Students' Self-Efficacy and English Performance

Worralak Pakampai

5745893629

Advisor: Nuarpear Lekfuangfu, Ph.D.

May 21, 2018

Senior Research Submitted in Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree
in Economics International Program
The Bachelor of Arts Program in Economics
Faculty of Economics
Chulalongkorn University

Academic Year 2017

Approved by:

(Assoc.Prof. Sothitorn Mallikamas, Ph.D.)

Chairman

Date of Approval

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I feel mostly obliged to my advisor, Nuarpear Lekfuangfu, Ph.D. who supported my study at Chulalongkorn University academically. It has been an honor to be her student. She taught me how a good senior research is done, and how to be a good researcher. I appreciate all her contributions of time and ideas. I am also really thankful for the great example she has provided as a successful advisor and professor. Even though the journey was arduous, it was so fruitful, and I sincerely appreciate this.

Furthermore, there are no proper words to convey my deepest gratitude to the following special people: Mrs. Maria Vinia Perez, Mrs. Carly Bullock, Ms. Janet Totto Roduta, Mr. Dizon Cueto Perez, and Ms. Jennifer M. Padilla, and most importantly, Mr. Piyabut Em-ot. I am most grateful for the permission to conduct my study and the continuous support of my senior research. I very much appreciated their willingness to provide me with their assistance especially Mrs. Maria Vinia Perez who was always ready to help me.

Additionally, I am greatly indebted to all my survey respondents. I would like to acknowledge and appreciate their time, honesty, and transparency during the completion of the questionnaires. Without them, I would have been nowhere.

Even though carrying out a senior research required strenuous effort, my time was still made so meaningful and enjoyable in large part due to my dear friends. I would like to express my special thanks to Ms. Rawinnipa Khaosa-ard who gave me continued laughter and joy. Thanks for her great sense of humor. Moreover, I also thank Ms. Nuttaya Sinsommanus for inspirational discussions and for giving me words of motivations. Discussing my work with her has always been invaluable for my research.

Lastly, it would not have been possible to do without the love and heart-warming support from my parents. I want to thank my parents for believing in myself and always being there for me, supporting all my pursuits. Thank you for raising me with love and being the best parents ever.

A big thank you to everyone who has helped me throughout this tough journey both directly and indirectly. I do honestly apologize for not mention your name here.

Thank you.

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between students' self-efficacy and their English language performance, as well as the existing linkage among other independent variables such as motivation and locus of control. The research was conducted on a group of 254 students studying in English Program. The obtained results reveal that there was a positive relationship between the level of English self-efficacy and English language performance, when other confounding variables and other relevant independent variables were excluded from the model. Additionally, the effect of English self-efficacy on English performance was relatively stronger among the lowly efficacious individuals. However, when including all other predictor variables, the result shows that there was no significant relationship between the two interested variables. Instead, the finding reveals that there was a significant strong relationship between internal locus of control and students' average English grade. Regarding gender difference, male students tend to be efficacious than female students.

Keywords: English Self-efficacy, Integrative Motivation, Instrumental Motivation, Locus of Control, English Language Performance

Contents

List of Tables

1 Introduction

Disappointedly, the present picture of the current English language educational system in Thailand is aged and ossified, and despondently seems to get gloomier. In 2015, Thailand witnessed a remarkable plunge in the EF English Proficiency Index, ranking the 14th out of 16 Asian countries despite the country being among the heaviest spenders on education (Educational First, 2015). Fortunately, in the latest EF English Proficiency Index report, Thailand showed significant improvements, eventually breaking out from the Very Low Proficiency band to Low Proficiency band, but yet still globally languishing near the bottom in the survey (Educational First, 2017).

Many excuses have been given for the low level of English proficiency of Thai students in terms of both language and non-language factors (Anyadubalu, 2010). In Thailand, the grammar-translation teaching approach, which emphasizes on grammatical rules and the direct translation of English language into Thai language, has prevailed for decades (Teng & Sinwongsuwat, 2015). Since the teaching method is examination-oriented, students mostly focus on the outcomes (Teng & Sinwongsuwat, 2015). They tend to memorize rather than analyze. Therefore, Thai students are more capable to read English better than understanding and speaking the language (Anyadubalu, 2010). As a result, this directly imputes to a number of language factors concerning proficiency issues such as grammatical structures, vocabulary, and sentence construction (Anyadubalu, 2010). Even though many efforts have been made from the Thai government to address such issues, the policies adopted seem to be ineffective (Anyadubalu, 2010). As a consequence, other non-language factors may have to be taken into account in order to alleviate this ongoing matter.

A considerable body of research in the area of English language learning, encompassing a

wide scope of non-language factors including learners' beliefs, motivation, and strategies, has been conducted. Research indicates that non-linguistic factors potentially have a substantial effect on English language learning success of an individual. Self-efficacy proves to be a principal component in predicting learners' achievement in academic setting, and can predict learners' performance even better than their real capabilities (Bandura, 1997). According to Hsieh and Schallert (2008), among different attributional beliefs and motivational variables, self-efficacy was the strongest predictor of students' academic achievement. In a similar vein, Wang et al. (2009) also explored attributions among students' beliefs and language learning strategies, the result also reveals that self-efficacy had the strongest influence on students' language performance.

Furthermore, a preponderance of evidence shows that motivation is also a predictor of students' success in learning foreign language. According to Dornyei (1998), highly motivated students can perform well in second language learning even though they have low abilities. In the same vein, Gardner and Lambert (1972) also claim that motivation provides the foundation for students' accomplishment as it determines the effort learners exert into acquiring second language. That is, highly motivated individuals tend to hold positive attitudes towards learning language, and thereby have a strong desire to learn and acquire that language.

The purpose of this study is therefore to examine the relationship among independent variables, namely self-efficacy, motivation, and locus of control, confounding variables and students' performance in English language. The issue of self-efficacy is mainly focused on this study in the sense that students need to assess their abilities to perform a specific task particularly in the fields of English language acquisition.

It is hoped that this study could potentially provide a better understanding of predictors of English learning achievement in the context of Thailand. Admittedly, Thai educational system has indeed faced a number of formidable challenges, and investigating the relationship among aforementioned variables could at least mitigate some of these issues. Before any educational policies are developed, it is necessary that the correct foundations for the new English learning strategies are laid. Instead of hastily switching from one educational policy to another, a series of smaller steps could better guarantee a more sustainable change, and ultimately the future of the English language education in Thailand may become brighter.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Self-efficacy

According to the social cognitive theory proposed by Bandura (1997), self-efficacy refers to an individual's beliefs in their capabilities to perform a given task using the skills he/she possesses. It plays a vital role in determining personal accomplishment and human motivation particularly in educational contexts (Bandura, 1997). Additionally, Kornilova et al. (2009) viewed self-efficacy as a persons' beliefs in the possibility that he/she can successfully learn or complete a given task. Pajares (1996) also defined self-efficacy related to one's judgements of one's abilities to execute and succeed a given specific task.

As can be drawn from the concept of self-efficacy, the main component here is the belief individuals have in themselves. Self-efficacy not only determines how much effort being exerted into a task, but also have a notable effect on how individuals think, react, feel, and motivate themselves (Bandura, 1997). That is, the higher the level of self-efficacy, the greater the effort, and the higher they are motivated. Thus, learners' beliefs in their abilities could have a tremendous effect on their performance. As a result, it is of considerable importance for educators in terms of pedagogical implications in that highly efficacious students tend to achieve higher score compared to those with lower self-efficacy, although they may have low abilities (Bandura, 1997; Dornyei, 1998).

2.2 Self-efficacy and Academic Success

A number of research studies have investigated the role of self-efficacy in different domains, mostly in relation to learning strategies, language anxiety, personality traits and overall academic performance. Several researchers have attempted to explore the relationship of self-efficacy and academic success econometrically, and the findings are mostly consistent

with the notion that self-efficacy beliefs correlate with academic accomplishment.

Self-efficacy can strongly predict the individuals' academic success (Hsieh & Schallert, 2008; Wang, et al.,2009). In other words, successful learners are often associated with a high degree of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Bassi et al. (2007) conducted a study on 130 students in Italy. The participants were given different academic tasks, and were closely monitored by the researchers. The findings demonstrate that highly self-efficacious students were more motivated, and more persevering; therefore, they were likely to become more successful than low-efficacious students (Bassi, et al., 2007).

In a similar vein, the result from the research done by Zimmerman, Bandura, and Martinez-Pons (1992) draws the same conclusion. The higher the level of students' self-efficacy, the greater their interest in doing that task, and thereby the better their performance (Zimmerman, et al., 1992). To elaborate, low efficacious students perceive that a given task is tough, and thus they have a narrow perspective on how to deal with that. Consequently, they avoid engaging in that task, and thereby this results in a low level of achievement (Mahyuddin, et al., 2006).

2.3 Self-efficacy and English Language Performance

There has been a considerable body of research on self-efficacy, but less research has directly focused on self-efficacy in the field of English language learning.

Mahyuddin et al. (2006) carried out a research on 1,146 students chosen from eight secondary schools in Selangor, Malaysia. The result reveals that there was a positive relationship between self-efficacy and academic performance in English language which is in line with the study done by Cotterall (1999). According to the study conducted by Cotterall (1999) on 113

students at Victoria University of Wellington, students who strongly believe in themselves tend to learn a language more successfully compared to the learners with low self-efficacy, and they seem to have the ability to find the effective learning styles that suit them.

Nevertheless, the result from Anyadubalu's research (2010) was not in line with previous studies. The study found that there was no significant relationship between self-efficacy and English language performance. There were 318 participants in the study, and each student was asked to judge their ability towards English language through questionnaires (Anyadubalu, 2010). Anyadubalu (2010) claimed that the contributing factors to the result might be the age of students as they were still young, and the fact Thailand is a collectivist society where individuals are encouraged to make decision based for the whole.

2.4 Motivation

In this study, motivation is generally categorized into two main groups: integrative and instrumental motivation. According to Gardner (2004), integrative motivation is indicated by the willingness of a language acquirer to be more culturally involved with the target language society; on the other hand, an individual is considered to be instrumentally motivated if he/she utilizes the language as an instrument to achieve a specific outcome such as getting a better job. That is, integratively motivated individuals mainly focuses attention on interaction with members of the target language community (Gardner, 2004).

2.5 Motivation and Academic Success

A number of studies found a significant relationship between self-efficacy and academic success. Choomthong and Chaichompoo (2015) conducted a study on 1,475 undergraduate students in Thailand, and the finding indicates that students appeared to be more instrumentally

motivated in terms of learning English language in Thailand. In a similar vein, Nuchnoi (2008) also contends that English language learners in Thailand were mainly instrumentally motivated. The vast majority of the learners were short-term oriented with a goal to pass the English courses only (Nuchnoi, 2008). Additionally, the same result was also revealed in Kitjaroonchai and Kitjaroochai's (2012) study.

In contrast, Hernandez (2006) showed that English language learners were highly integratively motivated, and the integrative motivation was the main contributor to English language learning success. In addition, Samad et al. (2012) also observed that high level of English language was strongly correlated with the high level of integrative motivation, implying that students with a higher integrative motivation were likely to be more academically successful in language acquisition.

2.6 Locus of control

Locus of control refers to an individual's belief regarding their own actions over the outcomes of their lives (Rotter, 1990). Locus of control can be divided into internal locus of control and external locus of control. Individuals with an internal locus of control believe that their own actions and experiences mainly attribute to their life events. That is, they believe that their destiny can be internally controlled by themselves (Rotter, 1990). On the other hand, ones associated with an external locus of control tend to believe that they rarely have a control over their life, and their successes or failures are mainly designated by fate, chance, and luck (Rotter, 1990).

2.7 Locus of control and academic success

There is a preponderance of evidence showing that there is a strong linkage between internal locus of control and academic achievement. According to Keith et al. (1986), the internal locus of control was found to be a strong predictor of academic success, students incorporate with an internal locus of control tend to exert more efforts towards study, thus they have a high potential to be more academically successful. Similarly, Bar-Tal & Bar-Zohar (1977) and Bar-On (1997) also states the same result.

In brief, self-efficacy proves to be a principal variable in predicting learner motivation, and individual success, as well as their well-being (Pajares, 1996). Individuals' perception on self-efficacy plays a vital role in their academic accomplishment, thus the relationship among them should be taken into consideration.

Therefore, based on the findings by previous studies, it is therefore the aim of this study to investigate the relationship between students' self-efficacy and their English language performance, whether performance in the English language is largely explained by the level of English self-efficacy or not. Moreover, the linkage among other variables such as motivation, locus of control and academic achievement is also investigated.

3 Methodology

3.1 Participants

Participants were 254 middle-school students (12 to 15 years old) studying in English language program at one secondary school in Rayong province, Thailand. As part of an agreement, the name of the school needs to be kept anonymous. 145 (57.09%) of the respondents were females, and 109 (42.91%) were males.

3.2 Instrument

Five-part survey questionnaire was administered to the respondents, and each part aims to investigate different variables. To assure that the participants had no difficulty in understanding the survey, all questions were translated into Thai language (See Appendix).

3.2.1 Confounding Variables

The first part of the survey asked students' personal information such as gender, primary school, English language learning experience, and English language activities which are identified as confounding variables in this study.

3.2.2 General Self-efficacy

The second part of the survey was the General self-efficacy scale developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995). The scale consists of 10 items, asking participants to make judgement about their abilities to cope with daily hassles and to adapt themselves after experiencing unpleasant live situations and hardships. Responses are made on a 4-point rating scale from 4 (exactly true) to 1 (not true at all). Summing-up all 10 items yields the final composite score ranging from 10 to 40, with a higher score indicates more self-efficacy. In samples from 23 countries, the scale is a valid measure of General self-efficacy as the internal reliability

(Cronbach's alphas) ranged from 0.76 to 0.90, with the majority of .80s on average. However, the scale is only one-dimensional.

3.2.3 English Self-efficacy

The third part of the survey was the Questionnaire of English Self-efficacy (QESE) scale which was developed by Wang, Kim, Bong, and Ahn (2013). The scale consists of 32 items, asking respondents to assess their abilities towards English language learning which is the main independent variable in this study. Responses are made on a 7-point rating scale from 7 (I can do it very well) to 1 (I cannot do it at all). It was created to measure the following aspects: (a) self-efficacy for listening (Items 1, 3, 9, 10, 15, 22, 24, and 27); (b) self-efficacy for speaking (Items 4, 6, 8, 17, 19, 20, 23, and 30); (c) self-efficacy for reading (Items 2, 12, 16, 21, 25, 26, 29, and 32); and (d) self-efficacy for writing in English (Items 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 18, 28, and 31). The mean score of all 32 items are calculated to represent each student's sense of their English self-efficacy beliefs. To ensure validity and reliability of the QESE scale, Wang et al. (2013) conducted a study on 167 university students in South Korea to thoroughly examine the properties of the scale. The results provide a strong evidence for the scale validity and reliability as showed by a Cronbach's alpha of 0.96, test-retest reliability of 0.82, and the concurrent validity of 0.55. This means that the items on the questionnaire tend to measure the same thing and are highly related. Additionally, the responses are quite stable even though the same group of respondents complete the survey at two different points in times since the test-retest reliability is quite high. Moreover, the set of items are effectively ordered in the way that they do not produce response bias. When developing these 32 items, the distinction among some perplexing psychological concepts were carefully considered. For instance, the conceptual meanings of self-efficacy and self-esteem were clarified. An item measuring English self-efficacy of the respondents would begin with "how well do you think you can do . . . ", whereas an item used to measure respondents' self-esteem would be "I feel

good about...", and the respondents then evaluate that. However, the scale may not cover a wide range of all potential variables, adding more items may be helpful for further research.

3.2.4 Motivation

The fourth part of the survey was adapted from the Gardner's Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) (2004), containing 2 parts. The first part was designed to measure the instrumental motivation (Items 1 to 7), and the second part was created to evaluate the integrative motivation (Items 8 to 14). Each item represents learners' motivations to study English language, and responses are made on a 6-point rating scale from 6 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). The mean score of all 14 items are calculated to represent each student's motivation towards acquiring English language. To assure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire under the Thai context, Choomthong and Chudapak (2015) run the estimation of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient, and the result reveals the Cronbach's alpha of 0.891 which means that the instrument is highly reliable in terms of measuring learners' motivation towards English language acquisition. However, a few students were unclear with some questions which required a further explanation from the researcher; therefore, the future revision and modification of some questions are recommended (Choomthong Chaichompoo, 2015).

3.2.5 Locus of Control

Eventually, the last part of the questionnaire was adapted from Pearlin Mastery scale developed by Pearlin and Schooler (1978). The scale consists of 7 items, aiming to measure the extent to which students regard themselves as being their personal control rather than impersonally ruled. Responses are made on a 4-point rating scale from 4 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Summing-up all 7 items yields the final composite score ranging from 7 to 28, with a higher score indicates greater levels of mastery. A high level of mastery

means that students believe that their own actions can influence events and outcomes in their lives. The estimated Cronbach's alpha coefficient is 0.82 highlighting the instrument to be highly valid.

3.3 Data analytical procedure

The selected school was given information about the study and the permission was taken to conduct the survey. The Thai version of the survey questionnaires were applied to 254 students. Since it was a week prior to the final examination period, all of the class materials were fully covered. Thus, the researcher was allowed to administer the questionnaires during regular class hours. Both instructors and the researcher were present, and the participants were closely monitored. The respondents were informed about the purpose of the survey, and were told that it was extremely crucial to answer the questions sincerely in order to prevent responses bias. Responding to the questionnaires lasted about 20-30 minutes, and the data collection procedures lasted about 2 weeks. Some students were absent; therefore, they were excluded from the study. Also, those questionnaires with error(s) in completion were omitted from the research.

4 Results

4.1 Descriptive Results

Descriptive statistics of participant's English self-efficacy, general self-efficacy (GSE), motivation, and locus of control across two different profiles are reported below. The sample was divided into top halves and bottom halves, using 50th percentile as a cut point. Nevertheless, table 4 is an exception as the observations were divided into three different categories using 25th and 75th percentiles as cut points.

4.1.1 English Self-efficacy profiles

Table 1: Descriptive Results of English Self-efficacy Profiles

	Profile 1 (Low)	Profile 2 (High)
Male	48	61
Female	75	70
Maximum QESE	5.531	6.938
Minimum QESE	3.031	5.563
QESE Mean (SD)	5.029	6.149
	(0.467)	(0.385)
English Score Mean (SD)	3.473	3.559
	(0.453)	(0.430)

Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics of participants across two different English self-efficacy profiles. Of the 254 participants included in the analysis, 123 (48.43%) were members of Profile 1, 131 (51.57%) were members of Profile 2. This implies that the majority of the respondents perceived themselves as highly efficacious in terms of English language skills. According to the table, 61 (55.96%) male students out of the total male respondents were in high English Self-efficacy profile, whereas 75 (51.72%) female students from the total female participants were in low English Self-efficacy profile. Thus, the results suggest that male students were more efficacious in their English language abilities compared to female

students. The QESE total mean scores, calculated from the third part of the questionnaire, reveal that the total mean score was higher in Profile 2 than in Profile 1, meaning that the respondents in Profile 1 had lower scores in all items than those in Profile 2. Additionally, the mean English score, computed from all English subjects taken in academic year 2017, was higher for Profile 2.

4.1.2 General Self-efficacy profiles

Table 2: Descriptive Results of General Self-efficacy Profiles

	Profile 1 (Low)	Profile 2 (High)
Male	53	56
Female	56	89
Maximum GSE	3.1	4
Minimum GSE	2.1	3.2
GSE Mean (SD)	2.874	3.424
	(0.232)	(0.183)
QESE Mean (SD)	5.297	5.840
	(0.698)	(0.615)
English Score Mean (SD)	3.504	3.527
	(0.452)	(0.436)

Table 2 reports the descriptive statistics results of general self-efficacy profiles. Of the 254 students included in the study, 109 (42.91%) were members of Profile 1, and 145 (57.09%) were members of Profile 2. Thus, the figures suggest that most students regarded themselves to be high efficacious in general. Moreover, the table also indicates that 56 (51.38%) male students out of the total male students were in high general self-efficacy profile, and 89 (61.38%) female students were also in that profile, implying that both male and female students considered themselves as high efficacious individuals. The GSE total mean scores, computed from the second part of the questionnaire, were relatively higher in Profile 2 compared to Profile 1 with the percentage difference of 17.49%. The mean of QESE and English scores were both higher in Profile 2 in relative to Profile 1. That is, individuals who reported themselves to be high efficacious in general tend to have a higher English self-efficacy score, and were more likely to have a better English performance compared to those in Profile 1.

4.1.3 Motivation profiles

Table 3: Descriptive Results of Motivation Profiles

	Profile 1 (Low)	Profile 2 (High)
Male	65	44
Female	48	97
Maximum Motiv	5.5	6
Minimum Motiv	3.5	5.571
Motiv Mean (SD)	5.041	5.813
	(0.421)	(0.149)
Instru_motiv Mean (SD)	5.023	5.806
	(0.469)	(0.202)
Integra_motiv Mean (SD)	5.060	5.820
	(0.508)	(0.187)
QESE Mean (SD)	5.628	5.590
	(0.691)	(0.716)
English Score Mean (SD)	3.498	3.533
	(0.459)	(0.430)

Table 3 shows the descriptive results for students' learning motivation in two different motivational profiles. Of the 254 students participated in the study, 113 (44.49%) were members of Profile 1, and 141 (55.51%) were members of Profile 2. Hence, the figures reveal that the majority of the students were highly motivated towards English language acquisition. Furthermore, up to 67% of the total female students were considered to be highly motivated, whereas the majority of male students were lowly motivated: 65 (59.63%)

in Profile 1, and 48 (40.37%) in Profile 2. The motivation mean scores, evaluated based on the fourth part of the questionnaire, were comparably higher in Profile 2 than that of Profile 1 with the percentage difference of 14.23%. Additionally, the mean score of integrative motivation was higher than that of instrumental motivation in both profiles, suggesting that most respondents were integratively motivated learners.

Table 4: Descriptive Results of Motivation Profiles

	Profile 1 (Instrumentally)	Profile 2 (Integratively)	Profile 3 (Equally)
Male	42	37	30
Female	48	62	35
Maximum instru_motiv	6	5.857	6
Minimum instru_motiv	3.714	3.714	4.286
Maximum integra_motiv	5.857	6	6
Minimum integra_motiv	3.286	3.857	4.286
Mean instru_motiv (SD)	5.583	5.196	5.684
	(0.477)	(0.512)	(0.422)
Mean integra_motiv (SD)	5.239	5.570	5.684
	(0.591)	(0.438)	(0.422)
Mean QESE (SD)	5.537	5.609	5.700
	(0.668)	(0.728)	(0.715)
Mean English Score (SD)	3.414	3.609	3.520
	(0.469)	(0.383)	(0.463)

The table depicts descriptive results of motivation profiles based on ***integrative and instrumental categories.***

To further investigate on the two aspects of motivation, the descriptive analysis of participants

based on integrative and instrumental categories was shown in Table 4. Students were divided into three different profiles: (1) Instrumentally motivated if the mean score of instrument motivation was greater than that of integrative motivation, (2) Integratively motivated if the mean score of integrative motivation was greater than that of instrumental motivation, and (3) Equally motivated if the means score calculated from both instrumental and integrative motivations were equal. According to the table, of the 254 students included in the analysis, 90 (35.43%) were part of Profile 1, 99 (38.98%) were part of Profile 2, and around one fourth (25.6%) were part of Profile 3. Overall, the figures suggest that the vast majority of the students tend to be integratively motivated. However, nearly half (42.76%) of female students were integratively motivated, whereas male students (38.53%), who were instrumentally motivated, accounted for the biggest proportion among three profiles. Therefore, the findings reveal that males and females were motivated in different ways, even though a higher proportion of respondents were integratively motivated in general.

4.1.4 Locus of Control Profiles

Table 5: Descriptive Results of LOC Profiles

	Profile 1 (Low)	Profile 2 (High)
Male	55	54
Female	44	101
Maximum loc	19	28
Minimum loc	0	20
Mean loc (SD)	16.758	22.477
	(2.615)	(2.102)
QESE Mean (SD)	5.490	5.681
	(0.748)	(0.666)
English Score Mean (SD)	3.372	3.611
	(0.478)	(0.392)

Table 5 illustrates the descriptive results for students' locus of control in two different groups. Individuals with low mastery scores were in Profile 1 while those with high mastery scores were members of the second profile. Low mastery scores implicitly mean that a person has a strong sense of external locus of control; on the other hand, high mastery scores imply that an individual possess an internal locus of control belief. According to the table, the vast majority (61%) of the respondents were in the second profile, meaning that most students believed that they can internally control the outcomes of their lives. That is, they are the architect of their own fate, using their own power to design their own future. In addition, the mean scores of locus of control were greater in Profile 2 that than of Profile 1 with the percentage difference of nearly 30%. Male students were equally distributed between the

two profiles, whereas the largest proportion (69.66%) of female students were members of the second profile. In addition, the mean of QESE and English scores were relatively higher in Profile 2 than in Profile 1, showing that individuals with internal locus of control were likely to be more efficacious in their English language capabilities and tend achieve higher academic outcomes.

4.2 Model

4.2.1 Standardization

According to the questionnaire, different parts report different variables, and each variable has its own rating scale. For instance, the students' locus of control scores range from 0 to 28, whereas the responses on QESE are made on a 7-point rating scale. Since the magnitude of the estimated coefficients partly depends on the mean and variance of the independent variables, varying scales potentially have a significant on the coefficients. That is, the unstandardized estimated coefficients may be not directly comparable because the ranges are different among the variables. A one point increase in QESE scores would cause a large increase in average English grade, whereas a one point increase in locus of control scores would be associated with a relatively smaller increase. As a result, standardized coefficients are required in order to make comparisons possible.

4.2.2 Model specification

Unrestricted model

$$\begin{aligned} avg\_eng\_std = {} & \beta_0 + \beta_1 eng\_se\_std + \beta_2 mean\_gse\_std \\ & + \beta_3 motiv\_std + \beta_4 instru\_std + \beta_5 integra\_std \\ & + \beta_6 loc\_std + \beta_7 female + \beta_8 tutor + \beta_9 abroad \\ & + \beta_{10} study\_ep + \beta_{11} Wi \\ & + \varepsilon \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Equation (1) represents the full unrestricted model including all independent and confounding variables. By running the first model represented in equation 1, some independent variables

were extremely statistically insignificant at all confidence levels. The highest non-significant p-values were found among confounding variables. Furthermore, the estimated sign of confounding variables was not as anticipated, reflecting that the model might suffer from misspecification and other issues regarding the nature of the predictor variables.

For instance, the coefficient of -0.007 of the dummy variable "often_speak" was unexpectedly negative, meaning that individuals who often speak English have an average English grade around 0.007 lower compared to those students who rarely speak English, controlling for the other independent variables. Moreover, its p-value was noticeably large, nearly approaching to one, implying that the variable was substantially statistically insignificant. Consequently, the insignificant confounding variables were excluded from the model.

Even though the majority of the confounding variables were not statistically significant, the findings suggest that there is a significant difference between male and female students. Female students tend to have an average English grade approximately 0.49 higher than male students, ceteris paribus. In addition, its p-value was relatively small, thus it was statistically significant at all alpha levels and should be included in the model. As a result, model 2 was developed.

Restricted model

$$\begin{aligned} avg\_eng\_std = {} & \beta_0 + \beta_1 eng\_se\_std + \beta_2 mean\_gse\_std \\ & + \beta_3 motiv\_std + \beta_4 instru\_std + \beta_5 integra\_std \\ & + \beta_6 loc\_std + \beta_7 female \\ & + \varepsilon \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Equation (2) represents the restricted model excluding all insignificant confounding variables. In this equation, the estimated coefficients of all those confounding variables are assumed to be zero. However, the regression results using model 2 appear to be anomalous because the estimated coefficients of motiv_std, instru_std, and integra_std, as well as their corresponding standard errors tend to be inflated. This may be a result from multicollinearity. That is, excluding some of these variables may greatly change the estimated coefficients and their standard errors. Therefore, in order to detect multicollinearity, Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was used.

Table 6: Multicollinearity Diagnostics for Model 2

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
motiv_std	223517.38	0.000004
integra_std	64890.56	0.000015
instru_std	63846.39	0.000016
eng_se_std	1.45	0.689787
mean_gse_std	1.35	0.738188
female	1.21	0.825991
loc_std	1.16	0.863086
Mean VIF	50322.79	

As anticipated, the regression output from model 2 exhibits severe multicollinearity due to incredibly high VIF values. The variable motiv_std constituted the highest VIF value of roughly around 224000 which was more than hundred thousand times higher than that of loc_std, implying that this variable might be the root of the issue. Additionally, the VIF values for integra_std and instru_std were approximately 64000 which were considered to

be spectacularly high. Therefore, these three explanatory variables were highly correlated, thus some of these variables should not be entered into a regression equation. Consequently, model 3 was developed.

$$\begin{aligned} avg\_eng\_std = \beta_0 + \beta_1 eng\_se\_std + \beta_2 mean\_gse\_std \\ + \beta_4 instru\_std + \beta_5 integra\_std + \beta_6 loc\_std \\ + \beta_7 female + \varepsilon \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Equation (3) shows the restricted model omitting all confounding variables and the independent variable that seemed to produce multicollinearity. By excluding motiv_std, the VIF values were noticeably declined. Nevertheless, the regression output illustrates that mean_gse_std and instru_std were statistically insignificant at all confidence intervals, and thereby removing them might be appropriate. Thus, model 4 was designed.

$$\begin{aligned} avg\_eng\_std = \beta_0 + \beta_1 eng\_se\_std \\ + \beta_4 instru\_std + \beta_5 integra\_std + \beta_6 loc\_std \\ + \varepsilon \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Equation (4) displays the restricted model consisting of variables that have a relatively stronger correlation with the dependent variable compared to others. In order to compare the goodness of fit between model 3 and model 4, a likelihood ratio test (LR test/ Chi-squared test) was performed. The test result reports that model4 is a subset of model 3, $X^2(2, N = 254) = 2.21, p = 0.3320$.

In other words, model 4 is nested in model 3, and that adding more parameters may not significantly improve the fitness of the model to a dataset. In addition, the correlation between the independent variables and dependent variable is computed using scatterplot matrix and Pearson's r correlation coefficient. The result reveals that the relationship between mean_gse_std and avg_eng_std is the weakest ($r = .0967$), thus omitting mean_gse_std might be more befitting. Therefore, model 4 is better at predicting the data compared to the model 3.

Furthermore, the Ramsey Regression Equation Specification Error Test (RESET) test was conducted to check whether the fourth model has suffered from the Omitted Variable Biased or not. The null hypothesis is that the model contains no omitted variables, and vice versa for the alternative hypothesis. The result shows that the null hypothesis is not rejected as F (3,246) = 0.23, $p = 0.8767$. Therefore, the fourth model is appropriate.

4.3 Regression Results

4.3.1 Simple Linear Regression

Table 7: Simple Linear Regression Results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std
eng_se_std	0.152*					
	(0.0623)					
mean_gse_std		0.0964				
		(0.0627)				
motiv_std			0.222***			
			(0.0614)			
instru_std				0.152*		
				(0.0623)		
integra_std					0.262***	
					(0.0608)	
loc_std						0.305***
						(0.0600)
Constant	-1.60e-08	-1.87e-08	-1.88e-08	-3.81e-08	-1.88e-08	-1.70e-08
	(0.0621)	(0.0626)	(0.0613)	(0.0621)	(0.0607)	(0.0599)
Observations	254	254	254	254	254	254
R^2	0.023	0.009	0.049	0.023	0.069	0.093

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 7 provides the regression results using simple linear regression method, a statistical method that examines the relationship between one dependent variable and one independent variable only. The method estimates how a given dependent variable (avg_eng_std) is explained by a specific independent variable.

Overall, the regression output reveals that all standardized regression coefficients in different equations are positive, indicating that for every standard deviation unit increase in the predictor variable, the response variable will increase by the estimated coefficient value in terms of standard deviation units. In general, the closer the estimated regression coefficient is to 1, the stronger the effect of that predictor variable on the response variable, ceteris paribus. In this case, the level of locus of control appears to have the strongest effect on the changes in average English grade, whereas the general self-efficacy seems to produce the smallest strength.

To elaborate, a one standard unit increase in the students' level of locus of control contributes to a 0.305 standard deviation increase in students' English grade on average. The independent variable is significant at all confidence levels, meaning that there is a statistically significant positive relationship between these two variables.

Additionally, the level of motivation also has a positive effect on an English grade. A marginal standard unit increase in the level of motivation leads to a 0.222 standard deviation increase in average English score which is statistically significant at all alpha levels. To be specific, the integrative motivation is the major contribution to this relationship. It generally produces the second strongest effect on average English grade after the locus of control level, and has a larger size of the effect compared to the other type of motivation. Its estimated coefficient is 0.262, indicating that an extra unit increase in the level of integrative motivation will give

rise to a 0.262 standard deviation increase in average English grade. The p-value of 0.000 suggests that the variable is significant at all confident interval.

Furthermore, the relationship between students' English self-efficacy and their English language performance is of the main interest in this research. According to Table 6, an additional standard unit increase in English self-efficacy results in a 0.152 standard deviation unit increase in an average English grade, and the correlation is deemed to be statistically significant at the 0.5 level. The magnitude of the effect seems to be relatively small compared to other variables such as the level of motivation, and locus of control.

Nevertheless, the level of general self-efficacy tends to have the lowest effect on the changes in the level of English grade. Its beta coefficient is 0.0964, meaning that a one standard deviation unit change in general self-efficacy score brings only about 0.0964 standard deviation increase in English average grade. However, the coefficient is tested to be statistically insignificant as its p-value is larger a 10-percent alpha-level.

4.3.2 Regression analysis among different groups of respondents

Table 8: Gender Differences

	Males	**Female**
	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std
eng_se_std	0.215*	0.0919
	(0.0893)	(0.0807)
Constant	-0.330***	0.247**
	(0.0969)	(0.0748)
Observations	109	145
R^2	0.052	0.009

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Self-efficacy strength between males and females Table 8 reveals a linear relationship between average English grade and students' English self-efficacy. The output shows that the magnitudes of English self-efficacy effect on average English grade differ between male and female students. An additional standard deviation increase in English self-efficacy gives rise to a 0.215 standard deviation increase in English grade on average among male students, while that for female students is only a 0.0919 standard deviation increase. In addition, the beta coefficient of English self-efficacy for males is statistically significant at alpha-level of 0.05, whereas the estimated regression coefficient for female students is not statistically significant at all. The result is consistent with the descriptive analysis in section 4.1 the male students appear to have higher English self-efficacy compared to female students, and thereby the size of the English self-efficacy effect on average English grade is greater among male participants.

Table 9: Differences in QESE profiles

	Low	**High**
	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std
eng_se_std	0.337*	0.0198
	(0.137)	(0.157)
Constant	0.177	0.0788
	(0.144)	(0.148)
Observations	123	131
R^2	0.048	0.000

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Self-efficacy strength between low and high efficacious individuals Table 9 provides a linear relationship between average English grade and students' English self-efficacy across different English self-efficacy profiles. Among the respondents in low English self-efficacy profile, the effect of English self-efficacy is greater compared to the other group. A marginal standard deviation increase in the level of English self-efficacy score causes average English grade to increase by 0.337 standard deviation among low efficacious English language learners; on the other hand, an additional standard deviation increase in English self-efficacy score only brings about a 0.0198 standard deviation increase in English grade on average among the higher efficacious English language acquirers, with a non-significant beta coefficient as the p-vale is greater than a 10-percent alpha-value. The result implies that by improving English self-efficacy, low efficacious students could potentially achieve higher English performance.

Table 10: Differences in Motivation profiles

	Low	**High**
	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std
eng_se_std	0.195	0.0701
	(0.0993)	(0.0879)
Constant	-0.0605	0.0848
	(0.102)	(0.0858)
Observations	113	141
R^2	0.033	0.005

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Self-efficacy strength between low and high motivated individuals Table 10 depicts information about the linear relationship between English grade and students' English self-efficacy across different motivation profiles. Lowly motivated individuals appear to be more effected than the other group. By increasing an additional standard deviation unit of English self-efficacy score, the English grade is improved by 0.195 standard deviation on average. However, the beta of coefficient is deemed to be insignificant.

Table 11: Differences in LOC profiles

	Low	**High**
	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std
eng_se_std	0.0620	0.165*
	(0.103)	(0.0744)
Constant	-0.319**	0.193**
	(0.110)	(0.0707)
Observations	99	155
R^2	0.004	0.031

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Self-efficacy strength between internal and external LOC beliefs Table 11 illustrates the linear relationship between English grade and students' English self-efficacy across different LOC profiles. Among the individuals with an internal locus of control belief, the changes in English self-efficacy score have a greater impact on their English performance compared to the other profile. That is, increasing English self-efficacy by one standard deviation unit contributes to a 0.165 standard deviation unit increase in their English performance, with a significant beta coefficient at 5 percent alpha-level.

4.3.3 Multiple Linear Regression

The main limitation of applying simple linear regression method is that the estimator fails to capture other effects of the relevant independent variables that have originally been excluded from the regression equation. Thus, using multiple linear regression might be more efficient. Different models developed through a process of model specification described in section 4.2.3. Table 12 represents different regression outputs using different models.

Table 12: Multiple Linear Regression Results

	(Model 2)	(Model 3)	(Model 4)
	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std	avg_eng_std
eng_se_std	0.117	0.115	0.0858
	(0.0700)	(0.0697)	(0.0654)
mean_gse_std	-0.0481	-0.0532	
	(0.0678)	(0.0668)	
motiv_std	-21.70		
	(27.51)		
instru_std	11.49	-0.104	
	(14.70)	(0.0869)	
integra_std	11.87	0.177	0.0964
	(14.82)	(0.0925)	(0.0706)
loc_std	0.220***	0.224***	0.220***
	(0.0626)	(0.0622)	(0.0612)
female	0.415**	0.414**	0.404**
	(0.129)	(0.129)	(0.128)
Constant	-0.238*	-0.236*	-0.230*
	(0.0942)	(0.0935)	(0.0933)
Observations	253	254	254
R^2	0.172	0.170	0.163

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

The main limitation of applying simple linear regression method is that the estimator fails to capture other effects of the relevant independent variables that have originally been excluded

from the regression equation. Thus, using multiple linear regression might be more efficient. Different models developed through a process of model specification described in section 4.2.3. Table 12 represents different regression outputs using different models.

Overall, model 2 produces the strongest effect of the level of English self-efficacy on the students' English language performance, even though the model exhibits multicollinearity. The magnitude of estimated coefficients of LOC is roughly stable, and the estimates remain significant at all confidence interval among the three models.

According to the model specification, model 4 was proved to be the most appropriate. Focusing on the effect of English self-efficacy on the average English course grade in model 4, the effect size is the smallest although the model was restricted, consisting of less number of independent variables. An additional standard deviation unit increase in English self-efficacy unit results in a 0.0858 increase in the average English score. In fact, this estimated coefficient is deemed to be statistically insignificant at all confident intervals.

5 Discussion and Conclusion

Based on a simple linear regression model, the result proves that highly efficacious English learners achieve higher English language performance compared to the lowly efficacious. This finding agrees with several studies which ascertained that high level of English self-efficacy positively affects the students' academic performance (Zimmerman, et al., 1992; Bandura, 1997; Cotteral, 1999; Mahyuddin, et al., 2006; Bassi, et al., 2007).

Nevertheless, by applying a multiple linear regression, the opposite result is obtained. The students' English self-efficacy does not significantly affect the students' English performance per se. That is, the two variables are not statistically related to each other as the estimated coefficient is tested to be insignificant at all confidence levels. Therefore, the finding tends to be contrary to the affirmation from previous literatures (Zimmerman, et al., 1992; Bandura, 1997; Cotteral, 1999; Mahyuddin, et al., 2006; Bassi, et al., 2007) that students with high level of self-efficacy would likely to academically outperform those students with lower level of self-efficacy. In fact, the finding is actually in line with Anyadubalu's (2010) study, and that the main contributing factor to the result might be the fact that Thailand is a collectivist country where children are discouraged to make decisions on their own, and thereby ineffectively judge their capabilities in performing a specific task. Consequently, this might be indirectly translated in the students' level of self-efficacy.

Furthermore, in terms of motivation, the respondents seem to be integratively motivated rather than instrumentally motivated as their integrative motivation was found slightly higher than their instrumental motivation on average. Additionally, the integrative motivation holds a larger effect on students' English performance than instrumental motivation, thus the variable is considered to be a good predictor of students' English language proficiency.

The finding of this study is actually consistent with Hernandez's (2006) and Samad's (2012) studies. However, the result is in contrast with some previous research (Nuchnoi, 2008; Kitjaroonchai & Kitjaroonchai, 2012; Choomthong & Chaichompoo, 2015) conducted in Thailand in which a stronger relationship was established between instrumental motivation and English language learning. That is, students acquire English language as a means to pass a course, to obtain a good job and to earn higher pay (Choomthong & Chaichompoo, 2015).

In fact, the selected sample in this study was English Program students, thus the result may vary from the previous findings. In other words, the decision to study in English language program might due to the fact that they would like get more culturally engaged with English speaking countries rather than obtaining English language as an instrument to achieve a specific outcome. All in all, according to Gardner & Lambert (1972), integrative motivation is a key success in learning second language.

In addition, a statistically significant positive relationship between internal locus of control and English language performance was found. It seems logical that students with an internal locus of control achieve higher English grade than individuals with an external locus of control. For instance, a person possesses an internal locus of control would probably exert much efforts towards acquiring English language, thus their own actions attribute to their own success. And, the finding is consistent with Rotter's locus of control theory (Rotter, 1990) and several studies (Bar-Tal & Bar-Zohar, 1977; Keith, et al., 1986; Bar-on, 1997).

Regarding to gender, the study found a gender difference, with male students being more efficacious than female students in terms of English language learning. The result is in line with the study investigated by Fallan and Opstad (2016). This may be stemmed from the

different in personality types as males are normally more intuitive and tend to subdue their feelings with logical arguments (Nissen & Shemwell, 2016).

6 Bibliography

Anyadubalu, C. C., 2010. Self-Efficacy, Anxiety, and Performance in the English Language among Middle-School Students in English Language Program in Satri Si Suriyothai School, Bangkok. International Journal of Human and Social Sciences, 5(5), pp. 193-198.

Bandura, A., 1997. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Bandura, A., 2006. Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In: Self-efficacy beliefs of Adolescents. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing, pp. 307-337.

Bar-On, R., 1997. The Emotional Intelligence Inventory (EQ-i): technical manual.. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Bar-Tal, D. Bar-Zohar, Y., 1977. The relationship between perception of locus of control and academic achievement: Review and some educational implications. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 2(2), pp. 181-199.

Bassi, M., Steca, P., Della Fave, A. Caprara, G. V., 2007. Academic self-efficacy and quality of experience in learning. Journal of youth and adolescence, pp. 301-312.

Choomthong, D. Chaichompoo, C., 2015. English language motivation of Thai undergraduate students in the globalized era. Suranaree J. Soc. Sci., 9(2), pp. 23-45.

Cotteral, S., 1999. Key variables in language learning: What do learners believe about

them?. 2(4), pp. 493-513.

Dornyei, Z. N., 1998. Motivation in second and foreign language learning. Language Teaching, 31(3), pp. 117-135.

Educational First, 2015. EF English Proficiency Index, London: Educattion First Ltd.

Educational First, 2017. EF English Proficiency Index Report, London: Educational First Ltd.

Fallan, L. Opstad, L., 2016. Student Self-Efficacy and Gender-Personality Interactions. International Journal of Higher Education, 5(3), pp. 32-44.

Gardner, R., 2004. Attitude/Motivation Test Battery: International AMTB Research Project.

Gardner, R. C. Lambert, W. E., 1972. Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.

Hernandez, T., 2006. Integrative Motivation as a Predictor of Success in the Intermediate Foreign Language Classroom. FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANNALS, 39(4).

Hsieh, P. P.-H. Kang, H.-S., 2010. Attribution and Self-Efficacy and Their Interrelationship in the Korean EFL Context. Language Learning, 60(3), pp. 606-627.

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, Volume 33, pp. 513-532.

Keith, T., Pottebaum, S. Eberhrdt, S., 1986. Effects of self-Concept on academic achievement: a large-sample path analysis. Journal of Psycho educational Assessment, Volume 4, p. 61–72.

Kitjaroonchai, N. Kitjaroonchai, T., 2012. Motivation toward English language learning of Thai students majoring in English at Asia Pacific International University. Catalyst, 7(1), pp. 21-38.

Kornilova, T. V., Kornilov, S. and Chumakova, M. A., 2009. Subjective evaluations of intelligence and academic self-concept predict academic achievement: Evidence from a selective student population. Learning and Individual Differences, Volume 19, pp. 596-608.

Mahyuddin, R. et al., 2006. The relationship between students' self efficacy and their English language achievement. Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan, Jil, Volume 21, pp. 61-71.

Nissen, J. M. Shemwell, J. T., 2016. Gender, experience, and self-efficacy in introductory physics. PHYSICAL REVIEW PHYSICS EDUCATION RESEARCH, Volume 12.

Nuchnoi, R., 2008. A survey of the motivation of the Rangsit English major students towards learning English. Journal of Humanities and Social Scieneces, 5(9), pp. 93-116.

Pajares, F., 1996. Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. Review of Educational Research, Volume 66, pp. 543-578.

Pearlin, L. Schooler, C., 1978. The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social behavior, Volume 19, pp. 2-21.

Rotter, J., 1966. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80(1), pp. 1-28.

Rotter, J. B., 1990. Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A case history of a variable. American psychologist, 45(4), pp. 489-493.

Samad, A. A., Etemadzadeh, A. Far, H. R., 2012. Motivation and Language Proficiency: Instrumental and Integrative Aspects. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 66, pp. 432-440.

Schwarzer, R. Jerusalem, M., 1995. Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In: Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs. Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON, pp. 35-37.

Teng, B. Sinwongsuwat, K., 2015. Teaching and Learning English in Thailand and the Integration of Conversation Analysis (CA) into the Classroom. English Language Teaching, 8(3), pp. 13-23.

Tilfarlioglu, F. Y. Ciftci , F. S., 2011. Supporting Self-efficacy and Learner Autonomy in Relation to Academic Success in EFL Classrooms (A Case Study). Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1(10), pp. 1284-1294.

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, Volume 59, pp. 24-34..

Wang, J., Spencer, K. Xing , M., 2009. Metacognitive beliefs and strategies in learning Chinese as a foreign language. System, Volume 37, pp. 46-56.

Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A. Martinez-Pons, M., 1992. Self motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. American Educational Research Journal, Volume 29, pp. 663-676.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Data dictionary

STATA_Variable	Variable type	Description/ Coding instruction	Value
uniqueid		Unique ID of each student	String
gender	Independent	0=male 1=Female	Numeric
year_eng	Confounding	When did you start learning English language?	Numeric
study_ep_bef	Confounding	Have you ever studied under English Program before attending this school? Yes = 1 No = 0	Numeric
eng_tutor	Confounding	Do you have a tutoring for English subject right now? Yes = 1 No = 0	Numeric
revise_hour	Confounding	How many hours do you spend revising English or developing your English skills by yourself per week?	Numeric
go_abroad	Confounding	Have you ever stayed in a foreign country and use English language in that country?	Numeric
listen_eng	Confounding	Listening to English songs, English radio or English news Never = 0 Somestimes = 1 Often = 2	Numeric
watch_eng	Confounding	Watching English television programs or English movies Never = 0 Somestimes = 1 Often = 2	Numeric
write_eng	Confounding	Writing an English e-mail or searching information from the Internet using English Never = 0 Somestimes = 1 Often = 2	Numeric
speak_eng	Confounding	Speaking English with others Never = 0 Somestimes = 1 Often = 2	Numeric

STATA_Variable	Variable type	Description/ Coding instruction	Value
mean_gse	Independent	Mean score of General Self-Efficacy items obtained from questionnaire part 2	Numeric
mean_gse_std	Independent	Standardized variable of mean_gse	Numeric
eng_se	Independent	Mean score of English Self-Efficacy items obtained from questionnaire part 3	Numeric
eng_se_std	Independent	Standardized variable of eng_se	Numeric
motiv	Independent	Motivation score obtained from questionnaire part 4	Numeric
motiv_std	Independent	Standardized variable of motiv	Numeric
instru_motiv	Independent	Intrumental motivation obtained from questionnaire part 4	Numeric
instru_motiv_std	Independent	Standardized variable of instru_motiv	Numeric
integra_motiv	Independent	Integratuive motivation obtained from questionnaire part 4	Numeric
integra_motiv_std	Independent	Standardized variable of integra_motiv	Numeric
loc	Independent	Summation of Pearlin Mastery Scale items obtained obtained from questionnaire part 5	Numeric
loc_std	Independent	Standardized variable of loc	Numeric
avg_eng	Dependent	Students' average score for English courses taken in academic year 2017	Numeric
avg_eng_std	Dependent	Standardized variable of avg_eng	Numeric
gpa_2017	Dedependent	Academic year 2017 GPA	Numeric

Appendix 2

ชื่อ-นามสกุล…….. ชื่อเล่น……..…… ชั้น……

<u>ตอนที่ 1 ข้อมูลทั่วไปของนักเรียน</u>

คำชี้แจง โปรดทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ หรือระบุข้อความ

1. **เพศ**

   ☐ หญิง ☐ ชาย

2. **ระดับชั้นที่เริ่มเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ**

   ☐ อนุบาล ☐ ประถมศึกษาตอนต้น ☐ ประถมศึกษาตอนปลาย ☐ อื่นๆ โปรดระบุ ……..

3. **นักเรียนจบการศึกษาระดับชั้นประถมศึกษาจากสถาบันใด**

   ☐ อนุบาลระยอง ☐ เซนต์โยเซฟระยอง ☐ อัสสัมชัญระยอง ☐ มารีวิทย์สัตหีบ

   ☐ อื่นๆ โปรดระบุ ……..……

4. **นักเรียนเคยเรียนระบบ English Program มาก่อนหรือไม่**

   ☐ เคย ☐ ไม่เคย

5. **นักเรียนเรียนพิเศษวิชาภาษาอังกฤษหรือไม่**

   ☐ เรียน ☐ ไม่เรียน

6. **จำนวนชั่วโมงในการทบทวนหรือพัฒนาทักษะภาษาอังกฤษด้วยตัวเอง** …… ชั่วโมง *(ต่อสัปดาห์)*

7. **เกรดเฉลี่ยสะสม** ……..

8. **เกรดวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ**

   - **ม. 1 เทอม 1** ……..
   - **ม. 1 เทอม 2** ……..
   - **ม. 2 เทอม 1** ……..
   - **ม. 2 เทอม 2** ……..
   - **ม. 3 เทอม 1** ……..

9. **นักเรียนเคยเดินทางไปต่างประเทศและใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในประเทศนั้นหรือไม่**

   ☐ เคย ระบุประเทศ …….

   ระยะเวลา …….

   เพื่อ ☐ ศึกษาภาคฤดูร้อน

   ☐ ทัศนศึกษา

   ☐ ร่วมโครงการนักเรียนทุนแลกเปลี่ยน

   ☐ อื่นๆ โปรดระบุ …….

   ☐ ไม่เคย

10. **กิจกรรมที่เกี่ยวกับภาษาอังกฤษ**

    - **การอ่านสิ่งพิมพ์ที่เป็นภาษาอังกฤษเช่น หนังสือพิมพ์ นิตยสาร หรือ การ์ตูน**

      ☐ ไม่เคย ☐ บางครั้ง (2-3 ครั้งต่อสัปดาห์) ☐ บ่อยครั้ง (มากกว่า 3 ครั้ง ต่อสัปดาห์)

    - **การฟังเพลง วิทยุหรือข่าวสารเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ**

      ☐ ไม่เคย ☐ บางครั้ง (2-3 ครั้งต่อสัปดาห์) ☐ บ่อยครั้ง (มากกว่า 3 ครั้ง ต่อสัปดาห์)

    - **การดูรายการทีวีหรือภาพยนต์ที่เป็นภาษาอังกฤษ**

      ☐ ไม่เคย ☐ บางครั้ง (2-3 ครั้งต่อสัปดาห์) ☐ บ่อยครั้ง (มากกว่า 3 ครั้ง ต่อสัปดาห์)

    - **การเขียนอีเมล์ หรือสืบค้นข้อมูลจากอินเทอร์เน็ตโดยใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ**

      ☐ ไม่เคย ☐ บางครั้ง (2-3 ครั้งต่อสัปดาห์) ☐ บ่อยครั้ง (มากกว่า 3 ครั้ง ต่อสัปดาห์)

    - **การสนทนากับผู้อื่นด้วยภาษาอังกฤษ**

      ☐ ไม่เคย ☐ บางครั้ง (2-3 ครั้งต่อสัปดาห์) ☐ บ่อยครั้ง (มากกว่า 3 ครั้ง ต่อสัปดาห์)

ชื่อ-นามสกุล…….. ชื่อเล่น……..…… ชั้น……

11. ชื่อ-นามสกุล เพื่อนสนิท

11.1 ชื่อ ……นามสกุล……ชื่อเล่น……..

11.2 ชื่อ ……นามสกุล……ชื่อเล่น……..

11.3 ชื่อ ……นามสกุล……ชื่อเล่น……..

<u>ตอนที่ 2 แบบสอบถามวัดการรับรู้ความสามารถของตนเอง</u>

คำชี้แจง โปรดพิจารณาข้อความแต่ละข้อต่อไปนี้ว่าเป็นจริงสำหรับตัวนักเรียนเพียงไร แล้วทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ให้ตรงกับระดับความคิดเห็นที่เหมาะสมกับนักเรียนมากที่สุด จากเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (4) จนถึง ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (1) โดยในแต่ละข้อนั้นจะมีเพียงคำตอบเดียว (โปรดตอบทุกข้อ)

ข้อความ	ระดับความมั่นใจ			
	เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (4)	ค่อนข้างเห็นด้วย (3)	ค่อนข้างไม่เห็นด้วย (2)	ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (1)
1. ฉันสามารถที่จะจัดการกับปัญหายากๆได้ถ้าฉันใช้ความพยายามมากพอ				
2. ถึงแม้ว่าจะมีคนต่อต้านฉัน ฉันมั่นใจว่าฉันสามารถบรรลุเป้าหมายที่ต้องการได้				
3. มันเป็นเรื่องง่ายสำหรับฉันที่จะยึดติดกับเป้าหมายที่ต้องการและทำมันให้สำเร็จ				
4. ฉันมั่นใจว่าฉันสามารถจัดการกับเหตุการณ์ที่ไม่คาดหวังได้อย่างมีประสิทธิภาพ				
5. เพราะสติปัญญาของฉัน ฉันจึงสามารถรับมือกับสถานการณ์ที่ไม่คาดฝันได้				
6. ฉันสามารถแก้ไขปัญหาที่พบเจอได้ ถ้าฉันทุ่มเทความพยายามให้กับมันอย่างจริงจัง				
7. ฉันสามารถทำใจให้สงบได้เมื่อต้องเผชิญกับเรื่องยุ่งยากใดๆ เพราะฉันเชื่อมั่นว่าตัวเองสามารถจัดการกับปัญหาได้ดี				
8. เมื่อฉันเผชิญกับปัญหา ฉันสามารถหาทางออกในการแก้ปัญหานั้นได้หลายรูปแบบ				
9. ถ้าฉันอยู่ในสภาวะที่มีปัญหา ฉันสามารถคิดหาทางออกได้				
10. ฉันสามารถรับมือได้กับทุกเรื่องที่เข้ามาในชีวิต				

ชื่อ-นามสกุล..... ชื่อเล่น..... ชั้น.....

<u>ตอนที่ 3 แบบสอบถามวัดการรับรู้ความสามารถภาษาอังกฤษของตนเอง</u>

คำชี้แจง โปรดพิจารณาข้อความแต่ละข้อต่อไปนี้ว่าเป็นจริงสำหรับตัวนักเรียนเพียงไร แล้วทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ให้ตรงกับระดับความคิดเห็นที่เหมาะสมกับนักเรียนมากที่สุด โดยในแต่ละข้อนั้นจะมีเพียงคำตอบเดียว (โปรดตอบทุกข้อ)

โดยมีเกณฑ์การให้คะแนนคำตอบดังนี้

ระดับความมั่นใจ	เกณฑ์การให้คะแนน
ฉันสามารถทำได้มากที่สุด	7
ฉันสามารถทำได้	6
ตามหลักการแล้วฉันว่าฉันทำได้	5
ฉันคิดว่าอาจจะทำได้	4
ฉันคิดว่าอาจจะทำไม่ได้	3
ฉันไม่สามารถทำได้	2
ฉันไม่สามารถทำได้เลยแม้แต่นิดเดียว	1

ข้อความ	ระดับความมั่นใจ						
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
1. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจเรื่องราวที่ถูกเล่าเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
2. ฉันสามารถทำการบ้านที่มีการอ่านบทความภาษาอังกฤษได้ตามลำพัง							
3. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจรายการโทรทัศน์ของอเมริกันที่เป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
4. ฉันสามารถบรรยายโรงเรียนของฉันเป็นภาษาอังกฤษให้กับผู้อื่นได้							
5. ฉันสามารถเขียนข้อความภาษาอังกฤษบนอินเทอร์เน็ตได้ (เช่น บน Facebook หรือ Twitter)							
6. ฉันสามารถอธิบายทางไปโรงเรียนจากบ้านของฉันเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
7. ฉันสามารถเขียนข้อความเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
8. ฉันสามารถบอกเล่าเรื่องราวเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
9. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจรายการวิทยุของประเทศที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษได้							
10. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจรายการโทรทัศน์ภาษาอังกฤษที่ถูกผลิตในประเทศไทยได้							
11. ฉันสามารถฝากข้อความเป็นภาษาอังกฤษให้กับนักเรียนคนอื่นได้							
12. ฉันสามารถคาดเดาความหมายของคำศัพท์ที่ฉันไม่รู้เมื่ออ่านบทความภาษาอังกฤษได้							

ชื่อ-นามสกุล…….. ชื่อเล่น……..…… ชั้น……

ข้อความ	ระดับความมั่นใจ						
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
13. ฉันสามารสร้างประโยคใหม่จากคำศัพท์ที่เพิ่งเรียนไปได้							
14. ฉันสามารถเขียนอีเมลเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
15. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจบทสนทนาเกี่ยวกับเรื่องราวต่างๆ ในโรงเรียนที่เป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้ (ในรูปแบบการบันทึกเสียง)							
16. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจข้อความหรือข่าวสารเป็นภาษาอังกฤษบนอินเทอร์เน็ตได้							
17. ฉันสามารถถามคุณครูเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
18. ฉันสามารถสร้างประโยคโดยใช้สำนวนและวลีในภาษาอังกฤษได้							
19. ฉันสามารถพูดแนะนำคุณครูให้กับผู้อื่นเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
20. ฉันสามารถอภิปรายเรื่องที่น่าสนใจโดยทั่วไปกับเพื่อนร่วมห้องของฉันเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
21. ฉันสามารอ่านบทความเรื่องเล่าแบบสั้นๆ ที่เป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
22. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจภาพยนต์ภาษาอังกฤษโดยไม่ต้องมีคำบรรยายข้างใต้ได้ (subtitles)							
23. ฉันสามารถตอบคำถามคุณครูเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
24. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจเพลงภาษาอังกฤษได้							
25. ฉันสามารถอ่านหนังสือพิมพ์ภาษาอังกฤษได้							
26. ฉันสามารถหาความหมายของคำศัพท์ใหม่โดยใช้พจนานุกรมแบบ monolingual (แปลภาษาอังกฤษ-ภาษาอังกฤษ) ได้							
27. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจหมายเลขโทรศัพท์ที่ถูกพูดขึ้นมาเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
28. ฉันสามารถจดบันทึกประจำวันเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้ (diary)							
29. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจบทความภาษาอังกฤษที่เกี่ยวข้องกับวัฒนธรรมไทยได้							
30. ฉันสามารถพูดแนะนำตัวเองเป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้							
31. ฉันสามารถเขียนเรียงความเป็นภาษาอังกฤษความยาวประมาณ 2 หน้ากระดาษเกี่ยวกับคุณครูผู้สอนได้							
32. ฉันสามารถเข้าใจเนื้อหาการอ่านใหม่ๆ (เช่น บทความบน the Time magazine) ที่ถูกเลือกโดยคุณครูผู้สอนได้							

ชื่อ-นามสกุล..... ชื่อเล่น..... ชั้น.....

<u>ตอนที่ 4 แบบสอบถามเพื่อสำรวจแรงจูงใจในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ</u>

คำชี้แจง โปรดพิจารณาข้อความแต่ละข้อต่อไปนี้ว่าเป็นจริงสำหรับตัวนักเรียนเพียงไร แล้วทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ให้ตรงกับระดับความคิดเห็นที่เหมาะสมกับนักเรียนมากที่สุดจากเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (6) จนถึง ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (1) โดยในแต่ละข้อนั้นจะมีเพียงคำตอบเดียว

ข้อความ	ระดับความคิดเห็น					
	เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (6)	เห็นด้วยปานกลาง (5)	ค่อนข้างเห็นด้วย (4)	ค่อนข้างไม่เห็นด้วย (3)	ไม่เห็นด้วยปานกลาง (2)	ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (1)
1. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะฉันต้องการใช้ในการทำงานในอนาคต						
2. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะมันทำให้ฉันมีความรู้มีการศึกษามาก						
3. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะมีประโยชน์ในการหางานดีๆ และเงินเดือนสูงๆ						
4. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะฉันต้องการใช้ในการเดินทางไปต่างประเทศ						
5. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะฉันต้องการใช้กับเทคโนโลยีและอินเทอร์เน็ต						
6. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะคนอื่นจะให้ความเคารพฉันมากขึ้นถ้าฉันรู้ภาษาอังกฤษ						
7. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะฉันจะได้อ่านหนังสือพิมพ์นิตยสารและหนังสือที่เป็นภาษาอังกฤษได้						
8. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะมันทำให้ฉันรู้สึกสบายใจเมื่ออยู่กับคนที่พูดภาษาอังกฤษ						
9. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะมันทำให้ฉันได้พบปะพูดคุยกับคนได้หลากหลายมากขึ้น						
10. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะมันทำให้ฉันเข้าใจและซาบซึ้งไปกับศิลปะและวรรณคดีภาษาอังกฤษ						
11. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะฉันสามารถเข้าร่วมกิจกรรมของกลุ่มวัฒนธรรมต่างๆ ได้อย่างเสรี						
12. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะมันช่วยทำให้ฉันได้เพื่อนใหม่ๆ จากหลายที่ทั่วโลก						
13. การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมีความสำคัญเพราะมันทำให้ฉันได้เรียนรู้ สังคม วัฒนธรรมของผู้ที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ						

ชื่อ-นามสกุล…….. ชื่อเล่น……..…… ชั้น……

14. ฉันเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเพราะมันสนุก						

<u>ตอนที่ 5 แบบสอบถามเพื่อสำรวจความเชื่อในอำนาจภายใน-ภายนอกตน</u>

คำชี้แจง โปรดพิจารณาข้อความแต่ละข้อต่อไปนี้ว่าเป็นจริงสำหรับตัวนักเรียนเพียงไร แล้วทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ให้ตรงกับระดับความคิดเห็นที่เหมาะสมกับนักเรียนมากที่สุดจากเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (4) จนถึง ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (1) โดยในแต่ละข้อนั้นจะมีเพียงคำตอบเดียว (โปรดตอบทุกข้อ)

ข้อความ	ระดับความคิดเห็น			
	เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (4)	เห็นด้วย (3)	ไม่เห็นด้วย (2)	ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง (1)
1. ไม่มีทางเป็นไปได้เลยที่ฉันจะสามารถแก้บางปัญหาที่ฉันมีอยู่ได้				
2. บางครั้งฉันรู้สึกเหมือนชีวิตฉันถูกควบคุมอยู่				
3. ฉันแทบจะไม่สามารถควบคุมสิ่งต่างๆ ที่เกิดขึ้นกับตัวฉันได้เลย				
4. ฉันสามารถทำทุกอย่างที่ฉันตั้งใจไว้ได้				
5. บ่อยครั้งฉันรู้สึกหมดหนทางในการจัดการปัญหาชีวิตของฉัน				
6. ฉันรู้สึกว่าสิ่งที่จะเกิดขึ้นในอนาคตขึ้นอยู่กับตัวฉันเองเป็นส่วนใหญ่				
7. ฉันรู้สึกว่าฉันแทบจะไม่สามารถเปลี่ยนแปลงสิ่งสำคัญต่างๆ ในชีวิตฉันได้				