Detecting the Underlying Constructs of the Self-efficacy Scale for English Language Learners' Textbooks (SES-ELLT) through Exploratory Factor Analysis

Seyyedeh Mina Hamedi
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

Reza Pishghadam
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

Mohammad Ghazanfari
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

Abstract—The present study attempts at determining the inherent components of the validated Self-Efficacy Scale for English Language Learners' Textbooks (SES-ELLT) (Hamedi, Pishghadam, & Ghazanfari, 2013). To this end, 290 language learners from several language institutes of Mashhad (Iran) engaged in the study to examine the underlying dimensions of the scale. Participants were asked to reflect on the importance of the 33 items for the English language textbooks. Afterwards, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was administered to substantiate the construct validity of the scale. Two tests were employed to measure the factorability of the inter-correlation matrix: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) and Bartlett's test of Sphericity. The results of the two tests demonstrated the appropriateness of the factor model. Finally, the scale revealed five major factors, accounting for 39.94% of the total variance to be used by textbook designers and material developers as a set of empirically based self-efficacy inducing factors.

Index Terms—SES-ELLT, underlying dimensions, EFA, factorability, five factors

I. INTRODUCTION

Self-efficacy is defined as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1997, p.3). Bandura (1986, 1997) suggests that our predictions about possible outcomes of behavior are remarkably affected by self-efficacy. In fact, we imagine future consequences by relying on our past experiences and our observations of others (Woolfolk, Winne, & Perry, 2003).

Meta-analyses across various fields of study asserts the impact of perceived self-efficacy in human self-development, adaptation, and change (Boyer et al., 2000; Holden, 1991; Holden, Moncher, Schinke, & Barker, 1990; Moritz, Feltz, Fahrbach, & Mack, 2000; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Sadri & Robertson, 1993; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). It is claimed that high efficacious people outperform the low efficacious ones (Templine, Guile, & Okuma, 200l). Several studies have observed that students with higher sense of self-efficacy are seen to participate more actively, to work harder, and to be more enthusiastic in learning (Bandura, 1997).Therefore, higher extent of self-efficacy can promote higher intrinsic motivation, perseverance and self-regulation (Schunk, 1989).

On the other hand, in the realm of second language acquisition, textbooks are the major components of language teaching and learning which are widely used and designed for language learners to boost their linguistic and communicative abilities (Sheldon, 1987). In fact, textbooks give cohesion to the teaching and learning process by offering direction through various language based activities for further classroom practice of the students (Mares, 2003); however, to the researchers' best knowledge no study has been conducted to identify the prominent self-efficacy enhancing factors affecting the learners' sense of self-efficacy.

In a study conducted by Hamedi et al. (2014), SES-ELLT was constructed in order to measure the degree to which textbooks can impact the learners' sense of self-efficacy. The scale was validated using Rasch measurement model. After the investigation of the psychometric properties of the scale, the results demonstrated that all items except three contributed towards the expected purpose of the scale; however, due to the novelty of the scale a revalidation of it through EFA can testify the previous findings as well. More importantly, Rasch model is incapable of identifying the inherent components of the scale. Henceforth, the primary objective of the study is to find out the underlying factors acting on the language learners' sense of self-efficacy.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Self-efficacy

Bandura (1977) first proposed the concept of self-efficacy to provide a unified theory of behavior change (Gallagher, 2012). Pajares and Schunk (2002) pointed out that self-efficacy beliefs revolve around the concept of "can". In all, Pajares and Schunk (2002) believed that if psychologists are really eager to figure out the major reasons of why students show preference towards some activities while avoiding the others, why they succeed in some academic disciplines and fail at the others, or why they anticipate some tasks and panic the others, they should meticulously examine the students' beliefs about themselves and their abilities, in the first place.

Within the domain of language education, the four identified types of self-efficacy are collective self-efficacy, teachers' self-efficacy, collective teachers' self-efficacy, and creative self-efficacy. Collective self-efficacy accounts for the capabilities of the group, team, or larger social entity (Bandura, 1997). It is not simply the average of individuals' self-efficacy but rather it refers to the extent to which each member believes the group may achieve by attempting unanimously. Teachers' self-efficacy refers to the instructor's beliefs in his capabilities to help the students succeed in learning (Pajaras, 1997; Tschannen- Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, as cited in Pajares & Schunk, 2001). Collective teacher self-efficacy is the impact of teachers collective capabilities on students outcomes (Goddard, Hoys & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). Caprara, Barbaranell, Bargogni, and Steca (2003) have demonstrated that there is a positive relationship between this type of self-efficacy and teachers' job satisfaction. Finally, creative self-efficacy is defined as the individual's beliefs in oneself to produce creative outcomes (Tierney & Farmer, 2002).

Indeed, there are four major channels through which self-efficacy can be affected. First and foremost are the mastery experiences which are our direct experiences that are highly considered to be the most informative source of efficacy (Woolfolk et al., 2003). Secondly, vicarious experiences which are modeling other similar individuals succeeding by struggling with hardships might be stimulating to the point that they think they, too, have the required capabilities to carry out the task in a relative manner (Bandura, 1995). Thirdly, social persuasion which is referred to as a verbal assurance that they, too, have the essential capabilities to fullfill the given activities (Bandura, 1995). Ultimately, somatic or emotional cues being defined as the individual's estimation of his abilities by relying on their emotional states can be the least constructive but still effective method of promoting self-efficacy beliefs (Gallagher, 2012).

Recently, in the realm of second language acquisition there has been a growing attention towards the role of self-efficacy. Sani and Zain (2011) found that there is a positive relationship among second language reading attitude, reading self-efficacy, and reading ability. In other words, they proved reading attitudes and efficacy to have significant roles in reading improvement in a non-supportive foreign language setting. Besides, Ghonsooly and Elahi (2009) asserted that high self-efficacious respondents gained higher scores in reading comprehension than the low self-efficacious ones. Moreover, Rahimi and Gheitasi (2010) found a positive relationship between English teachers' sense of efficacy and the feedback on form and content of the writings. In spite of numerous studies, it seems that no study has been focused to extract the major underlying factors of English Language Teaching (ELT) textbooks affecting the learners sense of self-efficacy.

B. Textbooks' Impact on Language Learning and Teaching

Sheldon (1987) takes textbooks as a published book designed for language learners to boost their linguistic and communicative abilities. In fact, textbooks give cohesion to the teaching and learning process by offering direction through various language based activities for further classroom practice of the students (Mares, 2003).

As a matter of fact, textbooks play a crucial role in ELT classes in the whole world (Dendrinos, 1992; Williams, 1983). Studies have revealed that it is highly common to apply textbooks for daily teaching programs and a few professionals would not utilize published ELT materials in their classes (Cunningsworth, 1984; Litz, 2005; McDonough & Shaw, 1993) as they are on the belief that textbooks might expose learners to the inauthentic language, distorted content, and may even overlook the learners' or deskilled teachers needs (Richards, 2001, as cited in Hamedi et al., 2013). In fact, those who disapprove of shaping their syllabi based on textbooks would rather focusing on the students' needs to make them able of acquiring life skills through a life based syllabus. This is quite in line with the premises of life syllabus being proposed by pishghadam (2011) as a new syllabus which can play a significant role not only in education but also in enhancing life qualities.

C. Life Skills

In sum, inspired by Pishghadam (2011), ELT can be viewed as an independent and scientific field ready to contribute to and be applied to other fields of study by language teachers who are empowered to go beyond the reflective, critical, and participatory language teaching (Ketabi, Zabihi, & Ghadiri, 2012). Recently, Pishghadam and Zabihi (2012) gave a new lease of life to the field of English language teaching and learning by granting it a more contributory and life-changing role, and encouraging the teachers to take a fresh look at its principles. It corroborates the principles of humanistic education which asserts that education should enable people to lead a more meaningful and purposeful life by fostering their intellectual and emotional capabilities (Ketabi et al., 2012). As a result, the underlying assumption of recent ideas of applied ELT, and educational language teaching is that ELT practitioners should focus their attention on the promotion of learners' life skills, and critical thinking prior to language-related skills (Ketabi et al., 2012).

D. Self-efficacy Measurement

Since judgments of self-efficacy are task specific and may differ in various domains; therefore, scales of perceived self-efficacy must accord with the specific domains of functioning that is the object of interest (Bandura, 2006). Indeed, most of the designed self-efficacy scales have resorted to Bandura's guidelines on the self-efficacy scale development (Bandura, 2001; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990; Zimmerman, 1995). Within the context of language learning Templin et al. (2001) constructed a reliable and valid self-efficacy scale to measure the learners' self-efficacy and achievement. In fact, despite the numerous self-efficacy studies at hand, the dearth of a comprehensive research identifying the implicit factors affecting the learners' sense of efficacy while studying ELT textbooks is noteworthy. Having this in mind, the main goal of the study was to extract the underlying components of SES-ELLT (Hamedi et al., 2013). To this end, EFA was conducted to examine the most influential factors which had an impact on the learners' sense of self-efficacy.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

A total number of 290 language learners from different fields of study comprising 100 males (34.5%) and 190 females (65.5%) from various language institutes of Mashhad volunteered to engage in the study to investigate the underlying components of the scale, with no expectation of incentives. They had at least two years of familiarity with their textbooks as they were expected to assess their books with regard to the extent to which textbook activities might affect their sense of self-efficacy. In all, the ages of the participants ranged from 15 to 64 years. Their overall mean age was 26.63 years, with a standard deviation of 9.28.

B. Instruments

1. SES-ELLT

In order to conduct EFA, a 5-point SES-ELLT (Hamedi et al., 2013) ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*srongly agree*) was utilized to specify the underlying factors of the scale. SES-ELLT has 33 items which has been validated by using Rasch rating scale model (Andrich, 1978) as implemented in WINSTEPS (Linacre, 2006a). In fact, Rasch reliability statistics were fairly high for both person separation (.81) and item separation (.87). Moreover, the scale proved to enjoy an acceptable index of reliability (Cronbach's α= .84) as well. The overall analysis of the scale revealed that the scale was unidimensional and only three items were misfitting.

2. Exploratory Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a commonly used complicated set of techniques in social sciences (Costello & Osborne, 2005). It attempts to reduce "the dimensionality of the original space and to give an interpretation to the new space, spanned by a reduced number of new dimensions which are supposed to underlie the old ones" (Rietveld & Van Hout, 1993, p. 254). Besides, it can explain the variance in the observed variables in terms of underlying latent factors" (Habing, 2003, p. 2) More specifically, it is used to investigate the interrelationships among numerous variables and to explain these variables regarding their common underlying dimensions (factors) (Field, 2000).

Indeed, there are two main categories of factor analysis, exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory (CFA). EFA is utilized to generate a theory or model from a relatively large number of latent constructs (Swisher, Beckstead, & Bebeau, 2004; Thompson, 2004); however, CFA is performed to test a proposed model based on priori theory regarding the number of factors and which factor theories or models best fit (Thompson, 2004).

C. Procedure

The researchers attempt at revalidating and specifying the underlying constructs of SES-ELLT. To achieve this end, SES-ELLT was distributed among 290 learners in various language institutes of Mashhad. The scale comprises 33 items which are scored based on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly agree* (5) to *strongly disagree* (1). It took around 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The participants were language learners who had a longstanding familiarity with their language textbooks. They were supposed to rate their ELT textbooks i.e. *Top Notch 3B* (Saslow & Ascher, 2006), *Summit 1A* (Saslow & Ascher, 2006)*, American English file: Students' book 3* (Oxenden, Koenig, & Seligson, 2008), *Total English (upper intermediate)* (Acklam & Crace*, 2007*), and *Interchange (students' book 3)*(Richards, Hull, & Proctor, 2005) with regard to the extent to which their textbook activities can promote their sense of self-efficacy. Besides, they were assured of the confidential nature of the study and that they could disengage from the study prior to submitting the questionnaire.

IV. RESULTS

Cronbach Alpha estimated the reliability of the whole items as .84. Besides, all of the five factors yielded good reliability estimates ranging from .58 to .77 (Table 1).

TABLE 1
RELIABILITY OF EACH FACTOR

Factors	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Factor 1	.77	6
Factor 2	.69	7
Factor 3	.58	4
Factor 4	.60	9
Factor 5	.61	6

The items of (SES-ELLT) were subjected to principal components analysis (PCA) using SPSS version 19. Prior to performing PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .81, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance (Table 2), supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

TABLE 2
KMO AND BARTLETT'S TEST

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.810
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2342.859
	Df	528
	Sig.	.000

Principal components analysis revealed the presence of ten components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 19.88%, 5.59%, 5.18%, 4.85%, 4.42%, 4.29%, 3.81%, 3.67%, 3.21%, and 3.07% of the variance respectively; however, an inspection of the scree plot did not clearly support a ten factor solution. In fact, the scree plot cutoff is quite subjective (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan., 1999) and this leads to the difficulty of identifying the precise cutoff point and overextraction of factors (Henson & Roberts, 2006). Therefore, using parallel analysis which has shown to be the most accurate (Pallant, 2011), it was decided to retain five fixed components for further investigation. It revealed only five components with eigenvalues exceeding the corresponding criterion values for a randomly generated data matrix of the same size (33 variables $\times$ 290 respondents). In all, the five-component solution explained a total of 39.94% of the variance. Furthermore, to aid in the interpretation of these five components, orthogonal rotation was performed. The result of Varimax with Kaiser Normalization was a rotated component matrix (Table 3) (see appendix B). The rotated solution revealed the absence of simple structure (Thurstone, 1947), with variables that loaded on more than one factor (Table 3) (see appendix B).

As Table 3 (see appendix B) demonstrates, although five items are cross-loading, they should be retained in as much as the cross-loadings on both factors are not greater than .40 (Schonorock-Adema, Heijne-Penninga, Van Hell, & Cohen-Schotanus, 2009). Besides, according to this table, item 14 should be removed from the set as it does not possess a significant loading on any of the factors.

In sum, the five resultant factors were descriptively labelled as indicated below. Factor 1 was given the label of *perseverance*. There were six items that loaded on this factor, with loadings ranging from 0.38 to 0.80 (explained variance of 19.88%). The top item within the factor was ''It makes me try to write well- constructed sentences'' (loading 0.80). Factor 1 included characteristics such as demonstrating effort to support one's ideas, being well organized and focused, using effective words and well-constructed sentences for the writing skill, and interacting well through effective written communication skills. These components illustrated the factor tagged as perseverance.

Factor 2 was labelled as the *self-regulation strategy*. There were seven items that loaded on this factor, with loadings ranging from 0.44 to 0.64 (explained variance of 5.59%). The top item within the factor was ''It encourages me to do extra work on tasks to improve my knowledge'' (loading 0.64). Factor 2 included characteristics such as recognizing language capabilities, estimating language capabilities, being a task initiator, gaining advantage of past experiences, being proactive regulators of the learning process, adhering to the task, and being a goal-oriented learner.

Factor 3 was given the label of *problem-solving* capability. There were four items that loaded on this factor, with loadings ranging from 0.35 to 0.635 (explained variance of 5.18%). The top item within the factor was ''It helps me feel I can solve the problems effectively'' (loading 0.635). Factor 3 included characteristics such as having the capacity for tackling language problems, personal problems, interpersonal problems, and task analysis.

Factor 4 was tagged as *self-reflection*. There were nine items loading on this factor, with loadings ranging from 0.31 to 0.69 (explained 4.85% of the variance). The top item within this factor was "It can make me confident that I can well participate in a class discussion" (loading 0.69). Factor four included characteristics such as thought inspection of language capabilities, feeling inspection of language capabilities, clarity of understanding listening skill improvement, clarity of understanding reading skill improvement, thought inspection of being a focused language reader, thought inspection of language weakness, thought inspection of one's language strengths, thought inspection of being a well language communicator, and thought inspection of having the speech power.

Lastly, factor five was labelled as *self-assessment*. There were six items loading on this factor, with loadings ranging from 0.39 to 0.51 (explained 4.42% of the variance). The most loaded item within this factor was "It makes me think how well I am doing as I am proceeding a task" (loading, 0.51). This factor included characteristics such as language

assessment, achievement assessment, tolerance assessment, language skills mastery assessment, vicarious experience, and problem solving assessment. In all, items representing each factor are displayed in Table 4 and Table 5 (see appendix C), and the validated scale is provided at (see appendix A).

TABLE 4
FIVE FACTORS OF THE SCALE

Factors	Statements	N of Items	Percentage
Perseverance	21, 20, 22, 23, 19, 24,	6	18.75
Self-regulation	17, 18, 13, 3, 1, 2, 12	7	21.88
Problem-solving	5, 4, 10, 7	4	12.5
Self-reflection	32, 33, 31, 30, 25, 29, 27, 28, 11	9	28.12
Self-assessment	9, 15, 8, 16, 26, 6	6	18.75
	Total	32	100

V. DISCUSSION

EFA was used to extract the main components of SES-ELLT. Following the initial extraction conducting exploratory factor analysis on the scale items, the data were analyzed using Varimax rotation detecting ten factors with eigenvalues exceeding one; however, given the fact that parallel analysis is the most accurate way of identifying the number of components to be retained with both Kaiser's criterion and Catell's scree test tending to overestimate the number of components (Hubbard & Allen 1987; Zwick & Velicer, 1986), parallel analysis was decided to be performed, determining the number of factors that best-fit model and had to be extracted as five . However, one item (Item 14: It helps me feel confident that I can understand the basic concepts taught by the book) failed to load on any factor; henceforth, given the clearly inappropriate loading noted in the extraction phase, modification for this item seems to be recommended. Probably, the reason behind this might be the confusing nature of the word "basic" in this statement and the difficulty of assuming what concepts as the basic ones. In all, the five extracted factors that best represent this construct and accounted for 39.94% of the variance were descriptively labelled as mentioned below.

The first detected component of self-efficacy was perseverance, which is in consistence with Bandura (1977), Brown and Inouye (1978), Schunk (1981), Weinberg, Gould, and Jackson (1979), and Zimmerman, Bandura, Martinez-Pons' (1992) that perceived self-efficacy can greatly affect the amount of effort to mobilize, and the individual's perseverance in the face of difficulties. Besides, as mentioned earlier, persistence can be mostly generated by social persuasion mechanism (Bandura, 1995) as people are assured verbally of their required capabilities.

The second extracted factor was self-regulation which indicates the extent to which learners are metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviorally proactive regulators of their own learning process (Zimmerman, 1986, 1990a). This is in accord with Zimmerman, et al. (1992) earlier research in which they announced that the students' perceived self-regulatory efficacy would affect their perceived self-efficacy for academic achievement. Moreover, it confirms Zimmerman's (1989, 1990b) claim of the higher exhibition of a sense of self-efficacy by the self-regulator learners.

The third identified component was problem-solving which is in parallel with Hall (2007) findings who believed that self-efficacy is influenced by the feedback that fosters problem- solving skills. Afterwards, self-reflection which is the inspection and evaluation of one's thoughts, feelings, and behavior, as well as the clarity of understanding these thoughts, and feelings (Carver & Scheier, 1998) was the fourth recognized factor. It corroborates Bandura's (1986) notion of depicting self-efficacy as a *self-system*, which is comprised of cognitive and affective components including the ability to symbolize, learn from others, regulate one's own behavior, and engage in self-reflection; therefore, enabling people to exercise control over their thoughts, feelings, and actions.

Finally, self-evaluation which is the assessment and comparison of one's accomplishments to a standard or a goal (Dinther, Dochy, & Segers 2011) was the last extracted factor which is in line with Gist's conception of self-efficacy that seems to emphasize on the self-assessment of skills (as cited in Claggett & Goodhue, 2011).

Indeed, the present study is worthwhile on the premise that no specific study has been concentrated exclusively on the extraction of ELT textbooks' components regarding their extent to which they may boost the learners' self-efficacy. More importantly, in the light of life syllabus (Pishghadam, 2011) which prioritizes life issues and language rather than merely language in classes, the researchers are looking forward to assisting EFL teachers and learners in the detection and utilization of these factors for the enhancement of the learners' sense of self-efficacy through ELT textbooks.

Moreover, as choosing an appropriate ELT textbook paves the way for taking better teaching and learning strategies and entails a considerable professional, financial or even political investment, the findings of the current study will have significant implications for language teachers, supervisors, L2 learners, lesson planners, material developers, syllabus designers, decision makers, and the language scholars to make more valid decisions about the effects of the ELT materials on promoting the L2 learners' sense of self-efficacy and to provide them with a cornerstone to adopt the most self-efficacy inducing books, respectively.

APPENDIX A

Self-Efficacy Scale for the English Language Learners' Textbooks

No.		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	The current textbook helps me think about my language capabilities.					
2.	It helps me estimate my language capabilities before starting a task.					
3.	It excites my feelings to start doing the tasks.					
4.	It helps me feel I can do my homework effectively.					
5.	It helps me feel I can solve the problems effectively.					
6.	It helps me think how well I can answer the difficult questions in the class.					
7.	It helps me feel I can do my classwork effectively.					
8.	It helps me think how well I can achieve my academic goals.					
9.	It makes me think how well I am doing, as I am proceeding a task.					
10.	It helps me feel determined how to solve a task before I begin.					
11.	It helps me feel confident that I can understand the most difficult materials offered by the textbook.					
12.	It makes me resort to my past experiences while performing a task.					
13.	It encourages me to work as hard as possible on tasks.					
14.	It helps me feel confident that I can understand the basic concept taught by the book.					
15.	It helps me think how well I can master skills by the course.					
16.	It helps me set some of my classmates as the language learner models while doing pair works or group works.					
17.	It encourages me to do extra work on tasks to improve my knowledge.					
18.	It helps me stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.					
19.	It makes me try to use details in my writings to support my ideas.					
20.	It makes me try to write a well-organized, focused text with an inviting beginning, developed middle, and a meaningful ending.					
21.	It makes me try to write well-constructed sentences.					
22.	It makes me try to use effective words in my writings.					
23.	It makes me try to write effectively to express my thoughts and interact with others.					
24.	It makes me try to use punctuation accurately in my writings.					
25.	It helps me feel confident that I have the required ability for improving my listening skill.					
26.	It helps me feel how well I can find a strategy to answer most of the questions even if the listening tasks are hard and I cannot understand them completely.					
27.	It helps me feel confident that my listening comprehension is improving.					
28.	It helps me feel confident that I have the ability to focus my concentration on the text I am reading.					
29.	It helps me feel confident that I am capable of improving my reading comprehension skill.					
30.	It makes me feel although my world knowledge is good, I have problems in reading comprehension.					
31.	It helps me confident that I can understand difficult passages in the textbooks.					
32.	It can make me confident that I can well participate in a class discussion.					
33.	It helps me feel confident that I can communicate my agreement or disagreement in a discussion.					

APPENDIX B

TABLE3
ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
SE21	.802				
SE20	.700				
SE22	.623				
SE23	.591				
SE19	.588	.311			
SE24	.382				
SE17		.646			
SE18		.635			
SE13		.587			
SE3		.507			
SE1		.478			
SE2		.469			
SE12		.442			
SE5			.635		
SE4			.633		
SE10			.518		
SE7			.355		
SE32				.696	
SE33				.668	
SE31				.518	
SE30				.449	.386
SE25				.420	
SE29				.400	
SE27				.390	
SE28				.359	.301
SE11				.314	
SE9					.511
SE15					.493
SE8					.462
SE16		.359			.414
SE26					.400
SE6			.376		.394
SE14					

APPENDIX C

TABLE 5
THE FACTORS OF SES-ELLT

Perseverance
1. It makes me try to write well-constructed sentences.
2. It makes me try to write a well-organized, focused text with an inviting beginning, developed middle, and a meaningful ending.
3. It makes me try to use effective words in my writings.
4. It makes me try to write effectively to express my thoughts and interact with others.
5. It makes me try to use details in my writings to support my ideas.
6. It makes me try to use punctuation accurately in my writings.
Self-regulation
1. It encourages me to do extra work on tasks to improve my knowledge.
2. It helps me stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.
3. It encourages me to work as hard as possible on tasks.
4. It excites my feelings to start doing the tasks.
5. The current textbook helps me think about my language capabilities.
6. It helps me estimate my language capabilities before starting a task.
7. It makes me resort to my past experiences while performing a task.
Problem-solving
1. It helps me feel I can do my homework effectively.
2. It helps me feel I can solve the problems effectively.
3. It helps me feel determined how to solve a task before I begin.
4. It helps me feel I can do my class work effectively.
Self-reflection
1. It can make me confident that I can well participate in a class discussion.
2. It helps me feel confident that I can communicate my agreement or disagreement in a discussion.
3. It helps me feel confident that I can understand difficult passages in the textbooks.
4. It makes me feel although my world knowledge is good, I have problems in reading comprehension.
5. It helps me feel confident that I have the required ability for improving my listening skill.
6. It helps me feel confident that I am capable of improving my reading comprehension skill.
7. It helps me feel confident that my listening comprehension is improving.
8. It helps me feel confident that I have the ability to focus my concentration on the text I am reading.
9. It helps me feel confident that I can understand the most difficult materials offered by the textbook.
Self-assessment
1. It makes me think how well I am doing, as I am proceeding a task.
2. It helps me think how well I can master skills by the course.
3. It helps me think how well I can achieve my academic goals.
4. It helps me set some of my classmates as the language learner models while doing pair works or group works.
5. It helps me feel how well I can find a strategy to answer most of the questions even if the listening tasks are hard and I cannot understand them completely.
6. It helps me think how well I can answer the difficult questions in the class.

REFERENCES

[1] Acklam, R. & Crace, A. (2007). Total English: Upper-intermediate students' book. NY: Pearson/ Longman.
[2] Andrich, D. (1978). A rating formulation for ordered response categories. *Psychometrika*, *43*(4), 561-573.
[3] Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.
[4] Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
[5] Bandura, A. (1995). Self-efficacy in changing societies. New York: Cambridge University Press.
[6] Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.
[7] Bandura, A. (2001). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales (revised), Retrieved May 9, 2005 from http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/Bandura/.
[8] Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307-337). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
[9] Bartlett, M.S. (1954). A note on multiplying factors for various chi-squared approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 16*, 296-298.
[10] Boyer, D. A., Zollo, J. S., Thompson, C. M., Vancouver, J. B., Shewring, K., & Sims, E. (2000, June). A quantitative review of the effects of manipulated self-efficacy on performance. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, Miami, FL.
[11] Brown, I. J., & Inouye, D. K. (1978). Learned helplessness through modeling: The role of perceived similarity in competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 900- 908.
[12] Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., & Steca, P. (2003).Efficacy beliefs as determinants of teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95,* 821- 832.
[13] Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). On the self-regulation of behavior. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
[14] Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, *10*(7). Retrieved July 3, 2008 from http://pareonline.net/.
[15] Cunningsworth, A. (1984). Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching materials. London: Heinemann.
[16] Dendrinos, B. (1992). The EFL textbook and ideology. Greece: N.C. Grivas Publications.

[17] Dinther, M. V., Dochy, F., & Segers, M. (2011). Factors affecting students' self-efficacy in higher education. *Educational Research Review, 6*, 95-108.

[18] Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4*(3), 272- 299.

[19] Field, A. (2000). Discovering Statistics using SPSS for Windows. London – Thousand Oaks – New Delhi: Sage publications.

[20] Gallagher, M. W. (2012). Self-efficacy. In V. H. Ramachadran (2nd ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (pp. 314-320). Elsevier.

[21] Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 37,* 479-507.

[22] Ghonsooly, B., & Elahi, M. (2009). Learners' self-efficacy in reading and its relation to foreign language reading anxiety and reading achievement. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 217,* 46-67**.**

[23] Habing, B. (2003). Exploratory Factor Analysis. Retrieved July 23, 2007 from http://www.stat.sc.edu/~habing/courses/530EFA.pdf

[24] Hall, T. S. (2007*).* Improving self-efficacy in problem solving: Learning from errors and feedback. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved April 5, 2009 from http://library.uncg.edu/.

[25] Hamedi, M., Pishghadam, R., & Ghazanfari, M. (2014). Constructing and validating a scale for English language learners' textbooks through Rasch measurement model. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 3*(6), 73-84.

[26] Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2006). Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*(3), 393-416.

[27] Holden, G. (1991). The relationship of self-efficacy appraisals to subsequent health related outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Social Work in Health Care, 16,* 53-93.

[28] Holden, G., Moncher, M. S., Schinke, S. P., & Barker, K. M. (1990). Self-efficacy of children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Reports, 66,* 1044-1046.

[29] Hubbard, R. & Allen, S.J. (1987). An empirical comparison of alternative methods for principal component extraction. *Journal of Business Research, 15,* 173–90.

[30] Kaiser, H. F. (1970), "A Second Generation Little Jiffy," *Psychometrika, 35,* 401–415.

[31] Ketabi, S., Zabihi, R. Ghadiri, M. (2012).Critical thinking across the ELT curriculum: A mixed methods approach to analyzing L2 teachers' attitudes towards critical thinking instruction. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 2,* 1-10.

[32] Linacre, J. M. (2006a). A user's guide to WINSTEPS/MINISTEP: Rasch-model computer programs. Chicago, IL: Winsteps.com.

[33] Litz, D. R. A. (2005). Textbook evaluation and ELT management: A South Korea case study, *Asian EFL Journal.* Retrieved November 12, 2012 from http://www.Asian-efl-journal.com/ Litz_thesis.Pdf.

[34] Mares, C., (2003). Writing a Coursebook. In B. Tomlinson (Ed*), Developing materials for language teaching* (pp.130-140). London: Continuum.

[35] McDonough, J. & Shaw, C. (1993). Materials and methods in ELT: a teacher's guide. Oxford: Blackwell Pub.

[36] Moritz, S. E., Feltz, D. L., Fahrbach, K. R., & Mack, D. E. (2000). The relation of self-efficacy measures to Sport performance: A meta-analytic review. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 71,* 280-294.

[37] Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38,* 30-38.

[38] Oxenden, C., Koenig, C. L. (2008). American English file: Students' book 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[39] Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. H. (2001). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and school achievement. In R. J. Riding & S. G. Rayner (Eds.), *Self-perception* (pp. 239-265). Westport, CT: Ablex.

[40] Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). Self and self-belief in psychology and education: An historical perspective. In J. Aronson (Ed.) (2002), *Improving Academic Achievement.* New York: Academic Press.

[41] Pallant, J. (2011). SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using the SPSS. England, Open University Press.

[42] Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* 33-40.

[43] Pishghadam R. (2011). Introducing Applied ELT as a new approach in second/foreign language studies. *Iranian EFL Journal, 7*(2), 8-14.

[44] Pishghadam, R, & Zabihi, R. (2012). Life syllabus: A new research agenda in English language teaching. *Perspectives, 19*(1), 23-27.

[45] Rahimi, A., & Gheitasi, P. (2010). The interface between English teachers' sense of efficacy and their feedback on learners' writing, and learners' writing achievement. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5,* 1932-1938.

[46] Richards, J. C., Hull, J., & Proctor, S. (1998). Interchange series: Students' book 2 (3rd ed.). Cambridge: CUP.

[47] Rietveld, T. & Van Hout, R. (1993). Statistical Techniques for the Study of Language and Language Behaviour. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

[48] Sadri, G., & Robertson, I. T. (1993). Self-efficacy and work-related behavior: A review and meta-analysis. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 42,* 139-152.

[49] Sani, A. M., & Zain, Z. (2011). Relating adolescents' second language reading attitudes, self-efficacy for reading, and reading ability in a non-supportive ESL setting. *The Reading Matrix, 11,* 243-254.

[50] Saslow, J. & Ascer, A. (2006). Top Notch 3B: English for today's world. White Plains, NY: Pearson/ Longman.

[51] Saslow, J. & Ascer, A. (2006). Summit 1A: English for today's world. White Plains, NY: Pearson/ Longman.

[52] Schonrock-Adema, J., Heijne-Penninga, M., Van Hell, E.A. & Cohen-Schotanus, J. (2009). Necessary steps in factor analysis: enhancing validation studies of educational instruments. *Medical Teacher, 31,* 226-232.

[53] Schunk, D. H. (1981). Modeling and attributional effects on children's achievement: A self-efficacy analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 73,* 93-105.

[54] Schunk, D. H. (1989). Self-efficacy and cognitive skill learning. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education*: *Goals and cognitions* (pp. 13-44). San Diego: Academic Press.

[55] Sheldon, L. (1987). ELT textbook and materials: Problems in evaluation and development Oxford: Modern English Publications.

[56] Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performances: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 240–261.

[57] Swisher, L. L., Beckstead, J. W., & Bebeau, M. J. (2004). Factor analysis as a tool for survey analysis using a professional role orientation inventory as an example. *Physical Therapy*, *84*(9), 784-799.

[58] Templin, S. A., Guile, T. C, Okuma, T. (2001). Creating a reliable and valid self-efficacy questionnaire and English test to raise learners' L2 achievement via raising self-efficacy. International Conference center, Kitakyushu, Japan. November 22-25.

[59] Thompson, B. (2004*). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis: Understanding concepts and applications. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

[60] Thurstone, L.L. (1947). Multiple factor analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[61] Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2002). Creative self-efficacy: Its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 1137-1148.

[62] Weinberg, R. S., Gould, D., & Jackson, A. (1979). Expectations and performance: An empirical test of Bandura's self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 1,* 320-331.

[63] Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. *ELT Journal*, *37* (3), 251-255.

[64] Woolfolk, A. E., Winne, P. H., & Perry N. E. (2003). Educational psychology. Canada: Pearson Education.

[65] Zimmerman, B. J. (1986). Development of self-regulated learning: Which are the key subprocesses? *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 16*, 307-313.

[66] Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*, 329-339.

[67] Zimmerman, B. J. (1990a). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: *An overview*. *Educational Psychologist, 25*(1), 3-17.

[68] Zimmerman, B. J. (1990b). Self-regulating academic learning and achievement: The emergence of a social cognitive perspective. *Educational Psychology Review, 2,* 173-201.

[69] Zimmerman, B. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. In Bandura, A. (Ed.), *Self- efficacy in Changing society* (pp. 202-231). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[70] 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, 29***,** 663-676.

[71] Zwick, W.R. & Velicer, W.F. (1986). Comparison of five rules for determining the number of components to retain. *Psychological Bulletin*, *99*, 432-42.

Seyyedeh Mina Hamedi, M.A., is a TEFL student at the English Department of Mashhad, Iran. Her primary research interests concern language testing, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, foreign language teaching methodologies, and research methodologies. She has published a number of articles in some international journals.

Reza Pishghadam has a PhD in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).He is currently on the English faculty of Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. He is an associate professor of TEFL and teaches socio-psychological aspects of language education. Over the last five years, he has published more than 120 articles and books in different domains of English-language. In 2007 he was selected to become a member of the National Association of Elites of Iran. In 2010, he was classified as the distinguished researcher in humanities in Iran.

Mohammad Ghazanfari has a PhD in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).He is currently on the English faculty of Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. He is an associate professor of TEFL and teaches several courses such as applied linguistics, discourse analysis, advanced writing, research methodologies and translation. He has a number of published papers in the international language journals and conferences.