

Development and Validation of a Self-Efficacy Scale with Writing and Social Factors

Sadegh Soheili Anaraki
s-soheili@live.com

Seyed Mohammad Reza Amirian
sm.amirian@hsu.ac.ir

Moslem Zolfagharkhani
moslemzolfagharkhani@gmail.com

Hakim Sabzevar University – Tohid Shahr – Sabzevar – 379 post box
Postal Code: 9617916487, IRAN

Abstract

As a useful base for scale development, self-efficacy construct can be used in measuring competency and self-perception of individuals in their social behavior and academic achievements. The aim of this study was to develop a self-efficacy scale with two subscales of writing and social self-efficacy. To this effect, 261 high school students' responses were used and resulted in development and validation of a 25-item self-efficacy scale. The presented two-factor model was supported with a principal factor analysis with high alpha reliabilities. It was also checked for model fit through conducting confirmatory factor analysis and was approved. Moreover, the developed scale was tested for presence of differential item functioning (DIF). The results presented confirmation for reliability and construct validity for the proposed scale and no DIF was detected. Further implications of the developed self-efficacy scale along with the limitations for this research are discussed in the concluding section.

Keywords *self-efficacy scale, writing self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, scale development*

INTRODUCTION

People, even knowing what to do, tend to behave ineptly if they lack self-efficacy inside (Bandura, 1986). As an echoing statement, it is heard in the classrooms that some adolescents are just not motivated, particularly when writing tasks are at work. In addition, the role of social competence is stressed in child and adolescent development as a construct to achieve social goals, and social-cognitive skills as well as personal expectancies play an important role in making an effect on this construct (Spivack & Shure, 1982; Dodge & Murphy, 1984). As a component of social-cognitive theory, self-efficacy explains how one's engagement is firmly affected by self-perceptions of his capability to do a particular task or achieve a goal. It is a crucial mediator of personal action and change in behavior (Bandura, 1977).

Writing, as a demanding task, is a congregation of various skills that must be monitored and executed. Learning to write, as Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) noted, can be viewed as a transition to composition which commences and develops in school years and thereafter. It is in this period that also social behaviors change and develop along the motivational beliefs (Anderman & Maehr, 1994; Shell *et al.*, 1995). This is observed that many middle-school students experience difficulties with writing, lack of confidence in doing such tasks will cause failure (Hooper *et al.*, 1993).

As well, at this critical age, adolescents' self-efficacy for social behavior is of high importance and shows self-expectations for their personal skills in doing what underlies their personal relationships. As Gist (1987) stated, it is expected that self-efficacy influence the effort and persistence in doing a task, the interest learner expresses, and the difficulty of goal he selects for performance. Chance of success in completing a task is higher for individuals with greater efficacy expectations (Oliver & Shapiro, 1993).

Positive effect of high level of self-efficacy on attaining better performance is frequently found in research (Bandura *et al.*, 1982).

The goal of this study is to develop an acceptably reliable and valid self-efficacy scale in construct that appropriately measures adolescent students' self-perception of their ability in performing a writing task and social skills.

Self-efficacy Construct

The practical and theoretical implications of self-efficacy concept for human organizational behavior and resource management is under the influence of individual differences. It is rooted in complex cognitive, social, linguistic, and physical skills which are gradually acquired by experiencing (Bandura, 1982). Individuals modify their choices and activities through evaluating their capabilities. As suggested by Bandura (1977, 1986), there are four sources of information which are the basis for personal efficacy: accomplishments, experiences, verbal and emotional engagements.

Three components are assumed for self-efficacy: magnitude, strength, and generality. Magnitude refers to the highest difficulty level of the task that one perceives he can do; strength signifies how much the person believes in the magnitude; and generality implies the extent to which individual's expectation is generalized regarding various situations. The purpose of evaluating these components is to identify the questions best explaining and predicting one's intentions, actions, and outlooks. Being a dynamic construct, self-efficacy changes over time due to acquisition of new information and experiences.

The research has shown that individuals performance is significantly affected by the perceived ability of doing a task even when intervening variables are controlled (Mentro *et al.* 1980). It is also suggested by Gist (1987) that self-efficacy improves skills. The individuals enjoying moderate to high self-efficacy are more likely to engage in task-related activities and carry on doing them. This opens ways in parallel enhancement of self-efficacy and mastery experiences. On the other hand, individuals with low self-efficacy tend to attend less often in challenging efforts. The probability of abandoning tasks is higher due to lack of mastery under adversity, which leads to reinforcement of their low self-efficacy (Bandura and Schunk, 1981; Bandura, 1982).

Self-efficacy can be measured in different levels of specificity and correspondence within any given domain with diverse levels of task demands. Tasks ranging from simple to complicated require individuals to measure their belief strength for doing them at different levels quantitatively. Along these lines, efficacy assessment offers specific items in diverse levels of difficulty to assess the domain collectively.

As conceptualized by Bandura (1986), self-efficacy is an individualized self-perception that is in course of change across diverse activities and situational circumstances as opposed by being a general disposition which can be tested using a collective test. Owen (1986) also suggests that self-efficacy could be reliably measured and that such measures might be used to assess a composite of affect, cognition and performance. Similarly, Owen (1986) credits for reliability of self-efficacy measurement and suggests that such measurement of self-efficacy could be used to measure affect, composition and performance as a whole. The self-efficacy construct is a useful source for developing measures on assessment of individuals' self-perception and self-competency on the subject of social behavior and academic success. Pajares and Johnson (1993) defined writing self-efficacy as students' judgments of their capabilities and skills in writing which are essential for performing a variety of writing tasks. In addition, social self-efficacy is defined by Gecas (1989) as cited in Wei, Russell and Zakalik (2005, p.1) as an "individuals' belief that they are capable of initiating social contact and developing new friendships". Social and writing self-efficacy play important roles in social behavior and academic success of students.

Students need more than ability and skills in order to perform successfully; they also need the sense of efficacy to use them well and to regulate their learning (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy beliefs differ from related constructs such as competence beliefs and self-concept in that they are more task-specific, and are established through normative criteria rather than through comparison with others (Zimmerman, 1995). Efficacy beliefs play a part in managing motivation in expectancy-value theory, which asserts that individuals evaluate courses of behavior for their value or potential to produce certain outcomes. An expectancy-value item might ask "How useful is it to write a good paragraph?" Shell *et al.*

(1989) found that adding a self-efficacy component significantly increased the expectancy-value constructs predictively. Self-efficacy beliefs, then, consist of the degree to which individuals believe they can control their level of performance and their environment (Bandura *et al.*, 1996).

While a bulk of literature has been conducted on delving the effect of self-efficacy on both writing and social skills, separately, there is a paucity of research taking these two factors into account at the same time. Yet among the few studies touched these issues separately (Connolly, 1989; Dodge & Murphy, 1984; Shell, & Bruning, 1995; Smith & Betz, 2000; Klassen, 2002; Amirian, Alavi, & Fidalgo, 2014; Alavi, Ali Rezaee, & Amirian, 2012; Fidalgo, Alavi, & Amirian, 2014), neither have they considered them with regard to young learners nor integrated them as two interrelated subjects. Hence, filling this research gap seems urgent. The purpose of this study is to develop a self-efficacy scale that measures Students' perception of social and writing ability. To this end, a self-efficacy scale including two subscales of writing and social self-efficacy was developed and pilot tested.

METHODOLOGY

Bandura (2006) makes several recommendations about constructing a self-efficacy scale. He includes: (a) using "can do" rather than "will do;" (b) conceptually analyzing the relevant domains of functioning; (c) including items in varying levels of task difficulty; and (d) using a response scale that ranges from 0 (cannot do it at all) to 100 (highly certain can do it). However, a 0 to 100 response scale can be difficult for adolescent students to infer and may cause difficulty for them to show their beliefs.

Participants

The participants of this study were 261 high school students (49% male, 51% female) who were attending school in Khorasan Razavi Province, Iran. The age of participants ranged from 11 to 17 with a mean of 15.54. After receiving necessary permissions from presidents of schools, the scale was administered to the students at the end of their English class within 30 minutes. One of the researchers was present during the administration to answer the questions if there was any.

Procedures

The self-efficacy scale was developed through several stages. First, we reviewed the literature on writing and social self-efficacy (Klassen, 2002; Connolly, 1989; Scigliano, 1999; Smith & Betz, 2000; Broaddus; 2012). Second, possible items were adapted and translated (17 items for writing self-efficacy and 15 items for social self-efficacy). Next, experts were asked to review the items. The wording of three items was changed based on their comments. Finally, a Likert-type five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was developed for pilot testing. The survey was administered to the 261 high school students.

We explored the questionnaire responses considering purification, unidimensionality of items for each subscale, reliability and differential item functioning as objectives. First, to purify the items, as suggested by Churchill (1979) in order not to meet more dimensions which could confound the interpretation of the factor analysis than what is intended, we removed the items with item-total correlation less than 0.5. The rationale for this is provided by the domain sampling model. As the main assumption of this model is that the items belonging to one domain have an equal amount of common core, and the items of each construct should have highly interrelated responses. The measure for this is provided by the correlated item total correlation (Churchil, 1979).

We also checked the internal consistency of items in each subscale examining Cronbach' alpha. The items were eliminated if the reliability of remaining items would be 0.90 or above. Following this procedure, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis to determine items loading on assumed factors. The items were eliminated if loading less than 0.50 on corresponding factor.

Then a confirmatory factor analysis was done to test the fitness of proposed model using comparative fit indices (CFI), goodness of fit (GFI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation

(RMSEA). Traditionally, values of GFI and CFI above .80 indicate good fit, while values above .90 indicate excellent fit (Hu & Bentler, 1998). For the AASR and RMSEA, values below .06 indicate excellent fit (Kline, 2005).

Finally, the questionnaire was assessed for the presence of differential item functioning (DIF) with regard to gender directedness. Using Differential Item Functioning Analysis System (DIFAS) program version 5.0, Mantel Chi-square statistic (Mantel, 1963, Zwick, Donoghue & Grima, 1993; Zwick, Thayer & Mazzeo, 1997) and Liu-Agresti Cumulative Common Log-Odds Ratio (Liu & Agresti, 1996; Penfield & Algina, 2003) were obtained and analyzed for presence and direction of DIF in favor of males or females. Items with values over critical value of 3.84 for Mantel chi-square were considered bearing DIF. In addition, positive and negative values in Liu-Agresti Cumulative Common Log-Odds Ratio (L-A LOR) indicated DIF in favor of males and females, respectively.

RESULTS

Among items in social self-efficacy subscale, five items (items s1, s4, s5, s12, and s13) were deleted because they had a correlated-item total correlation less than 0.50 (Table 1). All items in writing subscale showed a correlated-item correlation above 0.50. The range of corrected-item total correlation for items in writing subscale was 0.51 to 0.68 (Table 2) and for items in social self-efficacy subscale after omitting items s1, s4, s5, s12, and s13 was 0.51 to 0.60. Although researchers have frequently used a range between 0.5 and 0.7, there are no established criteria for this cut-off point, and reliability analysis supported these items. At that point, we checked *Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted* to see whether it improves radically, but no item was deleted because the change was less than 0.01.

Table 1 Corrected item-total correlation and cronbach's alpha if item deleted for social self-efficacy subscale

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
s1. I can start a conversation with a boy or girl who I don't know very well.	49.29	101.785	.466	.866
s2. I can keep up my side of the conversation.	49.29	102.721	.506	.864
s3. I can find someone to spend recess with.	49.03	102.100	.521	.863
s4. I can express your feelings to another kid.	49.06	102.041	.489	.864
s5. I can ask someone over to your house on a Saturday.	49.30	100.798	.498	.864
s6. I can ask someone to go to a movie with me.	49.11	99.157	.592	.859
s7. I can make friends with kids my age.	48.76	100.448	.593	.860
s8. I can join a group of kids in the school cafeteria for lunch.	49.20	99.502	.592	.859
s.9. I can put myself in a new and different social situation.	49.14	101.745	.557	.861
s10. I can ask a group of kids who are planning to go to a movie if you can join them.	49.22	100.102	.566	.861
s11. I can get invited to a party that's being given by one of the most popular kids in the class.	49.33	100.148	.555	.861
s12. I can go to a party where I are sure you won't know any of the kids.	50.15	104.667	.324	.873
s13. I can ask another student for help when I need it.	49.12	102.402	.476	.865
s14. I can help a student who is visiting my school for a short time to have fun and interesting experiences.	49.05	101.251	.538	.862
s15. I can help make a new student feel comfortable with my group of friends.	48.96	101.410	.536	.862

* **Note.** Corrected Item-Total Correlations > .5 are in bold

Table 2 Corrected item-total correlation and cronbach's alpha if item deleted for writing self-efficacy subscale

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
w1. I can compose a one or two-page essay in answer to a question.	53.29	137.764	.654	.914
w2. I can write useful class notes.	52.35	142.713	.554	.917
w3. I can correctly spell all words in a one-page passage.	52.83	142.209	.508	.918
w4. I can correctly punctuate a one-page passage.	53.00	141.197	.533	.917
w5. I can correctly use parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.).	52.76	138.519	.655	.914
w6. I can write a simple sentence with proper punctuation and grammatical structure.	52.45	139.864	.596	.916
w7. I can correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes.	52.76	140.904	.613	.915
w8. I can write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure.	52.72	140.001	.633	.915
w9. I can organize sentences into a paragraph as to clearly express a theme.	53.11	140.996	.579	.916
w10. I can write a paper with good overall organization (e.g. ideas in order, effective transitions, etc.).	52.81	138.923	.668	.914
w11. I can get ideas across in a clear manner by staying focused without getting off the topic.	52.72	139.926	.639	.914
w12. I can write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea.	53.04	139.371	.600	.916
w13. I can structure paragraphs to support ideas in the topic sentences.	53.08	139.404	.667	.914
w14. I can end paragraphs with proper ending.	52.53	140.501	.649	.914
w15. I can express my thoughts in writing.	52.75	139.044	.606	.915
w16. I can organize my writing so that others can understand your thoughts.	52.40	139.387	.624	.915
w17. I can write a well-organized and well-sequenced paper that has a good introduction, body, and conclusion.	52.54	141.614	.568	.916

Using the responses of 261 samples, the reliability (alpha) was calculated. Coefficient alpha reliability score was equal to 0.87 for social self-efficacy subscale and 0.92 for writing.

After purification, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted for which we used principal components as the means of extraction as well as varimax with Kaiser Normalization as the method of rotation. We specified 2 fixed factors for extraction—as we proposed writing and social self-efficacy subscales. As indicated in Table 3, among 17 items which were proposed to be constituents of the first factor, writing self-efficacy, items *w16* and *w17* did not load on this factor ($w16 = .497$, $w17 = .358$; $>.5$). Afterwards, items proposed for the second factor were investigated; all the ten remaining items proposed for social self-efficacy subscale loaded on this factor and were reserved. The range of factor loading after elimination of *w16* and *w17* was 0.56 to 0.72 for writing and 0.55 to 0.71 for social self-efficacy subscale.

Table 3 Factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis of self-efficacy scale for writing and social self-efficacy subscales with items deleted

Factors and Items	Component	
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Factor 1: Writing		
w1. I can compose a one or two-page essay in answer to a question.	.617	
w2. I can write useful class notes.	.611	
w3. I can correctly spell all words in a one-page passage.	.541	
w4. I can correctly punctuate a one-page passage.	.563	
w5. I can correctly use parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.).	.679	
w6. I can write a simple sentence with proper punctuation and grammatical structure.	.626	
w7. I can correctly use plurals, verb tenses, prefixes, and suffixes.	.637	
w8. I can write compound and complex sentences with proper punctuation and grammatical structure.	.675	
w9. I can organize sentences into a paragraph as to clearly express a theme.	.643	
w10. I can write a paper with good overall organization (e.g. ideas in order, effective transitions, etc.).	.719	
w11. I can get ideas across in a clear manner by staying focused without getting off the topic.	.659	
w12. I can write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea.	.579	
w13. I can structure paragraphs to support ideas in the topic sentences.	.562	
w14. I can end paragraphs with proper ending.	.558	
w15. I can express my thoughts in writing.	.568	
w16. I can organize my writing so that others can understand your thoughts.	.497	
w17. I can write a well-organized and well-sequenced paper that has a good introduction, body, and conclusion.	.386	
Factor 2: Social Self-Efficacy		
s2. I can keep up my side of the conversation.		.547
s3. I can find someone to spend recess with.		.621
s6. I can ask someone to go to a movie with me.		.687
s7. I can make friends with kids my age.		.713
s8. I can join a group of kids in the school cafeteria for lunch.		.695
s9. I can put myself in a new and different social situation.		.657
s10. I can ask a group of kids who are planning to go to a movie if you can join them.		.667
s11. I can get invited to a party that's being given by one of the most popular kids in the class.		.643
s14. I can help a student who is visiting my school for a short time to have fun and interesting experiences.		.623
s15. I can help make a new student feel comfortable with my group of friends.		.593

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

* **Note.** Factor loading values > .5 are in **bold**

Once the seven items (s1, s4, s5, s12, s13, w16, and w17) were eliminated during reliability analysis and exploratory factor analysis, a model with two factors (factor 1, writing self-efficacy, with 15 items and factor 2, social self-efficacy, with 10 items) was prepared for confirmatory factor analysis. The results for default model achieved the minimum for model fit (Chi-square = 590.98; Degree of freedom = 274; Probability level = .000).

Table 4 Confirmatory factor analysis, baseline comparisons; comparative fit index

Model	NFI Delta1	RFI rho1	IFI Delta2	TLI rho2	CFI
Default model	.784	.764	.872	.858	.870
Saturated model	1.000		1.000		1.000
Independence model	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

Table 5 Confirmatory factor analysis, RMR and GFI: goodness of fit index

Model	RMR	GFI	AGFI	PGFI
Default model	.089	.845	.816	.713
Saturated model	.000	1.000		
Independence model	.436	.283	.224	.262

Comparative fit index (CFI = .89), as shown in Table 4, indicated a good fit of the presented model according to the scale provided by Hu and Bentler (1998). In the same way, in table 5, goodness of fit value (GFI = .85) was witnessed to be in support of good fit of the model. Moreover, as shown in Table 6, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation value (RMSEA = 0.67) indicated adequate fit for the model.

Table 6 Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation

Model	RMSEA	LO 90	HI 90	PCLOSE
Default model	.067	.059	.074	.000
Independence model	.177	.171	.183	.000

The data was finally analyzed by DIFAS program to see whether DIF is present in items of the survey across gender. With this aim, male participants were taken as reference group and females as focal group. Mantel Chi-square spotted no item with DIF across gender. It means that this value for all the items was less than 3.84. In addition, to identify the direction of possible DIF in scale items, L-A LOR column was studied. The positive value shows differential item functioning towards reference group (males in this study); negative values show tendency towards focus group (females). As shown in Figure 1, thirteen positive and 12 negative values in L-A LOR column indicated a good balance between male and female directed items. As a result, no item was modified or deleted after conducting this analysis.

DIF STATISTICS: POLYTOMOUS ITEMS

Name	Mantel	L-A LOR	LOR SE	LOR Z	COX'S B	COX SE	COX Z
Var 2	0.113	-0.095	0.281	-0.338	-0.054	0.1606	-0.336
Var 3	0.98	-0.302	0.301	-1.003	-0.165	0.167	-0.988
Var 4	1.875	0.377	0.269	1.401	0.213	0.1552	1.372
Var 5	0.038	0.053	0.267	0.199	0.026	0.1361	0.191
Var 6	0.681	0.24	0.289	0.83	0.135	0.1641	0.823
Var 7	0.218	-0.124	0.279	-0.444	-0.068	0.1451	-0.469
Var 8	0.008	0.023	0.279	0.082	0.014	0.1637	0.086
Var 9	3.478	-0.522	0.274	-1.905	-0.314	0.1685	-1.864
Var 10	2.74	-0.493	0.275	-1.793	-0.271	0.1639	-1.653
Var 11	0.009	-0.027	0.284	-0.095	-0.016	0.1655	-0.097
Var 12	0.058	0.067	0.286	0.234	0.042	0.1765	0.238
Var 13	0.183	-0.121	0.279	-0.434	-0.065	0.1529	-0.425
Var 14	0.467	0.194	0.29	0.669	0.124	0.1817	0.682
Var 15	3.005	0.533	0.3	1.777	0.32	0.1847	1.733
Var 16	0.024	0.045	0.27	0.167	0.025	0.1625	0.154
Var 17	0.27	-0.146	0.298	-0.49	-0.087	0.1668	-0.522
Var 18	0.337	0.177	0.297	0.596	0.088	0.1523	0.578
Var 19	1.941	0.425	0.301	1.412	0.205	0.1474	1.391
Var 20	0.03	0.052	0.302	0.172	0.029	0.1668	0.174
Var 21	0.754	-0.242	0.266	-0.91	-0.127	0.1463	-0.868
Var 22	0.08	0.074	0.255	0.29	0.046	0.1622	0.284
Var 23	3.829	0.598	0.315	1.898	0.279	0.1425	1.958
Var 24	0.029	-0.047	0.278	-0.169	-0.024	0.1438	-0.167
Var 25	0.835	-0.253	0.269	-0.941	-0.134	0.147	-0.912
Var 26	1.648	-0.34	0.28	-1.214	-0.187	0.1454	-1.286

Reference Value = 1, Focal Value = 2

Figure 1 DIFAS output for DIF presence and direction

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to develop a survey to measure self-efficacy of adolescents for writing ability and social action. Self-efficacy points out one’s expectation of personal mastery of particular tasks which leads to success. Considering writing and social self-efficacy, it brings about success in accomplishing a writing task and social relationships. Results of this study led to a reliable measure of self-efficacy scale with two dimensions of writing and social self-efficacy. Likewise, self-efficacy for each of these two subscales proved to be unidimensional constructs. Also, the results provided support for the validity of writing and social construct.

Such a two-dimensional measure of adolescents’ self-efficacy that indicates their beliefs in writing and social behavior may have several gains. The self-efficacy scale might provide applicable indicator for studying adolescents’ performance in academic milieu considering both social behavior and academic achievement. As self-efficacy is in shadow of person’s behavior not the affect, it is more likely to avoid unbalanced expectations or bias in attitude. Therefore, the obtained results through this measure (the outcome) can be of great interest for teachers, psychologists, and researchers.

Considering domain dependency of self-efficacy construct, selecting items which represent a specific domain is essential for developing content validity of the scale. The researchers are aware that specific aspects of the given dimensions, writing and social self-efficacy, are not presented in this scale as unmixed sub categories (e.g. organization, and idea in writing and social assertiveness, participation in social groups, and aspects of friendship and intimacy in social behavior). In addition, some criteria may be given with more deliberation in the scale (e.g. grammar). This puts forward possibility of improving content validity of the instrument.

Selecting items for self-efficacy scales will always be a challenge in different societies and cultures because various factors play a role in that. Yet, this should not deter researchers from doing what they aim for. The present scale displays good validity and reliability. The presented scale serves as a useful instrument though it’s content validity can be improved.

Suggestion for Further Research

The developed scale in this study will lead the self-efficacy research into new areas of adolescents' behavior study in academic setting. This scale is a concise, easy-to-administer, and reliable measure suitable to be used by practitioners, teachers, and interested researchers for studying learners' self-efficacy in writing and social dimensions. Using in research settings, it helps in providing useful information about how learners' beliefs in significance of writing brings about success in social relation and communication (Klassen, 2002). Understanding level of self-efficacy in these areas can help teachers where students are in need of "will" and "skill" for success in academics (Pictrich and De Groot, 1990).

REFERENCES

- Alavi, S. M., Ali Rezaee, A., & Amirian, S. M. R. (2012). Academic discipline DIF in an English language proficiency test. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(7), 39-65.
- Amirian, S. M. R., Alavi, S. M., & Fidalgo, A. M. (2014). Detecting gender DIF with an English Proficiency Test in EFL Context. *Iranian Journal of Language Testing*, 4(2), 187-203.
- Anderman, E. M., & Maehr, M. L. (1994). Motivation and schooling in the middle grades. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(2): 287-309.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychologist*, 37, 122 -147.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. NJ: Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307-337). Retrieved from <http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/014-BanduraGuide2006.pdf>
- Bandura, A., & Schunk, E. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 586-598.
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. *Child Dev.* 67: 1206-1222.
- Bandura, A., Reese, L. & Adam, N. E. (1982). Microanalysis of action and fear arousal as a function of differential levels of perceived self-efficacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 5-21.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. NJ: Erlbaum, Hillsdale.
- Broadus, M. B. (2012). Students' writing self-efficacy, motivation, and experience: Predictors in journalism education. (*Doctoral Dissertation*). Retrieved from http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/1275
- Churchill, G. A., Jr., (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Market Research*, 16, 64-73.
- Connolly, J. (1989). Social self-efficacy in adolescence: Relations with self-concept, social adjustment, and mental health. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 21(3), 258.
- Dodge, K., & Murphy, R. (1984). The assessment of social competence in adolescents. In P. Karoly & J. Steffan (Eds.), *Advances in child behavioral analysis and therapy: vol. 3. Adolescent behavior disorders: foundations and contemporary concerns*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Fidalgo, A. M., Alavi, S. M., & Amirian, S. M. R. (2014). Strategies for testing statistical and practical significance in detecting DIF with logistic regression models. *Language Testing*, doi: 10.1177/0265532214526748
- Gecas, V. (1989). The social psychology of self-efficacy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15(1), 291-316.
- Gist, M. (1987). Self-efficacy: implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(3), 472 -486.
- Hooper, S. R., Swartz, C. W., Montgomery, J. W., Reed, M. S., Brown, T. T., Wasileski, T. J., & Levine, M. D. (1993). Prevalence of writing problems across three middle school samples. *School Psychol. Rev.* 22(4), 610-622.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological methods*, 3(4), 424.
- Klassen, R. (2001). After the statement: Reading progress made by secondary students with SpLD provision. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 17(2), 121-133. doi: 10.1080/02667360124011
- Klassen, R. (2002). Writing in early adolescence: A review of the role of self-efficacy beliefs. *Educational psychology review*, 14(2), 173-203.
- Kline, T. J. (2005). *Psychological testing: A practical approach to design and evaluation*. CA: Sage Publications.

- Liu, I-M, & Agresti, A. (1996). Mantel-Haenszel-type inference for cumulative odds ratios with a stratified ordinal response. *Biometrics*, 52(4), 1223-1234. doi: 10.2307/2532838
- Mantel, N. (1963). Chi-square tests with one degree of freedom: Extension of the Mantel-Haenszel procedure. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58, 690-700.
- Mentro, A. J., Cartledge, N. D. & Locke, E. A. (1980). Maryland vs. Michigan vs. Minnesota: another look at the relationship of expectancy and goal difficulty to task performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 25, 419-440.
- Oliver, T. A. & Shapiro, F. (1993). Self-efficacy and computers. *Journal of Computer-based Instruction*, 20, 81-85.
- Penfield, R. D., & Algina, J. (2003). Applying the Liu-Agresti Estimator of the Cumulative Common Odds Ratio to DIF Detection in Polytomous Items. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 40, 353-370.
- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 82: 33-40.
- Scigliano, D. A. (1999). The effects of a drama telementoring model upon students' self-efficacy beliefs. (*Doctoral Dissertation*). United States: Duquesne University.
- Shell, D., Colvin, C., & Bruning, R. (1995). Self-efficacy, attributions, and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement: Grade-level and achievement-level differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 87, 386-398.
- Smith, H. M., & Betz, N. E. (2000). Development and validation of a scale of perceived social self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 8(3), 283-301.
- Spivack, G., & Shure, M. (1982). The cognition of social adjustment: Interpersonal cognitive problem solving thinking. In B. Lahey & A. Kazdin (Eds.), *Advances in clinical child psychology*, vol. 5. New York: Plenum.
- Wei, M., Russell, D.W., & Zakalik, R. A. (2005). Adult attachment, social self-efficacy, self-disclosure, loneliness and subsequent depression for freshman college students: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(4), 602-614.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. In Bandura, A. (ed.), *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 202-231.
- Zwick, R., Donoghue, J. R., & Grima, A. (1993). Assessment of differential item functioning for performance tasks. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 30, 233-251.
- Zwick, R., Thayer, D. T., & Mazzeo, J. (1997). Descriptive and inferential procedures for assessing differential item functioning in polytomous items. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 10, 321-334.

Appendix A: Self-Efficacy Scale

با سلام

هدف از این پرسش نامه جمع آوری اطلاعات در مورد خود بسندگی است که شما در زمینه ی یادگیری زبان انگلیسی دارید. موارد این پرسشنامه دارای 5 گزینه به شرح زیر است:

1= کاملاً مخالفم 2= مخالفم 3= نظری ندارم (نه مخالف، نه موافق) 4= موافقم 5= کاملاً موافقم
پاسخ های شما صرفاً به منظور یک هدف پژوهشی مورد استفاده قرار می گیرد. پس لطفاً در پاسخگویی به سوالات دقیق و صادق باشید.

جنسیت: زن مرد سن: _____ مقطع تحصیلی: _____

5	4	3	2	1	
کاملاً موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملاً مخالفم	
5	4	3	2	1	1 می توانم در پاسخ به یک سوال یک متن یک یا دو صفحه ای بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	2 می توانم در کلاس یادداشت برداری مفید داشته باشم.
5	4	3	2	1	3 می توانم تمام کلمات موجود در یک صفحه را با املای صحیح بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	4 می توانم یک متن یک صفحه ای را به درستی علامت گذاری کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	5 می توانم اجزای کلام (یعنی اسم ها، فعل ها، صفت ها و غیره) را به درستی استفاده کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	6 می توانم یک جمله ی ساده با علامت گذاری و قواعد ساختاری صحیح بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	7 می توانم حالت های جمع، زمان فعل ها، پیشوند و پسوند ها را به درستی استفاده کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	8 می توانم جملات را در یک بند به گونه ای مرتب کنم که یک درون مایه را به صورت واضح بیان کنند.
5	4	3	2	1	9 می توانم جملات مرکب و پیچیده با علامت گذاری و قواعد ساختاری صحیح بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	10 می توانم یک متن با سازماندهی کلی خوب (همچون ایده، چیدمان، تغییرات مناسب و غیره) بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	11 می توانم با تمرکز بر روی موضوع و خارج نشدن از آن، ایده ها را با به صورت واضح جایگذاری کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	12 می توانم یک پاراگراف قوی بنویسم که جمله عنوان (topic sentence) یا ایده اصلی (main idea) خوبی داشته باشد.
5	4	3	2	1	13 می توانم پاراگراف ها را به گونه ای سازماندهی کنم که ایده های جملات عنوان را حمایت کنند.
5	4	3	2	1	14 می توانم پاراگراف ها را با پایان مناسب ببندم.
5	4	3	2	1	15 می توانم یک متن با سازماندهی و چیدمان مناسب بنویسم که مقدمه، بدنه، و نتیجه گیری خوبی داشته باشد.
5	4	3	2	1	16 می توانم افکارم را در نوشتن بیان کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	17 می توانم نوشته ام را به گونه ای سازمان دهی کنم که دیگران افکارم را بفهمند.
5	4	3	2	1	18 می توانم گفتگویی را با پسر یا دختری شروع کنم که خیلی خوب نمی شناسمش.

5	4	3	2	1	19 می توانم جبهه خودم را در گفتگو حفظ کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	20 می توانم کسی را پیدا کنم تا اوقات فراغتم را با او بگذرانم
5	4	3	2	1	21 می توانم احساساتم را با کسی که هم سن و سال خودم است در میان بگذارم.
5	4	3	2	1	22 می توانم از کسی بخواهم که جمعه به خانه ی ما بیاید.
5	4	3	2	1	23 می توانم از کسی بخواهم که برای شرکت در یک برنامه در مدرسه یا رفتن به سینما با من بیاید.
5	4	3	2	1	24 می توانم با بچه های هم سن خودم دوست شوم.
5	4	3	2	1	25 می توانم به گروهی از بچه ها ببینم که برای نهار در تریای مدرسه جمع شده اند.
5	4	3	2	1	26 می توانم خودم را در یک موقعیت اجتماعی جدید و متفاوت قرار دهم.
5	4	3	2	1	27 می توانم از گروهی از بچه ها که در حال برنامه ریزی برای رفتن به سینما هستند بپرسم که آیا می شود من هم با آنها بروم.
5	4	3	2	1	28 می توانم در جشنی که یکی از مشهور ترین بچه های کلاس ترتیب داده دعوت بگیرم.
5	4	3	2	1	29 می توانم به جشنی بروم که مطمئن هستم هیچکدام از بچه ها را نمی شناسم.
5	4	3	2	1	30 می توانم از دانش آموز دیگری درخواست کمک کنم زمانی که به آن نیاز دارم.
5	4	3	2	1	31 می توانم به دانش آموزی که برای مدت کوتاهی به بازدید از مدرسه ما آمده است کمک کنم تا به او خوش بگذرد و خاطرات خوبی داشته باشد.
5	4	3	2	1	32 می توانم به دانش آموز جدید کمک کنم تا در میان دوستانم احساس راحتی کند.

Appendix B: Revised Self-Efficacy Scale

با سلام

هدف از این پرسش نامه جمع اوری اطلاعات در مورد خود بسندگی است که شما در زمینه ی یادگیری زبان انگلیسی دارید. موارد این پرسشنامه دارای 5 گزینه به شرح زیر است:

1= کاملاً مخالفم 2= مخالفم 3= نظری ندارم (نه مخالف، نه موافق) 4= موافقم 5= کاملاً موافقم
پاسخ های شما صرفاً به منظور یک هدف پژوهشی مورد استفاده قرار می گیرد. پس لطفاً در پاسخگویی به سوالات دقیق و صادق باشید.

مقطع تحصیلی:

سن:

جنسیت: زن مرد

5	4	3	2	1	
کاملاً موافقم	موافقم	نظری ندارم	مخالفم	کاملاً مخالفم	
5	4	3	2	1	1 می توانم در پاسخ به یک سوال یک متن یک یا دو صفحه ای بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	2 می توانم در کلاس یادداشت برداری مفید داشته باشم.
5	4	3	2	1	3 می توانم تمام کلمات موجود در یک صفحه را با املا ی صحیح بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	4 می توانم یک متن یک صفحه ای را به درستی علامت گذاری کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	5 می توانم اجزای کلام (یعنی اسم ها، فعل ها، صفت ها و غیره) را به درستی استفاده کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	6 می توانم یک جمله ی ساده با علامت گذاری و قواعد ساختاری صحیح بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	7 می توانم حالت های جمع، زمان فعل ها، پیشوند و پسوند ها را به درستی استفاده کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	8 می توانم جملات را در یک بند به گونه ای مرتب کنم که یک درون مایه را به صورت واضح بیان کنند.
5	4	3	2	1	9 می توانم جملات مرکب و پیچیده با علامت گذاری و قواعد ساختاری صحیح بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	10 می توانم یک متن با سازماندهی کلی خوب (همچون ایده، چیدمان، تغییرات مناسب و غیره) بنویسم.
5	4	3	2	1	11 می توانم با تمرکز بر روی موضوع و خارج نشدن از آن، ایده ها را با به صورت واضح جایگذاری کنم.
5	4	3	2	1	12 می توانم یک پاراگراف قوی بنویسم که جمله عنوان (topic sentence) یا ایده اصلی (main idea) خوبی داشته باشد.
5	4	3	2	1	13 می توانم پاراگراف ها را به گونه ای سازماندهی کنم که ایده های جملات عنوان را حمایت کنند.
5	4	3	2	1	14 می توانم پاراگراف ها را با پایان مناسب ببندم.
5	4	3	2	1	15 می توانم یک متن با سازماندهی و چیدمان مناسب بنویسم که مقدمه، بدنه، و نتیجه گیری خوبی داشته باشد.

5	4	3	2	1	می توانم جبهه خودم را در گفتگو حفظ کنم.	16
5	4	3	2	1	می توانم کسی را پیدا کنم تا اوقات فراغتم را با او بگذرانم	17
5	4	3	2	1	می توانم از کسی بخواهم که برای شرکت در یک برنامه در مدرسه یا رفتن به سینما با من بیاید.	18
5	4	3	2	1	می توانم با بچه های هم سن خودم دوست شوم.	19
5	4	3	2	1	می توانم به گروهی از بچه ها بپیوندم که برای نهار در تریای مدرسه جمع شده اند.	20
5	4	3	2	1	می توانم خودم را در یک موقعیت اجتماعی جدید و متفاوت قرار دهم.	21
5	4	3	2	1	می توانم از گروهی از بچه ها که در حال برنامه ریزی برای رفتن به سینما هستند بپرسم که آیا می شود من هم با آنها بروم.	22
5	4	3	2	1	می توانم در جشنی که یکی از مشهور ترین بچه های کلاس ترتیب داده دعوت بگیرم.	23
5	4	3	2	1	می توانم به دانش آموزی که برای مدت کوتاهی به بازدید از مدرسه ما آمده است کمک کنم تا به او خوش بگذرد و خاطرات خوبی داشته باشد.	24
5	4	3	2	1	می توانم به دانش آموز جدید کمک کنم تا در میان دوستانم احساس راحتی کند.	25