RESEARCH ARTICLE: Growth mindset and english language learning efficacy among junior high school students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School

Alfaiza T. Iribani[1]*, Nelson U. Julhamid[1], Masnona L. Sabdani-Asiri[1]
[1]Sulu State College Graduate School, Capitol Site, Jolo, Sulu
*Corresponding author: iribanialfaiza@gmail.com

Abstract. This study assessed the level of students' growth mindset and English language learning efficacy of junior high school students at Sulu State College– Laboratory High School during the School Year 2022-2023 using descriptive-correlational study. With 100 samples taken through non-probability sampling method via purposive sampling, and with the use of weighted mean, standard deviation, t-test for independent samples, One-way ANOVA, and Pearson's r, this study reveals the following findings: 1) Out of 100 student-respondents, mostly are female, within the range of 20 years old & below, whose parents have college level of education, whose parents' monthly earning pegged at 10,000 & below, and grade level from 7 to 10 are equally represented. 2) On the average, students moderately believe that their own intelligence allows them to embrace and overcome difficulties in learning English language. 3) On the average, students have high ability and efficacy in learning English language through self-efficacy in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. 4) Generally, students' demographic profiles in terms of Age, Average Monthly Family Income, and Grade Level do significantly mediate in ways how they assessed the Growth Mindset. 5) Generally, students' demographic profiles do not significantly mediate in ways how they assessed English language learning efficacy. 6) The junior high school students at Sulu State College-Laboratory High School who assessed the level of Growth Mindset as Moderate Level are most probably the same group of junior high school students who assessed the English Language Learning efficacy with High Level, respectively. 7) This study seems to support Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive Framework which espouses that the triadic interaction between personal, behavioral and environmental factors is central to the social cognitive theory. Accordingly, human beings have cognitive abilities to self-organize, self-reflect, and self-regulate according to the changes in the environment and determine their own social destiny. In order to do so, people have to be proactive in their development and make things happen through their own efforts.

Keywords: Growth, Mindset, English Language, Learning Efficacy, Development

ARTICLE DETAILS
SPHE-0003; Received: January 28, 2024; Accepted: February 22, 2024; Online March 14, 2024
CITATION:
Iribani, Alfaiza T., Julhamid, Nelson U., Sabdani-Asiri, Masnona L. (2024). Growth mindset and english language learning efficacy among junior high school students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School. Social Psychology and Human Experience. DOI: https://doi.org/10.62596/q9e5f423.

Introduction

For students to be successful in their educational endeavor, they need to have quality learning in basic education that can be triggered by the quality of teaching practices in English language subject. The goal of students to achieve higher degree of academic performance can be propelled by their performance in English language. Students' growth mindset, vis-à-vis their perception and beliefs about one's own intelligence is related to their English Language Learning Efficacy. The beliefs about one's own intelligence allow individuals to embrace and overcome difficulties. Students who perceive their intelligence is malleable show persistence and effort in their task unlike the students with fixed mindsets (Rui, Y. & Muthukrishnan, P., 2019).

Student self-beliefs are significantly related to several types of achievement outcomes (Rui, Y. & Muthukrishnan, P., 2019), albeit students' English Language Learning Efficacy. The Philippines, like any other countries, needs to produce citizen who are proficient in the use of the English language, people who can communicate internationally and actively participate in international affairs. To this effect, the DepEd's k-12 educational program, through the basic school curriculum, is advocating for the 21st century skills, vis-à-vis digital age literacies, inventive thinking, effective communication, and high productivity.

Self-efficacy is defined as learners' beliefs in their capability to succeed in executing a task (Bandura, 1986; Bernhardt, 1997 as cited in Raoofi et al., 2012). It is a context-specific perception (Bandura, 1986) and is also defined as a person's subjective convictions to successfully learn or complete a specific task given the skills, he/she processes (Pajares, 1996). Later, Pajares (2000) accounts for self-efficacy as related to the way how students judge their academic competence, wherefore related to students' growth mindset. As an affective variable, self-efficacy affects our decision, behaviors and attempts when facing challenges (Bandura, 1986).

Therefore, these research findings brought new insights in understanding the students' growth mindset and the importance of students' English language learning efficacy. The research findings will also assist teachers and educators to provide more effective measures, allow students to develop growth mindset and to guide students to perform better in EFL classroom. It should be noted that research on teaching and learning processes in EFL classroom in the Philippines is still at its infancy and many questions related to students' beliefs and English language learning efficacy are still unexplored. It is hoped that this current study added some new knowledge in this area. Therefore, the present research gathered empirical data as basis to determine the identified research questions.

Research Questions

This study determined the Growth Mindset and English Language Learning Efficacy among junior high school students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School during the School Year 2022-2023. Specifically, this study sought answers to following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of junior high school students at Sulu State in terms of (a) gender, (b) age, (c) parent's educational attainment, (d) parent's average monthly income, and (e) grade level?
2. What is the level of Growth Mindset of junior high school students at Sulu State College?
3. What is the level of English language learning efficacy of junior high school students at Sulu State College in terms of self-efficacy for (a) learning, (b) speaking, (c) reading, and (d) writing?
4. Is there a significant difference in the level of Growth Mindset of junior high school students at Sulu State College when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of a) gender, (b) age, (c) parent's educational attainment, (d) parent's average monthly income, and (e) grade level?
5. Is there a significant difference in the level of English language learning efficacy of junior high school students at Sulu State College when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of a) gender, (b) age, (c) parent's educational attainment, (d) parent's average monthly income, and (e) grade level?
6. Is there a significant correlation between Growth Mindset and English language learning efficacy of junior high school students at Sulu State College-Laboratory High School?

Literature Review

Mindset

Dweck (1999 in Rhew et al., 2018) explored why certain students enjoyed learning, even though the work was difficult, while other students were anxious or unwilling to attempt tasks that appeared challenging. She developed a theory of mindset with a spectrum ranging from the fixed mindset to the growth mindset. The spectrum illustrated how people could have different mindsets—fixed or growth—toward varying areas within their lives. For example, students with a fixed mindset toward their ability to complete academic tasks may simultaneously experience a growth mindset toward their ability to play baseball. Students with a fixed mindset deem intelligence as a factor that cannot be changed (Dweck, 1999, 2006; Mueller & Dweck, 1998 in Rhew et al., 2018). Normally, students with a fixed mindset saw their

failures, whether academic or not, as a reflection of their intelligence. Even more debilitating for students was the combination of exerting effort and still enduring failure; this blend left the fixed mindset students with no other excuse for their failure except perceived lack of intelligence (Dweck, 2006 in Rhew et al., 2018).

Research shows growth mindset can lead to better cognitive and affective states in learning (Aronson et al., 2002; Costa et al., Good et al., 2003; Blackwell et al., 2007). Zeng et al. (2016) found a positive impact of growth mindset on Chinese students' (n=1279) psychological wellbeing and school engagement. Other studies have shown that students with incremental view earned significantly higher grades or greater academic performance (Aronson, Fried, & Good, 2002; Blackwell et al., 2007; Good, Aronson, & Inzlicht, 2003; Henderson & Dweck, 1990; Romero, Master, Paunesku, Dweck, & Gross, 2014; Yeager & Dweck, 2012), deeper perceptual level (Grant & Dweck, 2003), higher task value (Degol, Wang, Zhang, & Allerton, 2018), more adaptive to learning (Yeager & Dweck, 2012), greater interest in classroom activities (Aronson et al., 2002; Hidi & Renninger, 2006), boost self-confidence (Abdullah, 2008; Dweck, 2007; Kamins & Dweck, 1999), higher psychological well-being and engagement (Zeng, Hou, & Peng, 2016), higher happiness (Costa, 2018; Sudnawa, Theeranate & Yailaibang, 2019), resilience (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995) and higher motivation in writing (Truax, 2017).

Students with a fixed mindset characteristically ignore constructive feedback and feel threatened by the success of their peers (Saunders, 2013). They may blame outside factors for their failure. For instance, if they failed a test, fixed mindset students might blame teachers by suggesting, "They did not teach us that," or, "That was not on the study guide." As a result, students with a fixed mindset tended to believe that their failure was not due to their lack of skill or determination, but rather the result of other people's actions (Dweck, 2006 in Rhew et al., 2018).

Conversely, students with a growth mindset believed that intelligence was malleable and could change, and through their failures, they learned and grew. Belief in the importance of effort permitted students with a growth mindset to view failure as a motivator that drove them to continue learning (Blackwell, Trzesniewski, & Dweck, 2007; Plaks & Stecher, 2007 in Rhew et al., 2018). Eventually, growth mindset students' persistence and desire to persevere resulted in success (Dweck, 1999, 2006 in Rhew et al., 2018). Furthermore, students with a growth mindset used constructive feedback to improve and learned from the success of others (Saunders, 2013 in Rhew et al., 2018). Dweck (2006 in Rhew et al., 2018) found student improvement even when the feedback was negative. Students with a growth mindset did not blame outside factors for their failures, and they looked for ways to improve on the subsequent assessments.

Self-efficacy

Psychologist Albert Bandura (1986 in Rhew et al., 2018) described self-efficacy as a belief in one's own ability to be successful in particular circumstances. Self-efficacy attitudes governed how prospects and hindrances were observed and affected not only people's choices, but how much they were willing to strive and persist until they were successful (Bandura, 1997 in Rhew et al., 2018). An individual's self-efficacy was built upon past successes, especially ones that challenged the individual and were overcome with abundant effort. Otherwise, failures easily shattered an individual's sense of self-efficacy, especially if the individual only achieved accomplishments effortlessly (Bandura, 1995 in Rhew et al., 2018).

In addition, if individuals with a growth mindset observed others succeeding at a task, they perceived that they had the potential to be successful. When individuals with a fixed mindset observed others failing at a task or if individuals were given negative verbal feedback about their ability to achieve, these individuals put forth less effort or would not attempt the task at hand (Bandura, 1995 in Rhew et al., 2018).

Academic self-efficacy significantly affected students' success at the secondary level and in higher-education coursework. "Self-efficacy beliefs have shown convergent validity in influencing such key indices of academic motivation as choice of activities, level of effort, persistence, and emotional reactions" (Zimmerman, 2000, p. 86 in Rhew et al., 2018). Therefore, students who had greater levels of academic self-efficacy were more likely to work harder to complete a challenging task. Students with high academic self-efficacy tended to be eager to participate in an activity, persevered through trials, and had fewer emotional frustrations or negative feelings when they were not successful than students who had lower academic self-efficacy (Zimmerman, 2000 in Rhew et al., 2018).

Self-efficacy was an essential component to students' ability to complete daily classroom activities, perform well on standardized assessments, and succeed overall in school (Pajares & Schunk, 2001 in Rhew et al., 2018). "Compared with students who doubt their learning capabilities, those who feel efficacious for learning or performing a task participate more readily, work harder, persist longer when they encounter difficulties, and achieve at a higher level" (Pajares & Schunk, 2001, p. 2–3 in Rhew et al., 2018). Self-efficacy "makes a difference in how people feel, think and act" (Schwarzer, 2014, p. 1 in Rhew et al., 2018). For instance, low self-efficacy caused feelings of depression and anxiety as well as an overall feeling of helplessness (Schwarzer, 2014). Klassen, Krawchuk, and Rajani (2008 in Rhew et al., 2018) found that undergraduate students with lower self-efficacy had significantly lower GPAs and higher tendencies to procrastinate on daily academic work.

Self-Efficacy and Growth Mindset Inter-relationship

Academic self-efficacy is a person's perception that he or she will succeed in a certain task or domain (Honicke & Broadbent, 2016 in Zander et al., 2018). Students' academic self-efficacy can enhance feelings of preparedness for university and facilitate successful transitions (Byrne & Flood, 2005 in in Zander et al., 2018) and is related to academic achievement (Brouwer, Jansen, Flache, & Hofman, 2016; Honicke & Broadbent, 2016; Richardson, Abraham, & Bond, 2012 in Zander et al., 2018). While self-efficacy can be influenced by others (Siciliano, 2016; Usher & Pajares, 2008 in Zander et al., 2018), it is still unclear whether highly self-efficacious students are more attractive as providers of academic support. On the one hand, students entertaining these optimistic "I-can-do-believes" (Kraft, Rise, Sutton, & Roysamb, 2005 in Zander et al., 2018) can serve as models to overcome challenges. So asking for advice from a person who signals high self-efficacy (Siciliano, 2016 in Zander et al., 2018) can be appropriate. On the other hand, in a new learning environment students may feel insecure. So rather than serving as a successful model, asking someone for support who expresses high self-confidence in his or her ability to master challenges could evoke threats and perceptions of incompetence in help- and support-seekers, and ultimately leading to avoidance (Nadler, 2015 in Zander et al., 2018). In the latter case, students may prefer to approach someone with similar self-efficacy beliefs or feelings (Townsend, Kim, & Mesquita, 2014 in Zander et al., 2018).

On the other hand, growth mindset is concept that may facilitate adaptive responses to challenges in educational settings. Zander et al. (2018) explain that implicit theories of intelligence, also labeled as growth and fixed mindsets, form a framework that people can use to make attributions and interpret everyday challenges in academic settings (Molden & Dweck, 2006; Yeager & Dweck, 2012). Students with fixed mindsets (entity theorists) assert that intellectual abilities are innate and cannot be changed. Students with growth mindsets (incremental theorists) believe that effort can improve intellectual abilities (Dweck, 1999, 2006; Yeager & Dweck, 2012 in Zander, 2018). When faced with academic challenges, students with fixed mindsets tend to believe that it is useless to put effort into the learning process once they feel they have reached a limit to their intellectual abilities (Blackwell, Trzesniewski, & Dweck, 2007 in Zander, 2018). Alternatively, students with growth mindsets tend to be optimistic and motivated to learn, as they interpret difficulty as an opportunity to grow and built their intellectual abilities, which may facilitate their academic performance (e.g., Romero, Master, Paunesku, Dweck, & Gross, 2014 in Zander, 2018).

Zander et al. (2018) assert that growth mindsets could positively affect students' willingness to provide academic help to others in their learning environment. For example, while students with growth mindsets might assume that both their own intellectual abilities and those of their peers can be changed through effort, students with fixed mindsets might regard requests for academic support as signals of incompetence. Students with growth mindsets might therefore provide more academic peer support, because they express the optimistic perspective that help seeking is crucial for growing and learning, and encourage help-seekers to use their support to build their competences. Indirect evidence for this argument can be derived from research in organizations: managers were more willing to provide support when growth mindsets beliefs are induced (Heslin & VandeWalle, 2008; Heslin, VandeWalle, & Latham, 2006 in Zander, 2018).

Methods

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design with the intent to describe, quantify, infer, and discover relationships among variables (Chavez, 2020; Inoferio et al., 2024)). In this study, growth mindset is the independent variable while English learning efficacy is the depended variable, with demographic profile affecting the identified variables. Data were interpreted by identifying significant difference and correlation. Through this approach, it established the pedagogical context of growth mindset and English learning efficacy among junior high school students in the said institution. The primary data collected in this study served as the underlying evidence for more in depth assessment and interpretation.

Participants & Sampling

The respondents of this study were junior high school students at Sulu State College – Laboratory High School enrolled during the School Year 2022-2023. Purposive sampling was used to select the participants among Junior High School unit of Sulu State College based on students' availability. The use of purposive sampling in this study was to ensure the representation of gender, age, parent's educational attainment, parent's average monthly income, and grade level. Representatives of one hundred (100) samples were purposively chosen from the Grades 7 to 10. This method allowed researcher to focus on specific demographics relevant to her research for in-depth gathering of insights and thorough exploration of findings (Ceneciro et al., 2023; Chavez & Ceneciro, 2023; Chavez et al., 2023bc).

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher first obtained permission to administer the distribution of questionnaire from the Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, and from the principal of Laboratory High School, of Sulu State University. Upon granting of approval, the researcher proceeded to launching and distribution, as well as retrieval of the questionnaire. Throughout the administration of the survey, ethical norms were upheld, giving priority to impartiality, student safety, and result confidentiality.

Statistical Analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistical tools were appropriately adopted in the treatment of data to be gathered for this study. To determine the significant difference in the level of growth mindset, level of students learning efficacy, t-test for independent samples was adopted when data are grouped according to gender; and One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to determine the significant differences when data are grouped according to age, parent's average monthly income, parent's educational attainment, and year level. To determine the significant correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under growth mindset and Students' English language learning efficacy in research problem number six, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r) was employed.

The following rating scales intervals were adopted in the analyses of the results of the computations to be obtained through the use of both descriptive and inferential statistical tools:

Rating Scales Interval on respondents' level of growth mindset based on modified 4-point Likert's Scale:

Point	Scale Value	Descriptors
4	3.50-4.00	Strongly Agree
3	2.50- 3.49	Agree
2	1.50- 2.49	Disagree
1	1.00- 1.49	Strongly Disagree

B) Rating Scales Interval on respondents' level of students' English language learning efficacy based on 5-point Likert's Scale:

Point	Scale Value	Descriptors
5	4.50-5.00	I am able to do this well (L-5)
4	3.50-4.49	I am basically and in principle able to do this (L-4)
3	2.50- 3.49	I am possibly able to do this (L-3)
2	1.50- 2.49	I am possibly unable to do this (L-2)

1	1.00- 1.49	I am unable to do this (L-1)

Results

Based on the procedural scoring and statistical treatments of data gathered for this study, the following are the presentations, analyses and interpretations of results which correspond to each of the research questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of junior high school students at Sulu State in terms of:

1.1 On Gender

Table 1.1 In this study, female students are far higher in number than male students. This result implies that at SCC-Laboratory high school, female students constitute the majority number than their male counterpart for the school year 2023-2024.

Gender	Number of Students	Percent
Male	25	25.0%
Female	75	75.0%
Total	100	100%

1.2 On Age

Table 1.2 In this study, great majority students at SSC-Laboratory high school for School Year 2023-2024 are within the age range of 20 years old & below.

Age	Number of Students	Percent
20 years old & below	79	79.0%
21-22 years old	21	21.0%
23 years old & above	0	0%
Total	100	100%

1.3 On Parents' Educational Attainment

Table 1.3 In this study, nearly three-fourth of the parents of students at SSC-Laboratory high school have college level of education. This result implies that most of these students have greater possibilities of availing academic support from their parents in terms of knowledge and technical skills.

Parent's Educational Attainment	Number of Students	Percent
Elementary	2	2.0%
High School	13	13.0%
College	64	64.0%
Master's	20	20.0%
Doctorate	1	1.0%
Total	100	100%

1.4 On Parents' Average Monthly Income

Table 1.4 Students of SSC-Laboratory high school who were involved in this study are children of families whose income within the lowest bracket. This result implies that most of these students could hardly benefit from sufficient financial support for their educational needs due to their parents' meager income.

Parent's Average Monthly Income	Number of Students	Percent
10,000 & below	52	52.0%
10,001 to 20,000	24	24.0%
20,001 to 30,000	15	15.0%
30,001 & above	9	9.0%
Total	100	100%

1.5 On Grade Level

Table 1.5 In this study, students of SSC-Laboratory high school are equally represented in terms of grade level.

Parent's Average Monthly Income	Number of Students	Percent
Grade 7	25	25.0%

Grade 8	25	25.0%
Grade 9	25	25.0%
Grade 10	25	25.0%
Total	100	100%

2. *What is the level of Growth Mindset of junior high school students at Sulu State College?*
Table 2. Under this category, students' assessment has total weighted mean score of 3.4156 with standard deviation of .35896 which is rated as Agree or with Moderate Level. This result indicates that student-respondents have moderate beliefs about their own intelligence which allows them to embrace and overcome difficulties in learning English language.

Statements		Mean	S.D.	Rating
1	No matter how much intelligence I have, I can always change it quite a bit.	3.3300	.56951	Moderate
2	I can always substantially change how intelligent I am.	3.2600	.61332	Moderate
3	I can always change basic things about the kind of person I am.	3.4500	.60927	Moderate
4	Music talent can be learned by anyone.	3.3900	.73711	Moderate
5	The harder I work at something, the better I will be at it.	3.7000	.59459	High
6	No matter what kind of person I am, I can always change substantially.	3.3300	.60394	Moderate
7	All human beings without a brain injury or birth defect are capable of the same amount of learning.	3.0700	.86754	Moderate
8	Human beings are basically good, but sometimes make inappropriate decisions	3.5900	.55222	High
9	An important reason why I do my school work is that I like to learn new things.	3.6200	.61595	High
Total Weighted Mean		3.4156	.35896	Moderate

Legend: (1) 1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree (Very Low); (2) 1.50 – 2.49=Disagree (Low);
(3) 2.50 – 3.49= Agree (Moderate); (4) 3.50 – 4.00=Strongly Agree (High)

3. What is the level of English language learning efficacy of junior high school students at Sulu State College in terms of:
3.1 On Self-Efficacy for Listening

Table 3.1 Under this category, students' assessment has total weighted mean score of 4.4825 with standard deviation of .55987 which is rated as I am basically and in principle able to do this or with High Level. This result indicates that student-respondents involved in this study that junior high school students have high level of belief that they have the capability to succeed in learning English through listening skills.

Statements		Mean	S.D.	Rating
1	I can understand stories told in English.	4.4100	.79258	High
2	I can understand American TV programs (in English).	4.4500	.71598	Very High
3	I can understand radio programs in English-speaking countries.	4.2800	.79239	High
4	I can understand English-language TV programs made in Philippines.	4.6700	.68246	High
5	I can understand English dialogs (audio recordings) about everyday school matters.	4.3700	.81222	High
6	I can understand English films without subtitles.	4.4000	.82878	High
7	I can understand English songs.	4.7400	.62957	Very High
8	I can understand telephone numbers spoken in English.	4.5400	.82168	Very High

Total Weighted Mean		4.4825	.55987	High

Legend: (5) 4.50-5.0 = I am able to do this well (Very High); (4) 3.50-4.49 = I am basically and in principle able to do this (High); (3) 2.50-3.49 = I am possibly able to do this (Moderate); (2) 1.50-2.49 = I am possibly unable to do this (Low); (1) 1.00-1.49 = I am unable to do this (Very Low)

3.2 On Self-Efficacy for Speaking

Table 3.2 Under this category, students' assessment has total weighted mean score of 4.3838 with standard deviation of .59413 which is rated as I am basically and in principle able to do this or with High Level. This result indicates that student-respondents involved in this study believe in their capability to succeed in learning English through speaking skills.

Statements		Mean	S.D.	Rating
1	I can describe my school to other people in English.	4.2400	.88899	High
2	I can describe the way to my school from the place where I live in English?	4.2700	.93046	High
3	I can tell a story in English.	4.4700	.77140	Very High
4	I can ask my teacher questions in English.	4.4000	.69631	High
5	I can introduce my teacher (to someone else) in English.	4.5600	.72919	Very High
6	I can discuss subjects of general interest with your fellow students (in English).	4.2000	.84087	High
7	I can answer my teacher's questions in English.	4.2300	.76350	High
8	I can introduce myself in English.	4.7000	.61134	Very High
Total Weighted Mean		4.3838	.59413	High

Legend: (5) 4.50-5.0 = I am able to do this well (Very High); (4) 3.50-4.49 = I am basically and in principle able to do this (High); (3) 2.50-3.49 = I am possibly able to do this (Moderate); (2) 1.50-2.49 = I am possibly unable to do this (Low); (1) 1.00-1.49 = I am unable to do this (Very Low)

3.3 On Self-Efficacy for Reading

Table 3.3 Under this category, students' assessment has total weighted mean score of 4.4138 with standard deviation of .54114 which is rated as I am basically and in principle able to do this or with High Level. This result indicates that student-respondents involved in this study believe in their capability to succeed in learning English through reading skills.

Statements		Mean	S.D.	Rating
1	I can do homework/home assignments alone when they include reading English texts.	4.6600	.53598	Very High
2	I can guess the meaning of unknown words when I am reading an English text.	3.8400	.84948	High
3	I can understand messages or news items in English on the internet.	4.5200	.70324	Very High
4	I can read short English narratives.	4.4800	.67390	Very High
5	I can read English-language newspapers.	4.6500	.65713	Very High
6	I can find out the meanings of new words using an English dictionary.	4.6200	.77564	Very High
7	I can understand English articles on Filipino culture.	4.4500	.70173	Very High
8	I can understand new reading materials (e.g., news from the Time magazine) selected by my instructor.	4.0900	.82993	High
Total Weighted Mean		4.4138	.54114	High

Legend: (5) 4.50-5.0 = I am able to do this well (Very High); (4) 3.50-4.49 = I am basically and in principle able to do this (High); (3) 2.50-3.49 = I am possibly able to do this (Moderate); (2) 1.50-2.49 = I am possibly unable to do this (Low); (1) 1.00-1.49 = I am unable to do this (Very Low)

3.4 On Self-Efficacy for Writing

Table 3.4 Under this category, students' assessment has total weighted mean score of 4.3562 with standard deviation of .61015 which is rated as I am basically and in principle able to do this or with High Level. This result indicates that student-respondents involved in this study believe in their capability to succeed in learning English through writing skills.

Statements		Mean	S.D.	Rating
1	I can compose messages in English on the internet (face book, twitter, blogs, etc.).	4.5300	.62692	Very High
2	I can write a text in English.	4.6400	.61167	Very High
3	I can leave a note for another student in English.	4.4600	.73057	Very High
4	I can form new sentences from words I have just learned.	4.3100	.86100	High
5	I can write e-mails in English.	4.3200	.85138	High
6	I can produce English sentences with idiomatic phrases.	4.2000	.82878	High
7	I can write diary entries in English.	4.3700	.81222	High
8	I can write an essay in about two pages about my teacher in English.	4.0200	.94259	High
Total Weighted Mean		4.3562	.61015	High

Legend: (5) 4.50-5.0 = I am able to do this well (Very High); (4) 3.50-4.49 = I am basically and in principle able to do this (High); (3) 2.50-3.49 = I am possibly able to do this (Moderate); (2) 1.50-2.49 = I am possibly unable to do this (Low); (1) 1.00-1.49 = I am unable to do this (Very Low)

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of Growth Mindset of junior high school students at Sulu State College when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of:

4.1 By Gender

Table 4.1 This table shows the mean difference of .08000 with *t*-value of .965 and *p*-value of .337 of growth mindset is not significant difference at alpha .05. This means that male and female student-respondents do not differ in their perceptions in the ways how they assessed the level of their growth mindset. This finding implies that being a male student-respondent may not necessarily put him in vantage point towards assessing the level of growth mindset than his female counterpart, or vice versa.

VARIABLES Grouping		Mean	S. D.	Mean Difference	t	Sig.	Description
Growth Mindset	Male	3.4756	.33567	.08000	.965	.337	Not Significant
	Female	3.3956	.36635				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

4.2 By Age

Table 4.2 This table shows the value of F-ratio=10.347 with *P*-value=.002 of growth mindset is significant difference at alpha .05. This means that despite that student-respondents vary in age range, yet they differ in their perceptions towards the assessment of their own growth mindset. This result implies that being a younger in age or 20 years old & below may put a student in vantage point towards perceiving the level of growth mindset than those who are older in age or 21-22 and 23 years old & above, or vice versa.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Growth Mindset	Between Groups	1.218	1	1.218	10.347	.002	Significant
	Within Groups	11.538	98	.118			
	Total	12.756	99				

*Significant alpha .05

4.3 By Parent's Educational Attainment

Table 4.3 This table shows that the value of F-ratio=1.548 with P-value=.195 of growth mindset is not significant difference at alpha .05. This means that although the student-respondents vary in the level of their parent's education, yet they do not differ in their perceptions towards the assessment of their own

growth mindset. This result implies that being a student-respondent who comes from parents with master's or doctorate degree may not necessarily put him/her in vantage point towards perceiving the level of growth mindset than those who come from parents with elementary, high, and college level of education, or vice versa.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Growth Mindset	Between Groups	.780	4	.195	1.548	.195	Significant
	Within Groups	11.976	95	.126			
	Total	12.756	99				

*Significant alpha .05

4.4 By Parent's Average Monthly Family Income

Table 4.4 This table shows the value of F-ratio=3.291 with P-value=.024 of growth mindset is indeed significant difference at alpha .05. This means that despite the student-respondents vary in the range of their parent's average monthly family income, yet they indeed differ in their perceptions towards the assessment of their own growth mindset. This result implies that being a student-respondent whose parents with average monthly family income of 10,000 & below may probably put him/her in vantage point towards perceiving the level of growth mindset than those students whose parents with 10,001–20,000; 20,001–30,000 and 30,001 & above of average monthly family income, or vice versa.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Growth Mindset	Between Groups	1.190	3	.397	3.291	.024	Significant
	Within Groups	11.566	96	.120			
	Total	12.756	99				

*Significant alpha .05

4.5 By Grade Level

Table 4.5 This table shows the value of F-ratio=9.227 with P-value=.000 of growth mindset is indeed significant difference at alpha .05. This means that despite the student-respondents vary in the grade level, yet they indeed differ in their perceptions towards the assessment of their own growth mindset.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Growth Mindset	Between Groups	2.855	3	.952	9.227	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	9.901	96	.103			
	Total	12.756	99				

*Significant alpha .05

5. Is there a significant difference in the level of English language learning efficacy of junior high school students at Sulu State College when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of:

5.1 By Gender

Table 5.1 This table shows that the mean differences, t-values and probability values of all the sub-categories subsumed under the level of English language learning efficacy are not significant at alpha .05. This means that male and female student-respondents although vary in their in gender, yet they do not differ in their assessment of their self-efficacy for listening towards learning English as a foreign language.

VARIABLES Grouping		Mean	S. D.	Mean Difference	t	Sig.	Description
Self-Efficacy for Listening	Male	4.3900	.50816	-.12333	-.953	.343	Not Significant
	Female	4.5133	.57597				
Self-Efficacy for Speaking	Male	4.2600	.69496	-.16500	-1.205	.231	Not Significant
	Female	4.4250	.55561				
	Male	4.4100	.51856	-.00500	-.040	.968	Not Significant

Self-Efficacy for Reading	Female	4.4150	.55185				
Self-Efficacy for Writing	Male	4.2700	.66014	-.11500	-.815	.417	Not Significant
	Female	4.3850	.59444				

*Significant at alpha 0.05

5.2 By Age

Table 5.2 This table shows that the F-values and probability values of all the sub-categories subsumed under the level of English language learning efficacy are not significant at alpha .05. This means that male and female student-respondents although vary in their in age bracket, yet they do not differ in their assessment of their self-efficacy for speaking towards learning English as a foreign language.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Self-efficacy for Listening	Between Groups	.210	1	.210	.668	.416	Not Significant
	Within Groups	30.822	98	.315			
	Total	31.032	99				
Self-efficacy for Speaking	Between Groups	.521	1	.521	1.485	.226	Not Significant
	Within Groups	34.424	98	.351			
	Total	34.945	99				
Self-efficacy for Reading	Between Groups	.661	1	.661	2.286	.134	Not Significant
	Within Groups	28.330	98	.289			
	Total	28.990	99				
Self-efficacy for Writing	Between Groups	1.231	1	1.231	3.386	.069	Not Significant
	Within Groups	35.625	98	.364			
	Total	36.855	99				

*Significant alpha .05

5.3 By Parent's Educational Attainment

Table 5.3 Results of this table show that, except for "Self-efficacy for Writing", the F-values and probability values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the level of English language learning efficacy are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, generally student-respondents although vary in their parent's educational attainment, yet they do not differ in their assessment of their self-efficacy for speaking towards learning English as a foreign language.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Self-efficacy for Listening	Between Groups	.384	4	.096	.298	.879	Not Significant
	Within Groups	30.648	95	.323			
	Total	31.032	99				
Self-efficacy for Speaking	Between Groups	2.708	4	.677	1.995	.102	Not Significant
	Within Groups	32.238	95	.339			
	Total	34.945	99				
Self-efficacy for Reading	Between Groups	2.050	4	.513	1.807	.134	Not Significant
	Within Groups	26.940	95	.284			
	Total	28.990	99				
Self-efficacy for Writing	Between Groups	3.740	4	.935	2.682*	.036	Significant
	Within Groups	33.116	95	.349			
	Total	36.855	99				

*Significant alpha .05

5.4 By Parent's Average Monthly Family Income

Table 5.4 shows the difference in the level of English language learning efficacy of junior high school students at Sulu State College when data are categorized according to students' demographic profiles in terms of parent's average monthly family income. It can be gleaned from this table that, except for "Self-efficacy for Reading", the F-values and probability values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the level of English language learning efficacy are not significant at alpha .05. This means that, generally student-respondents although vary in their parent's average monthly family income, yet they do not differ in their assessment of their self-efficacy for reading towards learning English as a foreign language.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Self-efficacy for Listening	Between Groups	1.477	3	.492	1.599	.195	Not Significant
	Within Groups	29.555	96	.308			
	Total	31.032	99				
Self-efficacy for Speaking	Between Groups	1.906	3	.635	1.846	.144	Not Significant
	Within Groups	33.040	96	.344			
	Total	34.945	99				
Self-efficacy for Reading	Between Groups	2.419	3	.806	2.913*	.038	Significant
	Within Groups	26.571	96	.277			
	Total	28.990	99				
Self-efficacy for Writing	Between Groups	2.544	3	.848	2.373	.075	Not Significant
	Within Groups	34.311	96	.357			
	Total	36.855	99				

*Significant alpha .05

5.5 By Grade Level

Table 5.5 This table shows that except for "Self-efficacy for Listening", the F-values and probability values of all other sub-categories subsumed under the level of English language learning efficacy are indeed significant at alpha .05. This means that, despite that student-respondents vary in their grade level, generally they indeed differ in their assessment of their self-efficacy for reading towards learning English as a foreign language.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Self-efficacy for Listening	Between Groups	2.391	3	.797	2.671	.052	Not Significant
	Within Groups	28.641	96	.298			
	Total	31.032	99				
Self-efficacy for Speaking	Between Groups	6.574	3	2.191	7.415*	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	28.371	96	.296			
	Total	34.945	99				
Self-efficacy for Reading	Between Groups	3.324	3	1.108	4.145*	.008	Significant
	Within Groups	25.666	96	.267			
	Total	28.990	99				
Self-efficacy for Writing	Between Groups	6.352	3	2.117	6.663*	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	30.504	96	.318			

	Total	36.855	99				

*Significant alpha .05
* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

6. Is there a significant correlation between Growth Mindset and English language learning efficacy of junior high school students at Sulu State College–Laboratory High School?

Table 6. Specifically, the degrees of correlations between student's English academic achievement and English teachers' feedback are as follows:

1) Low positive correlation between students' Growth Mindset and Self-efficacy for Listening;
2) Moderate positive correlation between students' Growth Mindset and Self-efficacy for Speaking;
3) Moderate positive correlation between students' Growth Mindset and Self-efficacy for Reading; and
4) Moderate positive correlation between students' Growth Mindset and Self-efficacy for Writing.

These results indicate that the junior high school students at Sulu State College- Laboratory High School who perceived the level of Growth Mindset as Moderate Level are most probably the same group of junior high school students who assessed the English Language Learning efficacy with High Level, respectively. Meanwhile, it is safe to say that, generally the level of students' growth mindset is moderately correlated with students' English language learning efficacy towards learning English as a foreign language.

Variables					
Dependent	Independent	Pearson *r*	Sig	N	Description
English Language Learning Efficacy	Self-efficacy for Listening	.273**	.006	100	Low
	Self-efficacy for Speaking	.374**	.000	100	Moderate
	Self-efficacy for Reading	.368**	.000	100	Moderate
	Self-efficacy for Writing	.334**	.000	100	Moderate

*Correlation Coefficient is significant at alpha .05
Correlation Coefficient Scales Adopted from Hopkins, Will (2002):
0.0-0.1=Nearly Zero; 0.1-0.30=Low; .3-0.5 0=Moderate; .5-0.7-0=High; .7-0.9= Very High; 0.9-1=Nearly Perfect

Conclusion

The following are the conclusions made based of the findings of this study:

1) Students involved in this study are sufficiently represented in terms of gender, age, parent's educational attainment, parent's average monthly income, and grade level.
2) On the average, students moderately believe that their own intelligence allows them to embrace and overcome difficulties in learning English language.
3) On the average, students have high ability and efficacy in learning English language through self-efficacy in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
4) Generally, students' demographic profiles in terms of Age, Average Monthly Family Income, and Grade Level do significantly mediate in ways how they assessed the Growth Mindset.
5) Generally, students' demographic profiles do not significantly mediate in ways how they assessed English language learning efficacy.
6) The junior high school students at Sulu State College-Laboratory High School who assessed the level of Growth Mindset as Moderate Level are most probably the same group of junior high school students who assessed the English Language Learning efficacy with High Level, respectively.
7) This study seems to support Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive Framework which espouses that the triadic interaction between personal, behavioral and environmental factors is central to the social cognitive theory. Accordingly, human beings have cognitive abilities to self-organize, self-reflect, and self-regulate according to the changes in the environment and determine their own social destiny. In order to do so, people have to be proactive in their development and make things happen through their own efforts

References

Aquino, Aleejah Caitlin (2016). Demotivating Factors in Learning the English Language. Presented at the DLSU Research Congress 2016 De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines March 7- 9, 2016

Azam Md. Golam (2012). Factors Affecting Students' English Achievement at Secondary Level in Bangladesh: The Comparative Study of Narayanganj and Bhola Sadar Upazilla. Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation Hiroshima University September 2012.

Bandura, A., & Banfield, J. (1991). The impact of conceptions of ability on selfregulatory factors and motor skills acquisition. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 8(3), 213-226.

Ceneciro, C. C., Estoque, M. R., & Chavez, J. V. (2023). Analysis of debate skills to the learners' confidence and anxiety in the use of the English language in academic engagements. *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture*, *33*, 4544-4569.

Chavez, J. V., Alberto, J., & Adalia, H. (2023a). Parental support strategies and motivation in aiding their children learn the English language. In *Forum for Linguistic Studies, 5(2).*

Chavez, J. V. (2021). Bilingual parents' dispositions: Precursor to developing the English language teaching curriculum. *Psychology and Education*, *58*(5), 161-166.

Emily Rhew, Jody S. Piro, Pauline Goolkasian & Patricia Cosentino (2018). The effects of a growth mindset on self-efficacy and motivation, Cogent Education, 5:1, 1492337, DOI: 10.1080/2331186X.2018.1492337. To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1492337

Esther Martinez Piñeiro (2002). Oral Communicative Competence in English Language at the Complexion of Compulsory Education. Level of Achievement an Conception of Galician Community Students. CAUCE, Revista de Filología y su Didáctica, n" 25, 2002 / págs. 533.561.

Genç et al. (2016). Exploring EFL Learners' Perceived Self-efficacy and Beliefs on English Language Learning. Australian Journal of Teacher Education; Volume 41, Issue 2 Article 4.

Geske, Andrejs and Ozola, Antra (2008). Factors Influencing Reading Literacy at the Primary School Level. OF EDUCATION IN THE 21st CENTURY; Volume 6, 2008.

Hafiz Muhammad Waqas Rafiq et al. (2013). Parental Involvement and Academic Achievement; A Study on Secondary School Students of Lahore, Pakistan. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. Vol. 3 No. 8 [Special Issue – April 2013].

Khajavy, MacIntyre and Hariri (2020). Grit and Mindset in Language Learning: A Closer Look at Grit and Language Mindset as Predictors of Foreign Language Achievement. Studies in Second Language Acquisition; Volume 42, Number 2, May 2020. Cambridge University Press. Jourden.

Kammins, M.L., & Dweck, C.S. (1999). Person versus process praise and criticism: Implications for contingent self-worth and coping. Developmental Psychology, 35(3), 835-847.

Kohn, A. (2015, August 16). The "mindset" mindset: What we miss by focusing on kids' attitudes. Retrieved from www.alfiekohn.org/article/mindset.

Komarraju, M., & Nadler, D. (2013). Self-efficacy and academic achievement: Why do implicit beliefs, goals, and effort regulation matter? Learning and Individual Differences, 25, 67-72.

Kuusisto, E., Laine, S., & Tirri, K. (2017). How do school children and adolescents perceive the nature of talent development? A case study from Finland. Education Research International, 2017, 1-8.

Lucas, Rochelle Irene et al. (2011). English Language Learning Anxiety among Foreign Language Learners in the Philippines. Philippine ESL Journal, Vol. 7, July 2011.

Farooq, M.S. et al. (2011). Factors Affecting Students' Quality of Academic Performance: A Case of Secondary School Level. Journal of Quality and Technology Management Volume VII, Issue II, December, 2011, Page 01 - 14.

Mahbubur Rahman, Mohammad (2014). Exploratory Study into Factors Affecting Achievement in English among Bangladeshi College Students: An Investigation of Teachers and Students Perceptions. Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:6 June 2014.

Noemi Mangaoang – Boado (2013). Factors Influencing the Academic Performance in Physics of DMMMSU - MLUC Laboratory High School Fourth Year Students S.Y. 2011 – 2012. E – International Scientific Researc h Journal, VOLUME – V, ISSUE – 2 , 2013, ISSN 2094 - 1749.

Paunesku, Walton, Romero, Smith, Yeager, and Dweck (2015). Mind-Set Interventions Are a Scalable Treatment for Academic Underachievement. Psychological Science OnlineFirst, published on April 10, 2015 as doi:10.1177/0956797615571017

P. M. Arsad, N. Buniyamin, J. Ab. Manan (2014). Students' English language proficiency and its impact on the overall student's academic performance: An analysis and prediction using Neural Network Model. WSEAS TRANSACTIONS on ADVANCES in ENGINEERING EDUCATION.

Raoofi, Saeid et al. (2012). Self-efficacy in Second/Foreign Language Learning Contexts. English Language Teaching; Vol. 5, No. 11; 2012, ISSN 1916-4742 E-ISSN 1916-4750, Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education.

Sisk, Burgoyne, Sun, Butler, and Macnamara (2018). To What Extent and Under Which Circumstances Are Growth Mind-Sets Important to Academic Achievement? Two Meta-Analyses. Psychological Science; 2018, Vol. 29(4) 549–571. © The Author(s) 2018. Reprints and permissions: sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav. DOI: 10.1177/0956797617739704. www.psychologicalscience.org/PS

Teimouri, Plonsky and Tabandeh (2022). L2 grit: Passion and perseverance for second language learning. Language Teaching Research, 2022, Vol. 26(5) 893–918. © The Author(s) 2020. Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions. DOI: 10.1177/1362168820921895. journals.sagepub.com/home/ltr

Victor Mlambo (2011). An analysis of some factors affecting student academic performance in an introductory biochemistry course at the University of the West Indies. Caribbean Teaching Scholar Vol. 1, No. 2, November 2011, 79–92.

Wang et al. (2013). Examining measurement properties of an English Self-Efficacy scale for English language learners in Korea. International Journal of Educational Research 59 (2013) 24–34.

Wenglinsky, Harold (2011). Teacher Classroom Practices and Student Performance: How Schools Can Make a Difference. RESEARCH REPORT September 2001 RR-01-19.

Westa, Buckleyb, Krachmanb, and Bookman (2018). Development and implementation of student social-emotional surveys in the CORE Districts. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology 55 (2018) 119–129

Zander, L., Brouwer, J., Jansen, E., Crayen, C., & Hannover, B. (2018). Academic self-efficacy, growth mindsets, and university students' integration in academic and social support networks. Learning and Individual Differences, 62, 98-107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.01.012