





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,  $\chi^2(364, N = 686) = 1837.78$ ,  $p < .01$ , 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 ( $p < .0001$ ). In contrast to these results, the skewness and kurtosis values were in acceptable ranges (skewness  $< 1$ , kurtosis  $< 3$ ).



Table 3

-



Bandura's framework may also be applied

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

Bandura  
= .07      Bandura = .04  
(MPSES)  
Bandura      (224) = 568.49 < .001       $\alpha = .97$   
Bandura      = .95

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