# THE EFFECT OF TRANSLANGUAGING ON STUDENT'S SELF EFFICACY IN SPEAKING ENGLISH

## Muhimmatul 'Ulya, Lailatul Masruroh

*English Language Education Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Qomaruddin University, Indonesia*

muhimmatul63@gmail.com, lailatulmasruroh@uqgresik.ac.id

## Abstract

The aim of this study was to identify the effect of translanguaging on students' self-efficacy in speaking. This research used procedure text of personal money management. Translanguaging is a process of creating meaning, shaping experience, acquiring understanding and knowledge by using two languages (Baker, 2011). Recently, it is a suitable strategy for teaching and learning language, especially to gain self-efficacy in speaking English because it gives students freedom to dynamically use their L1 and L2 repertoire which can create safe environment and reducing anxiety in speaking by implementing translanguaging concepts; stance, design, and shift (Carstens, 2016; Vogel & García, 2017; D. Wang, 2019). Then, the subjects were students at SMA Negeri 1 Dukun Mentaras, Dukun, Gresik. This research consists of around 72 eleventh graders students as samples and used quasi-experimental which had an experimental class and control class. Pre-intervention test, treatment, and post-intervention test are the tools used in this research to gather data. Based on the data analysis by comparing the result of pre and post test data of experimental group in Wilcoxon signed-rank (p-value 0.135) and the post test data of control and experimental group in Mann-Whitney U (p-value 0.386), there is no significant improvement on self-efficacy in students speaking English of the experimental group after treatment. It is due to the complication in implementation of translanguaging concepts that are explained in discussion.

*Keywords: Translanguaging, Effect, Self-Efficacy, Speaking English, Procedure Text*

## I    INTRODUCTION

Self-efficacy is an individual belief or judgment of their capability to exert a certain level of control over their personal action and behaviour, in addition to their environmental events (Feist & Feist, 2008). Fundamentally, it is about individual confidence in their ability to achieve desired outcomes and handle various situations effectively (Zwart et al., 2020). It should be noted that self-efficacy is different from self-confidence. It is different in a way that self-confidence is general in nature, while self-efficacy is specific to particular skills (Feist & Feist, 2008). As explained by Bandura in Feist & Feist (2008), a person can have high self-efficacy in one situation and low self-efficacy in another. This occurs because self-efficacy is greatly influenced **by the competencies required for each activity**. Self-efficacy as a psychological aspect is one of the most crucial factors that is often ignored by teachers in learning foreign languages, especially English. Whereas, self-efficacy influences students' cognitive system (Tilfarlioğlu & Cinkara, 2009), motivation (Alawiyah, 2018), level of effort (Gürsoy & Karaca, 2018), persistence, and preference of activities (Mills, 2014), which means, it mediates the relationship between knowledge and action that is very important for students to master the four English skills.

One of the most affected by self-efficacy is speaking skill. As a productive skill, speaking pushes students to elaborate their thoughts using words and sentences orally to create meaningful interaction and engage effectively in communication (Bleistein et al., 2020). In fact, students in EFL classrooms mostly feel anxious and avoid the class activity when it comes to using their speaking skill due to the lack of speaking self-efficacy, belief of their ability to speak the target language, in themselves (Amoah & Yeboah, 2021). Especially in Indonesia, students mostly reject using English to answer or giving simple expressions in class. They often said "I cannot speak English", "I feel embarrassed when I make mistakes", or "I'm afraid my friends will mock me" that implied a feeling of anxiety in speaking (Mukminin et al., 2015). According to Jamshidnejad, those reactions of anxiety in students when they have to speak in English appear due to low self-efficacy in themselves. It is also in line with Gursoy and Karaca's (Gürsoy & Karaca, 2018) statement that anxiety in speaking is greatly influenced by a student's level of self-efficacy. Students' perception on themself to be a perfect speaker that is fluent and mastering all linguistic aspects make them afraid to speak when they feel that they don't fit the criteria. Then, the perception of other people's expectation and reaction to their speaking also makes them afraid to make a mistake that might humiliate themselves (Jamshidnejad, 2020). That is why self-efficacy is very crucial for students' speaking, it reduces their anxiety which affects their confidence to express their thoughts using English.

The use of appropriate approaches is very important to help teachers in solving this problem of self-efficacy in student's speaking skill. By this conjecture, there is a potential of using translanguaging to increase students' self-efficacy in speaking English. According to Canagarajah (2011) translanguaging is multilingual or bilingual skills to move fluidly between languages and view the various languages in their repertoire as a unified system. This perspective opposes code-switching as a traditional view of bilingualism. Which, code-switching understood as the alternation between two or more distinct languages that treat each language as a separate system. While, translanguaging adopts the dynamic perspective that views an individual's entire linguistic repertoire as an integrated system and suggests multilingual speakers use their entire linguistic resources to communicate and make sense of their world (Bhatt & Bolonyai, 2020). Other studies also mention translanguaging as a process of creating meaning, shaping experience, acquiring understanding and knowledge by using two languages (Baker, 2011). Vogel and Garcia (Vogel & García, 2017) also state that translanguaging is an ability to move fluidly between languages that students have and utilize it to enhance their engagement and understanding of complex texts and content. It is an approach in bilingual education that supports the development of both languages as a unified system of students' overall linguistic repertoire. Translanguaging gives students flexibility to use both languages in expressing their thoughts which can create a safe environment (Carstens, 2016) that reduces anxiety (D. Wang, 2019) in speaking foreign languages, which might help developing speaking self-efficacy. So, this research focuses on finding the translanguaging effect on students' self-efficacy in speaking English for the eleventh graders of SMA Negeri 1 Dukun.

## II    MATERIALS AND METHOD

This research used Quasi-Experimental design from a quantitative method. It is one of experimental designs that does not use randomization to choose the group sample due to ethical issues. Quasi-experimental consists of a control and experimental group. To gain the data, it uses pre-test as a task before the treatment to determine the sample's baseline, post-test as a test that is conducted after giving intervention/treatment, and treatment that is an intervention applied to analyse its effect on the dependent variable. While the treatment is only given in the experimental group (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Shofi & Masruroh, 2018). Quasi-experiment aims to find out whether the intervention might change participants' behaviour after exposure to it (Mgijima & Makalela, 2016). This design is very suitable for this study that wants to find the influence of the translanguaging approach in students' self-efficacy.

The research was conducted in SMA Negeri 1 Dukun in the first semester of academic year 2024/2025 in October 2024. In preliminary observation in eleventh graders, it has been found that most students refused to use English in the English subject class because the medium of communication was used mostly in Indonesian, while the English appeared just in the form of basic expressions. Unfortunately, this caused students to mock the use of English in class, both when used by fellow students and teachers, which creates anxious and shameful moments for students who try to speak English. The sample was 36 students from XI-2 as experimental group and 36 students from XI-3 as control group (total sample 72 students). Then, the data was collected in four meetings including pre-intervention, treatment, and post-intervention. Also, to give a topic limitation this study used procedure text.

To gain the data this study used an oral speaking test and Questionnaire of English Self-Efficacy adopted from Wang (2013). The oral speaking test was conducted by giving students a procedure text that they have to retell it to the researcher. It used to trigger students' experiences speaking English. Then, the Questionnaire of English self-Efficacy (C. Wang et al., 2013) consists of 8 questions about self-efficacy in speaking that are measured using 1-7 points rating scale.

The treatment focused on using translanguaging (English-Indonesia) as medium of class communication by implementing the key concepts (stance, design, shift). First is the stance that refers to the belief of teachers and students that the students' entire repertoire (L1 and L2) is an interconnected and valuable resource. In this stage, using translanguaging by mixing Indonesian and English can help teachers show and encourage students in realizing that all their repertoire is valuable. Even if their English vocabulary is limited, inappropriate grammar, and not fluent they are still categorized as people that can use and speak English. Which means accepting their ability of English and Indonesian can impact their self-efficacy (Vogel & García, 2017; D. Wang, 2019). Second is design, a strategic lesson plan that can encourage the practice of translanguaging in class. By giving appropriate translanguaging lesson plans can create a safe environment that gives students self-efficacy to experiment in speaking

using English without any doubt (Carstens, 2016). The last is shift, this translanguaging concept give students time to adjust the shift in using both languages, which give them appropriate time to feel themselve and build their efficacy (D. Wang, 2019).

To find the student self-efficacy baseline, the first meeting occurred by giving a pre-test. The pre-test consists of an oral speaking test and self-efficacy questionnaire. The oral test is conducted by giving the students a procedure text. The students were asked to orally retell the text after 10 minutes of preparation. After the oral test, the questionnaire of self-efficacy (C. Wang et al., 2013) is given to the students.

The questionnaire consists of 8 questions designed to measure students' self-efficacy in speaking English. Examples of the aforementioned question are "Can you tell a story in English?", "Can you answer your teacher's questions in English?". Students respond to these questions using a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 indicates "strongly disagree" and 7 indicates "strongly agree".

In the second and third meeting the researcher used translanguaging (English-Indonesian) as the medium of instruction in experimental class, and Indonesian as medium of interaction in control class. Both classes studied procedure text by discussion and games. Then, the post-test was conducted in the fourth meeting by doing the same procedure as the pre-test.

## III  RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1  RESULTS

After all procedures of the research including collecting pre-test, post-test data and giving intervention have been done, SPSS 21 engine has been used to compare the data to establish whether translanguaging affects student's efficacy in speaking English. In the beginning of the research, the sample was 72 participants including 36 participants from XI-2 (experimental group) and 36 participants from XI-3 (control group). After removing invalid data there were 26 data of pre-test post-test from the experimental group and 31 data of pre-test post-test of the control group.

*Table 1. The Result of Pre-test and Post-test in Experimental and Control Group*

| EXPERIMENTAL CLASS | | | CONTROL CLASS | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject | Pre-test | Post-test | Subject | Pre-test | Post-test |
| E-1 | 49 | 37 | C-1 | 22 | 32 |
| E-2 | 24 | 31 | C-2 | 26 | 34 |
| E-3 | 30 | 33 | C-3 | 32 | 35 |
| E-4 | 33 | 34 | C-4 | 32 | 34 |
| E-5 | 16 | 24 | C-5 | 25 | 21 |
| E-6 | 50 | 36 | C-6 | 30 | 31 |
| E-7 | 31 | 30 | C-7 | 47 | 35 |
| E-8 | 47 | 47 | C-8 | 28 | 28 |
| E-9 | 38 | 46 | C-9 | 23 | 23 |
| E-10 | 39 | 46 | C-10 | 30 | 29 |
| E-11 | 36 | 36 | C-11 | 35 | 35 |
| E-12 | 24 | 27 | C-12 | 32 | 28 |
| E-13 | 31 | 29 | C-13 | 35 | 36 |

| E-14 | 31 | 34 | C-14 | 19 | 34 |
|------|----|----|------|----|----|
| E-15 | 31 | 29 | C-15 | 35 | 48 |
| E-16 | 31 | 52 | C-16 | 35 | 36 |
| E-17 | 54 | 54 | C-17 | 45 | 50 |
| E-18 | 32 | 37 | C-18 | 46 | 33 |
| E-19 | 35 | 42 | C-19 | 52 | 54 |
| E-20 | 33 | 36 | C-20 | 35 | 34 |
| E-21 | 39 | 46 | C-21 | 28 | 30 |
| E-22 | 32 | 48 | C-22 | 49 | 49 |
| E-23 | 34 | 32 | C-23 | 39 | 37 |
| E-24 | 35 | 35 | C-24 | 23 | 24 |
| E-25 | 30 | 21 | C-25 | 35 | 25 |
| E-26 | 30 | 21 | C-26 | 21 | 22 |
|      |    |    | C-27 | 44 | 48 |
|      |    |    | C-28 | 28 | 24 |
|      |    |    | C-29 | 26 | 28 |
|      |    |    | C-30 | 48 | 53 |
|      |    |    | C-31 | 35 | 37 |

After the final data obtained, the next process was determining the normality distribution of data. It aims to determine which type of test can be used, parametric test or non-parametric test. Then, the result of the normality test showed as follow:

*Table 2. The Normality Test of Experimental and Control Groups in Pre-test and Post-test Data*

|                | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|----------------|-----------|----|------|-----------|----|------|
|                | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| PreExperiment  | .183      | 26 | .025 | .915      | 26 | .035 |
| PostExperiment | .151      | 26 | .129 | .958      | 26 | .358 |
| PreControl     | .183      | 26 | .025 | .946      | 26 | .184 |
| PostControl    | .203      | 26 | .007 | .907      | 26 | .023 |

According to the table above, the data normality test used by Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk with the significance level or alpha is 0.05. The Result appeared that the data in pre-test of the experimental group gained a significant value of 0.025 and 0.35 that is lower than 0.05, which indicated that this data is not normally distributed. The post-test data of the experimental group gained a significant value of 0.129 and 0.358 which is higher than 0.05 and indicated that the data is normally

distributed. Then, the pre-test data of the control group gained 0.025 in kolmogorov-Smirnov that indicate not normally distributed and 0.184 Shapiro-Wilk that indicate normally distributed. Due to the different result, the data is indicated as not normally distributed. The post-test gained significant values of 0.007 and 0.023 which indicate that the data is also not normally distributed. In addition, it can indicate that all sets of data categorized as not normally distributed and cannot run a parametric test. So, to find the effect of translanguaging in students' speaking self-efficacy, this research used a non-parametric test.

*Table 3. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test in Experimental and Control Groups*

|  | PostExperiment-PreExperiment | PostControl-PreControl |
|---|---|---|
| Z | -1.496[b] | -1.206[b] |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .135 | .228 |

The results of Wilcoxon signed rank in control group post-test and pretest appeared with asymptotic significance (2-tailed) value or p-value is 0.228 which, higher than 0,05. So, it proved that using Indonesian or Bahasa Indonesia as a medium of communication in an EFL classroom did not help students to gain self-efficacy in speaking English. Then, the results of the experimental group post-test and pretest appeared with asymptotic significance (2-tailed) value or p-value is 0.135 which is higher than 0,05. It indicates that there was no significant difference in self-efficacy in speaking English on students before and after using translanguaging (English-Indonesia) as medium of class communication. Then, to gain a deeper analysis for describing the data, the researcher continued the measurement with Mann-Whitney U test to compare experimental group and control group. The result of the test displayed as follow:

*Table 4. Mann-Whitney U Rank*

|  | Group | N | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre | Control | 31 | 27.87 | 864.00 |
|  | Experiment | 26 | 30.35 | 789.00 |
|  | Total | 57 |  |  |
| Post | Control | 31 | 27.26 | 845.00 |
|  | Experiment | 26 | 31.08 | 808.00 |
|  | Total | 57 |  |  |

The preceding table shows a comparative analysis of the control and experimental groups based on mean rank data for both pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test phase, the control group consisting of 31 participants achieved a mean rank of 27.87. While the experimental group consisting of 26 participants had a slightly higher mean rank of 30.35. This suggests that in the beginning of research, the experimental group's baseline of self-efficacy in speaking was marginally ranked higher than the control group.

Then, in the post-test phase the control group mean rank was 27.26 and the experimental group mean rank was 31.08. It showed there was a decreased mean rank in the control group and slightly increased in experimental group mean rank. Although these mean ranks showed a small shift, it could have been assumed that students in the experimental class who were exposed to translanguaging might have developed a marginally higher level of self-efficacy in speaking English than those in the control group. Then to confirm the assumptions that emerged from the mean rank results, the researcher then examined the statistical results of the test presented in the following table:

*Table 4 Mann-Whitney U Test Statistic*

|  | Pre | Post |
|---|---|---|
| Mann-Whitney U | 368.000 | 349.000 |
| Wilcoxon W | 864.000 | 845.000 |
| Z | -.563 | -.867 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .574 | .386 |

The table above provided Mann-Whitney U statistical results. For the pre-test result of the experimental group and control group, the Mann-Whitney U value is 368.000, with a corresponding Wilcoxon W value of 864.000. The Z-score for the pre-test phase is -0.563, and the associated Asymptotic Significance (2-tailed) value or p-value is 0.574. This p-value was considerably above the commonly accepted threshold of 0.05, which indicated that the observed rank difference in the pre-test did not statistically have a significant difference. It concluded that the baseline self-efficacy in speaking English of both experimental and control groups was the same.

In the post-test, the Mann-Whitney U value was slightly lower at 349.000, with a Wilcoxon W value of 845.000. The Z-score was -0.867, with a p-value of 0.386, which also exceeded the 0.05 threshold. So, the measurement in this research found that the results were not significantly different. Which means, Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. The hypothesis of this research explained below:

(3-1)    The null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted when the value of t score > t table, significant level 0.05. This indicated that there was significant difference in self-efficacy in speaking English between students taught using translanguaging (Indonesian-English) and students taught entirely in Bahasa Indonesia.

(3-2)    The alternative hypothesis (Ha) was rejected and the null hypothesis (Ho) was accepted when the value of t score > t table, significant level 0.05. This indicated that there was no significant difference in self-efficacy in speaking English between students taught using translanguaging (Indonesian-English) and students taught entirely in Bahasa Indonesia.

In line with the acceptance of null hypothesis (Ho) and the rejection of alternative hypothesis (Ha) due to the value of t score was lower than t table. It indicated that there was no substantial effect of self-efficacy in speaking English between students that utilized translanguaging (English-Indonesia) as a medium of instruction and students who utilized Indonesian as a medium of instruction in class.

## 3.2   DISCUSSION

Based on the result above, from 72 samples the final pre-test and post-test data sets were found for 26 participants in the experimental class and 31 participants in the control class which were not normally distributed. Then, the purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of translanguaging on students' self-efficacy in speaking English. Several tests in SPSS were carried out in processing the data obtained to prove the research objectives.

The result of Mann-Whitney U test for comparing experimental group and control group pretest has a significant value of 0.574. It indicated that before the treatment was held, the baseline of students' self-efficacy in speaking English of both groups was equal. Then after the treatment given, the researcher used Wilcoxon signed-rank test to determine the shift between pre-test and post-test in each group The Wilcoxon signed-rank test on the control group revealed that the comparison of pre-test and post-test was no significant difference with a significant value of 0.228. It proved that the use of Bahasa Indonesia as medium of class communication did not help students to have self-efficacy in speaking English. Unfortunately, the experimental group test brought out the same result. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test of the experimental group showed no significant difference with a significant value of 0.135, which is higher than 0.05. This dictates that the use of incorporating English and Bahasa Indonesia (translanguaging) did not affect students' self-efficacy in speaking English. Then automatically, the post-test comparison of both groups was revealing no significant difference.

According to Donley (2022) and Vogel & Garcia (2017) translanguaging as an approach of language learning in bilingual education comes with three key concepts. First is stance, it refers to the belief and attitude of teachers and students that the students' entire repertoire (L1 and L2) is an

interconnected resource that can enhance learning. Second is design that reflects a strategic plan that encourages students to use multiple languages by spontaneously mixing for practicing language features in academic tasks. Third is shift, which reflects the moment-by-moment needs of learners to adjust the shifts between languages to ensure understanding, engagement, or clarification. Those concepts indicate that translanguaging supports dynamic and flexibility in using language in each person. That is why this research investigates the translanguaging effect on self-efficacy in speaking English. Even though the result showed that translanguaging did not affect students' self-efficacy in speaking English, it might have appeared due to some complication in implementation of the concept.

Based on the accidental observation during the implementation of translanguaging (English-Indonesian) in an experimental group, the researcher found that most students had imagined English as a difficult lesson that makes them feel ashamed if they cannot use and pronounce it correctly in academic tasks. This indicated that students viewed English not as the actual language itself, which there was no belief in themselves that each English word in their repertoire is a valuable resource for themselves to improve their English ability. So, the stance as the first concept in implementing translanguaging has not been fulfilled properly. This affected on unsuccessfully building a proper and safe environment to utilize translanguaging, which also affected the process of gaining self-efficacy in speaking English.

## IV    CONCLUSION

The finding of this study revealed that there is no significant difference in students' self-efficacy in speaking English between students taught using translanguaging (Indonesian-English) and students taught entirely in Bahasa Indonesia as medium of class communication in eleventh grade of SMA Negeri 1 Dukun. This result can be seen that the Wilcoxon Signed-rank result of the experiment pre-test and post-test comparison gained 0.135 value that is lower than 0.05 and the Mann-Whitney U result of control and experimental groups post-test comparison gained 0.386 that is also lower than 0.05. Which means, translanguaging does not affect or increase students' self-efficacy in speaking English. This result can appear due to complications in implementation of the stance concept in class that affects the process of building a safe environment that can influence the growth of self-efficacy in students.

## REFERENCES

Alawiyah, T. (2018). Speaking Self-Efficacy and EFL Student Teachers' Speaking Achievement. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran, 5*(1), 87–96. https://doi.org/10.19109/ejpp.v5i1.2052

Amoah, S., & Yeboah, J. (2021). The speaking difficulties of Chinese EFL learners and their motivation towards speaking the English language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17*(1), 56–69. https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.4

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual matters.

Bhatt, R. M., & Bolonyai, A. (2020). Code-switching and Translanguaging. In J.-O. Östman & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics: 22nd Annual Instalment*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/hop.22

Bleistein, T., Smith, M. K., & Lewis, M. (2020). *Teaching Speaking*, Revised. TESOL Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Carstens, A. (2016). Translanguaging as a vehicle for L2 acquisition and L1 development: Students' perceptions. *Language Matters, 47*(2), 203–222. https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2016.1153135

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.

Donley, K. (2022). Translanguaging as a theory, pedagogy, and qualitative research methodology. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 12*(3–4), 105–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/26390043.2022.2079391

Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2008). *Theories of Personality (Seventh edition)*. McGraw-Hill.

Gürsoy, E., & Karaca, N. (2018). The Effect of Speaking Anxiety on Speaking Self-Efficacy of Children in a Fll Context. *International Journal of Language Academy, 6*(24), 194–210. https://doi.org/10.18033/ijla.3947

Jamshidnejad, A. (Ed.). (2020). *Speaking English as a Second Language: Learners' Problems and Coping Strategies*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55057-8

Mgijima, M. V. D., & Makalela, P. L. (2016). The effects of translanguaging on the bi-literate inferencing strategies of fourth grade learners. *Perspectives in Education, 34*(3). https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v34i3.7

Mills, N. (2014). 2. Self-Efficacy in Second Language Acquisition. In S. Mercer & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple Perspectives on the Self in SLA* (pp. 6–22). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/doi:10.21832/9781783091362-003

Mukminin, A., Masbirorotni, M., Noprival, N., Sutarno, S., Arif, N., & Maimunah, M. (2015). EFL Speaking Anxiety among Senior High School Students and Policy Recommendations. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn), 9*(3), 217–225. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v9i3.1828

Shofi, A. T., & Masruroh, L. (2018). *The Effectiveness of Using Multimedia-Based Learning to Improve the Students' Speaking in English of Stkip Qomaruddin Gresik*.

Tilfarlioğlu, F. Y., & Cinkara, E. (2009). *Self- Efficacy in Efl: Differences Among Proficiency Groups and Relationship with Success*.

Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In S. Vogel & O. García, *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181

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, 59*, 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2013.02.004

Wang, D. (2019). *Multilingualism and Translanguaging in Chinese Language Classrooms*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02529-8

Zwart, D. P., Noroozi, O., Van Luit, J. E. H., Goei, S. L., & Nieuwenhuis, A. (2020). Effects of Digital Learning Materials on nursing students' mathematics learning, self-efficacy, and task value in vocational education. *Nurse Education in Practice, 44*, 102755. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2020.102755