the direction and strength of influences between self-efficacy and variables such as practice time, anxiety, and grade level. McPherson and McCormick (2006) identified one configuration of variables in which the data fit the proposed model, ^{2} (364, = 686) = 1837.78, < .01, AGFI = .93, and RMSEA = .08. In this model, self-efficacy mediated the influence of formal practice, informal practice, practice regulation, and grade level on the outcome variable of music performance. Self-efficacy beliefs determined, in part, the level of influence each variable had on performance achievement.

Although these studies have made important contributions to our understanding of self-efficacy, one area of concern has been the diversity of data collection techniques. Some researchers have adapted measures from other content areas. Nielsen (2004) altered the academic self-efficacy section from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (Pintrich et. al, 1991), and Ritchie and Williamon (2007) modified the general self-efficacy subscale from Sherer and others' (1982) Self-Efficacy Scale. Other researchers have

Several types of analyses were conducted. The objective of these analyses was to provide evidence in

regardless of missing data. No attempt was made to impute the missing scores. Extreme scores in which participants rated themselves very high or very low were not considered outliers due to the nature of the content and were included in the analyses. At first, the normality of the data distributions came into question. The results from the MPSES, CPSES, and WSES indicated non-normal distributions for each scale based on visual inspection of stem-and-leaf plots, box-and-whisker plots, and the Shapiro-Wilks test for normality (< .0001). In contrast to these results, the skewness and kurtosis values were in acceptable ranges (s1 (w) -

Table 3
-

Bandura's framework may also be applied to music. Rather than   , researchers interested in this topic might look to other studies for ideas and paradigms to explore self-efficacy.

Conclusion

The Music Performance Self-Efficacy Scale was constructed to measure the sources of self-efficacy in music performance. Although some self-efficacy measurements have been developed for specific events or contexts, the items in this scale were intentionally designed to be broad, allowing them to be applicable to different types of performing ensembles, different grade levels, different levels of music experience, and different times of the school year. This perspective follows Bandura's belief that the level of specificity in measuring self-efficacy should be consistent with the level of specificity to which one wishes to generalize. This broad and general scale of music performance self-efficacy was designed to reach broad and general conclusions. The unique feature of this scale is its ability to measure the sources of information that contribute to the development of self-efficacy beliefs.

This scale is a diagnostic tool. The target population for this scale is middle and high school music students. The results can be used to drive instructional choices based on the students' strengths and weaknesses. Educators may also use the data to evaluate the effectiveness of their own instructional practices and procedures. This scale can be used in a pretest-posttest design, or as a one-time "snapshot." To control consequential validity, it is essential that the results of this scale are kept confidential by the teacher and that they should not be used as a measure of achievement or academic grading.

It is my hope that the development and validation of this scale will provide researchers with a tool to pursue further investigations of self-efficacy in music performance. This study was conducted with one group of middle school students. Recommendations for future research would include carrying out a similar study with a larger and more diverse group of participants. It would also be beneficial to correlate the scores from this scale with music performance scores. This may be a particularly difficult task since music performance scores are often subjective and calculated in many different ways. Further examination of the differences in self-efficacy among students in various ensembles such as band, chorus, and string orchestra is another topic that warrants investment of time and energy. A final recommendation would be to establish scores for the sections, or sources of self-efficacy, that teachers can use as benchmarks. Teachers can then use these scores to compare their students' subtotal scores and determine the strengths and weaknesses of their students' self-efficacy in music performance. These efforts will result in a greater understanding of self-efficacy in music performance and improve student achievement by providing a balance of instruction in musical skills and self-perceptions in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Hendricks, K. S. (2009). -

-   (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved October 17, 2010,

Appendix A

Music Performance Self-Efficacy Scale

Identification Code:_____

Sources of Music Performance Self-Efficacy Scale

Directions: Respond to the following statements based on your current level of musical ability, experience, and primary instrument or voice. There are no right or wrong answers. Indicate to what degree you either agree or disagree with the statement by writing

_____16. People have told me that my practice efforts have improved my performance
skills.

_____17. I have received positive feedback on music performance evaluations.

_____18. I have met or exceeded other people's expectations of being a good musician
for someone of my age.

_____19. Write only the number 9 for this answer (not 0-100 rating).

Part IV - (Physiological state)

_____20. Performing with my instrument makes me feel good (Return to using 0-100 rating).

_____21. I enjoy participating

CHINESE ABSTRACT

Michael S. Zelenak

.   .   ,   . .

(MPSES)

Bandura

$\alpha = .97$

Bandura $(224) = 568.49$ $< .001$ $= .95$

$= .07$ $= .04$ Bandura

1 $= 0.63$ $(4{,}287) = 42.88$ $< .001$

(