

Proceedings of the Annual NEAR Conference

Volume 1, 2020

Contents

- i** **From the Editors**
- 1 - 11** **Deeper Discussion Using Flipped Classroom Design**
Cheryl Kirchhoff, Trane DeVore, and Jean-Pierre J. Richard
- 12 - 25** **Self-efficacy and IELTS: A Case of EAP Learners in Japan**
Nicholas Marx and Marshall Klassen
- 26 - 36** **Closing Gaps in Inclusive Support in Japanese Tertiary Education**
Ayako Ooiwa, Michael Y. Yap, and Clare Kaneko

Proceedings of the Annual NEAR Conference

Published by JALT Niigata

ISSN: 2434-6160

Self-efficacy and IELTS: A Case of EAP Learners in Japan¹

Nicholas Marx
Kanazawa Seiryō University

Marshall Klassen
Kanazawa Seiryō University

Abstract

Self-efficacy is concerned with the judgments of self-perceptions of the ability to accomplish tasks (Bandura, 1982), and in language learning its importance is due to its connection with motivation, commitment, and self-regulation of language learning strategies (Wang et al., 2014). High self-efficacy is also linked to lower anxiety and, in addition, academic success (Horwitz, 2001; Mills, 2014). In this quantitative study, a Japanese version of the Questionnaire of English Self-Efficacy (QESE) (Wang, 2004) translated by the researchers, and learners' self-reported self-efficacy were recorded. This study looked at the translation and use of the Japanese version of the QESE and the data gathered from it in relation to IELTS academic performance. Data shows self-efficacy is only partially correlated with performance on the IELTS academic test. The results suggest important pedagogical implications related to feedback during IELTS preparation courses.

自己効力という概念は、ある行動（タスク）を達成できるかという自分自身の判断が関連している（Bandura, 1982）。言語習得における自己効力感の重要性は、その動機とコミットメント、自己調節した言語学習ストラテジーに関連していることに起因している（Wang et al., 2014）。また、高い自己効力感は、不安感の低下に加え学術的な成功にも関連している（Horwitz, 2001; Mills, 2014）。本研究は私たちが日本語に翻訳した Questionnaire of English Self-Efficacy (QESE)(Wang, 2004)を利用し、学習者の自己報告の自己効力感について記録した。従って、本研究は日本語に翻訳された QESE を使用し、そこから記録した自己効力データと IELTS の学業成績（パフォーマンス）データの関連を調査した。調査の結果、自己効力感と IELTS パフォーマンスは部分的に相関していることが見出された。本研究の結果は、IELTS 準備コースのフィードバックに関する重要な教育的意義を示唆している。

Keywords: Self-Efficacy, Second Language Acquisition, IELTS, Language Testing,

¹ Suggested Citation

Marx, N., & Klassen, M. (2020). Self-efficacy and IELTS: A case of EAP learners in Japan. *Proceedings of the Annual NEAR Conference, 1*, 12-25.

Student's beliefs in their own language abilities can be one of the major factors in determining success in their studies, in how their performance manifests in the classroom and in evaluative instruments. The effects of self-efficacy can be seen not only in performance in formal test environments, as well as in how students perform in the classroom, and their ability to participate relative to their capacity and with their classmates. As language learning differs from the learning in other areas (Williams, 1994), language production is heavily dependent on students' sense of self-efficacy which relates to active participation and communication in the target language. Therefore, the study of self-efficacy and its connection with language study is of the utmost importance (Raofi et al., 2012).

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy of students can be a predicting factor to success in learning in numerous situations, including education (Bandura, 1984). One of the primary researchers of self-efficacy in its early stages, Albert Bandura, defined self-efficacy as "the belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute a course of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997, p.3). Bandura (1978) identified four sources related to self-efficacy: performance accomplishments, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal. Past successful performances tend to be associated with a higher sense of self-efficacy, which becomes vital in developing self-efficacy beliefs. Self-efficacy has been found to be predictive of academic success, the successful use of learning strategies, and through relationships with a variety of other affective factors (Bandura, 1997).

Bandura (1984) believed that successes raise efficacy while failures lowered it. Not only this, but the way in which success occurs is also tied to self-efficacy. Effort plays a key role in self-efficacy in a variety of ways (Nicholls & Miller, 1984). In this way, self-efficacy related to language learning has supported this relationship with language proficiency in previous studies (Hsieh & Kang, 2010; Hsieh & Schallert, 2008). Furthermore, learners who attribute their failures to lack of effort generally had higher proficiency than those who did not, and did not suffer losses in self-efficacy. Moreover, learners who attributed learning motivation to internal attributes, not only had higher self-efficacy but also had higher performance (Hsieh & Kang, 2010). In educational settings, self-efficacy was shown to be associated with academic achievement, particularly concerning engagement in academic tasks (Lane & Lane, 2001). According to Schunk (1990), "students who hold low self-efficacy for learning may avoid tasks; those who judge themselves efficacious are more likely to participate" (p.74). As a consequence, learners with lower self-efficacy are more likely to generally avoid tasks and participate less in class.

These participation preferences associated with self-efficacy, such as avoiding participation or active learning, proactive behavior such as raising hands, or persistent engagement with academic tasks, shows a behavioral intention to interact which could indicate positive self-efficacy views and lead to more positive general academic outcomes (Schunk, 1981 & 1990) as well as in foreign language education (MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei & Noels, 1998; Mill, Pajares, & Herron, 2007; Wang, 2004).

Language Performance and Self-Efficacy

In self-efficacy research, there have been findings to suggest that self-efficacy is correlated with academic achievement outside of foreign language education (Huang & Chang, 1998; Jones, 2008). Thanks to these findings, researchers in second and foreign language education have become interested to see if this correlation between self-efficacy and academic achievement can be observed in areas of foreign language acquisition.

While it is difficult to say that extensive research has been undertaken to look at correlations in self-efficacy and academic achievement, quite a few studies have looked into the notion of self-efficacy in the field of foreign language acquisition. A relationship between these factors has been found across a variety of contexts. Mills, Pajares, & Herron (2006) found a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and reading and listening performance of female participants. This study highlights that self-efficacy can be a complex construct, finding mixed results when including gender as a variable. Another study by Li & Wang (2010) further supported the findings related to reading in the context of Chinese English learners. In this study, the researchers found that high self-efficacy was linked to higher use of various reading strategies has been linked to higher reading achievement (Phakiti, 2003).

Specific to the language context in our own study, Onoda (2013) found a significant relationship between vocabulary skills and self-efficacy with concerns to Japanese learners of English. This study reported that learners with higher self-efficacy had a higher level of proficiency in English vocabulary skills. One common trend appears to be a significant correlation when comparing self-efficacy and language proficiency levels of learners. (Tsai, 2013). Learners who have a wide range of self-regulating strategies tend to have higher self-efficacy and higher proficiency in their target second/foreign language.

Methodology

Research Questions

In this study, the researchers investigated how students perceived self-efficacy and potential ties to performance, in particular, an English proficiency test, and the IELTS academic test. This research study posed three research questions:

Is the Japanese QESE translated for this study equivocally reliable as other versions of the QESE?

Is self-efficacy and performance on the IELTS correlated?

If so, in what ways is self-efficacy and performance on tests correlated in a foreign language context?

Participants

The participants of this study were 50 first-year university students at a small private university in Japan. The participants predominantly consisted of female learners, 42 females and 8 males. The students who participated in this study are first-year students in the Department of Humanities. This department, which opened in 2016, focuses on the development of English proficiency during the students' first year at the university. At the end of the first year, these students go abroad to various universities around the world to study. While a large percent of these students attend primarily English courses while abroad, a few are eligible to study content courses with local students in academic

courses. To determine which course they are eligible for, the students must take the academic IELTS (International English Language Testing System) test. At the time of this research, students took five required English classes twice a week for a total of 15 hours of English related in-class coursework per week.

Measurement

In the case of self-efficacy, the researchers took an already established self-efficacy questionnaire, the QESE, designed by Wang (2004) as part of his doctoral dissertation. This questionnaire was used in this study due to its high reliability amongst different languages in regards English education. In addition, it is one of few that is primarily concerned with English self-efficacy in Asian EFL contexts (Kim, Wang, Ahn, Bonh, 2015; Kitikanan, & Sasimonton, 2017; Ngoc Truong & Wang, 2019; Wang, Kim, Bai, & Hu, 2014; Wang, Schwab, Fenn, & Chang, 2013). The QESE is a 32 question 7-point Likert scales in which a high score indicates a high self-efficacy. The researchers then translated this into Japanese and made adjustments to ease understanding for the participants and to try to make the test linguistically and culturally appropriate. Finally, the questionnaire was proofread by native speakers of Japanese and pilot-tested to evaluate comprehensibility (Appendix A). Total self-efficacy scores were recorded by adding the scores of all 31 questions of the Japanese QESE. In addition to total scores, the QESE can be divided by language domains; reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Scores were totaled for each of these language domains as well.

During the translation process, changes were made to some of the measurement to make it more contextual for the participants of this study (Table 1).

Table 1
Key Changes to the QESE

Question	Change	Rationale
3	American TV shows → 英語のテレビ番組 (English Language TV Programs)	Changed as a way to ease understanding and answering of the question.
7	text in English → 英語のショートメール (English short-mail - the Japanese term for texting phone-to-phone)	Consulted young native Japanese speakers concerning the use of this item to make sure that it could be understood by college-aged people.
10	Question eliminated	Eliminated due to unfamiliarity with the content by researchers and the perceived unfamiliarity from the learners.
26	English-English dictionaries → 単語辞書 (word/vocabulary dictionaries)	Due to the learners' unfamiliarity with using English-English dictionaries at the time, the researchers were wary of using that term and instead adopted the use of "word dictionaries" keeping the type of dictionary ambiguous.

Regardless of the changes made in the Japanese translations, the version of the QESE developed by the researchers used in this study was found to be very reliable according to Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.96$). Table 2 compares the reliability score of the Japanese QESE to those of other versions of the QESE.

Table 2
Reliability Cronbach Alpha

Study	Alpha Result
This study	.964
Wang, Wang, & Li (2007)	.96
Wang, Hu, Zhang, Chang, & Xu (2012)	.97
Wang, Kim, Bong, & Ahn (2013)	.99
Wang, Schwab, Fenn, & Chang (2013)	.96
Kim, Wang, Ahn, & Bong (2015)	.99

The performance measurement used in this study the IELTS academic test conducted in August of 2018. The IELTS, jointly owned by the British Council, IDP Education, and Cambridge Assessment English, is a comprehensive four skills test of general and academic English ("About Us", 2019). This test is a requirement for all first-year students in the Department of Humanities to evaluate where they qualify to study abroad and for which coursework, English program or content courses. The IELTS is scored independently on reading, writing, listening and speaking by bands 1-9 with a possibility of scores to the 0.5 level. The scores on these four sections are then averaged and rounded to the nearest 0.5 score. However, in this study, we averaged the score across all four skills and used the unrounded score values to assess proficiency.

Procedures

The IELTS was taken in August 2018 after the end of the university semester, during summer break (8/18/2018). This performance measurement was completed at the university. Results of this test were given two weeks after the test was administered. In the case of the self-efficacy measurement, this was performed in early November 2018. The Japanese QESE survey (see Appendix A) was given to students at the beginning of regular lessons or outside of the classroom within the course of approximately two weeks. The students were previously informed that they would be completing a questionnaire during this time in which consent for participation was collected.

Results

Correlations

Some correlations were observed during this study relating to IELTS performance scores and self-efficacy scores. All correlations were measured using a Pearson correlations which reported correlations between IELTS and self-efficacy. In addition,

correlation scores were observed looking at individual academic performance of skill sets in language learning; reading, listening, writing, and speaking, and self-efficacy of those same domains. There were no issues with the Japanese QESE reliability score as it was found to be highly reliable ($\alpha=0.96$). In fact, all parts based on language domains of the Japanese QESE were found to be highly reliable: listening ($\alpha=0.82$), speaking ($\alpha=0.90$), writing ($\alpha=0.93$), and reading ($\alpha=0.86$). Table 3 suggests that a medium positive correlation was found in regards to overall IELTS scores and overall self-efficacy scores ($r=0.465$; $p<0.01$). However, when observing differences in skills, only listening ($r=0.494$; $p<0.01$), and reading ($r=0.285$; $p=0.045$) were both found to be significant. Listening had a medium positive correlation, whereas, a small positive correlation was found with reading. Writing ($r=0.062$; $p=0.669$) and speaking ($r=0.280$; $p=0.058$) were both found to have no significant correlations with self-efficacy. This means that the receptive language domains, listening and reading, were found to have significant correlations with self-efficacy in those skills, and the productive language domains, writing and speaking, were not significantly correlated.

Table 3
Paired Samples Correlations

Performance and Self-Efficacy	N	Correlation	Sig.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Listening Performance	50	.494	.000**	4.990	0.549
Self-Efficacy				3.934	0.686
Speaking Performance	50	.270	.058	4.840	0.681
Self-Efficacy				4.353	0.763
Writing Performance	50	.062	.669	5.150	0.368
Self-Efficacy				4.348	0.800
Reading Performance	50	.285	.045*	5.020	0.580
Self-Efficacy				4.498	0.695
Total Performance	50	.465	.001**	5.000	0.362
Self-Efficacy				4.294	0.684

High vs. Low IELTS Scores and Self-Efficacy

In addition, when looking at the top fifteen IELTS performing students versus the bottom sixteen, highlighted in Table 4.1, a significant observation can be made. The groups were chosen by their IELTS scores, the top group ($n=15$) had scores exceeding 5.25 and the bottom group ($n=16$) had scores below 4.7 on their overall IELTS means scores. Using an independent samples t-test, a significant difference was discovered

between these two groups in relation to self-efficacy as presented in Table 4.2. The top group had a higher self-efficacy reported score (M=4.68) than the bottom performing group (M= 3.98). The result of a t-test defined this separation in self-efficacy when examining the mean results of the QESE of the top-level scorers on the IELTS and the bottom level to be significant (p=0.003, d=1.23

Table 4.1
Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
QESE	Top	15	4.68	.731	.189
	Bottom	16	3.982	.329	.082

Table 4.2
Independent Samples t-Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
QESE	Equal variances assumed	9.707	.004	3.488	29	.002	.702	.201	.290	1.114
	Equal variances not assumed			3.412	19.174	.003	.702	.206	.272	1.132

Discussion

To reiterate, the primary goal of this inquiry was to determine potential correlations and connections between self-assessed measures of self-efficacy and the reliability of the translated measurement, and the objective measures of the IELTS academic language

testing system. Both the QESE and the IELTS testing system assess listening, speaking, reading and writing self-efficacy and performance, respectively.

QESE Reliability

First off, with consideration to the reliability of this QESE translations, similar reliability scores were found across previous studies which utilized the QESE, including the current study. The reliability of this self-efficacy measurement shows its viability to be transferred across multiple languages in relation to English efficacy.

Effects of Self-Efficacy

Measures of self-efficacy were fairly high, with both the high and low groups ranging from 5.5 and 4.5 out of a 7-point Likert scale, although there was a 1.0 gap between the high and low groups, which shows a significant difference in perception in self-efficacy among these groups as previously reported by Tsai (2013). Furthermore, there was a statistically significant difference in language domain performance scores which are measured by the IELTS testing system on two of the language domains, listening and reading in mean QESE scores when comparing the high and low proficiency groups.

Language Domains

Concerning the performance of students across domains of language, self-efficacy was shown to be an indicator of performance concerning receptive skills, reading and listening IELTS scores, and was most significant when concerning listening. These findings may suggest a relationship between self-efficacy and performance as proposed by previous studies on these skills (Li & Wang, 2010; Mills et al., 2006). However, concerning the productive domains of language, speaking and writing, these performance measures did not show significant correlations with the related self-efficacy measurement scores. While speaking was nearly significant ($p=0.058$), writing was not near significant ($p=0.669$) and with a very low correlation ($r=0.062$).

Implications and Limitations

Pedagogical implications

There are several implications for language education and the language classroom that can be drawn from these results. Potential implications of these findings include self-efficacy and its relations to predictive skills, or may point to potential areas that students need to improve upon.

Students may not be able to accurately measure their abilities in the productive skills of writing and speaking compared to receptive skills such as listening and reading. Assessing productive language skills in foreign language classrooms is a much more difficult task for language learners. Considering this, teachers should create feedback protocols to better aid learners in understanding their second language production abilities. Especially in the case of learners in this study, IELTS measurements for reading and listening are more objective and can often be measured on a correct or incorrect basis, while speaking and writing have guidelines but are subject to more subjective evaluation. These findings strengthen the arguments made in Onoda (2013), who found self-efficacy and vocabulary to have a positive correlation. As vocabulary knowledge is a major factor in receptive skills, the positive relationship between receptive skills and vocabulary acquisition may be noteworthy.

These implications may also be connected with the nature of classroom instruction that is common in Japan - as receptive skills are more likely to be taught and teacher-centered classrooms are more common, students will have a greater grasp over their own abilities concerning the passive skills (Nishino & Watanabe, 2008). Concerning the productive skills, which students have less experience with both classroom instruction and experience with exams, they may not be able to connect their self-efficacy in overall language skills with their performance in the productive skills test. Unlike other studies regarding self-efficacy and acting on self-efficacy beliefs in the language classroom through behaviors such as active participation, hand raising or avoiding conversation or difficult problems that may lead to loss of face (MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei & Noels, 1998; Schunk, 1981, 1990; Wang, 2004), despite the relatively high self-efficacy reported in these classes, classroom behaviors were not chronicled but could be another potential avenue for future research.

Extending these implications to the language classroom, the strength students have in connecting their self-efficacy to that of their receptive language skills may be representative of the fact that students have much more experience with the expectations of tests and evaluative measures, but concerning productive skills, students are not aware of the common expectations of productive skills, and need more exposure to the expectations of formal exams that require displaying their productive knowledge. Productive skills have, of course, traditionally been the more challenging skills to acquire for passive learners of a language, and without engagement in communicative or task-based language teaching or negotiation of meaning with other learners or speakers of the language, their self-efficacy, be it high or low, may not be an accurate predictor of their productive skills. Therefore, more active language learning opportunities and learning opportunities should be offered, not just in a formal educational setting, but also in extracurricular activities and interactive classrooms.

Conclusion

Overall, in the present study we conducted both a measure of students' self-efficacy compared with their performance on IELTS in productive and receptive skills. Self-efficacy scores were shown to be significant predictors of listening skills, and a minor predictor of reading skills but was not an indicator of the other productive skills. This gap between productive and receptive skills in light of the IELTS achievement test may be due to the fact that students have less experience with tests that measure productive skills.

One notable conclusion to draw from this research is that students have traditionally had less experience with productive language use, and subsequent measures of these language areas. More exposure to one-on-one writing evaluations, interviews and student presentations may provide students with the feedback that they need to gain a realistic expectation of their skills in light of formal assessments. Participation in active learning environments in the language classroom and productive language use with proficient speakers of English and highly experienced teachers can help to facilitate better calibration of students' own expectations of their abilities respective of their judgments of their self-efficacy.

Limitations

Though the results of this study have shown significant findings, some limitations should be acknowledged. One such limitation is the use of a self-reported questionnaire as a measurement of self-efficacy, despite the implementation of the IELTS as an objective measure of performance. This alone may not accurately record the participants' real perceptions and may benefit from being coupled with a mixed-method data collection methodology.

Another limitation of this study is the long gap between the performance data collection and the self-efficacy measurement. One possible suggestion for future studies in this regard is to lessen the time between measurements. In addition, it is possible that the reports of self-efficacy may differ if collected prior to the IELTS. Though the QESE is not directly related to the IELTS, some variance may occur when concerned with the time between measurements. While in this study, this may have not been a significant limitation, it would be interesting to measure efficacy before the performance measurement.

Regarding the self-efficacy measurement, the researchers slightly altered the translation of the QESE to better adapt it to the participants in this study. Due to the topic of self-efficacy, some translations were changed to be more familiar with regards to what the learners have experienced in their education. Along with this, there may need to be more adaptations to better consider cultural differences or even the development of a new scale that specifically aims more at academic self-efficacy in English. The QESE is not concerned with a lot of issues faced in academic English learners which include summarizing charts, or writing about complex sociopolitical issues. Adapting the QESE, to reflect more academic performance measurements, like the IELTS, could aid in strengthening the outcomes of the study.

Suggestions for Future Research

Concerning future directions, this research project will also include a post-test of self-efficacy and performance as the participants continue their university studies, in order to observe further changes in self-efficacy. QESE questions will continue to be revised as necessary, in regard to the appropriateness of the questions. This project also consists of looking at these factors in relation to another affective factor, foreign language anxiety. In addition, between two experimental sessions, the participants will have studied abroad which is another factor to examine.

Bio Data

Nicholas Marx is a part-time English instructor and international staff at Kanazawa Seiryō University teaching students English in the Department of Humanities and the Department of Economics. His research interests are primarily in affective factors, in particular, self-efficacy and anxiety. He is also interested in task-based language teaching and currently acts as the public relations chair of the TBLT SIG of JALT.

Marshall Klassen is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Humanities at Kanazawa Seiryō University. He teaches EAP courses focusing on speaking and writing. Research interests include study abroad, English Language Learners, Second Language Acquisition and self-efficacy.

References

- About us. (2019). Retrieved July 29, 2019, from <https://www.ielts.org/info-pages/about-us>
- Bandura, A. (1978). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Advances in Research and Therapy*, 1(4), 139–161. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0146-6402\(78\)90002-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0146-6402(78)90002-4)
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122>
- Bandura, A. (1984). Recycling misconceptions of perceived self-efficacy. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 8(3), 231–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01172995>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Hsieh, P. P. H., & Kang, H. S. (2010). Attribution and self-efficacy and their interrelationship in the Korean EFL context. *Language Learning*, 60(3), 606–627. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00570.x>
- Hsieh, P. H. P., & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Implications from self-efficacy and attribution theories for an understanding of undergraduates' motivation in a foreign language course. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(4), 513–532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2008.01.003>
- Huang, S. C., & Chang, S. F. (1998). Self-efficacy in learners of English as a second language: Four examples. *Journal of Intensive English Studies*, 12, 23–40.
- Jones, E. (2008). Predicting performance in first-semester college basic writers: Revisiting the role of self-beliefs. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(2), 209–238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2006.11.001>
- Kim, D. H., Wang, C., Ahn, H. S., & Bong, M. (2015). English language learners' self-efficacy profiles and relationship with self-regulated learning strategies. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 38, 136–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.01.016>
- Kitikanan, P. & Sasimonton, P. (2017). The relationship between English self-efficacy and English learning achievement of L2 Thai learners. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN)*, 10(1), 148-163.
- Lane, J., & Lane, A. (2001). Self-efficacy and academic performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 29(7), 687–693. doi:10.2224/sbp.2001.29.7.687
- Li, Y., & Wang, C. (2010). An empirical study of reading self-efficacy and the use of reading strategies in the Chinese EFL context. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12(2), 144–162.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Noels, K. A., & Clément, R. (1997). Biases in self-ratings of second language proficiency: The role of language anxiety. *Language Learning*, 47(2), 265–287. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.81997008>
- Mills, N. (2014). Self-efficacy in second language acquisition. In S. Mercer & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA* (pp. 6–19). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety: Self-Efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(2), 276–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02266.x>

- Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2007). Self-efficacy of college intermediate French students: Relation to achievement and motivation. *Language Learning*, 57(3), 417–442. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00421.x
- Ngoc Truong, T. and Wang, C. (2019). Understanding Vietnamese college students' self-efficacy beliefs in learning English as a foreign language. *System*, 84, 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.06.007>
- Nicholls, J. G., & Miller, A. T. (1984). Reasoning about the ability of self and others: A developmental study. *Child Development*, 55(6), 1990. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129774>
- Onoda, S. (2013). Exploration of the relationships among self-efficacy, self-regulation strategy use, and English vocabulary skills. *Studies in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 24, 107–125.
- Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at gender and strategy use in L2 Reading. *Language Learning*, 53, 649–702. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-9922.2003.00239.x>
- Raofi, S., Tan, B. H., & Chan, S. H. (2012). Self-efficacy in second/foreign language learning contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 60–73. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p60>
- Schunk, D. H. (1981). Modeling and attributional effects on children's achievement: A self-efficacy analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 73(1), 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.73.1.93>
- Schunk, D. H. (1990). Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 25(1), 71–86. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2501_6
- Tsai, C. C. (2013). The impact of foreign language anxiety, test anxiety, and self-efficacy among senior high school students. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 1(3), 1–17.
- Wang, C. (2004). *Self-regulated learning strategies and self-efficacy beliefs of children learning English as a second language*. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University). Retrieved from: http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1091546670
- Wang, C., Hu, J., Zhang, G., Chang, Y., & Xu, Y. (2012). Chinese college students' self-regulated learning strategies and self-efficacy beliefs in learning English as a foreign language. *Journal of Research in Education*, 22(2), 103–135.
- Wang, C., Kim, D. H., Bong, M., & Ahn, H. S. (2013). Examining measurement properties of an English self-efficacy scale for English language learners in Korea. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 59, 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2013.02.004>
- Wang, C. & Kim, D. H. & Bai, R., & Hu, J. (2014). Psychometric properties of a self-efficacy scale for English language learners in China. *System*. 44. 24–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.015>
- Wang, C., Schwab, G., Fenn, P., & Chang, M. (2013). Self-efficacy and self-regulated learning strategies for English language learners: Comparison between Chinese and German college Students. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 3(1), 173–191. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jedp.v3n1p173>
- Wang, C., Wang, L., & Li, Y. (2007). Chinese secondary school self-regulated learners of English. *Paper presented at TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) 2007 Convention*, Seattle, WA.

Williams, M. (1994). Motivation in foreign and second language learning: An integrative perspective. *Educational and Child Psychology, 11*, 77-84.

Appendix A

Self-Efficacy Scale (adapted from Wang, et al. 2014).

以下の質問をよく読んで、現在の英語のコマンドを正確に評価してください。これらの質問は、あなたの能力の判断を測るために設計されているので、正しいか間違った答えはありません。名前を書き添えてはいけません、すべての質問に答え、学生番号を書き留めてください。

これらの質問に応じて以下のスケールを使用してください。あなたの能力を正確に表す数字を選んでください。

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 全然できません。できません。多分できません。多分できます。大体できます。できます。上手にできます。

1. 英語で語った物語を理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. 英語のテキストを使用する宿題を一人でできるか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. 英語のテレビ番組・プログラムを理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. 自分の大学について英語で説明することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. インターネットのサイトや掲示板に英語で投稿ができますか。(Facebook, twitter, blogs, etc.)?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. 家から大学までの道案内は英語でできますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. 英語のショートメール (SNS メッセージ) を書くことができますか。(Line, Facebook messenger, twitter DM)?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. 英語で物語を語るすることができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. 英語を公用語としている国のラジオ番組を理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. 英語でメモを書き残すことができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. 英語のテキストの分からない言葉の意味を推測することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. あなたは今学んだ英単語から新しい文章を作ることができますか?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. 英語で e-メールを書くことができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. 学生生活についての英語会話 (録音したもの) を理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. インターネットの英語のメッセージやニュースを理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. 先生に英語で質問することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. 英語のイディオム (熟語) を使って文章を作ることができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. 先生を英語で誰かに紹介することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. クラスメイトと一般的な話題を英語で話し合うことができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. 短い英語の物語を読むことができますか?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. 字幕つけなくても英語の映画を理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. 先生の英語の質問は英語で答えることができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. 英語の歌を理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. 英字新聞を理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. 単語辞書を使って新しい単語の意味を調べることはできますか?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. 英語での電話番号を理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. 英語で日記を書くことができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. 日本の文化に関する英語の記事を理解できますか?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. 自己紹介を英語でできますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. 知っている有名人についての 2 ページのレポートを英語で書くことができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. 指導者によって選ばれた新しい英語のリーディング教材を理解することができますか。	1 2 3 4 5 6 7