use opportunities for pair-work to practice speaking, seek opportunities to speak the target language outside of class, and generally have a high level of participation. To the extent that this is true, then it is likely that these students were seen favorably by teachers who view participation as a characteristic of a “good” student. Thus, it is possible these students were “rewarded”—as much as subjective measures of performance within the confines of the course would allow—with a positive bias in terms of grade designations.

But this view suggests a form of behaviorism in which the environment is the ultimate determinant of behavior. From that perspective, students participate and speak because they are rewarded for doing so. Teachers “give” grades because they have been rewarded by participative students. As noted in Chapter 1, SCT posits a triadic reciprocal relationship between personal characteristics, behaviors, and the environment. Not only are individuals shaped by their immediate environment, but they are shapers of this environment as well. From this view, the “source” of a grade may be viewed as a combination of “reward” from the environment, and something “earned” on the part of the agentic student. In other words, while students with a high degree of participation may be seen favorably by their teachers and rewarded justly, students with a high sense of personal efficacy may interact with their environment in ways that change it to meet their own needs or goals.

Bandura (1997) noted that an optimal sense of personal efficacy is one that is only just above one’s actual capabilities. Self-efficacy that is unrealistically high is likely to
result in taking on tasks that lead to failure. However, self-efficacy that is *realistically* high is likely to be self-perpetuating. That is, these individuals are likely to take on tasks that push their abilities, and then persevere through challenges until success is met. The results suggest that a high sense of self-efficacy is probably associated with a host of strategies or behaviors—increased participation, for example—that are beneficial to the student. It is reasonable to assume that grades are simply a reflection of this.

**SETL subscales.** The principal components analysis indicated that the SETL was composed of two factors that accounted for more than 60% of the variance in student responses. One factor consisted of items that largely centered on tasks strictly associated with speaking (*strictly speaking*) while the other consisted of items that pertained to the cultural knowledge and self-regulatory aspects of speaking the target language (*indirect skills*). In the present study, these two subscales shared enough variance in predicting the outcome variables that they were subject to issues of multicollinearity, and were thus dropped from the analysis. However, such measures could be of use in different contexts with other outcomes being assessed. Reagan and Osborn (2002) note that language teachers,

must not only have competence in the target language, but must also understand the nature of language writ large, and must be sensitive to the political and sociocultural aspects of language and language use. In other words, the teacher of foreign languages must be able to function in a classroom setting as something of a critical, applied linguist. The role of the foreign language teacher, then, is not
merely that of a guide to the target language, but also, and perhaps more importantly, of a mentor and colleague in the students’ development of critical language awareness. (p. 2)

Thus, in contexts that examined students’ beliefs in their ability to master the sociocultural and political aspects of language use in contrast to those skills strictly associated with speaking, these measures may be of value. However, it should be noted that these measures were created for this study. Thus, refinement may be necessary. For example, the factor analysis did not produce a simple solution (i.e., several items loaded strongly to both factors). Thus, future studies should continue to assess the psychometric properties of the SETL and possibly modify, add, or drop items to refine the measure.

**Perceptions of the Classroom Context**

**Competitive Climates.** Classrooms perceived as competitive were significantly inversely related to a willingness to communicate. That is, as students’ perceptions of a competitive classroom climate increased, their willingness to communicate decreased. Though this is a new finding for this context, the result is not completely unexpected given the large body of work that suggests the adverse effects of competitive classrooms. Carole Ames (1984) has described three broad types of classroom climates: *Individualistic* (or success-oriented or mastery-based) in which structures encourage students to compare their present performance with their past performance, *cooperative* which is characterized as a positive interdependence between students where one's success or failure is bound by the group, and *competitive* characterized by *negative*
interdependence between students—that is, one’s success depends on another’s failure. Or, as Moos and Moos (1978) had put it, “an emphasis on competition may encourage cognitive growth among some students at great costs to others” (p. 267).

Though students may become socialized to be competitive at a young age (Ames, 1984), it is likely that cues present in the classroom encourage the adoption of competitive strategies. Classroom climate has been conceptualized as a student’s experience that reflects the values of the classroom, the interpersonal relationships, organizational structures, teaching practices, and goals (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009; Turner & Meyer, 2000). Thus, one element of classroom climate may be goal structures. Goal structures refer to the explicit and implicit messages teachers transmit regarding the salient goals of a particular context (E. Anderman & Wolters, 2006; Kaplan, Middleton, Urdan, & Midgely, 2002). Two types of goals pertinent to this discussion are mastery and performance. In brief, mastery goals (or, task-involved) refer to intent to master a particular task, while performance goals (or, ego-involved) refer to intent to demonstrate skill (Meece, Anderman & Anderman, 2006). However, the approach/avoidance distinction is also of importance. Mastery-approach has generally been shown to be associated with a host of beneficial learning outcomes, while results are somewhat mixed in terms of performance-approach (Midgley, Kaplan, & Middleton, 2001). Performance-avoidance goals are generally associated with negative learning outcomes (Midgley, Kaplan, & Middleton, 2001).
The presumption is that a competitive climate would be one in which performance goals would be salient. That is, students who are intent on demonstrating their competence would inherently be doing so in relation to their peers’ display of ability. However, even though there may be benefits for students who take a performance-approach orientation toward classroom tasks (Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011), classrooms that encourage such competition may be favoring those who already possess perceived competence at the expense of those who may be entering such contexts at a lower ability-level or who otherwise struggle (Midgley, Kaplan, & Middleton, 2001). In such circumstances those students may adopt performance-avoidance goals. Thus, language classrooms perceived as competitive may be ones in which opportunities to communicate are dominated by those few with the highest beliefs in their ability for speaking the target language, leaving the remaining students unwilling to put their lack of communicative prowess on the lighted stage. In other words, it may be that one manifestation of the adoption of performance-avoidance goals for such students may be an unwillingness to communicate.

And yet, perceived competitive climates were positively associated with grades. It may be that the concept of performance goals needs further elaboration. For example, Urdan and Mestas (2006) found that reasons the high school students in their study gave for pursuing performance goals could be categorized into those who adopted those goals out of considerations of appearance (e.g., want to prove self to others, want to avoid looking dumb in front of the teacher) and those who adopted those goals due to
competition (e.g., want to look competent, want to keep up with others). Senko, Hulleman, and Harackiewicz (2011) have suggested that performance goals can be broken down into those who are motivated to demonstrate competence and those who are motivated to outperform others (i.e., normative considerations). A meta-analysis of research on performance goals indicates that items or measures that emphasize normative performance are positively correlated with grades, while those that emphasize competence-demonstration are negatively correlated (Hulleman, Schrager, Bodmann, & Harackiewicz, 2010).

In the present study, competitive climates negatively predicted WTC and positively predicted grades. It could be that the difference is due to the public nature of these outcomes—communication in a language classroom is inherently a public performance; course grades are generally private. It may be that perceived competitive climates activate normative goals for those outcomes in which students have choice as to whether to display them or not (e.g., grades), but competence-demonstration goals for those tasks that are performed before peers. A proposed model is found in Figure 5.1. The results of this study indicate that language-learning environments in which the goals of the class are to promote proficiency in the target language—as opposed to the satisfaction of degree requirements—should avoid encouraging competition amongst students.
Communication-encouraged climates. Interestingly, though change in self-efficacy was significantly related to both grades and a willingness to communicate, classroom climates perceived as ones that encouraged communication were not significantly associated with either. Items that loaded to this factor asked participants about their speaking and listening opportunities. In other words, these items were intended to tap into the presence of perceived mastery experiences. The measure did not address the perceived nature of these opportunities. Indeed, the term “enacted mastery experience” is somewhat of a misnomer as it suggests that any engagement with the task will automatically produce “mastery” and serve to increase self-efficacy. However, as noted in Chapter 2, not all mastery experiences are alike. Easy tasks fail to provide the individual with much information from which to make judgments about her/his capabilities. Similarly, a task far too challenging could result in failure, and subsequently work to lower self-efficacy for the task in question. Thus, it could be that these
classrooms provided much in the way of opportunities to speak—but, opportunities of low quality.

That self-efficacy, self-perceived communication competence, and a willingness to communicate all increased during the study is noteworthy in light of the apparent lack of association between climates perceived to encourage communication and an actual willingness to communicate. It is also worth noting that the climate subscales are not orthogonal. That is, a class could conceivably be perceived as both emphasizing communication as well as competition. Thus, it could be that the classrooms in the study were generally not perceived as ones that emphasized communication. However, the data suggest this was not the case. Of the four classroom climate subscales, CEC had the second-highest mean score (after overt teacher encouragement). One possible answer is that other factors in the classroom contributed to moving students toward a place where they were more willing to communicate. Enactive mastery experiences are but one source of self-efficacy. As the qualitative results suggest, there may have been an abundance of other sources present (see Secondary Findings below).

**Measuring classroom climates.** Another possible explanation for the failed link between communication-encouraged climates and willingness to communicate is that of the measure used. Though items from the scale were constructed based on the four sources of efficacy, the exploratory factor analysis indicated the presence of four factors that, at least on the surface, did not appear to intuitively correspond to sources of self-efficacy. It should be noted that the *Perception of Classroom Climate* scale was
constructed for this study, and lacks the psychometric scrutiny that would result from repeated use. It should also be pointed out that the reliability from the *competitive climate* subscale was lower than desired (Cronbach’s α = .53). Additionally, the exploratory factor analysis did not produce a simple solution. That is, several items loaded strongly (i.e., > .4) to more than one factor. Thus, the measure would benefit from refinement. This may entail the addition of items that serve to boost reliability, validity, and utility of the constructs. For example, as noted previously, items from the *communication-emphasized climate* subscale did not address the quality of communication opportunities. Future iterations could include items that would distinguish between gradations of quality in speaking opportunities.

Still, such a measure could be of use in future studies of language classrooms. Turner and Meyer (2000) listed four reasons why classroom context is important to study: (a) students’ psychological reactions to the instructional context impact what students learn and how their learning develops, (b) instruction differs by content area which results in students’ varying perceptions of how different school subjects are learned, (c) theoretical developments now recognize the importance of classroom context (such acknowledgement was absent from earlier research), and (d) educational psychology will not be viewed as relevant to practice if it fails to consider contextual variables. Turner and Meyer added that contextualized findings are more meaningful for practicing teachers, as they “help explain the why and how behind student-teacher interactions” (p. 71). For example, classrooms could be identified and observed for a
greater understanding of the events that contribute to various aspects of students’ motivation for learning the target language.

**Autonomy, competition, and self-determination.** One unexpected finding from the exploratory factor analysis was the presence of the *autonomy-supportive* and *competitive* subscales. Interestingly, these subscales are compatible with *self-determination theory* (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2002). Briefly, SDT assumes that humans have a tendency toward psychological growth and integration—that is, a coherent sense of self. Integration involves *autonomy*, referring to an inner organization and holistic self-regulation, and *homonomy*, referring to integration of the self to others (Ryan & Deci, 2002). SDT posits three fundamental/basic needs: autonomy, relatedness, and competence. As fundamental needs, they are assumed to be universal though may have different behavioral manifestations/expressions in different cultural contexts (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2002). *Competence* “refers to feeling effective in one’s ongoing interactions with the social environment and experiencing opportunities to exercise and express one’s capacities” (Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 7). Individuals may meet this need when they direct their cognitive resources toward self-regulatory tools toward specific outcomes (Elliot & Dweck, 2005). *Relatedness* “refers to feeling connected to others, to caring for and being cared for by those others, to having a sense of belongingness both with other individuals and with one’s community” (Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 7). And finally, *autonomy* “refers to being the perceived origin or source of one’s own behavior” (Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 8).
Due to issues of multicollinearity, the autonomy-supportive subscale was excluded from the analysis. However, use of such a scale could aid in the development of SDT. Researchers operating from an SDT frame have long recognized the importance of contextual variables in the support of autonomy. For example, research on SDT in educational settings point to two broad findings: (a) students motivated by autonomy do well in educational settings, and (b) teachers who support autonomy benefit their students (Reeve, 2002). Two ways that teachers may support autonomy are by spending time listening to students (Reeve, 2002) and allotting time for independent work (Reeve, 2002; Reeve & Jang, 2006). Research has also indicated that the statements teachers make can support autonomy. Possible autonomy-supportive teacher statements include: praises on the quality of the performance; questioning of what the student wants; responding to student-generated questions; and empathic, perspective-taking statements (Reeve, 2002). A measure of students’ perceptions of classroom climate could serve to further support to contextualize findings.

The competitive climate subscale could also aid in understanding classroom contexts from an SDT frame. SDT actually subsumes no fewer than four “mini-theories.” One such theory pertinent to the present discussion is *organismic integration theory* (OIT). One of the primary assumptions of SDT is that self-determined individuals are intrinsically motivated. OIT describes the process of the internalization of values and regulations. Specifically, the theory proposes that externally regulated actions go through a process of internalization to become self-regulated (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci,
Ryan and Deci (2002) propose a continuum from amotivation to extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation, from nonself-determined to self-determined (see Figure 5.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Motivation</th>
<th>Amotivation</th>
<th>Extrinsic Motivation</th>
<th>Intrinsic Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Regulation</td>
<td>Non-regulation</td>
<td>External Regulation</td>
<td>Introjected Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Behavior</td>
<td>Nonself-determined</td>
<td>Self-determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2. *The self-determination continuum (adapted from Ryan & Deci, 2002).*

The types of regulation include: non-regulation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, integrated regulation, and intrinsic regulation.

*Amotivation* refers to a state of lacking any intention to act, or to act passively, or to lack any desire to see a particular course to fruition. *External regulation* refers to engaging in a particular behavior “to satisfy an external demand or a socially constructed contingency” (Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 17). *Introjected regulation* refers to behaviors performed to avoid guilt or shame. Behavior is still externally regulated as the individual is behaving in ways influenced by others—to seek approval. Regulated behavior becomes *identified* when individuals recognize that a particular course of action enables them to reach a meaningful goal. The behavior is still external in that it is not rewarding in itself. *Integrated regulation* “results when identifications have been evaluated and brought into congruence with the personally endorsed values, goals, and needs that are already part of
the self” (Ryan & Deci, 2002, p. 18). That is, the course of action is now seen as an integrated aspect of one's identify even if the action is not yet a reward in and of itself.

Teachers make known their expectations both explicitly and implicitly. Ames (1984) noted that children likely do not miss the cues of a competitive environment, such as when the best work gets posted, when groups or rows that finish first get allotted privileges, or when students are grouped by ability. To the extent that teachers structure environments that are competitive, students may be externally or introjectedly regulated. Similarly, language-learning classrooms in which only those whose language is the most fluid are chosen to model a dialog, or where only correct language use is praised instead of improvements, likely send signals to students about the values of the teacher. Again, a measure that adds context to findings may be of use in studies aiming to better understand the process of internalization of regulated behavior.

**Perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy.** In what was perhaps the first study on perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy, Li and Zhang (2000) found that student teachers who perceived their cooperating teachers as having a high sense of teaching efficacy were themselves more likely to have higher teaching self-efficacy. They drew on the work of Borko and Mayfield (1995) in offering a possible explanation. Borko and Mayfield found that cooperating teachers who believed they could play a role in the student teacher’s development offered richer feedback, which in turn resulted in a bigger influence on the student teacher’s learning. Knoblauch and Woolfolk Hoy (2008) also found a significant positive relationship between student teachers’ perceptions of their
cooperating teachers’ personal sense of efficacy for teaching and their own. They suggested that cooperating teachers perceived as highly efficacious acted as competent models and provided social persuasion in the form of encouragement.

In the present study, participants’ perceptions of their teacher’s sense of efficacy for teaching were a significant predictor of their willingness to communicate, though not their course grade. It is worth noting that participants were prompted to consider how their teacher would score the teachers’ sense-of-efficacy items. That is, participants were asked about their teacher’s beliefs, not their teacher’s behavior. What is not known is exactly what participants were drawing on in making judgments about their teacher’s sense of efficacy. It could be that those teachers who were rated as having a high sense of efficacy were perceived as confident, capable, credible, and seemingly unaffected by anxiety, and as individuals who approached challenges as problems to be solved creatively—as opposed to threats to be avoided. And to the extent these teachers were believed to be credible, student learning may have increased (Gray, Anderman, & O’Connell, 2011). That these perceptions predicted students’ willingness to communicate suggests that these teachers also acted in ways that promoted self-efficacy for speaking the target language. The implication of these results is that student perceptions of their teacher’s sense of efficacy may be an important contextual variable in predicting important outcomes. Clearly, more study is needed—perhaps cognitive interviewing to better understand exactly what cues students are using in forming judgments about their teacher’s beliefs or behaviors.
Other Student-Level Variables

Communication apprehension. The findings of the present study add support to a growing body of literature that indicates an inverse relationship between communication apprehension and beneficial student outcomes (e.g., Clark, 1989; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Samimi & Tabuse, 1991). Specifically, communication apprehension negatively predicted both WTC and grades. While the negative association between communication apprehension and WTC is not unexpected, it should be reiterated that the course grades were only partially based on students’ display of speaking skills. But again, it is reasonable to speculate that students who were apprehensive to speak the target language may have had anxiety associated with other aspects of the language as well. What is noteworthy is that whereas communication apprehension negatively predicted grades, classrooms perceived as competitive positively predicted them. While conventional wisdom might suggest that competitive classrooms are places that inherently produce anxiety—at least amongst those not at the top of the class—these results suggest the relationship may be more complex. As noted earlier, competitive climates may activate normative goals for tasks in which students have choice in whether or not to display skill or outcomes—such as grades. However, it could be that anxiety may undermine perceived choice and activate competence-demonstration goals instead. A revised model of the role of competitive climates on goal adoption is presented in Figure 5.3. Clearly, further investigation is warranted.
Figure 5.3. Revision of the proposed effects of competitive climates on student goals.

**Expectancy and value.** Students’ expectations for success were significant predictors of actual success as measured by grades. Expectations were not significantly associated with students’ willingness to communicate. An answer to this discrepancy may lie in the wording of the items used to measure expectancy: Items were general—*I expect to do very well in this class*—or normative—*I expect to do better than most of my classmates in this class*, and did not designate exactly which aspect of the course in which students expected to perform well. Given this lack of clarifying information, participants were left to draw their own inferences. It is reasonable to expect that university students when given such a prompt would presume that the items refer to grades.

Utility value, on the other hand, was a significant predictor of students’ willingness to communicate. This is consistent with a recent finding that the value students place on group work was associated with WTC (Fushino, 2010). However,
utility value was not a predictor of course grades. The *integrative* and *instrumental* motives (Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Gardner & Smythe, 1974, 1975) referred to in Chapter 1 may provide some guidance in interpreting this discrepancy. Dörnyei (2005) has said the integrative motive has been “the most researched and most talked about notion in L2 motivation studies and yet it has no obvious equivalent in any other approaches in mainstream motivational and educational psychology” (p. 95). However, it may be that the integrative and instrumental motives are simply different expressions of utility value.

The instrumental motive refers to utilitarian reasons for engaging in language study. The integrative motive refers to a desire to learn the language to move toward becoming a part of the people group associated with the target language (Gardner & Smythe, 1975). A number of researchers (e.g., Dörnyei, 1990, 1994, 2005; Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002; Irie, 2003; Lamb, 2004; Yashima, 2000) have noted that integrative and instrumental motives have not always been operationally distinct constructs. As noted in Chapter 1, Clément and Kruidenier (1983) pointed out that motives to pursue a target language to be able to “study abroad” are treated as an integrative motive in some studies, but as instrumental in others. Thus, like those who view language study for utilitarian purposes such as increased employability, it may be that the target language also serves as a means to an end for those who desire to integrate—in this case, the end being communion with the target community.
Conceptualizing integrative and instrumental motives as two sides of the same utility-value coin helps to shed light on the current findings. In other words, the measure of utility value in the present study may not have captured enough subtleties in value that participants were proscribing to study of the target language. Some of the utility items referred to language study for more instrumental ends (e.g., *Improving my ability in the target language is important to me because it will provide better job opportunities*) while others referred to more integrative ends (e.g., *One of the reasons I want to improve my ability to speak the target language is to communicate with people who are different from me*). Thus, it could be that some were taking the course to fulfill graduation requirements while others were studying the language out of a desire to actually learn it as a means to interact with native speakers of that language. It seems reasonable that the latter would likely place more value on being able to communicate in the target language than on the actual course grade they receive. The former may be more concerned with passing the class with an adequate grade than in their ability to communicate in the target language. Future studies in language contexts that utilize utility-value as a variable should make this distinction.

**Inseparable Sources**

The results of the qualitative portion of the study support Bandura’s (1997) notion that the sources of self-efficacy “rarely operate separately and independently” (p. 87). In the present study, vicarious experiences were often preceded or followed by enactive mastery experiences. In turn, mastery experiences were almost always coupled with
simple verbal or physical affirmation which may have served as social persuasion, but
more likely served to increase positive affect (see Secondary Findings below)—thus
influencing students’ affective states.

There were also multiple occasions when a single event possibly served as
*multiple* sources of self-efficacy. For example, performance feedback in the ESL classes
was always given in the target language. Thus, this event potentially served as both a
vicarious experience as well as social persuasion. However, as noted in Chapter 4, there
may have been times when a single event acted as multiple, *conflicting* sources of self
efficacy. That is, an event that may have raised self-efficacy in some individuals may
have lowered it in others. For example, affirmation for language use inconsistent with
expressed learning objectives may have maintained or even increased positive affect, but
it also could have contributed to maladaptive beliefs that successes in the target language
come easily, or that praise was lavished for incorrect use because the learner lacked
ability.

Again, self-determination theory may offer guidance on interpreting these
findings. As noted earlier, SDT subsumes at least four mini-theories. One of the mini-theories relevant to this discussion is that of *cognitive evaluation theory* (CET; Deci &
Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2002). In short, the theory attempts to describe the effects of
the social environment on one’s intrinsic motivation which is proposed to be related to
needs for competence and autonomy. Social events are interpreted as being supportive of
competence and autonomy or as thwarting it. These events are cognitively processed in
terms of their locus of causality (i.e., the perceived location of the cause of the event) as well as perceived competence (Ryan & Deci, 2002). In other words, learners need to make an attribution of causality toward their own competence if intrinsic motivation is to be enhanced.

The theory also posits that events have controlling and informational aspects. The controlling aspect of an event is perceived pressure to act to achieve specified outcomes that result in a perceived external locus of control—that is, pressure to think or behave in specified ways (Deci & Ryan, 1985). In other words, success is believed to have resulted due to adherence to the commands, values, or guidance of another (e.g., the teacher). The informational aspects of an event refer to embedded information that supports the individual’s experiences and competent engagement—that is, events that permit choice and provide information on how to autonomously and effectively navigate one’s environment (Deci & Ryan, 1985). The assumption is that events in which the controlling aspects are more salient will undermine intrinsic motivation, whereas those whose informational aspects are more salient will promote intrinsic motivation. In a study of native English-speaking Spanish students in the U.S., Noels (2003) found that students who had teachers perceived as controlling were less likely to report that Spanish learning was fun or valuable, or that they were studying the language by choice.

Similarly, how ambiguous events—such as those that may be sending different signals about one’s ability—are processed is likely an important determinant as to how those events are perceived. As Usher and Pajares (2008) have pointed out, it is the
students’ perception that is important. Thus, when a teacher repeats or rephrases a student’s contribution it may be perceived as a vicarious experience, and informational, to most of the observers, but as controlling to the one contributing to the dialog. To this individual, such an event may be a sign that only those contributions that strictly adhere to the language modeled by the teacher are correct. It could also be a sign that the teacher re-phrased the effort because it was lacking. Thus, even though the event may have acted as a source that promoted self-efficacy beliefs in some, it may have had the opposite effect on others.

**Teacher Use of Space**

**Physical space.** As described in Chapter 4, results from the qualitative portion of the study also indicated that teachers used physical space to support student self-efficacy for the target language. Specifically, teachers used space by moving around the room and by structuring seating in an attempt to facilitate student-to-student communication. This is consistent with findings from L. Anderman, Andrzejewski, and Allen (in press) who found that teachers identified by students as supportive of motivation frequently moved around the classroom to interact, engage, and monitor students. In the present study too, moving around the room likely resulted in greater teacher availability to monitor progress and answer questions. Presumably, closer monitoring enabled teachers to more accurately gauge students’ ability level. An accurate assessment of student ability would allow teachers to structure optimal mastery experiences and better provide meaningful performance feedback. Likewise, arranging seating to facilitate student-to-student
communication would better enable students to practice communicating in the target language—thus, increasing mastery experiences.

Interestingly, while these findings are congruent with those of L. Anderman and colleagues (in press), they are in stark contrast to the use of space by the elementary teachers described by Nespor (1997). In that context, control of space was viewed as central to the teacher’s identity. As he put it, “In elementary schools, the spaces of teaching are defined by students’ bodies. Having exclusive control of a bounded physical space is an important part of a teacher’s identity within the school” (p. 122). This control becomes more constraining as students move through the school system: “As kids grow older, schools’ spatial practices generally becomes constraining. Spaces are increasingly ‘ranked,’ pupils are assigned to specific, fixed places” (Nespor, 1997, p. 125). In the present study, leaving the traditional place of the teacher at the front of the class may have been a way to share control with students. It may be that this effort was actually a part of the teaching identity of these participants. In addition to promoting self-efficacy for speaking the target language, it may be that this behavior also indirectly served to decrease the interpersonal space between students and themselves.

**Interpersonal space.** It has long been known that positive teacher-student relationships are associated with positive learning outcomes (Davis, 2003). Perceived teacher support has been associated with motivation (Goodenow, 1993a; Meyer & Turner, 2006) and participation (Voelkl, 1995), while teacher-student closeness has been associated with academic performance (Juvonen, 2006; Karam, 2006), teacher ratings of
student self-directed behavior and school liking (Juvonen, 2006), and interest in school (Wentzel, 1998). Richards (2006) found that students who believed they could approach their teachers with both academic and personal concerns characterized these relationships positively. In other words, a decrease in the interpersonal space between teacher and student appears to contribute to a variety of positive outcomes in the U.S.

The teachers in this study acted in ways to decrease the interpersonal space with students in ways that likely fostered a sense of efficacy for speaking the target language. Ways in which this happened include: (a) disclosure of knowledge in regards to future courses in the sequence; (b) joining student-to-student conversations during breaks; (c) regularly leaving the conventional teaching space at the front of the classroom; (d) use of, and encouragement of, humor; (e) expressions of positive affect (e.g., smiles); (f) attention to non-academic needs; (g) encouragement of the use of their given names, and (h) attempts to decrease student-to-student interpersonal space. The latter was characterized by (a) providing explicit feedback about cross-cultural information, (b) frequent use of small-group discussions, and (c) encouraging students to recognize one another’s success. In addition to the aforementioned benefits of decreased teacher-student interpersonal space, the events found in this study likely supported students’ sense of personal efficacy for speaking the target language, by a general lowering of anxiety, while also building rapport in a supportive environment where students may have been more likely to solicit, and were more receptive to receiving performance feedback.
**Temporal space.** The results indicate that teachers used temporal space in the following ways to support students’ self-efficacy for speaking the target language: (a) sufficient wait-time given to students to form answers or respond to questions, (b) choice was given students to ask questions or to respond at times of their choosing, (c) instructional time was modified to maximize the impact of content, and (d) time was used for teacher to individual or small-group interaction. Use of time in these ways likely reduced anxiety and allowed students to engage in speaking when they felt prepared—thus, likely increasing the probability that their attempts at speaking the target language would be a success. In other words, time was used in such a way as to set the stage for the promotion of self-efficacy beliefs.

Sufficient wait-time for student responses after questions appears to be crucial for success. Indeed, *time* is one of the conditions of the *monitor hypothesis* which posits that learners need time if they are to consciously apply the language rules they have learned (Krashen, 1982). In terms of motivation, Reeve (2002) has indicated that wait-time is one way that teachers can support autonomy. A study that examined wait-time in elementary science classes over 35 years ago (Rowe, 1974) found that the average wait-time was a mere second before rephrasing the question or moving on to other students. Results of that study indicated that wait-times of three to five seconds were associated with: (a) increase in the length of students’ responses; (b) increases in the number of appropriate, unsolicited responses; (c) decreases in failures to respond at all; (d) increase in speculative responses; (e) increase in evidence of peer-comparisons; (f) increase in
evidence-based inferential statements; and (g) an increase in student questions asked (Rowe, 1974).

Subsequent studies have generally supported these findings, though there are indications that optimal wait-time may depend on the context and the learner. For example, young children taking kindergarten entrance exams may need extended time to formulate responses (Medcalf Davenport, 2003). However, children with cognitive disabilities coupled with challenging behaviors may actually benefit from decreased wait-time (Tincani & Crozier, 2007). In terms of English language learners, Gilbertson and Bluck (2006) found that the six-year olds in their study benefitted from a five-second wait-time—as opposed to a one-second wait-time—for a letter-naming task. They speculated that the extra time afforded students the opportunity to formulate learning strategies. Their study suggests that sufficient wait-time is likely especially important in language learning contexts in which students may need added time to work out how to form a response in the target language—in addition to the time needed to organize the content-aspect of the response. Thus, it is likely that the teacher-participants in the present study set their students up for success by allotting sufficient time for students to respond.

Practices Rooted in Beliefs

It has long been assumed that teacher practices are, at least in part, a reflection of their beliefs (Bussis, Chittenden, & Amarel, 1976; Pajares, 1992; Woolfolk Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006). Results of the study add further support to this assumption in that they
indicate the self-efficacy-supporting practices of these teachers are rooted in their espoused beliefs about motivation and SLA—beliefs rooted in their own episodic storage of experiences learning or teaching the target language. Specifically, all three expressed a belief that confidence in the target language results in continued study. Practices stemming from this belief include: (a) the maximization of in-class opportunities for practice-time speaking the target language, (b) repetition so as to provide students with a firm foundation of pronunciation and vocabulary, and (c) sensitivity regarding correction of mistakes.

Nespor (1987) has described several structural features of teacher beliefs. First, belief systems may be characterized by *existential presumption*. That is, teachers may hold well-defined views about rather abstract student characteristics. For example, teachers may hold a belief that students are “lazy.” *Alternativity* refers to representations of alternative realities. For example, teachers may aspire to create an ideal classroom climate that they themselves have never experienced. Belief systems also have *affective and evaluative* aspects to them—serving to regulate the amount of energy a teacher may devote to a particular practice. *Non-consensuality* refers to “affective feelings and evaluations, vivid memories of personal experiences, and assumptions about their existence of entities and alternative worlds, all of which are simply not open to outside evaluation or critical examination” (Nespor, 1987, p. 321). Belief systems are also characterized by their *unboundedness*. That is, they are not bound by outside logic, rules, or guides. Finally, belief systems may be functions, in part, of one’s *episodic storage*.
That is, critical experiences whilst a student or early in one’s teaching career provide a frame from which to interpret events and/or guide teaching practices. Patrick and Pintrich (2001) had also concluded that the beliefs of preservice teachers are largely the result of their own experiences as students. Though these beliefs change to an extent during preparation, they often revert back once they experience the challenges of the classroom. Nespor speculated that one of the reasons why beliefs may persist in the face of contrary evidence is that they provide teachers with a well-defined frame with which to navigate complex classroom environments often characterized by ill-defined problems.

The teacher-participants from the qualitative portion of the study were chosen from their students’ reports that their classrooms were ones that were self-efficacy promoting. The nature of belief-formation suggested by Nespor (1987) suggests that the beliefs that these participants had regarding motivation in language learning may have been the result of their experiences as students. It is not clear whether the efficacy-promoting practices of these teachers were the result of their own experiences as students, novice teachers, or during teacher preparation. However, while beliefs are thought to be relatively stable (Nespor, 1987; Woolfolk Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006) research has indicated that teachers can be taught to support motivation in the form of autonomy-support (e.g., SDT; Reeve, 1998), suggesting that these efficacy-supporting practices can be modified through teacher education.

**Secondary Findings**
**Getting to the source.** The observations indicated the presence of ample enactive mastery and vicarious experiences. In the Spanish classes, mastery experiences generally took the form of speaking opportunities in the context of small peer groups or through call-and-response. In the ESL class, these experiences were generally with the teacher before the larger group. In all classes, the teacher served as the primary model for the target language. Additionally, both observers reported that the climates for the Spanish classrooms were marked by positive affect and low anxiety. In short, three of the four sources of self-efficacy described by Bandura (1997) appeared to be in sufficient supply.

However, social persuasion was not likely a strong source of self-efficacy in the Spanish classrooms. Though both simple verbal and physical cues of affirmation were in abundance, meaningful performance feedback was nearly absent in the Spanish classes during the observation periods—though it was sufficient in the ESL class observations. Although these simple verbal and physical cues likely lacked much in the way of information from which learners could make judgments about their capabilities, it is possible that they served to contribute to a positive classroom climate and to reduce anxiety. Still, the lack of meaningful feedback does raise some concern. As noted in Chapter 2, Graham (2006) found that successes gained during lower levels of language study did not have lasting effects on students’ self-efficacy. In other words, easy successes may not prepare students for the increased challenges that language study brings during more advanced levels. Though she was referring to *mastery* experiences, it
is reasonable to conclude that students who receive no corrective or meaningful feedback may come to view incorrect language use as an “easy” success.

**Use of L1.** Though the Spanish teachers actually used the target language almost exclusively in their 100-level classes, there were times when they used English (i.e., the native language or L1). Specifically, L1 was used on occasion to explain grammar, provide verbal affirmation, or to modify directions to an activity. At the same time, student use of L1 was tolerated in these classes, though students generally limited use of L1 to insert a needed vocabulary word into an L2 phrase they were attempting to formulate or to ask questions about grammar or assignments. Though framed in an ESL context, Yough and Fang (2010) suggested several benefits to the use of L1 to support students’ self-efficacy for the target language by maximizing mastery experiences: (a) facilitation of vocabulary acquisition, (b) aiding in comprehension, (c) promotion of self-regulation, and (d) clear activity and assignment parameters so that students can better focus on language. Use of L1 in this study may have served to alleviate a degree of anxiety while also providing clear guidelines and appropriate levels of scaffolding so that learners could better focus on the target language.

**Summary of the Findings**

In sum, a change in self-efficacy for speaking the target language was a significant predictor of both students’ willingness to communicate in the target language as well as their course grade. Other personal variables such as students’ self-reported communication apprehension and the utility value placed on language study were
significant predictors of WTC, while age, gender, and expectancy were significant predictors of course grades (age was a negative predictor). Contextual variables were important for both outcomes: Perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy was a positive predictor of WTC, while perceived competitive climate was a negative predictor of WTC, but a positive predictor of grades. Three classrooms were chosen for observation based on students’ reports of classrooms perceived to support self-efficacy to examine the actual practices of these teachers. Findings revealed that these teachers provided a variety of mastery and vicarious experiences, and took steps to create climates characterized by positive affect and decreased anxiety. Social persuasion was also present, but the simple verbal and physical affirmations that constituted the majority of the feedback in the Spanish classes likely served to create positive climates rather than as a source of substantive feedback performance.

**Significance**

As noted in Chapter 1, student motivation is considered one of the most important variables to acquiring the target language (Dörnyei, 2001, 2005; Gass & Selinker, 2001). And yet, much remains unknown about the gap between ability and a willingness to communicate in the target language (Dörnyei, 2005). The results of this study move towards bridging that gap, and have implications for both social cognitive theory as well as our understanding of WTC.

In terms of SCT, this study represents the first true (i.e., *self-efficacy* as opposed to *self-reported communication competence*) attempt to examine students’ self-efficacy
for speaking the target language specifically. Even though the different categories of language (i.e., speaking, listening, reading, writing, sociocultural) are clearly interrelated, speaking is an active aspect of language that results in the enabling of close, interpersonal, and immediate relationships. Indeed, fluency in the target language has been shown to aid in the transition to the community associated with the target language (Yeh & Inose, 2003), and also may be related to positive perceptions of school climate (Yough, Li, & Leach, 2011).

This is also the first true attempt to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and willingness-to-communicate. Though recognized as an important variable in motivation in language-learning contexts, recommendations for what teachers can do to promote WTC have been scant. Previously, self-perceived communication competence has been recognized as an important antecedent to WTC. As mentioned earlier, SPCC is a related though conceptually distinct construct from self-efficacy which includes self-regulation and judgments about the task. In fact, it is likely that one’s perceived communication competence is but a component of self-efficacy beliefs. But here too, recommendations for practice have been few. However, self-efficacy has known sources (Bandura, 1997). As mentioned previously, this study describes what teachers actually do to promote a sense of personal efficacy for speaking the target language. It is likely that these same behaviors also lead to a willingness to communicate.

Though it has been widely assumed that teachers’ self-efficacy is positively related to beneficial student outcomes, few studies have actually demonstrated any kind
of link between the two. In a recent review of the research on teaching self-efficacy between 1998 and 2009, Klassen and colleagues (2011) found that only 6 of the 218 studies in their review attempted to examine this relationship. Four of these studies examined teachers’ collective efficacy and school-level achievement. The two remaining studies found only a modest relationship between teachers’ sense of efficacy and student outcomes—exam scores (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006), and computer skills and computer self-efficacy (Ross, Hogaboom-Gray, & Hannay, 2001). The results of the present study suggest that missing link between teachers’ reports of their sense of efficacy and student outcomes may be students’ perceptions of their teachers’ self-efficacy for teaching tasks.

This study represents one of the first attempts to examine students’ perceptions of their teachers’ sense of efficacy. Previous studies had examined preservice/student teachers’ perceptions of their cooperating teacher or mentor’s sense of efficacy for teaching tasks (e.g., Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; Li & Zhang, 2000). One other study has examined the relationship between teachers’ sense of efficacy and student perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy (Sarıçoban, 2010). In that study, differences were found between teacher reports and student perceptions of TSE. However, comparisons were made with each item of the TSES without adjusting the alpha level in determining significance. Even so, not all items proved to be significant. No differences were found in the present study between aggregate PTSES scores and teachers’ reports of their own self-efficacy for teaching. As was discussed earlier, that student perceptions of
teachers’ sense of efficacy proved to be a significant predictor of WTC suggests that it may be a note-worthy contextual variable—at least in language-learning classrooms. One aspect of language learning is that it is inherently a performance-based skill. That is, one cannot speak until there is another to be spoken to. It could be that language classrooms share this attribute with other performance-based content areas such as art, music, theatre, and athletics. It could be that in such situations, certain teacher characteristics are more salient to learner perceptions of the climate than others—such as teachers who act as models for the target skill. Though this study does not hold the answers to such speculation, it does contribute to the literature by suggesting this is a much-needed area of research.

**Recommendations for Practice**

Several of the findings from the present study suggest implications for pedagogy. The results revealed that self-efficacy for speaking the target language increased during the study and that this increase was positively associated with students’ reports of being willing to communicate as well as their course grade. Thus, it may be that teachers who take steps towards promoting a sense of efficacy amongst their students are also increasing their students’ willingness to communicate in the target language. The findings from the qualitative portion of the study offer some guidance as to what those steps may promote self-efficacy and a willingness to communicate in the target language: (a) provide ample opportunities for students to practice in the target language, (b) allow students to have “space,” and (c) structure environments that are marked by positive
affect and do not induce anxiety. Though the present study did not find rich examples of performance feedback in the Spanish classes, previous literature indicates that performance feedback should be meaningful (Chan & Lam, 2010). These recommendations are summarized in Table 5.1.

As noted earlier, all three teachers participating in the qualitative portion of the study provided students with ample opportunities to practice the target language. These opportunities took the form of call-and-response, teacher-to-student conversation before the class at large, and student-to-student interaction in small-groups. Of these three structures, it is likely that the student-to-student interactions in small-groups were of the greatest benefit towards promoting a willingness-to-communicate. Whereas the teacher-to-student conversation may have served as a mastery experience for select students and provided vicarious experiences for a larger number, they inherently only allowed few students—and often just one—to practice the target language at any given time. Similarly, though the call-and-response interactions may have increased student familiarity with the target language, it was also language that was largely devoid of context. Thus, it may have had a limited impact in promoting a willingness-to-communicate. On the other hand, the student-to-student interactions appeared to provide multiple sources of self-efficacy—mastery experiences in the form of practice, peer-modeling, implicit performance feedback, and a setting that was likely characterized by lower anxiety than speaking opportunities before the entire class.
However, the evidence provided here suggests that the quality of the mastery experience is important. As noted in Chapter 2, the mastery experiences that may be most effective in increasing self-efficacy beliefs are those that provide an optimal level of challenge (Bandura, 1997). It is worth reiterating that, whereas self-efficacy and willingness-to-communicate increased during the study and that the number of mastery experiences appeared to be adequate, a classroom climate perceived as encouraging communication was not a significant predictor of willingness-to-communicate. Thus, it may be that mastery experiences in general were well supplied, but those of high quality may not have been. Though it is possible that the small-group settings provided adequate challenge to a number of students, the observers recorded instances of mastery experiences that may have provided students with an optimal level of challenge. For instance, one teacher in particular (Emi) would regularly follow a student’s contribution to the larger conversations with follow-up questions, which likely resulted in a more authentic experiences characterized by language that was more contextualized. Observers also recorded instances of teacher-to-student conversation that was “off topic.” That is, conversation that strayed from the strict objectives of the lesson—again, providing an opportunity for language-use that was more deeply contextualized.

The second recommendation based on these findings is to provide students with optimal space and time. Structuring seating to promote student-to-student conversation may be an important step toward promoting a willingness to communicate. As noted previously, all three teachers in the study moved around the classroom. Of course,
movement in and of itself is not likely to promote self-efficacy. However, it does enable teachers to more closely gauge student ability-level and progress. To the extent that teachers are able to do this, activities may be better matched to student ability-level and performance feedback may be more meaningful. Additionally, leaving the traditional spot at the front of the room may be a way to reduce teacher-to-student interpersonal space. Other behaviors worth noting that the teachers of this study did to reduce interpersonal space were to: (a) join student-to-student conversations, (b) use humor, (c) smile, (d) attend to non-academic needs, and (e) encourage student-to-student relationships.

The teachers in the present study were also sensitive to issues of time. Specifically, all three were reported to allow students ample time to respond to inquiries, and allowed students to respond and ask questions at a time of their choosing—that is, they did not impose “hand-raising” as a way to “have the floor.” And yet, they all took steps to assure that less assertive students had opportunities to speak. These ranged from discretely asking more assertive students to hold back to cold-calling on students that had yet to participate in that particular session.

A third recommendation is to structure environments low in stress, but marked by positive affect. As noted previously, communication apprehension negatively predicted willingness-to-communicate and course grades. Thus, climates that do not unduly encourage stress or anxiety also be places where students can find success. The results suggest several ways classrooms could be moved in this direction. First is to reduce the interpersonal space in the classroom. The reduced interpersonal space that characterized
these classrooms likely contributed to both of these dimensions (i.e., low stress, positive affect). The teachers in this study accomplished this by engaging in informal conversations with students, encouraging students to recognize one another’s successes, and by expressing positive affect (e.g., smiling). All three teachers also expressed the importance of exercising discrimination when correcting student mistakes. Though the reasons for this varied, at least one teacher reported sensitivity to student communication anxiety. Additionally, all three teachers permitted select use of L1—typically used by students to ask questions about grammar or assignment parameters as well as to insert vocabulary into language otherwise consisting of L2.

A word about competition in language classes is warranted at this point as it may be assumed that competitive climates are also ones characterized by anxiety—at least for those students not up to the challenge of having their skills measured against their peers. As previously noted, climates perceived as competitive negative predicted willingness-to-communicate, but positive predicted grades. Thus, competitive classrooms may be places where students are more likely to see higher grades, but also places where they may be less likely to communicate. As communication in the target language is generally a desired outcome of foreign language courses, it is recommended that teachers avoid encouraging competition. Though competitive classrooms may be associated with grades, that by no means suggests that classrooms that avoid competition are places where students fail. Indeed, an increased change in self-efficacy was also significantly related to grades.
Table 5.1

Guidelines: Promoting Self-Efficacy and Encouraging Willingness to Communicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Provide ample opportunities to practice speaking that provide optimal challenge.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Give students “space.”</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Examples</em></td>
<td><em>Examples</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Have students practice in small groups or pairs.</td>
<td>1. Give students ample time to respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Be flexible. Allow natural, off-topic language use in areas of student interest.</td>
<td>2. Move around the room to make yourself better available for spontaneous questions and to monitor student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ask follow-up question to student speaking contributions.</td>
<td>3. Encourage students to encourage one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Arrange seating to promote student-to-student</td>
<td>4. Arrange seating to promote student-to-student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Allow students to ask questions and make contributions without requiring hand-raising.</td>
<td>5. Allow students to ask questions and make contributions without requiring hand-raising.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Create environments that are low in stress or anxiety, but marked by positive affect.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Provide meaningful performance feedback.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Examples</em></td>
<td><em>Examples</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Smile.</td>
<td>1. Tell students exactly what is problematic and what steps they can take to make corrections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Avoid language and activities that may encourage students to be competitive.</td>
<td>2. Encourage students to refer to their own previous performance to highlight improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use discretion when making corrections.</td>
<td>4. Permit students to use their native language to ask questions about the language or to insert key vocabulary to complete sentences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Limitations**

Though the study makes practical and theoretical contributions to the literature, there are several limitations that should be noted. Probably the most significant limitation was the small sample size for two of the target populations—ESL students and teachers. Indeed, the small sample size of ESL students prohibited any meaningful statistical analysis on the data collected in that program. The result was an inability to make comparisons across contexts. In regards to the teacher participants, though a sufficient number opened up their classrooms for recruitment in the present study, fewer returned completed surveys. The result was a sample small enough to prohibit a multilevel analysis.
analysis. As noted previously, social contexts are often embedded in hierarchies—and should be analyzed accordingly (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002).

Another limitation of the study was the relative small number of cases in the qualitative portion of the study. This was the result of several factors: (a) concerns by at least one of the partnering programs that observations may have a negative impact on teaching, (b) the general small number at the group level, and (c) concern that there would not be sufficient range and number between teachers whose students scored them high in perceptions of their classroom climates and those scoring low. Thus, the decision was made to address these concerns by only examining those classrooms with teachers high in PCC. Though this allowed for an analysis of potential efficacy-supporting behaviors in classrooms, it again prevented comparisons. And even though it did provide a glimpse into those behaviors, the small number also probably resulted in failing to capture what are surely many more behaviors that promote self-efficacy for speaking the target language.

A third limitation of the study was the number of language contexts. It has been noted that language-learning contexts vary greatly, and that it is likely that many motives for language study are specific to context (Clément, 1980). For example, those studying Spanish for college credit in the U.S. likely have far different motives for language study than does a missionary studying in Peru. Thus, caution should be issued before generalizing these results to other contexts. Still, though the number of language contexts was restricted in this study, important differences should be noted in interpretation of the
results. As noted previously, though worth reiterating, the Chinese course was structured so that students had a different teacher every day. Therefore, it cannot be determined which teacher participants were referencing when completing the *perceptions of teachers' sense of efficacy* scale. It is also likely that the “climates” structured by the various teachers in that program differed, though again, it is not clear exactly which teachers or climates were being referenced. That is, were participants referencing the teacher / climate at the time the survey was being completed, a “typical” climate, or an amalgam of climates.

Finally, some limitations of the self-efficacy change scores should be noted. This variable was created to control for the personal sense of efficacy that participants had at the outset of the study as well as to stave off issues of multicollinearity. However, Cohen and Cohen (1983) noted that such scores are subject to decreased reliability in terms of the variables being differenced as the change scores contain variance entirely due to the scores at the first time point. Additionally, attenuated correlations with other variables may result. Thus, additional caution should be used in interpretation of the results.

**Conclusion**

This dissertation began by reiterating MacIntyre’s (2007) observation that a concern of many foreign or second language educators is not knowing what steps to take to move their students toward becoming more willing to speak the target language. This was followed a little while later by Dörnyei’s (2005) observation that many learners who possess the ability to speak fluently in the target language are unwilling to do so. He
called for researchers to devote their attention to bridging the gap between ability and a 
*willingness to communicate*—a concept that has received considerable attention in the 
communication (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987, 1990) and L2 (MacIntyre, 1994; 
MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2003) literatures. One of the hypothesized 
antecedents of willingness-to-communicate is *self-reported communication competence*—a construct similar, but conceptually distinct, from self-efficacy. Although 
few studies have offered direction to teachers about how to promote self-reported 
communication competence, self-efficacy has been the focus of much research in 
educational settings (and beyond) and has been shown to contribute approximately 14% 
Furthermore, four known sources of self-efficacy have been described (Bandura, 1997), 
paving the way for researchers to suggest practical application.

There were three overarching purposes of the present study: (a) to examine the 
relationship between self-efficacy for the target language and select outcomes such as 
willingness-to-communicate and course grade, (b) to examine key contextual factors that 
may promote self-efficacy and willingness-to-communicate such as perceptions of 
teacher and classroom characteristics, and (c) to examine actual teacher practices that 
may lead to the promotion of self-efficacy beliefs. In total, 577 university students and 33 
teachers participated in this study. Participants were drawn from three programs: ESL, 
Spanish, and Chinese. Student participants completed surveys at the beginning and end of 
the term, while teachers completed them at the beginning. Surveys included measures to
tap into self-efficacy for the target language, willingness-to-communicate, communication apprehension, expectancy and values for the course, as well as perceptions of teachers’ sense of efficacy and classroom climate. Three teachers were then selected to collect observational and interview data.

Results from the quantitative analysis indicated that students’ self-efficacy for speaking the target language increased during the term, and that this increase predicted both their willingness to communicate as well as their course grade. Additionally, WTC was predicted by the utility value that students assign study of the target language, as well as their perceptions of an aspect of their classroom climate—their teacher’s sense of efficacy. Also, the more competitive a class was perceived to be, the less likely students were to report a willingness to communicate. Communication apprehension also negatively predicted students’ willingness to communicate. In addition to change in self-efficacy, grades were predicted by students’ expectancy. And while climates perceived as competitive negatively predicted students’ willingness to communicate, they positively predicted their course grade.

Qualitative findings revealed that the sources of self-efficacy in these classrooms often occurred together—bound by back-to-back events, or as one event that served as multiple sources. Teachers also used physical, temporal, and interpersonal space in ways that likely promoted self-efficacy of the target language. Findings also reveal that many of the teacher practices were an extension of their beliefs about student motivation in language-learning contexts. And finally, the findings indicated that mastery, vicarious
experiences, and affective/physiological states were all bountiful sources of self-efficacy whereas social persuasion—though occurring frequently—was not likely a significant source in the Spanish classes as the simple verbal and physical affirmations present lacked rich performance feedback.
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Student Survey

These series of questionnaires are designed to help researchers better understand the experience of learning a second or foreign language. **The directions for each individual part of the survey are different.** Please read the directions carefully. Your answers are confidential and you will not be identified by name. **“The target language” refers to the language you are studying in this class.**

---

Part A

DIRECTIONS: **Please rate how certain you are that you can do each of the things described below by writing the appropriate number.**

You can use any number between 1–100 (for example, 11, 20, 29, 48, 71, 80, 95, etc.). Your responses should be based on what you believe your ability to be at this moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidence (1-100)

1. Speak the target language in front of my classmates.
2. Participate in a conversation at the same speed as a native speaker of the target language.
3. Express my opinions in the target language when speaking about general topics.
4. Give a half hour speech on a topic I do not know well in the target language.
5. Use the target language in casual conversation with people I know.
6. Find or create situations to practice conversation in the target language.
7. Learn the “cultural rules” needed to successfully communicate in the target language.
8. Know how to act in social situations in which the target language is spoken.
9. Learn any language I set my mind to.
Part B

DIRECTIONS: Below are 15 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume that you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of time you would choose to communicate in the target language you are studying in each type of situation. Indicate in the space at the right what percent of the time you would choose to communicate. 1 = never, 100 = always.

1...... 10...... 20...... 30...... 40...... 50...... 60...... 70...... 80...... 90...... 100
Would NEVER choose to do this Would ALWAYS choose to do this

1.  Present a talk to a group of strangers.
2.  Talk in a small group of strangers.
3.  Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
4.  Talk in a small group of acquaintances.

Part C

DIRECTIONS: Below are 5 situations in which you might need to communicate. Please indicate how competent you believe you are to communicate in the target language in each of the situations described below. Indicate in the space provided at the right of each item your estimate of your competence. Presume 1 = completely incompetent and 100 = completely competent.

1...... 10...... 20...... 30...... 40...... 50...... 60...... 70...... 80...... 90...... 100
Completely INCOMPETENT (I could never do it) Completely competent (I could certainly do it)

1.  Talk with an acquaintance.
2.  Talk in a small group of strangers.
3.  Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
4.  Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
5.  Talk in a large meeting of strangers.

SPPO-pre
**Part D**

**DIRECTIONS:** This survey is composed of 5 statements concerning feelings about communicating with others in the target language. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by circling one number for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in class.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Communicating in class usually makes me uncomfortable.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
5. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

---

**Part E**

**DIRECTIONS:** Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by circling one number for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Considering what I want to do with my life, improving my foreign language ability is just not worth the effort.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
2. I expect to do better than most of my classmates in this class.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
3. I expect to do very well in this class.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
4. I worry that spending all my time in foreign language study will take time away from other activities I want to pursue.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
5. I have generally been interested in studying the target language.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
6. I feel that improving my ability to speak this target language is a necessary part of what will make me feel good about myself in the future.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
7. I want to improve my target language ability so that I can make more money.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I’m concerned that I’m not a good enough student to really improve my target language ability to get to the level I want.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
9. I am very good at learning this target language.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
10. I look forward to studying the target language in this class.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6
11. I don’t need to be good at the target language to fulfill my potential.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6
12. Improving my ability in the target language is important to me because it will provide better job opportunities. 

13. It frightens me that this class will be more difficult than classes I’ve had in the past.

14. In general, I find study of the target language to be boring.

15. I value the prestige that comes with a high level of ability in the target language.

16. I feel that my understanding of the world around me will be broadened by improving my ability to speak the target language.

17. One of the reasons I want to improve my ability to speak the target language is to increase my chances of becoming successful in an environment where it is regularly spoken.

18. One of the reasons I want to improve my ability to speak the target language is to communicate with people who are different from me.

What is the most important reason why you are seeking to improve your ability to speak the target language? (Please print clearly in the space provided below)

Part F

DIRECTIONS: Complete the questions to the best of your ability. Please print clearly ☺

1. My native language: __________________________

2. My home country is: __________________________

3. My primary area of study is: __________________________

4. How many hours a day do you spend speaking the target language outside of the classroom?

________

5. How many years old are you? ________________________

6. I am (circle one): male female
APPENDIX B: STUDENT SURVEY, SECOND ADMINISTRATION
Student Survey

These series of questionnaires are designed to help researchers better understand the experience of learning a second or foreign language. The directions for each individual part of the survey are different. Please read the directions carefully. Your answers are confidential and you will not be identified by name. “The target language” refers to the language you are studying in this class.

Part A

DIRECTIONS: Please rate how certain you are that you can do each of the things described below by writing the appropriate number.

You can use any number between 1–100 (for example, 11, 20, 29, 48, 71, 80, 95, etc.). Your responses should be based on what you believe your ability to be at this moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I ...... 10 ...... 20 ...... 30 ...... 40 ...... 50 ...... 60 ...... 70 ...... 80 ...... 90 ...... 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidence (1-100)

1. Speak the target language in front of my classmates.
2. Participate in a conversation at the same speed as a native speaker of the target language.
3. Express my opinions in the target language when speaking about general topics.
4. Give a half-hour speech on a topic I do not know well in the target language.
5. Use the target language in casual conversation with people I know.
6. Find or create situations to practice conversation in the target language.
7. Learn the “cultural rules” needed to successfully communicate in the target language.
8. Know how to act in social situations in which the target language is spoken.
9. Learn any language I set my mind to.
**Part B**

**DIRECTIONS:** Below are 15 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume that you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of time you would choose to communicate in the target language you are studying in each type of situation. Indicate in the space at the right what percent of the time you would choose to communicate. 1 = never, 100 = always.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1..... 10..... 20..... 30..... 40..... 50..... 60..... 70..... 80..... 90..... 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would NEVER choose to do this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Present a talk to a group of strangers.       
2. Talk in a small group of strangers.           
3. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.     
4. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.       

---

**Part C**

**DIRECTIONS:** Below are 5 situations in which you might need to communicate. Please indicate how competent you believe you are to communicate in the target language in each of the situations described below. Indicate in the space provided at the right of each item your estimate of your competence. Presume 1 = completely incompetent and 100 = completely competent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1..... 10..... 20..... 30..... 40..... 50..... 60..... 70..... 80..... 90..... 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely INCOMPETENT (I could never do it)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Talk with an acquaintance.                    
2. Talk in a small group of strangers.          
3. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.    
4. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.      
5. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.        

---
**Part D**

DIRECTIONS: This survey is composed of 5 statements concerning feelings about communicating with others in the target language. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by circling one number for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in class. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Communicating in class usually makes me uncomfortable. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence. 1 2 3 4 5 6

**Part E**

DIRECTIONS: Please rate how much you agree with the statements below as they pertain to this class. All the items refer to ORAL COMMUNICATION in the target language—not reading or writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t agree</td>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In this class...**

1. the teacher helps us set our own learning goals. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. the teacher involves us in decisions that impact the learning in the class. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. the teacher has high expectations for my success. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. the teacher praises me when I put forth effort in speaking complex sentences. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. we are encouraged to say positive things to one another when someone takes a chance in speaking the target language. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. only the best students are given positive feedback from the teacher. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. I feel that taking a chance is encouraged, even if it means that there are some mistakes. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. students encourage one another. 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. I sense the teacher cares about my progress in class. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. I sense the teacher cares about my personal life outside of class. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. we are encouraged to compete with one another in order to be our best. 1 2 3 4 5 6
Every day in this class....

13. I have enough time to practice speaking the target language with a partner.  
14. I have opportunities to practice speaking before the entire class.  
15. I have opportunities to speak about topics of my choice.  
16. I have opportunities to listen to good learners speak the target language.  
17. I have opportunities to listen to native speakers speak the target language.  
18. The teacher says things that make me feel a personal sense of accomplishment.  
19. The teacher gives me strategies that help improve my speaking ability.  
20. The teacher encourages me when I take risks in speaking the target language.  
21. Only correct spoken sentences in the target language are praised.  
22. When I am using the target language, I feel encouraged to take chances by using  
   grammar that I have recently learned.  
23. I am encouraged to ask questions when I don’t understand.  

Part F

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate how you believe that your TEACHER in the class in which  
received this survey would respond to each statement below.

You can use any number between 1–100 (for example, 11, 20, 29, 48, 71, 80, 95, etc.).

| 1...... 10 ...... 20 ...... 30 ...... 40 ...... 50 ...... 60 ...... 70 ...... 80 ...... 90 ...... 100 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Not at all certain | Moderately certain | Highly certain I can do this |
| I can do this | I can do this | I can do this |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence (1–100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Control disruptive behavior in the classroom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Motivate students who show low interest in school work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Get students to believe they can do well in school work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Help your students value learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Craft good questions for your students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Get students to follow classroom rules?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Use a variety of assessment strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Implement alternative strategies in your classroom?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part G

DIRECTIONS: Complete the questions to the best of your ability. Please print clearly ☺

1. My native language: ________________________________

2. My home country is: ________________________________

3. My primary area of study is: ________________________________

4. How many hours a day do you spend speaking the target language outside of the classroom? ______

5. How many years old are you? ________________

6. I am (circle one): male    female

7. How many times did you utilize the “Conversation Center” this quarter? ____________________
Teacher Survey

These series of questionnaires are designed to help researchers better understand the experience of teaching students learning English as a second or foreign language. The directions for each individual survey are different. Please read the directions carefully. Your answers are confidential.

Part I

DIRECTIONS: Please rate how certain you are that you can do each of the things described below by writing the appropriate number.

You can use any number between 1–100 (for example, 11, 20, 29, 48, 71, 80, 95, etc.). Your responses should be based on what you believe your ability to be at this moment.

Not at all certain I can do this  Moderate certain I can do this  Highly certain I can do this
1........ 10...... 20...... 30...... 40...... 50...... 60...... 70...... 80...... 90...... 100

1. Control disruptive behavior in the classroom.
2. Motivate students who show low interest in school work.
3. Get students to believe they can do well in school work.
4. Help your students value learning.
5. Craft good questions for your students.
6. Get students to follow classroom rules.
7. Calm a student who is disruptive or noisy.
8. Establish a classroom management system with each group of students.
9. Use a variety of assessment strategies.
10. Provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused.
11. Implement alternative strategies in your classroom.
12. Get your students to interact with native English speakers outside of the classroom.
13. Instill in your students a sense of belonging to the school.
14. Engage a student who is excessively shy.
15. In a single year, prepare students in your class to take standardized tests (e.g. TOEFL).
16. Encourage your students to join school-related activities outside of class.
17. Adopt new instructional techniques that your program wants you to implement.
18. Influence/impact the instructional approach that your peers take toward their students.
19. Get native English-speakers to understand what it is like to live in an environment where their language is not the language predominantly used.

20. Assure your students will stand up for their rights outside of the classroom.

21. Assure that your students will be accepted by their native English-speaking peers outside the classroom.

---

**Part II**

**DIRECTIONS:** Below are 15 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume that you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of time you would choose to communicate in each type of situation. Indicate in the space at the right what percent of the time you would choose to communicate. 1 = never, 100 = always.

---

1. Present a talk to a group of strangers.

2. Talk with an acquaintance while standing in line.

3. Talk in a large meeting of friends.

4. Talk with an acquaintance in this class.

5. Talk in a small group of strangers.

6. Talk with a friend while standing in line.

7. Talk with a stranger in this class.

8. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.

9. Talk with a stranger while standing in line.

10. Present a talk to a group of friends.

11. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.

12. Talk with a friend in this class.

13. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.

14. Talk in a small group of friends.

15. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.
Part III

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions by circling one number for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel like a real part of my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Others in my department take my opinions seriously.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Most people in my department are interested in me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel as if I don’t belong in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>People in my department are friendly to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People in my department are not interested in people like me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am included in lots of activities in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am treated with as much respect as other people in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I feel very different from most other people in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can really be myself in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The people in my department respect me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>People in my department know I can do good work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I wish I were in a different department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I feel proud of belonging to my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Other people in my department like me the way I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IV

DIRECTIONS: This survey is composed of 24 statements concerning feelings about communicating with others. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by circling one number for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am afraid to express myself in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Communicating in class usually makes me uncomfortable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am very relaxed when answering questions in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I have no fear of giving a speech.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part V

DIRECTIONS: Complete the questions to the best of your ability. Please print clearly 😊

1. My native language: __________________________

If English, skip to #6

2. Number of total months in the U.S.: __________________________

3. Number of years of English study in your home country: ______

4. How many hours a day do you spend speaking your native language? ______

5. How many hours a day do you spend speaking English outside of the classroom? ______

6. My home country is: __________________________

7. How long have you been teaching English to non-native speakers? ________________

8. How long have you been teaching in this program? ________________

9. How many students are currently enrolled in this class? ________________

10. How many years old are you? ________________

11. I am (circle one): male female
APPENDIX D: FIELD NOTE FORM
Observation Protocol

Date_________ Time_________ Class_________ Building/Room_________

Teacher_________________________ Number of students_________

What is occurring in the classroom that could possibly impact/change the self-efficacy beliefs of students?

What sources of self-efficacy appear—mastery, vicarious, social persuasion, affective/physiological states, other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context (e.g., lecture, group work, etc.)</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How long have you been teaching in SPPO?

What teaching experience did you have prior to this course?

What was the secret to your success? That is, what does it take to master a foreign language?

What are you teaching this quarter?

How is this group of students compared to other quarters?

What is going well?

What is not going so well?

What are some of the goals you have for students taking your course?

What steps do you take to move students in that direction (of the goals you have)?

How important is confidence in learning a foreign language?

[How does confidence in learning a foreign language develop?]

[What do you do to promote confidence in your classes?]